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About the EIB Investment Survey (EIBIS)
The EIB Group Survey on Investment and Investment Finance is a unique, EU-wide, annual survey of some 12,300 firms. It collects data on firm characteristics and performance, past investment activities and future plans, sources of finance, financing issues and other challenges that businesses face. Using a stratified sampling methodology, EIBIS is representative across all 28 member States of the EU, as well as for firm size classes (micro to large) and 4 main sectors. It is designed to build a panel of observations to support time series analysis, observations that can also be linked to firm balance sheet and profit and loss data. EIBIS has been developed and is managed by the Economics Department of the EIB, with support to development and implementation by Ipsos MORI. For more information see: http://www.eib.org/eibis.

About this publication
This Country Overview is one of a series covering each of the 28 EU Member States, plus an EU-wide overview. These are intended to provide an accessible snapshot of the data. For the purpose of these publications, data is weighted by value-added to better reflect the contribution of different firms to economic output. 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
Laurent Maurin, Ricardo Santos, EIB.

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.
This country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 535 firms in Portugal in 2018 (carried out between April and July).

### Key results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macroeconomic context:</th>
<th>Aggregate investment continued to recover in Portugal, but remains around 20% below its 2008 level. A large part of the gap reflects still weak investment by the government and households, resulting in lower investment in 'dwellings' and 'other buildings and structures'.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment outlook:</td>
<td>Firms hold a positive investment outlook for the current financial year, with large firms and infrastructure sector firms being the most positive. Expectations are broadly the same as those one year ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment activity:</td>
<td>79% of firms invested in the last financial year, the same proportion as in the previous wave, EIBIS 2017, but lower than the EU average (87%). Investment per employee has increased slightly, but remains below the EU average (by 28%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived investment gap:</td>
<td>15% of firms report investing too little in the last three years, similar to the EU average (16%) and lower than EIBIS 2017 (18%). The average share of state-of-the-art machinery and equipment in firms is below the EU average (34% versus 44%). The share of building stock satisfying high energy efficiency standards has fallen from 39% to 34%, but is in line with the EU (37%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment barriers:</td>
<td>Uncertainty about the future remains the most common barrier for 84% of firms, the same as EIBIS 2017 but higher than the EU average (69%). Energy costs (81%) and labour market regulations (79%) are also more commonly cited in Portugal than EU-wide. Availability of skilled staff is a barrier for 77% of firms in both Portugal and the EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External finance:</td>
<td>5% of firms are finance constrained, down from 12% in EIBIS 2017, and now in line with the EU average (also 5%). Construction sector firms and SMEs are more constrained than the average (with 9% and 8% of constrained firms respectively).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm performance:</td>
<td>Firms’ productivity is broadly comparable to the EU average as the performance of the most productive firms has fallen. Large firms with 250+ employees contribute a higher share to value added than in the EU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVESTMENT DYNAMICS

INVESTMENT ACTIVITY IN LAST FINANCIAL YEAR

Around eight in ten firms in Portugal (79%) invested in the last financial year, unchanged from the share in EIBIS 2017 and still below the EU average (87%).

Firms in the manufacturing and infrastructure sectors (83% and 82% respectively) were more likely than those in the construction sector (71%) to have invested in the last financial year, while large firms (85%) were more likely to invest than SMEs (75%).

Investment per employee increased slightly since EIBIS 2017, with the highest intensity again in the infrastructure sector, but remains below EU average.

*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 intensity is reported in real terms using the Eurostat GFCF deflator (indexed to the 2016 wave).

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

INVESTMENT CYCLE

Portugal remains in the ‘low investment expanding’ quadrant on the investment cycle for the third year in a row and has barely moved in the last year.

However, large firms nudge into the ‘high investment expanding’ quadrant, given the relatively high share of such firms investing in the last financial year.

All types of firm, by size and sector, appear in the ‘expanding’ half of the investment cycle as more firms expect to increase than decrease their investment in the current financial year.

Base: All firms
Share of firms investing shows the percentage of firms with investment per employee greater than EUR 500
The y-axis line crosses x-axis on the EU average for 2016
INVESTMENT DYNAMICS

EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS

More firms in Portugal increased than reduced their investment in the last financial year, slightly above expectations. In the current year, this positive outlook is expected to continue to a similar extent in line with the EU average. However this general trend masks divergences by types of firm. Large firms and firms in the infrastructure sector are most positive about increasing investment, but nearly as many manufacturing firms expect to reduce than increase investment.

FUTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (% of firms)

Looking ahead to the next three years, replacing existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT is still the main priority for investment (by 41% of firms), followed by capacity expansion (24%) and developing or introducing new products, processes or services (23%).

Firms in Portugal are more likely to prioritise replacement investment than the EU average (41% versus 33%).

Construction firms are more likely than average to prioritise replacement investment (52%), while manufacturers are more likely than average to prioritise investing into new products, services or processes (33%).

One in five SMEs (20%) say they have no investment planned, compared with just 2% of large firms.

Base: All firms

‘Realised change’ is the share of firms who invested more minus those who invested less; ‘Expected change’ is the share of firms who expect(ed) to invest more minus those who expect(ed) to invest less.

Q. Looking ahead to the next 3 years, which is your investment priority (a) replacing existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT; (b) expanding capacity for existing products/services; (c) developing or introducing new products, processes, services?
INVESTMENT AREAS
As in EIBIS 2017, the highest share of investment in Portugal is in machinery and equipment (48%), followed by land, business buildings and infrastructure (15%) then employee training and software, data and IT (12% each).

While similar to the EU-wide pattern, firms in Portugal invest a slightly higher share on training their employees than the EU average (12% versus 10%), and a lower share on R&D (6% versus 8%).

Manufacturing firms spend a higher than average share on machinery and equipment (57%), and R&D (9%, versus 1%-6% in other sectors). Large firms also allocate a higher share to machinery and equipment (54%, compared to 45% for SMEs). Conversely, SMEs invest a higher share on software, data, IT and website activities (14%, versus 9% among large firms).

Base: All firms who have 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?

PURPOSE OF INVESTMENT IN LAST FINANCIAL YEAR (% of firms’ investment)

The largest share of investment in Portugal was driven by the need to replace existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT (53%), higher than the EU average of 47%.

Construction firms allocated a 64% share to replacement.

The average share of investment allocated to capacity expansion is 30%, and is higher among large firms than SMEs (35% versus 27%).

Investment in new products and services accounted for a 16% share of investment – higher than average among manufacturing firms (20%), and lower in the infrastructure and construction sectors (11% and 10% respectively).

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

Q. What proportion of total investment was for (a) replacing capacity (including existing buildings, machinery, equipment, IT) (b) expanding capacity for existing products/services (c) developing or introducing new products, processes, services?
## INVESTMENT FOCUS

### INNOVATION ACTIVITY

Among all firms, two in five (40%) developed or introduced new products, processes or services as part of their investment activities. This remains higher than the EU average (34%).

Innovation activity remained higher than average among manufacturing firms (58%).

As in EIBIS 2017, 14% of firms in Portugal claimed to undertake innovation that is new to the country or global market. This is also higher than the EU average of 10%.

Large firms are more than twice as likely as SMEs to say they have developed or introduced new products, processes or services that are new to the country or world (22% versus 9%).

*Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)*

**Q.** What proportion of total investment was for developing or introducing new products, processes, services?

**Q.** Were the products, processes or services new to the company, new to the country, new to the global market?

### INVESTMENT ABROAD

Among firms in Portugal that invested in the last financial year, 10% invested in another country, slightly higher than the 8% reported in EIBIS 2017, bringing Portugal similar to the EU average (12%).

As in EIBIS 2017, firms in the construction sector were the most likely to have invested in another country (21%, a seven percentage point increase compared to EIBIS 2017), while the proportion of large firms investing abroad went up from 10% in EIBIS 2017 to 19%.

Service sector firms and SMEs (both with 5%) remain less likely than average to invest abroad.

*Base: All firms who invested in the last financial year*

**Q.** In the last financial year, has your company invested in another country?
INVESTMENT NEEDS

PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP

Fifteen per cent of firms believe they have invested too little in the last three years. This is similar to the EU average (16%) and the equivalent share of under-investing firms in EIBIS 2017 (18%).

Nonetheless, the vast majority of firms (83%) say they have invested about the right amount over the last three years.

This distribution does not differ significantly by firm size or sector.

Base: All firms (excluding ‘Company didn’t exist three years ago’ responses)

Q. Looking back at your investment over the last 3 years, was it too much, too little, or about the right amount?

SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY

Around half (49%) of Portuguese firms say they operated at or above full capacity in the last financial year.

However, this represents a fall of 10 percentage points from 59% in EIBIS 2017 and means that Portugal is now below the EU average (54%, a one-point increase vis-à-vis EIBIS 2017).

Manufacturing sector firms are less likely than average to be at or above maximum capacity (38%), while the share of large firms operating at full capacity dropped 20 percentage points from 66% in EIBIS 2017 to 46%.

Base: All firms

Full capacity is the maximum capacity attainable under normal conditions e.g. company’s general practices regarding the utilization of machines and equipment, overtime, work shifts, holidays etc.

Q. In the last financial year, was your company operating above or at maximum capacity attainable under normal circumstances?
INVESTMENT NEEDS

SHARE OF STATE OF THE ART MACHINERY AND BUILDING STOCK MEETING HIGH ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS

On average, Portuguese firms say that 34% of their machinery and equipment is state-of-the-art, in line with EIBIS 2017 (37%) and somewhat below the EU average of 44%.

The average share of building stock that is said to meet high energy efficiency standards in Portugal is 34%. This remains in line with the 37% EU average, despite a fall from 39% in EIBIS 2017. This pattern is relatively consistent across all sectors and sizes of firm.

Infrastructure firms report a higher than average share of state-of-the-art machinery and equipment (40%), while the reverse is true for services and the construction sector (28% and 21% respectively). It is also higher in large firms (41%) than SMEs (30%). Construction sector firms report the lowest share of energy efficient building stock (21%).

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. What proportion, if any, of your commercial building stock satisfies high or highest energy efficiency standards?
Q. What proportion, if any, of your machinery and equipment, including ICT, would you say is state-of-the-art?

ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENT

On average, Portuguese firms say that 34% of their machinery and equipment is state-of-the-art, in line with EIBIS 2017 (37%) and somewhat below the EU average of 44%.

The average share of building stock that is said to meet high energy efficiency standards in Portugal is 34%. This remains in line with the 37% EU average, despite a fall from 39% in EIBIS 2017. This pattern is relatively consistent across all sectors and sizes of firm.

Infrastructure firms report a higher than average share of state-of-the-art machinery and equipment (40%), while the reverse is true for services and the construction sector (28% and 21% respectively). It is also higher in large firms (41%) than SMEs (30%). Construction sector firms report the lowest share of energy efficient building stock (21%).

The average share of investment primarily for measures to improve energy efficiency is in line with the EU average (8% in Portugal, 9% EU-wide).

Firms within the infrastructure sector allocated a higher than average share of investment to energy efficiency (12%). Firms in the construction and service sectors allocated the lowest shares (4% and 6% respectively).

Large firms and SMEs channeled broadly the same share of their investment to energy efficiency.

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

Q. What proportion of total investment in the last financial year was primarily for measures to improve energy efficiency in your organisation?
LONG TERM BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT

Around eight out of ten firms consider future uncertainty, energy costs, business and labour market regulations as obstacles to their investment activities (84%, 81%, 79% and 77% respectively).

All are more likely to be seen as barriers in Portugal than EU-wide where the equivalent figures are 69%, 58%, 64% and 62%. Availability of skilled staff is a barrier for 77% of firms in both Portugal and the EU.

Availability of finance is also more likely to be considered as a barrier in Portugal than across the EU.

There are significant differences across sectors. Construction firms tend to name more barriers than average (91% mention uncertainty as a barrier). Transport infrastructure is a barrier for 52% of large firms, but only 36% of SMEs.

Base: All firms (data not shown for those who said not an obstacle at all/don’t know/refused)

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Portugal, to what extent is each of the following an obstacle? Is a major obstacle, a minor obstacle or not an obstacle at all? Reported shares combine ‘minor’ and ‘major’ obstacles into one category

LONG TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

Base: All firms (data not shown for those who said not an obstacle at all/don’t know/refused)

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Portugal, to what extent is each of the following an obstacle? Is a major obstacle, a minor obstacle or not an obstacle at all? Reported shares combine ‘minor’ and ‘major’ obstacles into one category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Demand for products/services</th>
<th>Availability of skilled staff</th>
<th>Energy costs</th>
<th>Digital infrastructure</th>
<th>Labour regulations</th>
<th>Business regulations</th>
<th>Transport infrastructure</th>
<th>Availability of finance</th>
<th>Uncertainty about the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRIVERS AND CONSTRAINTS

PERCEIVED SKILLS MIS-MATCH

The proportion of staff perceived to be without the right skills to fit their company’s current needs is 7% in Portugal, the same proportion as in the EU overall.

In Portugal, the proportion of employees within higher level occupations said not to have the right skills is 3%, which is lower than the EU average of 5%.

The proportion of employees within lower and intermediate level occupations that are perceived not to have the right skills is broadly in line with the EU average.

*Note: Data for Lower, Intermediate and Higher level occupations is included for each firm where answered, but “All” is only calculated if data is available for all levels of occupation present within a firm – hence the ‘All’ % may be higher than the three other percentages.

Base: All firms with staff in lower/intermediate/higher level occupations (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. How many of your existing staff would you regard as having the right skills to fit your company’s current needs?

PERCEIVED SKILLS MIS-MATCH BY SECTOR AND SIZE

Firms in the manufacturing sector report a higher proportion of employees without the right skills, notably in lower level occupations (10% skills mis-match, compared with 5%-6% in other sectors).

The service sector has a higher proportion of skills mis-match among staff in intermediate level occupations compared with the infrastructure sector (9% versus 4%).

SMEs report a higher share of skills mis-match (8%) than large companies (5%).

Base: All firms with staff in lower/intermediate/higher level occupations (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. How many of your existing staff would you regard as having the right skills to fit your company’s current needs?
INVESTMENT FINANCE

SOURCE OF INVESTMENT FINANCE

Internal funds account for the highest share of investment finance (64%). This is generally in line with both the EU average and the share reported in Portugal in EIBIS 2017 (62% and 65% respectively).

External finance makes up 34% of firms’ investment finance in Portugal, which is also very close to the EU average (35%) and the EIBIS 2017 share in Portugal (32%).

Internal funds contribute 66% of SMEs’ investment mix, compared to 58% among large firms. Large firms have a higher share of intra-group funding (5%, versus 2% for SMEs).

Base: All firms who invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. What proportion of your investment was financed by each of the following?

TYPE OF EXTERNAL FINANCE USED FOR INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES

Bank loans still account for the highest share of external finance (47%), followed by other bank finance such as overdrafts and credit lines (18%). The 65% combined bank finance share is on a par with the 64% EU average.

Bank finance contributes a higher than average share for service sector firms (81%), and a lower than average share for firms in the infrastructure sector (46%).

Firms within infrastructure and construction report higher than average shares of finance from leasing and hire purchase agreements (32% and 27% respectively, versus an average of 17%).

Grants account for a higher share of external finance among large firms (14%, compared with 5% for SMEs).

*Loans from family, friends or business partners

Base: All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. Approximately what proportion of your external finance does each of the following represent?
SHARE OF FIRMS HAPPY TO RELY EXCLUSIVELY ON INTERNAL SOURCES TO FINANCE INVESTMENT

Around one in seven of all firms in Portugal report they did not apply for external finance because they are happy to use internal funds or did not have a need for it (15%). This is broadly similar both with EIBIS 2017 (14%) and the EU average (16%).

There are some differences across sectors, with shares of firms happy to rely exclusively on internal sources to finance investment ranging from 12% in construction to 19% among infrastructure firms.

The share of SMEs satisfied with internal sources increased vis-à-vis EIBIS 2017 (17% vs 12%). On the other hand, the share of large companies happy to rely on internal sources declined slightly to 13% from 16% in EIBIS 2017 and is now lower than for SMEs.

SHARE OF PROFITABLE FIRMS

Around one-quarter of firms report being highly profitable (26%). This is a higher share of highly profitable firms when compared to the EU average of 20%.

The manufacturing sector has the highest share of highly profitable firms (31%) and the construction and service sectors have the lowest (18% and 19% respectively).

More generally, four in five firms in Portugal claim to make any profit (80%), in line with the EU-wide share of 82%.

SMEs are more likely than average to report making no profit (24% versus an average of 20% for all firms in Portugal).

Base: All firms excluding don’t know/refused

Q: Taking into account all sources of income in the last financial year, did your company generate a profit or loss before tax, or did you break even? Highly profitable is defined as profits/turndown of 10% or more
DISSIPATION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED

Firms that used external finance are on balance fairly satisfied with the amount, cost, maturity, collateral and type of finance received, both in Portugal and across the EU.

Broadly speaking, there has been a significant decrease in the share of firms dissatisfied, bringing Portugal in line with EU averages which remained largely stable.

The highest proportion of dissatisfaction recorded in Portugal is still with the cost of finance (9%, below the 15% reported in EIBIS 2017), closely followed by the collateral required (7%, down from 14% in EIBIS 2017).

DISSIPATION BY SECTOR AND SIZE

Construction firms and SMEs are most likely to be dissatisfied with collateral requirements, with 15% and 11% saying this, compared with the 7% average for all firms in Portugal.

SMEs are also more likely than average to be dissatisfied with the cost of external finance (12%, versus an average of 9%), Large firms tend to report less dissatisfaction than SMEs in general.

Base: All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with ....?
SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS

Just 5% of all firms can be considered finance constrained, much lower than the 12% recorded in EIBIS 2017. Portugal is now in line with the EU average (also 5%).

Construction firms (9%) and SMEs (8%) are more likely than average to be finance constrained, while none of the large firms sampled reported being finance constrained.

Among firms that did not invest, 18% are finance constrained, well above the share of external finance constrained investing firms (5%).

Base: All firms
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).

FINANCING CROSS

Portugal is close to the 2016 EU benchmarks in terms of firms’ likelihood to be finance constrained and to be happy to rely exclusively on internal funds.

The share of external finance constrained firms has decreased since EIBIS 2016 and the proportion of firms happy to rely exclusively on internal funds has increased in the same period.

Construction firms are most likely to be finance constrained and also the least likely to rely exclusively on internal funds.

On the other hand, infrastructure sector firms are most likely to rely on internal funds and have the lowest share of firms reported as constrained.

Base: All firms
Data derived from the financial constraint indicator and firms indicating main reason for not applying for external finance was ‘happy to use internal finance/didn’t need finance’
The x- and y-axes lines cross on the EU average for 2016
* Financing constraints for 2016 among non-investing firms estimated
PROFILE OF FIRMS

CONTRIBUTION TO VALUE ADDED

Large firms account for the greatest share of value-added (37%), well below the EU average (50%). Medium-sized and small firms in Portugal each make up 25% of value-added, compared to 21% and 20% respectively of EU value-added.

Firms in Portugal report a lower proportion of staff in higher level occupations (11%) than the EU average (15%). Conversely, the 59% share of staff in lower level occupations in Portugal is higher than the EU average of 48%.

Portugal continues to lag the EU average in terms of productivity; the service sector performs best relative to other sectors and the manufacturing sector worst.

DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. Approximately how many of your staff across all locations are employed in... occupations?

DISTRIBUTION OF FIRMS BY PRODUCTIVITY CLASS

Base: All firms
The charts reflects 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+
MACROECONOMIC INVESTMENT CONTEXT

Investment Dynamics over time

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.

- Despite the recovery in 2017, investment in Portugal is still close to 20% below its 2008 level.
- Following the improvement in corporate investment, the gap vis-à-vis pre-crisis levels is driven primarily by the government and household sectors.
- In terms of asset classes, investments in ‘dwellings’ and ‘other buildings and structure’ continue to be a drag on aggregate investment activities. Investment in ‘machinery and equipment’ on the other hand is almost at the same as in 2008.

Investment Dynamics by Institutional Sector

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.

Investment Dynamics by Asset Class

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. IPP stands for Intellectual Property Product. Source: Eurostat.
The final data are based on a sample, rather than the entire population of firms in Portugal, so the percentage results are subject to sampling tolerances. These vary with the size of the sample and the percentage figure concerned.

### SAMPLING TOLERANCES APPLICABLE TO PERCENTAGES AT OR NEAR THESE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>EU vs Portugal</th>
<th>Manufacturing vs Construction</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12355)</td>
<td>(535)</td>
<td>(146)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>(136)</td>
<td>(429)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(12355 vs 535)</td>
<td>(118 vs 146)</td>
<td>(429 vs 106)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **10% or 90%**: 1.0% 2.4% 4.4% 4.8% 4.6% 4.6% 2.6% 4.9% 2.6% 6.5% 5.5%
- **30% or 70%**: 1.5% 3.7% 6.8% 7.4% 7.0% 7.0% 3.9% 7.5% 4.0% 10.0% 8.4%
- **50%**: 1.7% 4.0% 7.4% 8.0% 7.7% 7.6% 4.3% 8.2% 4.4% 10.9% 9.2%

### 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 the current financial year compared to the 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.
# EIB 2018 – COUNTRY TECHNICAL DETAILS

## BASE SIZES (*Charts with more than one base; due to limited space, only the lowest base is shown*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base definition and page reference</th>
<th>EU 2017/2018</th>
<th>PT 2017/2018</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. 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 13, 14</td>
<td>12338/12355</td>
<td>535/535</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11839/11790</td>
<td>526/529</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 3</td>
<td>12020/12095</td>
<td>532/533</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 4</td>
<td>10321/10126</td>
<td>489/491</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 5</td>
<td>12073/12080</td>
<td>529/532</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who invested in the last financial year, p. 5</td>
<td>10889/10873</td>
<td>496/498</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding ‘company didn’t exist three years ago’ responses), p. 6</td>
<td>12306/12335</td>
<td>535/535</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7*</td>
<td>11265/11358</td>
<td>495/507</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7</td>
<td>NA/10004</td>
<td>NA/462</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (data not shown for those who said not an obstacle at all/don’t know/refused), p. 8</td>
<td>12338/12355</td>
<td>535/535</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have staff in higher / intermediate lower level occupations (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 9*</td>
<td>NA/8354</td>
<td>NA/433</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 10</td>
<td>9131/9030</td>
<td>426/424</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 10</td>
<td>4206/4323</td>
<td>219/225</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 11</td>
<td>10778/10865</td>
<td>484/507</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 12</td>
<td>4212/4339</td>
<td>218/226</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 14</td>
<td>NA/11466</td>
<td>NA/509</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>