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EIBIS 2020 – Hungary

KEY RESULTS

Investment Dynamics
With the COVID-19 crisis affecting the economy, investment in Q2 2020 is 11.3% below the pre-crisis 2019 level. 47% of Hungarian firms report that they will invest less than planned as a result of COVID-19. Another 47% indicated that their plans remain broadly the same.

Investment Focus
Only a quarter (26%) of Hungarian firms are planning to abandon or delay at least some of their investments in the light of COVID-19, which is much lower than the EU average (35%). The same proportion of firms (26%) plan to continue with at least some of their investment plans but with a reduced scale or scope (higher than the 18% EU-wide).

Hungarian firms were investing more into machinery and equipment, and less in intangibles than their EU peers.

Investment Needs and Priorities
Almost six in ten firms (59%) were operating at or above full capacity in 2019, the same level as in EIBIS 2019 and in line with the EU average (61%).

Around one in four firms (24%) believe they invested too little over the last three years. This is well above the EU-wide value of 15%. Looking ahead, capacity expansion is the most commonly cited investment priority among firms (36%), which is above the EU average (26%).

Innovation Activities
When it comes to firms’ innovation and R&D activity, only 9% of firms in Hungary are classified as ‘active innovators’, in line with EIBIS 2019 (12%) but well below the EU average (20%).

Almost two-thirds of firms (64%) have implemented, either fully or partially, at least one digital technology, which is significantly higher than in the last wave (53%). Large firms are much more likely to have implemented at least one digital technology than SMEs (84% versus 40%).

Drivers and Constraints
Firms in Hungary expect the economic climate, business prospects in their sectors and the availability of internal finance to deteriorate markedly in the next twelve months. This is in line with firms across the EU.

Uncertainty about the future is now the most commonly cited long term barrier to investment (66%), replacing the availability of skilled staff, which has been the most prominent barrier in the earlier survey waves.

Investment Finance
The types of external finance used for investment activities in 2019 continued to be more diverse in Hungary compared to the EU. There is a lesser role for bank loans, but non-loan types of bank finance (e.g. overdrafts), and grants were more wide-spread than elsewhere in the EU.

More than three-quarters of firms (77%) report generating a profit in 2019, twelve percentage points lower than EIBIS 2019 but in line with the EU average (80%).

Access to Finance
The highest levels of dissatisfaction recorded among firms in Hungary that used external finance in 2019 is with the cost of finance (9%) and the collateral requirements (8%).

Thirteen per cent of all firms in Hungary could be considered as finance constrained in 2019. This is a slight increase of five percentage points relative to EIBIS 2019 and more than double of the EU average (6%).

Energy Efficiency
About four in ten firms in Hungary (41%) have invested in measures to improve their energy efficiency, below the EU average (47%).

The average share of investment in measures to improve energy efficiency by firms in Hungary (11%) was the same as EIBIS 2019 and in line with the EU average (12%).

Climate Change
Four in ten firms in Hungary (41%) report that climate change and the related changes in weather patterns has had a minor impact on their business. This is similar to the EU average (35%).

More firms in Hungary are expecting the transition to a low-carbon future to be positive than negative for their reputation (13%) and market demand (4%) over the next five years but to have, on balance, a negative impact on their supply chain (-15%) in the next five years.

More than half of firms in Hungary (53%) have already invested or plan to invest in the next three years in measures to tackle the impact of weather events and reduction in carbon emissions. This is well below 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 -11.3% below the pre-crisis 2019 level. The negative investment dynamics end a period of relatively stable growth in investment.

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

Hungary has moved from the ‘low investment expanding’ quadrant to the ‘low investment contracting’ quadrant on the investment cycle.

In comparison to EIBIS 2019, more firms are investing (78% versus 69%) but - as in the EU - the net balance of firms expecting to increase rather than decrease investment in the current financial year has declined sharply due to the COVID-19 shock.

The services sector has the lowest share of firms investing (63%) but has a positive balance in terms of firms expecting to increase rather than decrease their investment (+3%).

Manufacturing and construction firms have the highest share of firms investing, but they expect stronger slow-down looking ahead.

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.
Investment Dynamics

EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS
Realised/expected change in investment

More firms increased rather than decreased their investment in the last financial year (11%), in line with expectations formulated in EIBIS 2019 (12%). Nevertheless, it is slightly below the EU average (16%).

The outlook for the current financial year, affected by the COVID-19 crisis, is particularly negative (-22%) but it is better than the expectation EU-wide (-28%).

Impact of COVID-19 on investment

47% of Hungarian firms report that they will invest less than planned as a result of COVID-19. Another 47% indicated that their plans remain broadly the same. These are in line with the EU average (45% and 50% respectively).

Firms in the manufacturing and infrastructure sectors are more likely to report investing less (both 51%). 61% of the construction firms are likely to maintain their plans broadly the same, indicating a perceived relative resilience of the property sector to the crisis.

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

**ACTIONS AS A RESULT OF COVID-19**

Only a quarter (26%) of Hungarian firms are planning to abandon or delay at least some of their investments as a result of COVID-19, which is much lower than the EU average (35%).

The same proportion of firms (26%) plan to continue with at least some of their investment plans, but with a reduced scale or scope (higher than the 18% EU-wide).

Q. You said you will invest less due to coronavirus. Can I just check which of the following actions will your company undertake?

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

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

The most frequently cited long-term impact of COVID-19 on firms in Hungary is the increased use of digital technologies (57%).

However, fewer firms expect the increased use of digital technologies within the construction sector (26%, compared to between 57% and 62% for the other sectors) and among SMEs rather than large firms (41% versus 69%). About half of the construction firms considered the long-term impact on supply chains to be important.

Almost one in five firms (19%) expect a permanent reduction in employment levels, this share is lowest (6%) for construction firms.

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)

The largest share of Hungarian firms’ investment activity was dedicated to capacity expansion in 2019 (39%). This represents an increase of ten percentage points relative to EIBIS 2019 and it is well above the EU average (27%).

This is followed by replacing existing capital (36%), a decrease of twelve percentage points on EIBIS 2019 and below the EU average (47%).

Infrastructure firms dedicated only 29% of their investment to capacity expansion, and their main focus was replacement (46%).

One in six firms (17%) invested in new products/services, in line with EIBIS 2019 (16%) and the EU average (18%).

Out of the six investment areas considered, the highest share of investment in Hungary was in machinery and equipment (56%), the same level as EIBIS 2019 and higher than the EU average (49%).

This was followed by land, business buildings and infrastructure (18%) and software, data, IT and website activities (12%), similar levels to EIBIS 2019 and the EU average. Nevertheless, the overall share of intangible investment continued to be lower than the EU average.

Construction firms report a higher share of investment in machinery and equipment compared to services and infrastructure firms (67% versus 46% and 50% respectively).
Investment Needs and Priorities

PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP

Around one in four firms (24%) believe they invested too little over the last three years. This is well above the EU-wide value of 15%. Only 6% of firms reported investing too much (in line with 4% EU-wide).

More than two-thirds of firms (68%) believe they have invested about the right amount, broadly in line with EIBIS 2019 (62%).

Infrastructure firms are more likely to report investing too little compared to manufacturing and construction firms (37% versus 18% and 24% respectively).

SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY

Almost six in ten firms (59%) were operating at or above full capacity in the last financial year. This is the same level as in EIBIS 2019 and in line with the EU average (61%).

Firms in the construction sector were more likely to be operating at or above full capacity compared to manufacturing and services firms (80% versus 47% and 67% respectively).
Investment Needs and Priorities

**FUTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (% of firms)**

Looking ahead to the next three years, capacity expansion is the most commonly cited investment priority among firms (36%), in line with EIBIS 2019 (32%) but above the EU average (26%). Firms in the services sector are the most likely to report prioritising capacity expansion (55%), while infrastructure firms are more likely to report replacement (56%).

Investment in developing or introducing new products, processes or services is prioritised by 22% of firms in Hungary. Manufacturing firms prioritise it more than firms in the other sectors (32%, compared to between 11% and 14%).

**COVID-19 IMPACT ON PRIORITIES**

When splitting the results by firms impacted by COVID-19 and firms that were not, impacted firms in Hungary are more likely to have been prioritising investment in capacity expansion than EU firms (41% versus 23%), and less likely to be prioritising investment in developing new products and services (19% versus 30%).
Innovation Activities

INNOVATION ACTIVITY

More than one-third of all firms (36%) developed or introduced new products, processes or services as part of their investment activities. This is eight percentage points higher than in EIBIS 2019 but still remains below the EU average (42%) - which also increased since the last survey wave.

One in four firms (25%) report innovation that is new to the firm, and a further one in ten (11%) report products or services new to the country or to the global market.

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?

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

INNOVATION PROFILE

When it comes to firms’ innovation and research & development activity, only 9% of firms in Hungary are classified as ‘active innovators’. This is in line with EIBIS 2019 (12%) but well below the EU average (20%).

The share of ‘developers’, i.e. firms that invested heavily in R&D activity but did not produce a new product, process or service, is 7% in Hungary, in line with the EU average (6%).

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

Almost two-thirds of firms (64%) have implemented digital technologies, either fully or partially. This is an increase of eleven percentage points on EIBIS 2019 (53%) and is in line with the EU average (63%).

Firms in the construction sector are the least likely to have implemented digital technologies within their business (38%, compared to services 60% and manufacturing 69%).

Large firms are much more likely to have implemented at least one digital technology than SMEs (84% versus 40%).

Firms in Hungary report relatively high take-up of the ‘internet of things’ compared to their EU peers, within the services and infrastructure sectors (both 53%).

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

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)
Drivers And Constraints

SHORT TERM FIRM OUTLOOK

Companies in Hungary - in line with EU peers - expect the economic climate, business prospects in their sectors and the availability of internal finance to deteriorate in the next twelve months. In contrast, firms in Hungary are more optimistic than firms in the EU regarding the political/regulatory climate (+3% versus -26%) and the availability of external finance (+20% versus -2%).

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

All sectors and sizes of firm are relatively pessimistic about the economic climate, business prospects in their sector and the availability of internal finance.

Infrastructure firms are the most negative on all five components of short-term outlooks - economic climate (-58%), business prospects (-61%), internal finance (-46%), external finance (-17%) and the political/regulatory climate (-10%).

Large firms are more negative about the availability of internal finance than SMEs (-24% versus -8%).

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

*Net balance is the share of firms seeing improvement minus the share of firms seeing a deterioration

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

Base: All firms
Drivers And Constraints

LONG TERM BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT

Uncertainty about the future has been the most cited long term barrier to investment (66%). It has increased by 12 percentage points since the last wave, but remains below the EU average (81%).

This is followed by the availability of skilled staff (54%). This barrier’s importance has decreased markedly - by fifteen percentage points - since EIBIS 2019.

There has also been a decline in the share of firms citing labour market regulations as a long term barrier to investment (37% down from 50%).

LONG TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Hungary, 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)

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

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Hungary, 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

The main financing source of investment activity in Hungary in the last financial year was internal funding (70%). This is in line with EIBIS 2019 (68%) but above the EU average (62%), indicating that Hungarian firms rely less on financial intermediation than their EU peers.

External finance made up more than one-quarter of investment finance (27%) and there is very little intra-group funding (2%).

This pattern is similar across all sectors and sizes of firms.

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<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>Internal</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-group</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the forms of external finance used for investment activities continues to be more diverse in Hungary compared to the EU. Non-loan bank finance has the highest proportion (29%), followed by bank loans (26%), leasing or hire purchase (23%) and grants (17%). Bank loans continued to make up the highest share of external finance for the EU average (59%). The high share of grants can be attributed to the availability of financing from the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF).

Manufacturing firms used more other (non-loan) bank finance compared to infrastructure and construction firms (42% versus 11% and 15% respectively), whereas infrastructure firms had a higher share of external financing attributed to leasing or hire purchase than manufacturing firms (45% versus 10%).

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

*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)
Investment Finance

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

Only six per cent of all firms in Hungary report they were happy to use internal funds or did not have a need for external finance as the main reason for not applying for external finance to fund their investment activities in 2019. This is well below the EU average (17%).

Services firms were more satisfied with relying on internal sources than construction and manufacturing firms (12% versus 3% and 5% respectively).

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

More than three-quarters of firms (77%) report generating a profit in the last financial year, twelve percentage points lower than EIBIS 2019 but in line with the EU average (80%).

Specifically, 14% of firms claim to be highly profitable, defined as generating a profit level at least 10% of firm turnover. This is similar to the EU average (16%).

Almost all construction and services firms report making any profit (97% and 96% respectively) and the former has the largest share of highly profitable firms (27%).

SMEs firms are more likely to report making a profit than large firms (88% versus 67%).

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/turnover of 10% or more

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

**DISSATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED**

Firms using external finance in 2019 are on balance satisfied with the amount, cost, maturity, collateral and type of finance received. The highest levels of dissatisfaction recorded among firms in Hungary is with the cost of finance (9%) and the collateral requirements (8%).

**Share of dissatisfied firms**

![Diagram showing share of dissatisfied firms with various factors such as amount, cost, maturity, collateral, and type of finance.]

**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 (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Collateral</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of dissatisfaction are low, among infrastructure firms the highest level of dissatisfaction was with the cost of the finance obtained.

**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 size less than 30
- **Effective bases for sub-groups are less than 30 – no significance testing applied**
Access To Finance

SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS

Thirteen per cent of all firms in Hungary could be considered as financially constrained in 2019. This represents an increase of five percentage points on EIBIS 2019 and it is more than double than the level of the EU average (6%).

Large firms report a slightly stronger financing constraints than SMEs – possibly due to the fact that many COVID-19 related financial measures have been targeting SMEs specifically.

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

There has been a slight increase in the share of finance constrained firms since EIBIS 2019, and it has now reached the same level as EIBIS 2016.

Firms in Hungary are much more likely to be finance constrained when compared to the EU average.

Base: All firms
Energy Efficiency

SHARE OF FIRMS INVESTING IN MEASURES TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY

More than four out of ten firms in Hungary (41%) have invested in measures to improve their energy efficiency, which is broadly in line with the EU average (47%), but it is lower than what was reported in the last wave.

The largest decline in energy efficient investments since EIBIS 2019 is attributed to the services sector (down by 23 percentage points). As a consequence the service sector has gone from the sector with the highest share (54%) to the one with the lowest share (31%).

The average share of investment in measures to improve energy efficiency by firms in Hungary (11%) was the same as EIBIS 2019 and in line with the EU average (12%).

The average share of investment is similar across all sectors and sizes of firms.

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

Base: All firms

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

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

ENERGY TARGETS, MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL AUDIT

Firms in Hungary are more likely to have had an energy audit in the past four years (63% versus 55%) than EU firms. They are also more likely to have set internal targets on carbon emissions and energy consumption (50% versus 41%). However, they are less likely to have designated a person to develop and monitor their climate change strategies than EU firms (15% versus 23%).

In comparison to the other sectors, firms in the manufacturing sector are more likely to have had an energy audit in the past four years (76%, compared to between 20% and 56%).

Large firms are much more likely to have all three of these elements in place than SMEs.
Climate Change

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT

More than four in ten firms in Hungary (41%) report that climate change and the related changes in weather patterns has had a minor impact on their business. This is similar to the EU average (35%).

A further 16% report a major impact, which is below the EU average (23%).

Large firms are more likely to report to have been impacted in either a major or minor way than SMEs (66% versus 47%). Similarly, infrastructure firms are more likely to be perceived impacted than manufacturing and services firms (74% versus 48% and 58% respectively).

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 %)

Firms in Hungary are expecting the transition to a low-carbon future to be positive for their reputation (13%) and market demand (4%) but to have a negative impact on their supply chain (-15%) over the next five years.

Construction firms believe it will be more positive for their reputation compared to infrastructure firms (32% versus 1%), whereas services firms are relatively more positive about market demand (12%).

Manufacturing and services firms (-26% and -14% respectively) are more negative about the impact on their supply chain than firms in other sectors.

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

*Net balance is the share of firms seeing positive impact minus the share of firms seeing a negative impact
Climate Change

INVESTMENT PLANS TO TACKLE CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT

About half of firms in Hungary (53%) have already invested or plan to invest in the next three years in measures to tackle the impact of weather events and reduction in carbon emissions. This is well below the EU average (67%).

The pattern of investment is similar across all sectors and sizes of firms.

The cost of investment activities (66%) is the most frequently cited barrier to investment in this area. Firms in the infrastructure sector and large firms report this the most (both 75%).

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about regulatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and taxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to help tackle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills to identify and implement investments related to climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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)
Profile of Firms

CONTRIBUTION TO VALUE ADDED

Large firms with 250+ employees (56%) and the manufacturing sector (49%) continue to account for the greatest shares of value-added in Hungary. These proportions are both higher than the EU average (48% and 38% 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+

Base: All firms

FIRM MANAGEMENT

About half of firms in Hungary report using a formal strategic monitoring system (48%), similar to the EU average (55%). Construction firms are the least likely to use such a system (26%, compared to between 45% and 52% for firms in the other sectors).

A higher share of firms in Hungary link individual performance to pay compared to the EU average (78% versus 70%). All sectors and sizes of firm have a similar share (between 77% and 83%).

Nearly three-quarters of firms in Hungary (73%) report being owned or controlled by their CEO or a member of the CEO’s family, well above the EU average (57%).

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)
EIBIS 2020 – 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 Hungary, 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>HU</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>EU vs HU</th>
<th>Manuf vs Constr</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1971)</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>(481)</td>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
<td>(110)</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>(433)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(11971 vs 481)</td>
<td>(122 vs 145)</td>
<td>433 vs 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or 70%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</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).

- **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 481 firms in Hungary (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>472/461</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>47</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>9605/NA</td>
<td>643/NA</td>
<td>383/NA</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>45</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>10138/9716</td>
<td>682/624</td>
<td>399/349</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>41</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>422/380</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>41</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>481/480</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>48</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>475/470</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>47</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>460/0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/ refused responses), p. 8 (top)</td>
<td>11720/11770</td>
<td>769/772</td>
<td>474/467</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 8 (bottom)</td>
<td>9039/8380</td>
<td>600/516</td>
<td>384/310</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 9</td>
<td>11938/11937</td>
<td>799/800</td>
<td>481/479</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>48</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>374/361</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>30</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>182/161</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 13</td>
<td>10711/10490</td>
<td>637/605</td>
<td>407/402</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>39</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>180/166</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 18</td>
<td>11898/NA</td>
<td>794/NA</td>
<td>481/NA</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 19</td>
<td>11739/NA</td>
<td>772/NA</td>
<td>473/NA</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 20*</td>
<td>11740/11627</td>
<td>777/762</td>
<td>473/472</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>