

**4DIRECT INVESTMENT TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP (DITEG)**

**OUTCOME PAPER (DITEG) # 16**

**FEBRUARY 9, 2005**

(1) Topic: **Use of maturity and instrument split for direct investment**

(2) Issues – see DITEG Issues Papers #16

(3) Recommendations:

(i) There was no consensus on this issue. Some members favored the maximum instrument detail, without expressing much interest in a maturity split; others had the reverse view, emphasizing maturity over instrument; some favored both maturity and instrument split; some felt the detail for both maturity and instrument split should be part of the standard components; others felt that the detail for both maturity and instrument should be supplementary. Some saw original maturity split as being more useful; others felt it was only residual maturity that mattered. No one who spoke supported the status quo.

(ii) Some members expressed concerns about the practicality of all the possible permutations.

(4) Rejected Alternatives:

None

(5) Questions for the Committee and the WIIS:

*(i) Do the Committee and the WIIS wish to adopt:*

*a) an instrument split for direct investment that is consistent with the SNA instrument breakdown?*

*b) a maturity split?*

*(ii) If yes to both (i) a) and (i) b), which should take precedence in priority?*

*(iii) If yes to both (i) a) and (i) b), should they both, either, or neither be standard components?*