IV. Points for discussion

1. What are the views of AEG members concerning the three alternatives considered by the TG-RT for the treatment of the fees associated to securities lending and reversible gold transactions, namely:
   (i) Treatment as investment (property) income;
   (ii) Treatment as financial service;
   (iii) Blended approach whereby it would be treated as financial services if the “lender” were a financial intermediary, and as investment (property) income in all other cases.

   The IMF Committee on Balance of Payments Statistics decided that the fee on securities lending should be treated as property income.

   The Committee decided that the fee on gold lending should be treated as a service if the gold were lent from allocated gold, and as property income if lent from a financial asset (unallocated gold or monetary gold).

   The Committee also noted that the payment of the fee may be made to the custodian. This payment represents a short-circuiting of the payment of the property income to the security owner, who would pay the custodian for the provision of a financial service. The Committee asked the IMF and the OECD to do further work to determine which type of service (financial intermediation or other financial services).

2. If treated as investment (property) income, under which category should securities and gold lending fees be included—interest, dividends, or some other category?