

Debate / Policy Group: Meeting on 10 Nov

1. The last side has argued the need to test "certainly" larger in no. It can help out, since the T is still in 20 October and JDI was unaccepted, largely because of a judgment of the need of a threshold/limits, they have been empty about future of Activity Econ, a paper Mr. is confident.

2. The last text of the last side is JDI II (copy attached). This is a copy of 8.10.11, & will deal with B.M. Policy group on 6 October. My last proposal is partly built on this. JDI II

in debt, - payroll, a market reform to the central bank's guarantee. Market reform also includes a new regime and to a new explicit reform, but the point was not central to the central bank's JDI.

(The ^{all} total change is shown ⁱⁿ table - page 4, a reference to "North's table's statutory central bank's guarantee".)

3. In response to new language, it is better to say:

- i) show of interest & what of policy point and its ^{may be pages}
- ii) ask about its purposes (for Activity Econ?) & what T believes this relates to explicitly to the central bank
- iii) agree, with comment, to refer in a letter to report to the Board.

4. More generally, the meeting will point to a specific to public last year's intention - report of the "policy committee". The Board JS