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KEY RESULTS

Investment Dynamics
With the COVID-19 crisis affecting the economy, investment in Q2 2020 is 23.5% below the pre-crisis 2019 level, a steeper decline than what was observed during the global financial crisis.

In 2019, the share of firms who increased investment was higher than the share of firms reducing investment (a positive balance of 16%). However, the investment outlook for 2020 is much more negative (-34%, on balance), which is in line with the EU average (-28%).

Due to COVID-19, almost half of firms in France (44%) plan to invest less in 2020. About a third of firms (35%) that previously had an investment plan report they will abandon or delay it due to COVID-19.

Investment Focus
Around a third of firms in France expect that, in the long term, COVID-19 will lead to a permanent reduction in employment (34%) or have an impact on their service or product portfolio (32%).

On average, firms allocated 55% of investment to replacing capacity in the last financial year.

Out of the six investment areas considered, 49% of investment was allocated to machinery and equipment, followed by training of employees (12%) and organization/business processes (12%).

Investment Needs and Priorities
The vast majority of firms consider that their investment over the last three years was about the right amount (79%), which is in line the EU average (80%).

Two-thirds of firms (67%) report that they were operating at or above full capacity in 2019, which is higher than the EU average (61%)

Looking ahead to the next three years, replacing capacity is the most cited investment priority by firms in France (42%). This is higher than the EU average (34%).

Innovation Activities
More than one-third of firms (37%) invested to develop or introduce new products, processes or services in the last financial year. 16% of firms are classified as ‘active innovators’ (i.e. firms that invested in R&D).

Around half of firms (52%) have implemented at least one digital technology. This is lower than the EU average (63%).

Drivers and Constraints
On balance, more firms in France expect the business outlook to deteriorate than improve in the next 12 months. Firms are especially pessimistic about the expected overall economic climate, which is in line with the overall EU trend.

Uncertainty about the future remains the most cited long-term barrier to investment (80%), in line with France in EIBIS 2019 (75%) and the EU average (81%). This is followed by labour market regulations (68%), business regulations (67%) and availability of staff with the right skills (65%).

Investment Finance
External funds accounted for around a half (51%) of investment finance in the past financial year, which is in line with France in EIBIS 2019 (50%), and remains well above the EU average (35%). Bank loans continued to make up the highest share of external finance (80%), which is above the EU average (59%).

Only 7% of firms report that the main reason for not seeking external finance in 2019 is because they were happy to use internal finance or did not need external finance. This is well below the EU average (17%).

Access to Finance
Firms that used external finance in 2019 are on balance satisfied with the finance received. The highest level of dissatisfaction is with the amount of finance (3% of firms). 4% of firms could be considered finance constrained in 2019, which is in line with the EU average (6%).

Energy Efficiency
The majority of firms (55%) were investing in measures to improve energy efficiency, a significant increase compared to EIBIS 2019 (31%). This is also above the EU average (47%). On average, firms allocated 19% of total investment in 2019 to improve energy efficiency, which is higher than the EU average (12%).

Climate Change
A third of firms (31%) report that climate change currently has a major impact on their business, which is above the EU average (23%). On balance, firms expect the transition to a low-carbon future to have a positive impact on their business over the next five years.

Almost three-quarters of firms (72%) report to have already invested or plan to invest to tackle the impact of climate change. This is in line with the EU average (67%).
Investment Dynamics

INVESTMENT DYNAMICS BY ASSET TYPE

With the COVID-19 crisis abruptly affecting the economy, investment in Q2 2020 is 23.5% below the level of Q4 2019. This steep decline halts the positive investment dynamics of the most recent years and brings investment levels even below those observed at the trough of the global financial crisis.

The graph shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation (in real terms) by asset type. The data has been indexed to equal 0 in 2008. Source: Eurostat.

INVESTMENT CYCLE

Investment activity by non-financial corporations in EIBIS 2020 places France in the ‘low investment contracting’ quadrant on the investment cycle. France in EIBIS 2019 was inside the ‘low investment expanding’ quadrant.

For the current financial year, on balance, firms across all four sectors and size classes are more likely to plan a reduction in investment than an expansion.

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. Source: Eurostat.

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

EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS
Realised/expected change in investment

In 2019, the share of firms that increased investment was higher than the share of firms that reduced investment (a positive balance of 17%). Investment activity was broadly in line with the investment expectations expressed in EIBIS 2019. The investment outlook for 2020 is much more negative, with 34% of firms expecting investment to fall on balance. This negative outlook is in line with the EU average (-28%).

Realised change (%)

Expected change (%)
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'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.

IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON INVESTMENT

Due to COVID-19, 44% of firms plan to invest less in 2020, while only 4% of firms report they plan to invest more.

The share of firms having reduced their investment expectations is similar across all sectors of activity and firm size classes.

Q. Have your company’s overall investment expectations for 2020 changed due to coronavirus?

Base: All firms with investment plans for the current financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Investment Focus

**LONG TERM IMPACT OF COVID-19 BY SECTOR AND SIZE**

Around a third of firms in France expect that, in the long term, COVID-19 will lead to a permanent reduction in employment (34%) or have an impact on their service or product portfolio (32%). This is different from EU firms, rather associating the long term impact of COVID-19 with the increased use of digital technologies.

Compared to manufacturing firms, construction firms in France are more likely to expect the coronavirus outbreak to lead to a permanent reduction in employment (25% and 40%, respectively).

At the same time, manufacturing firms are more likely to expect a long-term impact on the increased use of digital technologies than construction firms (28% and 10%, respectively).

**Q. Do you expect the coronavirus outbreak to have a long-term impact on any of the following?**

*Base: All firms*
Investment Focus

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

Investment in the last financial year was mainly driven by the need to replace existing building, machinery, equipment and IT (with an average share of 55% of investment allocated to capacity replacement). This is in line with the results for France in EIBIS 2019 (58%) and remains higher than the EU average (47%).

Comparing firms across different sectors, the average share of investment allocated to replacement is higher in services (63%) than manufacturing (50%).

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?

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

INVESTMENT AREAS

Out of the six investment areas considered, about half of investment in the last financial year went into machinery and equipment (49%), followed by training of employees (12%) and organisation/business processes (12%).

On average, firms allocated 41% of total investment to intangible assets (R&D, software, training of employees, and organisation/business processes).

Compared to firms in the manufacturing and infrastructure sectors, firms in the services sector allocated a lower share of investment to machinery and equipment (30%), but a higher share to land, business buildings and infrastructure (23%).

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 Needs and Priorities

PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP

Four out of five firms consider that their investment over the last three years was about the right amount (79%). This is in line with France in EIBIS 2019 (81%) and the EU average (80%).

Around one in seven firms (14% of firms) report having invested too little, while 5% report they invested too much.

The perceived investment gap is similar across all sectors and size classes.

SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY

Two-thirds of firms (67%) report operating at or above full capacity in the past financial year. This is higher than the EU average (61%) and in line with France in EIBIS 2019 (60%).

Comparing firms across sectors, a relatively high share of firms in construction (81%) report operating at or above full capacity, as opposed to a relatively lower share for firms in manufacturing (59%).

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?

Base: All firms (data not shown for those operating somewhat or substantially below full capacity)
Investment Needs and Priorities

FUTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (% of firms)

Looking ahead to the next three years, replacing capacity is the most cited investment priority by firms in France (42%). This is similar to the level in France in EIBIS 2019 (38%) and remains higher than the EU average (34%).

Developing new products or services is cited as an investment priority by 28% of firms. Fewer firms report to have no investment planned in France (7%) than the EU average (12%).

Looking at sectoral differences, investment in new products or services is more likely to be an investment priority in the manufacturing sector (44%). Conversely, firms in manufacturing are less likely to cite replacing capacity as a priority (27%).

Small firms are more likely than large firms to have no investment planned (12% and 3%, respectively).

Q. Looking ahead to the next 3 years, which is your investment priority (a) replacing existing buildings, machinery, equipment, IT; (b) expanding capacity for existing products/services; (c) developing or introducing new products, processes, services?

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

COVID-19 IMPACT ON PRIORITIES

Among firms impacted by COVID-19, replacing capacity is the most cited investment priority (44%), which is higher than the EU average (34%), followed by the development of new products or services (29%).

Among firms reporting no impact from COVID-19, replacing capacity is the most cited investment priority (37%), followed by expanding capacity (31%).

Q. Thinking about the impact of coronavirus, have you had to put staff temporarily on leave, make staff redundant or unemployed or reduce the number of hours they work compared to before the coronavirus pandemic?

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

INNOVATION ACTIVITY

More than one-third of all firms (37%) invested to develop or introduce new products, processes or services in the previous financial year. This includes 15% of firms reporting innovations that were new to the country or the global market.

Zooming in on different sectors, manufacturing firms are most likely to innovate (47%). Among these, 30% reported the products, processes or services were new to the firm and 16% reported they were new to the country or the global market. Firms in the service industry were the least likely to innovate (29%).

Four in ten large firms (41%) reported they had invested to develop or introduce new products, processes or services, but only a third of SMEs (34%) did so.

INNOVATION PROFILE

When firms’ innovation and research and development behaviour is profiled more widely, 16% of firms in France are classified as ‘active innovators’ (i.e. firms that invested in R&D). However, the proportion of ‘adopters’ has increased to 29% from 20% in EIBIS 2019.

Innovation profiles in France are broadly in line with the EU average.

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?
Q. In the last financial year, how much did your business invest in Research and Development (including the acquisition of intellectual property) with the intention of maintaining or increasing your company’s future earnings?

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

IMPLEMENTATION OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Around half of firms (52%) have implemented at least one digital technology. This is lower than the EU average (63%). Firms in the construction and services sectors (27% and 40% respectively) are less likely to have implemented digital technologies compared to firms in the manufacturing and infrastructure sectors (64% and 59% respectively).

Service sector firms in France lag their EU peers in the implementation of all the digital technologies asked about.

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)
Drivers And Constraints

SHORT TERM FIRM OUTLOOK

On balance, more firms expect the business outlook to deteriorate than improve in the next 12 months. Compared with EIBIS 2019, firms are much less optimistic about the expected overall economic climate (with the net balance down 67 percentage points to -64%), business prospects in the sector (down 57 percentage points to -25%) and the availability of internal finance (down 45 percentage points to -30%).

SHORT TERM FIRM OUTLOOK BY SECTOR AND SIZE (NET BALANCE %)

On balance, firms are more negative than positive about the business outlook across all four sectors and size classes. One exception is external finance in the construction sector where firms are slightly more optimistic than pessimistic.

Firms are especially pessimistic about the expected overall economic climate over the next 12 months, in particular firms in the services sector (-75%).
Drivers And Constraints

LONG TERM BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT
The share of firms reporting uncertainty about the future (80%) as a long term barrier remains in line with France in EIBIS 2019 (75%) and the EU average (81%). Uncertainty is the most cited long-term barrier among all sectors and size classes. This is followed by labour market regulations (68%), business regulations (67%) and availability of staff with the right skills (65%).

Compared with EIBIS 2019, there has been a decline in the share of firms reporting demand for products or services (25% and 39% in EIBIS 2019), access to digital infrastructure (25% and 38% in EIBIS 2019) and availability of adequate transport infrastructure (24% and 38% in EIBIS 2019) as long term barriers to investment.

LONG TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in France, 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

External funds accounted for around half (51%) of investment finance in France. This is in line with EIBIS 2019 (50%), and remains well above the EU average (35%).

SMEs report to use a higher share of internal finance than large firms (51% and 35%, respectively). At the same time, large firms report a higher share of intra-group funding than with SMEs (10% and 3% respectively).

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)

Q. Approximately what proportion of your external finance does each of the following represent? Base: All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Bank loans continued to make up the highest share of external finance (80%). This is in line with EIBIS 2019 (77%) and remains above the EU average (59%).

Focusing on other types of external finance, firms in the infrastructure sector tended to rely more on leasing (27%) compared to other sectors (ranging between 4% to 12%).
Investment Finance

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

Only 7% of firms report that the main reason for not seeking external finance was because they are happy to use internal finance or did not need external finance.

This is in line with France in EIBIS 2019 (4%), but remains substantially lower than the EU average (17%).

Firms in the services sector are the most likely to report being happy to use internal finance or not needing external finance (14%).

SHARE OF PROFITABLE FIRMS

Around three-quarters (76%) of firms report to have made a profit in the last financial year. This is similar to France in EIBIS 2019 (78%) and the EU average (80%).

Only 6% of firms report to be highly profitable, defined as generating a profit level at least 10% of firm turnover. This is similar to France in EIBIS 2019 (9%) but remains lower than the EU average (16%).

There is little variation across sectors or firm size classes in the share of firms reporting to have made a profit in the last financial year.
Access To Finance

**DISSATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED**

Firms that used external finance in 2019 are on balance satisfied with the amount, cost, maturity, collateral and type of finance they have received. The element where firms most frequently report dissatisfaction is the amount of finance (3%).

The share of firms dissatisfied with collateral (1%) and cost of external finance (1%) is lower than the EU average (7% and 5%, respectively).

**Share of dissatisfied firms**

![Graph showing the share of dissatisfied firms across different aspects of external finance received.]

Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with ...?

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

**DISSATISFACTION BY SECTOR AND SIZE (%)**

The levels of dissatisfaction with external finance in France remain very low.

There is no significant difference across sectors or firm size classes.

![Graph showing the levels of dissatisfaction by sector and size.]

Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with ...?

Base: All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses) * Caution very small base less than 30
Access To Finance

SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS

Four per cent of all firms in France could be considered finance constrained in 2019, which is similar to the EU average (6%) and France in EIBIS 2019 (4%).

Comparing firms across sectors, the share of finance constrained firms in France is slightly higher in the infrastructure sector (6%).

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).

Base: All firms

FINANCING CONSTRAINTS OVER TIME

The share of firms considered to be financially constrained has been stable over the past five years. This is similar to the trend for the EU average.

Base: All firms
Energy Efficiency

SHARE OF FIRMS INVESTING IN MEASURES TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY

The majority of firms (55%) were investing in measures to improve energy efficiency, a significant increase compared to France in EIBIS 2019 (31%). This is also above the EU average (47%).

There are some significant disparities across sectors. The share of firms investing in measures to improve energy efficiency was highest in the infrastructure sector (66%) and lowest in the construction sector (35%).

Large firms were more likely to be investing in energy efficiency improvements (64%) than SMEs (43%).

On average, firms in France allocated 19% of total investment in the last financial year to improve energy efficiency, a significant increase compared to France in EIBIS 2019 (10%). This is also above the EU average (12%).

Zooming in on different sectors, firms in the infrastructure sector allocated a higher share of total investment (33%) to improve energy efficiency than firms in manufacturing (11%), construction (12%) and services (13%).
Energy Efficiency

ENERGY TARGETS, MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL AUDIT

Half of the firms (50%) report to have internal targets on carbon and energy, which is higher than the EU average (41%). Firms in the services sector are less likely to have internal targets on carbon and energy (37%).

Almost six in ten firms have had an energy audit in the last four years (58%), which is in line with the EU average (55%). Firms in the construction sector are less likely to have had an energy audit (39%) than firms in other sectors. Large firms are more likely to have had it than SMEs (74% and 38%, respectively).

One in five firms (19%) report to have a designated person for climate change strategies, which is in line with the EU average (23%).
Climate Change

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT

Around six in ten firms (62%) report that climate change currently has an impact on their business. This is in line with the EU average (58%).

The proportion of firms reporting that climate change has a major impact on their business is higher in France (31%) than the EU average (23%).

Firms in the infrastructure sector are more likely to report a major impact on their business than manufacturing firms (41% versus 24%).

Q. Thinking about climate change and the related changes in weather patterns, would you say these weather events currently have a major impact, a minor impact or no impact at all on your business?

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

REDUCTION IN CARBON EMISSIONS OVER NEXT FIVE YEARS BY SECTOR AND SIZE (NET IMPACT %)

The share of firms reporting that the transition to a reduction of carbon emissions will have a positive impact on their business over the next five years is higher than the share of firms reporting a negative impact (i.e. a positive balance), with respect to the three main channels of impact considered.

Large firms are more positive than SMEs about the impact on market demand (52% and 31%, respectively) and the impact on their reputation (49% and 37%, respectively).

The share of firms reporting a positive impact of the transition to a low-carbon economy on their supply chain is (on balance) higher in the infrastructure sector (30%) than in manufacturing (7%) and services (8%) over the next five years.

Firms in the infrastructure sector were also more positive about the impact on their reputation (55%), especially compared to firms in services (33%).

Q. What impact will the transition to a reduction of carbon emissions have on the following aspects of your business over the next five years?

Base: All firms

Please note: green figures are positive, red figures are negative
Climate Change

INVESTMENT PLANS TO TACKLE CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT

Almost three-quarters of firms (72%) report to have already invested or plan to invest to tackle the impact of climate change. This is in line with the EU average (67%).

Firms in the construction sector are less likely to have already invested or plan to invest to tackle the impact of climate change (57%) than firms in manufacturing and infrastructure sectors (75% and 80%, respectively). Compared to large firms, SMEs are less likely to have invested or plan to invest to tackle climate change (81% and 59%, respectively).

There is little variation across sectors about the barriers to investing in tackling climate change. Compared to SMEs, large firms are less likely to cite the availability of finance as a barrier (67% and 52%, respectively).

BARRIERS TO INVESTING IN ACTIVITIES TO TACKLE CLIMATE CHANGE BY SECTOR AND SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Cost of investment activities</th>
<th>Availability of finance</th>
<th>Uncertainty about climate change impacts</th>
<th>Uncertainty about regulatory environment and taxation</th>
<th>Uncertainty about new technologies to help tackle the impact</th>
<th>Availability of staff with the right skills to identify and implement investments related to climate change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Now thinking about investments to tackle the impacts of weather events and reduction in carbon emissions, which of the following applies?

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

BARRIERS TO INVESTING IN ACTIVITIES TO TACKLE CLIMATE CHANGE BY SECTOR AND SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Cost of investment activities</th>
<th>Availability of finance</th>
<th>Uncertainty about climate change impacts</th>
<th>Uncertainty about regulatory environment and taxation</th>
<th>Uncertainty about new technologies to help tackle the impact</th>
<th>Availability of staff with the right skills to identify and implement investments related to climate change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. To what extent is the following an obstacle to investing in activities to tackle weather events and emissions reduction? Is it a major obstacle, minor obstacle or not at obstacle at all?

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

CONTRIBUTION TO VALUE ADDED

Large firms (250+ employees) account for 55% of value-added in France, which is higher than the EU average (48%).

Sectoral contributions to value-added are broadly similar, with the manufacturing, services and infrastructure sectors accounting for 31%, 28% and 30%, respectively.

The charts reflect the relative contribution to value-added by firms belonging to a particular size class / sector in the population of firms considered.

That is, all firms with 5 or more employees active in the sectors covered by the survey.

Micro: 5-9 employees; Small: 10-49; Medium: 50-249; Large: 250+

FIRM MANAGEMENT

French firms perform better than the EU average on two key measures of management practices. Three-quarters of firms (76%) link individual performance to pay, which is above the EU average (70%). Firms are also less likely to be managed by the owner in France (45%) than the EU average (57%).

However, less than half of firms (44%) use a strategic monitoring system, which is below the EU average (55%).

There are differences across sectors and firm size classes. Large firms in France are more likely to use a strategic monitoring system than SMEs (53% and 33%, respectively). Compared to firms in manufacturing, firms in the construction and services are more likely to be managed by the owner (34%, 55% and 56%, respectively).

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 own or control the firm, or have a family member that owns/controls it?

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
EIB Group survey on investment and investment finance 2020.
Country overview: France
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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 France, 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 vs FR</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>EU vs FR</th>
<th>Manuf vs Constr</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12672)</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>(603)</td>
<td>(177)</td>
<td>(139)</td>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>(509)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(11971 vs 601)</td>
<td>(39 vs 177)</td>
<td>(509 vs 92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10% or 90% | 1.1% | 3.5% | 3.1% | 5.3% | 6.2% | 6.3% | 2.4% | 5.3% | 3.3% | 8.1% | 5.8% |

30% or 70% | 1.7% | 5.3% | 4.8% | 8.1% | 9.5% | 9.6% | 3.6% | 8.2% | 5.1% | 12.4% | 8.9% |

50%       | 1.9% | 5.8% | 6.2% | 8.8% | 10.4% | 10.5% | 3.9% | 8.9% | 5.5% | 13.6% | 9.7% |

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).

SME
Firms with between 5 and 249 employees.

Large firms
Firms with at least 250 employees.

EIBIS 2019
The previous wave of the EIB Investment Survey, with interviews carried out between April-July 2019.

EIBIS 2020
The current wave of the EIB Investment Survey, with interviews carried out between May-August 2020.

Note: the EIBIS 2020 overview refers interchangeably to ‘the past/last financial year’ or to ‘2019’. Both refer to results collected in EIBIS 2020, where the question is referring to the past financial year, with the majority of the financial year in 2019 in case the financial year is not overlapping with the calendar year 2019.
EIBIS 2020 – Country Technical Details

The country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 601 firms in France (carried out between May and August 2020).

**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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11634/11417</td>
<td>748/711</td>
<td>586/544</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms with investment plans for the current financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 3 (bottom), p. 4 (top)</td>
<td>9606/NA</td>
<td>643/NA</td>
<td>482/NA</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 5 (top)</td>
<td>10136/9716</td>
<td>682/624</td>
<td>517/413</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 5 (bottom)</td>
<td>9874/9506</td>
<td>683/620</td>
<td>453/392</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding ‘Company didn’t exist three years ago’ responses), p. 6</td>
<td>11949/12042</td>
<td>799/802</td>
<td>599/599</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7 (top)</td>
<td>11727/11757</td>
<td>787/775</td>
<td>589/592</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7 (bottom)</td>
<td>11608/0</td>
<td>780/0</td>
<td>587/0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 8 (top)</td>
<td>11720/11770</td>
<td>769/772</td>
<td>600/593</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 8 ((5,4),(998,994))</td>
<td>9039/8380</td>
<td>600/516</td>
<td>437/332</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 9</td>
<td>11938/11937</td>
<td>799/800</td>
<td>598/595</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 12</td>
<td>9255/9008</td>
<td>648/587</td>
<td>436/355</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>54</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>4354/4369</td>
<td>314/252</td>
<td>273/217</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 13</td>
<td>10711/10490</td>
<td>637/605</td>
<td>555/507</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>87</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>4310/4292</td>
<td>314/245</td>
<td>274/214</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 18</td>
<td>11898/NA</td>
<td>794/NA</td>
<td>599/NA</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 19</td>
<td>11739/NA</td>
<td>772/NA</td>
<td>581/NA</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 20*</td>
<td>11740/11627</td>
<td>777/762</td>
<td>593/568</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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