and finance "marts" where standard compensatory transactions could be conducted according to well established and regulated procedures (e.g., the Miami's International Currency and Barter Exchange).

Because current CAs must respond to the differing and changing needs of the trading parties, their structures vary according to the countries, products, and expertise involved. Thus, with no precise model available for structuring CAs, the successful implementation of these transactions depends on the ability of exporters to design applications suited to their individual needs.

You noticed that I referred in my remarks to compensatory arrangements (CAs) in trade rather than just to countertrade (CT). As used in our discussion, CAs do not have to be confined solely to linked imports and exports of goods between two parties (i.e., CT), even though CT practices represent today a major portion of CAs with LDCs.

As used here, CAs also refer to, in addition or instead of CT, to any type of asset transfers from the exporter to the importer -- as a condition of purchase -- that result in tangible and desired benefits for the importer (e.g., domestic content, co-production, subcontracting, investments).

Thus, a main goal of CAs is to reduce or eliminate, over a period of time and through varied alternatives, the net outflow of foreign exchange for the importer. I believe that future expansion of CAs will most likely occur within this broader definition rather than solely under CT arrangements, because of :