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EIBIS 2019 – Luxembourg

KEY RESULTS

Investment Dynamics
Aggregate investment in Luxembourg stands well above its pre-crisis level.

Going forward, while still positive, there has been a fall in the net balance of firms that expect a further increase in their investment activities.

Innovation Activities
Around one-third of firms (34%) report to have developed or introduced new products, processes or services in the last financial year, matching the EU average. This includes 10% of firms claiming innovation activity new to the country or world. This is also in line with the EU average (11%).

Three in five firms (60%) state to have implemented, either fully or partially, at least one of the digital technologies they were asked about, similar to the EU average (58%).

Drivers and Constraints
The economic and political/regulatory climate weighs on firms’ investment outlook. On balance more firms expect it to deteriorate than improve in the next twelve months in Luxembourg, especially in the construction and infrastructure sectors.

The most commonly cited barrier to investment remains availability of skilled staff (for 75% of firms, compared with 72% in EIBIS 2018), and in line with the EU position with 77% of firms citing this.

Access to Finance
The share of finance constrained firms has declined since EIBIS 2018 (2%, down from 7% in EIBIS 2018) and is lower than the EU average (5%).

The highest level of dissatisfaction recorded is with the cost of finance (4%), followed by collateral requirements (3%), both below the EU average (7%).

Investment Focus
Developing or introducing new products, processes, services or IT is the most commonly cited investment priority for the next three years (by 39% of firms), closely followed by replacing existing buildings, machinery and equipment (33%).

The largest share of investment in the last financial year remains driven by the need to replace existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT (49%), in line with the EU average (48%). Similarly, 47% of investment was on machinery and equipment.

Investment Needs
Eight in ten firms believe their investment over the last three years was about the right amount (82%, EU average 79%). Firms’ perceived share of state-of-the-art machinery and equipment has declined in Luxembourg since EIBIS 2018 (43% compared with 52% in EIBIS 2018).

Almost two-thirds of firms report operating at or above maximum capacity in the last financial year (65%), slightly higher than the EU average of 59%.

Investment Finance
Internal funds account for the highest share of investment finance (67%). This is slightly above the EU average (62%)

The vast majority of firms report making a profit in the last financial year (86%, in line with the 87% share recorded in EIBIS 2018 and remaining somewhat higher than the EU average of 79%).
Investment Dynamics

INVESTMENT DYNAMICS BY INSTITUTIONAL SECTOR

Aggregate investment in Luxembourg is some 20 per cent above pre-crisis levels. After a strong growth performance in 2016 and 2017 by the non-government sector (households and corporates), investment activities in 2018 have been rather mute.

Around three-quarters of firms in Luxembourg invested in the last financial year (77%, down from 86% in EIBIS 2018). The proportion that invested is lower than the EU average (85%).

Firms in the manufacturing and service sectors (88% and 83% respectively) were more likely to invest than those in the construction and infrastructure sectors (69%).

The reported investment intensity is EUR 4,000 per employee, well below the EU average of EUR 6,600 per employee.

The investment intensity is especially low in the service sector.

*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 EIBIS 2016).

Base: All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses)
**Investment Dynamics**

**INVESTMENT CYCLE**

In Luxembourg, the investment activity cycle has changed since EIBIS 2018: with Luxembourg moving from the ‘high investment expanding’ quadrant to the ‘low investment expanding quadrant’.

While firms in the manufacturing sector still exhibit relatively high levels of investment and plan to expand in the current financial year, firms in the construction and infrastructure sectors appear to be quite cautious in their investment plans.

While still positive, there has been a fall in the net balance of firms that have increased rather than reduced their investment activities in the last financial year (+28%, down from +36% in EIBIS 2017).

The positive outlook is expected to continue in the current year, albeit (again) to a much lesser extent than in EIBIS 2018.

---

**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.**

Base: All firms

**EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realised/expected change in investment</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU 2017</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 2017</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2019</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 2019</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NO DATA FOR THIS PERIOD

**EU** 2019

**US** 2019

**LU** 2019

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

Base: All firms
Investment Focus

FUTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (% of firms)

Looking ahead to the next three years, investment in developing or introducing new products, processes, services is the most commonly cited as priority (39%), closely followed by replacing existing buildings, machinery, equipment (33%).

Capacity expansion for existing products and services is cited less often this year (21%, down from 34% in EIBIS 2018).

Investment in new products and services is the claimed priority for 49% of service sector firms in Luxembourg.

Investment in new products and services is a higher priority for larger firms compared to smaller firms (43% compared with 30% respectively).

Out of the six investment areas asked about, the highest share of investment is in machinery and equipment (47%), followed by software, data, IT and website activities (19%) and training of employees (17%). While the pattern is similar to the EIBIS 2018 and EU-wide findings, there has been a slight increase in the share of investment in software, data, IT and website (19%, versus 12% in EIBIS 2018).

Construction/infrastructure sector firms in Luxembourg report the highest share of investment in training of employees (27%, compared to 7% for firms in the other sectors).

Investment in new products and services is the claimed priority for 49% of service sector firms in Luxembourg.

Investment in new products and services is a higher priority for larger firms compared to smaller firms (43% compared with 30% respectively).

INVESTMENT AREAS

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 have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Investment Focus

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

As in previous years, the largest share of investment of firms in Luxembourg is driven by the need to replace existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT (49%). This is in line with the EU average (48%, and up from 40% in EIBIS 2018).

The share of investment in replacement is highest for firms in the service and construction/infrastructure sectors (52% and 51%, compared with 36% in manufacturing).

Firms in the manufacturing sector report the highest share of investment in expanding capacity for existing products and services (38%, compared with 22% in the construction/infrastructure sector and 21% in the service sector).

ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENT

Firms in Luxembourg report similar figures to EIBIS 2018 in terms of their share of building stock meeting high energy efficiency standards (32%, versus 34% in EIBIS 2018) and their share of investment primarily intended to improve energy efficiency (12%, versus 9% in EIBIS 2018).

Firms in the manufacturing sector report a higher than average share of building stock meeting high energy efficiency standards and a higher share of investment intended to improve energy efficiency.
Innovation Activities

INNOVATION ACTIVITY

In Luxembourg, around one-third of firms (34%) have developed or introduced new products, processes or services in the last financial year, matching the EU average.

One in ten firms (10%) claim to have undertaken innovation new to the country or world, which is also in line with the EU average (11%).

Firms in the service sector and larger firms are most likely to report innovation activity (43% and 38% respectively).

Looking at reported innovation and research and development behaviour, 17% of firms in Luxembourg are classified as either ‘active innovators’ or ‘developers’, lower than the EU average (28%) but slightly higher than in EIBIS 2018.
Innovation Activities

IMPLEMENTATION OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES
Three in five firms in Luxembourg (60%) claim to have implemented, either fully or partially, at least one of the digital technologies they were asked about, similar to the EU average (58%).

Larger firms are more likely than smaller firms to report that they have implemented digital technologies, either fully or partially (68% versus 43% respectively).

In the service sector, the share of firms stating that they fully implemented at least one digital technology is 12%, much higher compared to firms in other sectors (3%).

Manufacturing firms report a relatively higher take-up of Internet of Things (IoT) when compared with all EU manufacturers (39% versus 34%). However, firms in the other three sectors report a lower take-up of IoT compared to the EU as well as US average.

Q: Can you tell me for each of the following digital technologies if you have heard about them, not heard about them, implemented them in parts of your business, or whether your entire business is organised around them?

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

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES BY SECTOR

Reported shares combine implemented the technology ‘in parts of business’ and ‘entire business organised around it’

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

PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP

Around eight in ten firms believe their investment over the last three years was about the right amount (82%), similar to the EU average (79%). However, 11% of firms reported too little investment.

Overall, 4% of firms in Luxembourg report that they invested too much. In particular firms in the manufacturing sector are likely to report over-investing (12%).

The share of firms in the service sector reporting investing too little has increased since EIBIS 2018 (14%, up from 6%). In contrast, the share of construction/infrastructure firms reporting under-investment is now lower (7%, down from 19% in EIBIS 2018).

SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY

Nearly two-thirds of firms in Luxembourg report operating at or above maximum capacity in the last financial year (65%), slightly higher than the overall EU average of 59%.

Firms in the service sector remain most likely to say that they are at or above maximum capacity.

The share of manufacturing firms claiming to operate at or above maximum capacity has increased since EIBIS 2018 (54%, up from 41%).
Investment Needs

SHARE OF STATE-OF-THE-ART MACHINERY

The average share of perceived state-of-the-art machinery and equipment in firms has declined since EIBIS 2018 (falling to 43% from 52% EIBIS 2018). This decline is relatively consistent across all sectors and size classes.

The reported share in Luxembourg is in line with the EU average (44%) in EIBIS 2019.

ENERGY AUDIT

A decreased share of firms claim having had an energy audit in the past three years (24%, down from 29% in EIBIS 2018), which moves Luxembourg further away from the overall EU average (43%).

The manufacturing and service sectors are largely responsible for the decrease in energy audits in Luxembourg since EIBIS 2018.

Larger firms remain much more likely to report they have had an energy audit than smaller firms (31% versus 9%).
Drivers And Constraints

SHORT TERM INFLUENCES ON INVESTMENT

More firms expect both the political and regulatory climate and the economic climate to deteriorate rather than improve in the next twelve months, yet firms in Luxembourg are still more positive than the EU average. This is the first year in which more firms expect the economic climate to deteriorate than improve.

Only slightly more firms expect sector business prospects and the availability of finance to improve than deteriorate during the next year.

Across all measures, firms in Luxembourg as well as in the EU overall express reduced optimism compared to EIBIS 2018.

Expectations regarding the political and regulatory climate and economic climate are generally pessimistic across all sectors and size classes.

Firms in the construction and infrastructure sectors on balance expect the availability of internal finance to deteriorate in the next twelve months (net balance -4%).

Firms in the manufacturing sector are most optimistic on balance about expecting an improvement in the availability of internal and external finance.

Q. Do you think that each of the following will improve, stay the same, or get worse over the next 12 months?

Base: All firms
Drivers And Constraints

LONG TERM BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT

The most commonly cited barrier to investment remains availability of skilled staff (for 75% of firms), and in line with all EU firms (77%) and EIBIS 2018 (72%). The proportion of firms citing other barriers remains lower than the corresponding EU average.

Demand for products and services is perceived as an obstacle by a higher share of firms in the manufacturing sector (47%, compared to between 12% and 17% in other sectors). In addition, firms in the manufacturing and service sectors perceive labour market regulations more often as a barrier (52% and 53% respectively) compared to 44% of firms in the construction and infrastructure sectors.

LONG TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

Reported shares combine ‘minor’ and ‘major’ obstacles into one category

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

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

SOURCE OF INVESTMENT FINANCE

Internal funds account for the highest share of investment finance (67%). This is slightly above the EU average (62%) and consistent with EIBIS 2018.

Conversely, the share of external finance remains at 31%, slightly below the EU average (36%).

Construction/infrastructure firms report a higher share of external finance than firms in either the manufacturing or service sectors (36% versus 26% in both other sectors).

Q. What proportion of your investment was financed by each of the following?

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

*Caution very small base size less than 30

TYPE OF EXTERNAL FINANCE USED FOR INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES

Bank loans account for the highest share of external finance (47%). Similar to EIBIS 2018, but lower than the EU average (58%), there has been an increase in the share of external finance provided by leasing (39%, up from 22% in EIBIS 2018).

In contrast to EIBIS 2018, firms in Luxembourg state a much lower use of grants.

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

*Loans from family, friends or business partners

**Caution very small base size less than 30
Investment Finance

SHARE OF FIRMS HAPPY TO RELY EXCLUSIVELY ON INTERNAL SOURCES TO FINANCE INVESTMENT

Around one in six firms in Luxembourg report the main reason for not applying for external finance is because they are happy to use internal funds or did not have a need for the finance (17%, down slightly from 21% EIBIS 2018).

The share of firms stating that they are happy to rely exclusively on internal sources has risen in the manufacturing sector (28%, up from 18% in EIBIS 2018).

The vast majority of firms report making a profit in the last financial year (86%, in line with the 87% share recorded in EIBIS 2018 and remaining somewhat higher than the EU average of 79%).

However, the share of firms reporting to be highly profitable, defined as profit being 10% or more of firm turnover, has declined to 8% since EIBIS 2018 (from 25% in EIBIS 2018) and is now lower than the EU average (20%).

Larger firms are more likely to report generating a profit than smaller firms (90% versus 76%). However, highly profitable firms in Luxembourg are more likely to be micro/small firms (18%, compared with 3% of medium/large firms).

There is no significant difference between the share of firms that are highly profitable based on sector.

Q. What was your main reason for not applying for external finance for your investment activities? Was happy to use internal finance/didn’t need the finance

Base: All firms

SHARE OF PROFITABLE FIRMS

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 profit/toumver of 10% or more

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused)
Access To Finance

DISSATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED

Firms using external finance report that they are on balance satisfied with the amount, cost, maturity, collateral and type of finance received.

The highest level of dissatisfaction recorded is with the cost of finance (4%), followed by collateral requirements (3%).

Levels of dissatisfaction are below the overall EU average on all aspects.

Overall levels of dissatisfaction with external finance for firms in Luxembourg are very low. Manufacturing firms claim more often to be dissatisfied with collateral requirements, maturity terms and cost of finance, but this should be treated with caution due to the low number of manufacturing firms using external finance in the sample.
Access To Finance

SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS

The share of external finance constrained firms in Luxembourg has declined since EIBIS 2018 (2%, down from 7%), and is lower than the EU average (5%).

However, 5% of micro/small firms can be considered as finance constrained, which is similar to the EU average.

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 CONSTRAINTS OVER TIME

The share of firms which report to be finance constrained decreased to 2% from 7% reported in EIBIS 2018, taking Luxembourg below the EU average.

Data derived from the financial constraint indicator

Base: All firms
Profile Of Firms

CONTRIBUTION TO VALUE ADDED

Medium and large firms (i.e. 50-249 and 250+ employees) account for the greatest shares of value-added in Luxembourg (34% and 33% respectively).

The service sector contributes the highest share of value-added by sector (37%). The EU average in this sector is much lower (28%).

Firms in Luxembourg are less likely than the overall EU average to report using a formal strategic monitoring system (37% versus 60%). In contrast firms are slightly more likely than the overall EU average to say they link individual performance to pay (68% versus 61%).

Firms in Luxembourg are slightly more likely to report their company is owned or controlled by their CEO or a member of the CEO’s family than the EU average (66% compared with 55%). The majority of firms say their CEO or company head has at least ten years of industry experience (96%, compared to 92% at the EU level).

FIRM MANAGEMENT

Q. And does your company (a) use a formal strategic business monitoring system (that compares the firm’s current performance against a series of strategic key performance indicators) (b) link individual performance with pay?

Q. Does the CEO/ company head of your firm (a) own or control the firm, or have a family member that owns/controls it (b) have more than 10 years of experience in your firm’s industry or sector?
EIBIS 2019 – Country Technical Details

SAMPLING TOLERANCES APPLICABLE TO PERCENTAGES AT OR NEAR THESE LEVELS

The final data are based on a sample, rather than the entire population of firms in Luxembourg, so the percentage results are subject to sampling tolerances. These vary with the size of the sample and the percentage figure concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Construction/Infrastructure</th>
<th>Micro/Small</th>
<th>Medium/Large</th>
<th>EU vs LU</th>
<th>Manufacturing vs Construction/Infrastructure</th>
<th>Micro/Small vs Medium/Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12672)</td>
<td>(803)</td>
<td>(198)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(110)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(12672 vs 198)</td>
<td>(54 vs 92)</td>
<td>(110 vs 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or 70%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</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.

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).

Micro/Small firms
Firms with between 5 and 49 employees.

Medium/Large firms
Firms with at least 50 employees.
### EIBIS 2019 – Country Technical Details

The country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 198 firms in Luxembourg (carried out between April and June 2019).

#### BASE SIZES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All firms, p. 3, p. 4, p. 8, p. 10, p. 13, p. 15, p. 16</td>
<td>12672/12355</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>198/150</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11967/11790</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>181/145</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 6*</td>
<td>8802/9095</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>131/132</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7*</td>
<td>12533/NA</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>195/NA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 9</td>
<td>12216/11952</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>184/147</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 13</td>
<td>10980/10865</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>147/139</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 4</td>
<td>10005/10126</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>159/136</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding those who did not exist three years ago), p. 8</td>
<td>12640/12335</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>198/150</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 16*</td>
<td>12201/NA</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>189/NA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>82</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>9407/9030</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>123/100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding those who did not exist three years ago), p. 8</td>
<td>12640/12335</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>198/150</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 14*</td>
<td>4426/4212</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>56/38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (data not shown for those who said not an obstacle at all/don’t know/refused), p. 11</td>
<td>12672/12355</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>198/150</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>88</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>4578/4323</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>59/39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>