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About the EIB Investment Survey (EIBIS)
Being able to track changes in investment activities, identify investment needs and understand the constraints that hold investment back, is vital for effective policy making to support growth and job creation across Europe. The annual EIB Group Survey on Investment and Investment Finance (EIBIS) helps address this challenge.

In 2017, the survey consists of two modules. The main Investment Module targets 12,500 SMEs and larger corporates (General Module). The second one, 555 municipalities and their infrastructure investment activities (Add-on Module). EIBIS has been developed and is managed by the Economics Department of the EIB, with support by Ipsos MORI. For more information see: http://www.eib.org/eibis.

About this publication
This report is an overview of the 2017 Add-on module of the EIB Investment Survey. It is intended to provide an accessible snapshot of the data on municipality infrastructure investment activities. For the purpose of this publication, results for country groupings is weighted by the urban population of countries to better reflect size differences. Contact: eibis@eib.org.

About the Economics Department of the EIB
The mission of the EIB Economics Department is to provide economic analyses and studies to support the Bank in its operations and in the definition of its positioning, strategy and policy. The Department, a team of 40 economists, is headed by Debora Revoltella, Director of Economics.

Main contributors to this publication
Philipp-Bastian Brutscher (lead), Rocco Bubbico, Elena Durante, Christopher Hols, Désirée Rückert. The assistance of the Covenant of Mayors is gratefully acknowledged.

Disclaimer
The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the EIB.

About Ipsos Public Affairs
Ipsos Public Affairs works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector, as well as international and supranational organizations. Its c. 200 research staff in London and Brussels focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. This, combined with our methodological and communications expertise, helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.
The Municipality Infrastructure Investment Module of the EIB Investment Survey gathered information from key decision makers at local municipalities on local infrastructure investment activities and needs. This overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 555 municipalities across the EU. Interviews were carried out between May and August 2017. The EU results are weighted by the urban population of each country.

**Key findings**

**Investment Activities:** 42% of municipalities in the EU report an increase in investment activities in their jurisdictions over the last five years, and a rise in their own investment activities.

**Investment Priorities:** 43% of municipalities expect their investment to focus on repair and maintenance in the next 5 years. Modernisation and capacity expansion play a lesser role. In terms of policy priorities, municipalities will focus their investment on making their infrastructure more socially inclusive.

**Investment Gaps:** 33% more municipalities report under-investment in the last 5 years than over-investment, mostly in social housing, urban transport and ICT. The quality of municipal infrastructure is ranked at 3.2 (on a scale from 0 to 5). On balance, more municipalities in the EU are optimistic than sceptical about closing their infrastructure gaps in the next five years.

**Investment Efficiency:** More than half of municipalities in EU carry out independent ex ante assessments of infrastructure project quality, but only 40% both do this and take these assessments into account. In addition, less than half of municipalities coordinate their investment projects with other bodies.

**Drivers and Barriers:** The main barriers to infrastructure investments for EU municipalities are tight budgets and the length of approval process, as well as political and regulatory stability and technical capacity. The aging population is the most important driver of the demographic situation in EU municipalities.

**Finance:** Municipalities in the EU mainly resort to their own resources to finance infrastructure investment activities. External finance represents some 20% of municipalities' investment financing, with Banks and National Promotional Banks (NPBs) providing 80% of such external finance.
42% of municipalities report an ‘increase’ in infrastructure investment activities in their jurisdiction over the last five years. 36% saw infrastructure investment ‘stay the same’. Only 15% report a ‘decrease’ in infrastructure investment over this period.

The share of municipalities reporting an increase in infrastructure investment is highest for the ‘education’, ‘environment’ and ‘ICT’ sectors.

From a regional perspective, municipalities were most likely to report an increase in infrastructure investment in the ‘Baltics’ and ‘Poland’; while the share of municipalities reporting a decrease was highest in ‘Italy’ and ‘Other Southern Europe’.
### PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP

Around 50% of municipalities in the EU consider past investments in infrastructure to have been in line with needs.

One in three municipalities say that their investment activities over the past five years has been below needs. Less than 1% report ‘over provision’ over this period.

The share of municipalities reporting ‘under provision’ is largest for social ‘housing’.

From a cross-country perspective, Italy shows the highest percentage of municipalities reporting ‘under provision’ of investments (around 47%).

#### PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP BY COUNTRY/REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Other Northern Europe</th>
<th>Other Southern Europe</th>
<th>Other Central Europe</th>
<th>South East Europe</th>
<th>Balkics</th>
<th>Benelux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Transport</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base: All municipalities**

Q. For each of the following, would you say that, overall, past investment in your municipality has ensured the right amount of infrastructure, or led to an under-provision or over-provision of infrastructure capacity? * The Figure plots the net balance of municipalities that report under-investment by country/region and sector. The number in the circle states the net balance of municipalities that report under-investment vis-à-vis over-investment for a particular country/region (in%).
When asked to rate the quality of the infrastructure in their jurisdiction on a scale of 0 to 5, where 0 stands for completely outdated and 5 up to latest international standards, municipalities report an infrastructure quality that is, on average, slightly above the mid-point.

‘Education’ infrastructure ranks highest (in terms of quality); ‘housing’ infrastructure lowest.

There are very little cross-country differences in terms of reported infrastructure quality.
On balance, more municipalities are optimistic than sceptic about the possibility to close the infrastructure gaps in the next five years.

Municipalities are most positive for the 'ICT' and 'education' sectors. They are least confident that gaps can be closed in case of the 'health' sector.

The United Kingdom is the only country where more municipalities are sceptic rather than optimistic that infrastructure gaps can be closed. Municipalities are most optimistic in France.
EU - MUNICIPALITY RESPONSIBILITY

INVESTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

About one in five municipalities are fully responsible for infrastructure investment activities in their jurisdiction; one in two municipalities are partially responsible.

Only 20% of municipalities say that they are not in charge of infrastructure investment activities at all.

The share of municipalities that are (at least partially) responsible for infrastructure investments is highest in the ‘Environment’ and ‘Urban transport’ sector and lowest in the ‘Health’ sector.

Significant cross country differences exist with more than 90% of municipalities at least partially in charge of infrastructure investment activities in Poland; but less than 65% in France and the UK.

INVESTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES BY AREA

Base: All municipalities

Q. Can you tell me your municipality's legal responsibility when it comes to infrastructure investment activities. Is your municipality fully responsible, partially responsible or not at all responsible for each area?

Base: All municipalities. Sectors are aggregated by the corresponding sub-national share in public investment.

Q. Can you tell me your municipality’s legal responsibility when it comes to infrastructure investment activities. Is your municipality fully responsible, partially responsible or not at all responsible for each area?
EU – MUNICIPALITY INVESTMENT SPEND

CHANGE IN INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT SPEND OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS

Asked about their own investment activities (as opposed to investment activities in their jurisdiction), 42% of municipalities say that they increased their infrastructure investment activities over the last five years.

The share of municipalities that increased their investment activities was particularly high in the ‘Education’ and ‘ICT’ sectors and among Polish and Baltic municipalities.

CHANGE IN INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT SPEND OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS BY AREA

Base: All municipalities, fully or partially responsible for each area
Q. Has the overall spend in infrastructure increased, decreased or stayed around the same over the last five years? *Has the infrastructure investment share of your municipality increased, decreased or stayed around the same relative to total infrastructure spend?
*Net balance is the share of firms reporting an increase minus the share of firms reporting a decrease

Base: All municipalities who are fully or partially responsible for each area
Q. Has the overall spend in infrastructure increased, decreased or stayed around the same over the last five years? *Has the infrastructure investment share of your municipality increased, decreased or stayed around the same relative to total infrastructure spend?
*Net balance is the share of firms reporting an increase minus the share of firms reporting a decrease
The positive investment activities have led to a slight increase of municipalities’ investment share over the past five years.

On balance, 3% of municipalities report that their infrastructure investment activities have increased (relative to total infrastructure investment in their jurisdiction).

In the ‘education’ and ‘environmental’ sectors the net increase is nearly 14%. On the contrary, for the ‘health’, social ‘housing’ and ‘ICT’ sectors, more municipalities report a falling investment share (than an increasing one).

From a cross-country perspective, municipalities investment shares increased everywhere except for ‘France’, the ‘United Kingdom’, ‘Other Southern Europe’ and the ‘Benelux’.

**Base: All municipalities**

Q. Over the last five years has the infrastructure investment share of your municipality increased, decreased or stayed around the same? * 

Q. Over the last five years has the infrastructure investment share of your municipality increased, decreased or stayed around the same relative to total infrastructure spending in each area?

**Base: All municipalities. Sectors are aggregated by the corresponding sub-national share in public investment.**
INVESTMENT FOCUS FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

For the next five years, 43% of municipalities intend to focus their investment activities on the ‘repair and maintenance’ of existing infrastructure.

25% of municipalities want to invest primarily in ‘modernisation’ activities and 22% in expanding existing ‘capacity’.

‘Modernisation’ and ‘capacity’ expansion are named most frequently as investment focus for the ‘ICT’ sector and by municipalities in ‘Germany,’ ‘South East Europe’ and the ‘Baltics’.

INVESTMENT FOCUS FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS BY AREA

All municipalities fully or partially responsible for each area. Sectors are aggregated by the corresponding sub-national share in public investment.

Q. Looking ahead to the next five years, will the largest share of your spend on infrastructure in each of these areas be for maintenance and repair, modernisation or the construction of new infrastructure?
### POLICY PRIORITIES OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

![Policy Priorities Graph](image)

From a policy priority, municipalities expect to focus their investment activities on making their infrastructure more socially inclusive in the ‘housing’, ‘education’ and ‘health’ sectors to make it greener in the case of ‘environmental’ infrastructure; smarter in the case of ‘ICT’ infrastructure and more ‘growth’ friendly in the case of ‘urban transport’.

The share of municipalities foreseeing no infrastructure investment activities in the coming years is largest in ‘Spain’ and the ‘Benelux’ countries.

---

**Base:** All municipalities fully or partially responsible for each area

Q. From the following, what would you say will be the main priority over the next five years … Green infrastructure, Smart infrastructure, Socially inclusive infrastructure or Infrastructure that boosts economic growth?

### POLICY PRIORITIES OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS BY AREA

![Policy Priorities by Area](image)

**Base:** All municipalities fully or partially responsible for each area. Sectors are aggregated by the corresponding sub-national share in public investment.

Q. From the following, what would you say will be the main priority over the next five years … Green infrastructure, Smart infrastructure, Socially inclusive infrastructure or Infrastructure that boosts economic growth?

---
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The main barriers to infrastructure investment are tight budgets and the time it takes for infrastructure projects to get approved. 58% and 48% of municipalities name these two areas a major obstacle to their infrastructure investment activities, respectively.

Political and regulatory instability is another important obstacle; particularly for municipalities in Italy, Spain and the UK. Technical capacity is also felt as a constraint, particularly pressing in the UK and in Germany.

Lack of coordination with other bodies plays an important role in Spain.
EU – MUNICIPALITY DRIVERS

FACTORS IMPACTING DEMOGRAPHIC SITUATION

About seven in ten municipalities consider aging an important driver of the demographic situation in their jurisdiction.

This is followed by inward migration (57%) and outward migration (39%).

Ageing is of particular concern for municipalities in the Baltics, the group of Other Northern European Countries and South East Europe.

Outward migration plays an important role for municipalities in the Baltics, South East Europe and Other Central Europe; whereas inward migration matters most for the group of Other Northern European Countries, Germany and Spain.

FACTORS IMPACTING DEMOGRAPHIC SITUATION BY AREA

Base: All municipalities
Q. To what extent do each of the following impact the demographic situation in your municipality? (Data not shown for hardly at all/Not at all/don’t know/refused)

EU – MUNICIPALITY DRIVERS

FACTORS IMPACTING DEMOGRAPHIC SITUATION

About seven in ten municipalities consider aging an important driver of the demographic situation in their jurisdiction.

This is followed by inward migration (57%) and outward migration (39%).

Ageing is of particular concern for municipalities in the Baltics, the group of Other Northern European Countries and South East Europe.

Outward migration plays an important role for municipalities in the Baltics, South East Europe and Other Central Europe; whereas inward migration matters most for the group of Other Northern European Countries, Germany and Spain.

FACTORS IMPACTING DEMOGRAPHIC SITUATION BY AREA

Base: All municipalities
Q. To what extent do each of the following impact the demographic situation in your municipality? (Data not shown for hardly at all/Not at all/don’t know/refused)
Only around 50-60% of municipalities carry out ex ante assessments of infrastructure projects, either on the ‘Budgetary implications’, the ‘Economic costs and benefits’, the ‘Environmental and social impact’ of the projects, and/or whether the project ‘Fits municipalities’ urban development strategy’.

Of all those that carry out an ex ante assessment, only about 60% say that the results of the assessment enter the decision making process (not shown).

**INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS BY AREA**

- **Fit into urban development strategy**: EU - 61%, France - 46%, Germany - 55%, Italy - 89%, Spain - 66%, Poland - 83%, United Kingdom - 53%, Other Northern Europe - 67%, Other Southern Europe - 56%, Other Central Europe - 61%, South East Europe - 72%, Baltics - 43%, Benelux - 48%
- **Environmental and social impact**: EU - 61%, France - 42%, Germany - 60%, Italy - 80%, Spain - 60%, Poland - 77%, United Kingdom - 69%, Other Northern Europe - 58%, Other Southern Europe - 50%, Other Central Europe - 51%, South East Europe - 74%, Baltics - 50%, Benelux - 45%
- **Economic costs and benefits**: EU - 52%, France - 28%, Germany - 53%, Italy - 77%, Spain - 50%, Poland - 70%, United Kingdom - 54%, Other Northern Europe - 48%, Other Southern Europe - 43%, Other Central Europe - 55%, South East Europe - 73%, Baltics - 59%, Benelux - 47%
- **Budget implications**: EU - 62%, France - 53%, Germany - 50%, Italy - 77%, Spain - 60%, Poland - 73%, United Kingdom - 74%, Other Northern Europe - 58%, Other Southern Europe - 43%, Other Central Europe - 68%, South East Europe - 57%, Baltics - 43%, Benelux - 62%

**Base**: All municipalities; * All municipalities with an urban development strategy

Q. Before going ahead with an infrastructure project, do you carry out an independent assessment of …?

(Data not shown for occasionally/never/don’t know/refused)
Less than half of municipalities consult with other bodies when it comes to the planning and implementation of infrastructure projects. The degree to which this is true varies, however, across countries; with as many as 87% of Italian municipalities consulting with the region in which they are located; and as few as 19% of French municipalities coordinating their investment activities with networks of like-minded municipalities.

### CO-ORDINATING INVESTMENT PROJECTS BY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networks of like-minded municipalities</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Northern Europe</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Southern Europe</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central Europe</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Europe</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltics</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benelux</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Northern Europe</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Southern Europe</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central Europe</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Europe</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltics</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benelux</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan authorities</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Northern Europe</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Southern Europe</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central Europe</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Europe</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltics</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benelux</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Base: All municipalities; *All municipalities part of a larger metropolitan area

**Q. Thinking about planning and implementation of infrastructure projects, how often does your municipality coordinate its investment projects with ...?**
EU - INVESTMENT FINANCE

SOURCE OF MUNICIPALITY INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT FINANCE BY AREA

Own resources account for the largest share of investment finance (with more than 50%).

This is followed by other transfers, often from national or sub-national governments (23%), external finance, including bank loans (18%), and EU funding, including funding EU Structural Funds (8%).

A breakdown by the region shows significant differences in the funding mix; in particular with regard to the use of EU funds: for the Baltics and Central European countries, the share of EU funds accounts for 35% and 25% of total infrastructure funding, respectively. Italy also falls into this category (with more than 28% of total infrastructure finance coming from EU programs).

Poland stands out of the group of Central European countries with the highest share of own resources in funding infrastructure investments.

Base: All municipalities fully or partially responsible for at least one area (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. Can you tell me approximately what proportion of your infrastructure investment activities were financed by each of the following in the last financial year?
Banks are the main source of the external financing used to fund infrastructure projects, at 47% of total external finance used.

This is followed by national promotional banks (which account for about 30% of total external finance). International financial institutions and capital markets together account for around 10% of total external financing.

Southern Europe and Italy diverge from the overall picture, with national promotional banks playing a more important role (accounting for 66% and 57% of total external finance, respectively).

---

**Base: All municipalities who used external finance (excluding don’t know/refused responses)**

Q. Can you tell me approximately what proportion of your infrastructure investment activities were financed by each of the following?

* Banks excluding national or international promotional banks
MUNICIPALITY FINANCING CROSS

This figure shows on the x axis, the share of external finance constrained municipalities which comprises municipalities that (1) did not use external funding because of fiscal constraints (debt ceilings and/ or fiscal rules that do not allow borrowing); (2) who did not use external funding because they thought it would be too expensive; (3) that applied for external funding but were rejected; or (4) applied for external funding but did not receive the full amount.

The y axis shows the share of municipalities that are happy to rely exclusively on own resources and transfers. It is derived from the question: What was your main reason for not applying for external finance for your investment activities? Was happy to use internal resources /didn’t need the finance

Municipalities in the Baltics and South East Europe appeared to have the highest share of external finance constrained municipalities. At the same time, they reported a low share of municipalities that are happy to rely exclusively on own resources and transfers.

At the EU level, the share of externally constrained municipalities is around 20%. In particular, France has the lowest share of externally finance constrained municipalities (around 3%). Moreover, their willingness to rely exclusively on own resources is also very low (around 5%).

On the contrary, Italy and Spain, together with Other central Europe Countries, have the highest share of external financial constraints (about 38%, 31% and 27% respectively).
EIB 2017 – COUNTRY TECHNICAL DETAILS

The final data are based on a sample, rather than the entire population of firms, 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>Country/Region</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Other Northern Europe</th>
<th>Other Southern Europe</th>
<th>Other Central Europe</th>
<th>South East Europe</th>
<th>Baltics</th>
<th>Benelux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interviews</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage rounding
Percentages with value of less than 0.5 but greater than zero have not been shown in the charts.

Glossary

- **Other Northern Europe**: This comprises Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Austria and Ireland
- **Other Southern Europe**: This comprises Portugal, Malta, Cyprus and Greece
- **Other Central Europe**: This comprises the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia
- **South East Europe**: This comprises Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania
- **Baltics**: This comprises Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania
- **Benelux**: This comprises Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg
- **Green infrastructure**: Infrastructure that is designed to improve biodiversity and mitigate against or adapt to climate change
- **Smart infrastructure**: Infrastructure that makes use of information technology to increase the delivery of public services
- **Socially inclusive infrastructure**: Infrastructure that is equally accessible for all individuals and groups in the municipality
- **DK/Ref**: Don’t know/Refused
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THE EIB AND MUNICIPALITIES

Over 70% of Europeans live in urban areas, and 55% of public investment is made by regional or local governments. These investments allow building or modernisation of housing, schools, public transport networks, wastewater infrastructure, revitalisation of green areas and many other activities. The European Investment Bank (EIB) supports a broad range of municipal and regional projects by sharing knowledge with local and regional decision-makers to improve access to funds and help them use existing funds more effectively.

EIB Lending

Stimulating growth, liveability and innovation in the cities of Europe are important goals of our investment approach, informed by the EU Urban Agenda. EIB financing in the EU for the areas covered under the EU Urban Agenda is estimated at EUR 127.9 billion over the period 2011-2016. This figure comprises a holistic approach towards the urban financing and mirrors the Urban Agenda priorities by, for instance, including energy, water and public transport. This comprises EUR 108 billion of financing through investment loans, framework loans and equity funds, and EUR 19 billion of indirect financing through commercial and public sector banks.

The EIB lends across all of the priority themes of the EU Urban Agenda, and across all Member States. Our lending between 2011 and 2016 was strongest in the areas of water/sewerage (EUR 22.2 billion), urban transport (EUR 22.4 billion), education (EUR 19.9) and urban development (EUR 23.2 billion).

Within the EU-28 there are approximately 930 cities with a population above 75 000, which is typically the minimum size for a city to be able to absorb direct EIB lending. It is estimated that the EIB has lent to some 15-20% of these cities. Recognising the importance of smaller towns and cities, the EIB finances urban investments extensively via framework loans intermediated by regional administrations, public or private banks, and specialised enterprises such as housing companies or energy efficiency agencies. The EIB also provides extensive financing through commercial and public sector banks to public or private enterprises delivering urban services in areas such as services, energy and health.

EIB financing for urban infrastructure and services supports a wide range of public policy goals and initiatives. Our lending is highest in countries which have a large number of large secondary cities, including UK, France and Germany. Secondary cities are often lagging behind the capitals in terms of economic growth. To help them take advantage of their unique assets and unlock innovative potential the EIB provides technical and financial advice as well as financing for innovative smart city projects. EIB considers “smart” development as one important route towards sustainable urban development. Smart cities therefore not only use innovation and technology to tackle complex challenges, but also contribute to making the city climate change resilient, socially inclusive and green.

As the largest multilateral provider of climate finance worldwide, our direct investments in urban development have totalled some EUR 35 billion for climate action between 2011-2016. Our urban projects contribute to energy efficiency improvements in urban districts, housing and public buildings and decarbonisation of the urban economy. Our investments in sustainable urban mobility are a key contributor to reducing congestion, improving air quality and achieving CO2 reductions. Water and waste investments bring significant environmental, health and climate action benefits, and contribute to the circular economy and to improve resource efficiency.
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Furthermore, the EIB is one of the largest international investors in social and affordable housing across Europe. European cities face major social challenges including social exclusion of marginalised groups and their integration in the urban society. By supporting investments in urban regeneration, social housing, health, education, recreation and other community facilities we contribute to local economic development and social inclusion.

The role of Investment Plan for Europe in financing urban and regional projects

The European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), one of the core pillars of the Investment Plan for Europe, aims to mobilise private investment in strategically important projects. The EFSI guarantee enables the EIB to fund urban projects involving greater levels of risk. For example through risk sharing with promotional banks, lending to lower rated municipalities or municipal companies, supporting public–private partnerships or investing in funds targeting urban upgrades, the EIB helps overcome the current investment gaps in the EU.

Advisory support and knowledge development

Besides financing, the EIB contributes to the Urban Agenda through its advisory services, in particular:

- **JASPERS**, providing support to the preparation of European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) grant-funded projects in a number of urban areas
- **ELENA**, providing support to local and regional authorities in accelerating their investment programmes in the fields of energy efficiency and renewable energy sources
- Financial Instruments Advisory, including “fi-compass” and bilateral advisory support for the design and feasibility of financial instruments such as urban development funds and investment platforms.
- A new dedicated urban advisory platform, called URBIS, has been established within the Advisory Hub to provide advisory support to urban authorities to facilitate, accelerate and unlock urban investment projects, programmes and platforms. In its initial phase, URBIS consists of the three work-streams, implemented in parallel:
  - Increased awareness raising of existing instruments, programmes, services;
  - Tailor-made technical and financial advice to cities, and
  - Exploring innovative financing approaches for city investments

URBIS aims to simplify access to existing advisory programmes and services and address some of the current gaps in the provision of advisory support. To do this, URBIS is resourced by a specially created task force within the European Investment Advisory Hub, which will work with interested urban authorities on eligible advisory support assignments. It will provide both tailor made technical and financial advice in relation to project and programme development and support to urban authorities in exploring and developing investments, for example in relation to innovative financing such as investment platforms or innovative solutions such as smart city investments. This service will be provided in line with the current EIAH pricing policy (where currently public sector promoters receive support free of charge).