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EIBIS 2016 – COUNTRY OVERVIEW

Hungary

The annual EIB Group Survey on Investment and Investment Finance (EIBIS) is an EU-wide survey of 12,500 firms that gathers quantitative information on investment activities by both SMEs and larger corporates, their financing requirements and the difficulties they face.

As the EU bank, the EIB Group responds to the need to accelerate investment to strengthen job creation and long-term competitiveness and sustainability across all 28 EU member States. EIBIS helps the EIB to contribute to a policy response that properly addresses the needs of businesses, promoting investment.

This country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 476 firms in Hungary in 2016 (July-October). Note: The results are weighted by value-added, reflecting firms’ contribution to the economy.

Key results

Investment outlook: The share of firms that invested last year (75%) is lower than the EU average. However, in line with the EU average, 36% of firms in Hungary expect their investment in the current financial year to increase compared to the previous year.

Investment activity: Machinery and equipment takes up a majority share of investment activity. At 56%, this is higher than the EU average. At the same time, firms’ investment in R&D is well below the EU average, and also the lowest within the Visegrad 4 group.

Investment gap: A clear majority of firms in Hungary (71%) report their investment over the last three years to have been the right amount. However, 22% say they invested too little in the last three years, which exceeds the EU average of 15%. The share of machinery and equipment described by firms in Hungary as being state-of-the-art is higher than the EU average, while the share of firms’ building stock that is considered to meet high energy efficiency standards is similar to the EU average.

Investment barriers: In line with firms across the EU as a whole, the political and regulatory climate is perceived to be the main short-term barrier to carrying out investment. Firms consider uncertainty about the future and availability of skilled staff as the most significant barriers to investment over the longer-term.

External finance: The share of firms in Hungary considering themselves to be finance-constrained is 13%, which is higher than the EU average of 5%. Overall firms in Hungary want more of the type of external finance they are already using, in particular bank loans.

Firm performance: Employment dynamics are more positive than the EU average. Relative to the EU average, firms in Hungary were more likely to increase, and less likely to decrease, their number of employees over the last three years.
Overall 75% of firms in Hungary invested in the last financial year, significantly lower than the EU average of 84%.

As many as four in five large firms in Hungary (80%) invested in the last financial year.

The intensity of investment (investment per employee) is well below the EU average, and is lowest in the service sector.

---

### Investment activity in last financial year compared to previous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Share of firms investing (%)</th>
<th>Investment intensity of investing firms (EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>[chart showing intensity per employee]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The blue bars indicate the proportion of firms who have invested in the last financial year. A firm is considered to have invested if it spent more than EUR 500 per employee on investment activities. Investment intensity is the median investment per employee of investing firms.*

### Investment activity in last financial year

Out of all firms in Hungary that invested in 2015, 31% increased their investment in 2015, 45% invested the same as in 2014, while only 23% reduced investment. This is broadly in line with the EU as a whole.

The net balance (the % of firms increasing investment minus the % of firms reducing investment) is positive for all sectors and firm sizes.
In line with the EU average, 36% of firms in Hungary expect their investment in the current financial year to increase compared to 2015.

Firms in the manufacturing sector are the most optimistic about their investment plans in 2016 as compared to 2015.

However, more construction firms expect to reduce investment activity in 2016 than to increase investment activity in 2016 (by 36% to 24%).

**Investment cycle**

Within the investment cycle, the bulk of firms in Hungary are in the ‘low investment; expanding’ quadrant.

Large companies are closest to the ‘high investment; expanding’ quadrant.

Data is derived from two questions: firms who had invested in the last financial year were asked if they expect to invest more, around the same amount or less than last year; firms who had not invested in the last financial year were asked if they had already invested, or expect to invest in the current year.
INVESTMENT ACTIVITY

- Relative to the EU average, companies in Hungary invest a higher share of their investment spend into tangible assets – machinery and equipment in particular - as opposed to intangibles.

- The share of investment into R&D, reported by firms in Hungary is significantly below the EU level, and it is also the lowest within the Visegrad 4.

- While the share of R&D is the highest in the manufacturing sector, it is still low compared to CEE peers.

Investment abroad

- Overall four per cent of firms in Hungary have invested in another country in 2015, significantly below the EU average of 12%.

Base: All firms who invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. In the last financial year, how much did your business invest in each of the following with the intention of maintaining or increasing your company’s future earnings?

Base: All firms who invested in the last financial year
Q. In the last financial year, has your company invested in another country?
In line with the EU average of 53%, a majority of investment in Hungary last year (56%) went into replacing existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT. The next highest share of investment in Hungary (26%) was spent on capacity expansion, and 16% went on developing new products and services.

Manufacturing firms allocated a higher than average share of investment for capacity expansion and product development purposes.

Looking ahead, 95% of firms in Hungary are planning to invest in the next three years, which is above the weighted EU average of 91%.

As for investment priorities, only 16% of firms in Hungary say their priority will be new product development, which is significantly below the weighted EU average, and also lower than the corresponding values for Poland (32%) and the Czech Republic (27%).
The share of firms in Hungary that consider themselves to have invested too little in the last three years is 22%, which exceeds the EU average of 15%.

The perceived investment gap is less pronounced in the manufacturing sector, while it is highest in the construction industry.

Around half of firms in Hungary (53%) report operating at or above full capacity in the last year – this is close to the EU average of 51%.

Firms in the construction sector in Hungary are more likely than average to operate at or above full capacity, which is consistent with the fact that the same sector reported the highest perceived investment gap.
The average share of machinery and equipment owned by firms in Hungary that is described as being state-of-the-art is higher than across the EU as a whole (56% versus 44%).

The share of equipment perceived as being state-of-the-art is highest in the infrastructure sector (at 62%), which is possibly related to significant inflow of EU structural funds to the sector.

Firms in Hungary consider an average of 41% of their building stock meets high energy efficiency standards, which is in line with the EU average of 40%.

The average share of commercial building stock considered to meet high energy efficiency standards is highest among large companies in Hungary (at 46%).
In line with firms across the EU in general, companies in Hungary cite the political and regulatory climate as the main barrier to implementing planned investment in the current financial year.

**Short term influences on investment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hungary negative net balance</th>
<th>Hungary positive net balance</th>
<th>EU negative net balance</th>
<th>EU positive net balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political and regulatory climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall economic climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business prospects in the sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of external finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of internal finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** All firms who have planned to invest in the current financial year

Q. How do each of the following affect your ability to carry out your planned investment. Does it affect it positively or negatively, or make no difference at all?

*Net balance is the share of firms seeing a positive effect minus the share of firms seeing a negative effect*

Firms that report their investment in the past three years to have been below their needs are less positive than firms that say they have invested sufficiently, notably so on the impact of the overall economic climate and business prospects in their sector in terms of being conducive to the implementation of their planned investment projects.
- Again, not unlike their EU peers, uncertainty about the future and availability of staff with the right skills are considered as the main structural barriers to investment for firms in Hungary over the longer-term.

- Access to digital infrastructure is perceived to be less of a constraint in Hungary than across the EU as a whole.

Long term barriers by investment performance

- The most cited obstacle to investment for firms that say they invested too little in the last three years is uncertainty about the future, whereas for firms that say they invested sufficiently in the last three years the most cited barrier is availability of staff with the right skills.

- For those firms that have invested too little, the second most cited barrier is availability of external finance.

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Hungary, to what extent is each of the following an obstacle? Is a major obstacle, a minor obstacle or not an obstacle at all?

**Base:** All firms who invested too much, about the right amount or too little in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused/company didn’t exist three years ago responses), data shown for firms who said each was a major or minor obstacle

*Caution very small base size less than 30

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Hungary, to what extent is each of the following an obstacle? Is a major obstacle, a minor obstacle or not an obstacle at all?
Firms in Hungary rely more heavily on internal funds to finance their investment, vis-a-vis the EU average.

Bank financing (loans and other, such as overdrafts) is the most popular type of external finance, followed by grants and leasing.

Grants - EU structural funds - play a key role in every sector, in line with the diverse objectives of the operative programmes.

**Type of external finance used for investment activities**

**Source of investment finance**

![Graph showing distribution of investment finance sources in Hungary and EU]

**Satisfaction with external finance**

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels for various aspects of external finance]

**Base:** All firms who invested in the last financial year (excluding don't know/refused responses)

*Caution very small base size less than 30

Q. Approximately what proportion of your external finance does each of the following represent?

Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with ...?
In general, firms in Hungary want more of the type of external finance they are already using. However, the data indicates that some would be willing to switch from overdrafts and leasing towards other sources.

The share of finance-constrained firms in Hungary (13%) is significantly higher than the EU average of 5%.

As many as 17% of SMEs in Hungary consider themselves to be finance-constrained.

Share of finance constrained firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Finance</th>
<th>Share of Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Finance constrained firms include: those dissatisfied with the amount of finance obtained (received less), firms that sought external finance but did not receive it (rejected) and those who did not seek external finance because they thought borrowing costs would be too high (too expensive) or they would be turned down (discouraged).
PROFILE OF FIRMS

Contribution to Value-Added

- Large firms generate 56% of Hungary’s value-added, as opposed to 50% in the EU as a whole, whereas micro/small firms in Hungary play a lesser role.
- The manufacturing sector accounts for nearly half (49%) of the value-added in Hungary.
- Firms in Hungary tend to fall into the lowest (sector specific) productivity class; with some positive outliers in the service sector.
- Firms in Hungary are more likely to have increased their employment levels in the last three years, relative to the EU average.

Base: All firms
The charts reflect the relative contribution to value-added by firms belonging to a particular size class / sector in the population of firms considered. That is, all firms with 5 or more employees active in the sectors covered by the survey. Micro: 5-9 employees; Small: 10-49; Medium: 50-249; Large: 250+.

Employment dynamics in last 3 years

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know, refused and missing responses)
Q. Thinking about the number of people employed by your company, by how much has it changed in the last 3 years?

Distribution of firms by productivity class

Share of firms by productivity class (Total Factor Productivity). Productivity classes are sector specific; they are defined on the basis of the entire EU sample (for a particular sector).
By 2015, real investment in Hungary had almost reached the pre-crisis level.

EU-funded public investment played a key role in this recovery, while private investment is lagging behind.

Investment in machinery has been strong, while construction of dwellings has not yet recovered.

The graph shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation. (in real terms); against the series 'pre-crisis trend. The data has been indexed to equal 100 in 2008. Source: Eurostat.

The graph shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation. (in real terms); by institutional sector. The data has been indexed to equal 100 in 2008. Source: Eurostat.

The graph shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation. (in real terms); by asset class. The data has been indexed to equal 100 in 2008. Source: Eurostat.
The final data are based on a sample, rather than the entire population of firms in Hungary, so the percentage results are subject to sampling tolerances. These vary with the size of the sample and the percentage figure concerned.

### Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>EU vs Country</th>
<th>Manufacturing vs Construction</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
<td>(12483)</td>
<td>(476)</td>
<td>(119)</td>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>(119)</td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>(393)</td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td>(12468 vs 476)</td>
<td>(119 vs 121)</td>
<td>(393 vs 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or 70%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Glossary

**Investment**
A firm is considered to have invested if it spent more than EUR 500 per employee on investment activities with the intention of maintaining or increasing the company’s future earnings.

**Investment cycle**
Based on the expected investment in current financial year compared to last one, and the proportion of firms with a share of investment greater than EUR 500 per employee.

**Productivity**
Total factor productivity is a measure of how efficiently a firm is converting inputs (capital and labor) into output (value-added). It is estimated by means of an industry-by-industry regression analysis (with country dummies).

**Manufacturing sector**
Based on the NACE classification of economic activities, firms in group C (manufacturing).

**Construction sector**
Based on the NACE classification of economic activities, firms in group F (construction).

**Services sector**
Based on the NACE classification of economic activities, firms in group G (wholesale and retail trade) and group I (accommodation and food services activities).

**Infrastructure sector**
Based on the NACE classification of economic activities, firms in groups D and E (utilities), group H (transportation and storage) and group J (information and communication).

**SME**
Firms with between 5 and 249 employees.

**Large firms**
Firms with at least 250 employees.
## Base sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base definition and page reference</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All firms, p. 3, p. 6, p. 7, p. 9, p. 11, p. 12, p. 13</td>
<td>12483</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11838</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding those who have no investment planned/don’t know/refused responses), p. 5</td>
<td>12159</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding ‘Company didn’t exist three years ago’ responses), p. 6</td>
<td>12453</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know, refused and missing responses), p. 13</td>
<td>12162</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who invested in the last financial year, p. 2</td>
<td>12281</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who invested in the last financial year, p. 4</td>
<td>10881</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 4</td>
<td>10060</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 5</td>
<td>9682</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 10</td>
<td>9093</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have planned to invest in the current financial year and who invested too much, about the right amount or too little in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused/company didn’t exist three years ago responses), p. 8</td>
<td>10536</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 10, p. 11</td>
<td>4344</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage rounding

Percentage with value of less than 0.5 but greater than zero has not been displayed in the charts.