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EIBIS 2020 – Italy

KEY RESULTS

Investment Dynamics
With the COVID-19 crisis affecting the economy, investment in Q2 2020 is roughly 22.6% below the pre-crisis 2019 level, after a period of already subdued investment. In line with this, the investment outlook for 2020 is negative (net of -27%) but this in line with the EU average expectations (net of -28%). COVID-19 has affected firms’ investment strategies for 2020 with around two in five firms (41%) expecting to invest less than planned.

Investment Focus
One-quarter (25%) of firms with investment plans for the current financial year, plan to abandon or delay their at least some of their investments as a result of COVID-19, which is below the EU average (35%). While around one-fifth (22%) of firms will continue at least some of their investment plans with a reduced scale/scope, and this is in line with the EU average of 18%.

The most frequently cited long term transformational impact of COVID-19 on firms in Italy is expected to be on their increased use of digital technologies (45%), followed by changes in their service or product portfolio (38%).

Investment Needs and Priorities
Half of all firms in Italy were operating at or above full capacity in 2019, which was below the EU average (61%).

Firms who have been impacted by COVID-19 are more likely to have been prioritising new products, processes or services than firms not experiencing any impact from COVID-19 (35% versus 23%). Conversely, firms who had not been impacted are more likely to be prioritising capacity expansion (34% versus 21%).

Innovation Activities
Around a half (49%) of firms have developed new products, processes or services as part of their investment activities. This includes 11% whose innovation is new to the country or the global market.

Two thirds of firms in Italy (67%) have implemented, either fully or partially, the digital technologies they were asked about, this is higher than in EIBIS 2019 (58%).

Drivers and Constraints
More firms in Italy expect a deterioration rather than an improvement in the political regulatory climate, the economic climate, business prospects, and availability of internal finance in the next twelve months, although fewer firms are pessimistic about the political/regulatory climate than in EIBIS 2019 (-22% versus -33%).

The most common barrier to investment remains the uncertainty about the future and this is a growing concern among firms (96% up from 85% in EIBIS 2019).

Investment Finance
The overall pattern of sources and types of finance used remains in line with EIBIS 2019. Internal funds account for the highest share of investment finance (55%), which is below the EU average of 62%.

Nearly four fifths of firms in Italy (78%) reported making a profit in 2019, in line with EIBIS 2019 (81%) and the EU average (80%).

Access to Finance
Firms that use external finance were on balance satisfied with the finance received. Only five per cent of all firms could be considered financially constrained in 2019, which is in line with the average for the EU (6%).

Energy Efficiency
More than one-third (37%) of firms are investing in measures to improve energy efficiency, this is broadly similar to EIBIS 2019 (44%) but below the EU average (47%).

The average share of investment in measures to improve energy efficiency in Italy is at 8%, broadly similar to EIBIS 2019 (10%) and the EU average (12%).

Climate Change
More than three fifths (63%) of firms feel their business has been impacted by climate change and the related changes in weather patterns, including 23% who said it had a major impact. This is similar to the EU averages (58% and 23% respectively).

More firms in Italy are expecting a positive rather than negative impact on their business from the transition to a low-carbon economy—overall, more than a third said it would have a positive impact on their reputation (+38%), around one-fifth (+21%) on market demand and six per cent on the firms’ supply chain over the next five years.

Sixty five percent of firms in Italy 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 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 22.6% below the pre-crisis 2019 level. This negative pattern follows a period of subdued investment, with total capital formation in Q2 2020 37% below the investment levels observed at the beginning of 2008.

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

INVESTMENT CYCLE

Italy has moved to the ‘low investment contracting’ quadrant on the investment cycle. In comparison to EIBIS 2019, the net balance of firms expecting to increase rather than decrease investment in the current financial year has declined.

On balance, fewer infrastructure (-11%) and construction (-12%) firms are reducing rather than increasing their investment in the current financial year than firms operating in services (-22) and manufacturing (-42%).

Large firms and manufacturing firms continue to have a high share of firms investing.

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 (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Investment Dynamics

**EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS**

Realised/expected change in investment

The net balance of firms reporting an increase rather than a reduction of their investment activities in 2019 was 21%, far above the negative expectations for the year anticipated in EIBIS 2019 (net of -0.5%). However, the outlook for 2020 is much more negative (net of -27%) and in line with the EU average expectations (net of -28%).

**IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON INVESTMENT**

COVID-19 has affected firms’ investment strategies for 2020 with around two in five firms (41%) expecting to invest less than planned. This is in line with the EU average of 45%.

The manufacturing sector has been affected more than other sectors with half of the firms (50%) expecting to invest less due to COVID-19 (compared with 33% for both services and infrastructure and 41% for construction).

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**

One-quarter (25%) of firms with investment plans for the current financial year, plan to abandon or delay at least some of their investments as a result of COVID-19, which is below the EU average (35%).

Around one-fifth (22%) of firms will continue with at least some of their investment plans with a reduced scale/scope, and this is in line with the EU average of 18%.

Manufacturing firms are more likely to abandon or delay their investment plans as a result of COVID-19 than services firms (32% versus 19%).

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 Italy is expected to be their increased use of digital technologies (45%). Large firms are more likely to cite digital technologies than SMEs (52% compared with 40%).

The second most commonly cited long term impact of COVID-19 is on firms’ service and product portfolio (38%). Around two fifths of services and infrastructure firms (42% and 45% respectively) expect a change to their service or product portfolio compared with three in ten (30%) manufacturing 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 investment was still driven by the need to replace existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT (43%). This finding is similar to EIBIS 2019 (48%) and is in line with the EU average (47%).

Firms in infrastructure were the most likely to report a higher share of investment in replacement (53%) while those in manufacturing are the least likely to do so (36%).

Conversely, manufacturing firms were more likely to report a higher share of investment for introducing new products, processes or services (31%) than firms in other sectors (ranging from 19% to 21%).

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

Of the six investment areas asked about, the highest share of investments in Italy remained in machinery and equipment (50%), which is the same as the EU average (49%).

Firms in the service sector tend to allocate a lower proportion of their investment to machinery and equipment compared with firms in other sectors (38% compared with a range of 52% to 55%). Instead service firms allocate more of their overall investment to software, data, IT and website (20%, compared to a range of 9% to 12% of firms investing from other sectors).

Firms in the manufacturing sector continue to report the highest share of investment in Research & Development (20%).

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**

More than eight in ten firms still believe their investment over the last three years was about the right amount (83%). This is in line with EIBIS 2019 (83%) and the average for the EU (80%).

Less than one per cent of construction firms thought they had invested too much.

Overall, there were few differences in the perceived investment gaps across both sector and size of firm.

![Bar chart showing perceived investment gap](chart)

**SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY**

Half of all firms in Italy were operating at or above full capacity over the last financial year, which remains below the EU average (61%).

Firms in the manufacturing sector were the least likely to be operating at or above full capacity (38%, compared with between 51% and 65% among firms in other sectors).

![Bar chart showing share of firms at or above full capacity](chart)

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, firms believe that investment in new products and services (34%) will have the highest priority, followed by the need to invest in capacity expansion (23%) and replacing building, machinery, equipment and IT (22%).

The share of firms prioritising replacement has declined since EIBIS 2019 (22% compared with 31%). However, infrastructure and large firms are more likely to prioritise replacement than firms in the services sector and SMEs.

Around one-third (34%) of firms prioritise investment in new products and services. Firms in the manufacturing sector and large firms were the most likely to prioritise new products and services (47% and 39% respectively).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU 2020</th>
<th>US 2020</th>
<th>IT 2019</th>
<th>IT 2020</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of firms</td>
<td>Capacity expansion</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>New products/services</td>
<td>No investment planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of investment between Italian firms who were impacted by COVID-19 and firms who were not impacted is slightly different. Impacted firms are more likely to have been prioritising new products, processes or services than firms not experiencing any impact from COVID-19 (35% compared with 23%). Conversely, firms who had not been impacted are more likely to be prioritising capacity expansion (34% compared with 21%).

When compared to EU firms overall, Italian firms impacted by COVID-19 are more likely to invest in new products and services (35% compared with 30% EU average) and have no plans for investments (21% compared with 13% EU average).


Innovation Activities

**INNOVATION ACTIVITY**

Around a half (49%) of firms have developed new products, processes or services as part of their investment activities. This includes 11% claiming the innovation is new to the country or the global market.

When compared to the EU, fewer Italian firms have developed an innovation that is new to the country or global market (11% versus 15% EU average) but overall a higher share of Italian firms have developed an innovation compared with across the EU overall (49% versus 42% EU average).

Overall large firms and manufacturing firms tend to be the most likely to have developed new products, processes or services (61% and 59% respectively). When firms’ innovation and research and development behaviour is profiled more widely, 29% of firms in Italy are classified as ‘active innovators’, and a further 7% of firms are ‘developers’.

This breakdown is broadly in line with EIBIS 2019 (classifying 26% of firms as ‘active innovators’ plus 10% of firms as ‘developers’) and above the average for the EU (with 20% ‘active innovators’ plus 6% ‘developers’).

The 'No innovation and no R&D' group comprises firms that did not introduce any new products, processes or services in the last financial year. The 'Adopter only' introduced new products, processes or services but without undertaking any of their own research and development effort. 'Developers' are firms that did not introduce new products, processes and services and also invested in research and development activities. The two profiles differ in terms of the novelty of the new products, processes or services. For incremental innovators these are 'new to the firm'; for leading innovators these are new to the country/world.
Innovation Activities

IMPLEMENTATION OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Two thirds of firms in Italy (67%) have implemented, either fully or partially, the digital technologies they were asked about, this is higher than in EIBIS 2019 (58%).

Firms in the construction sector are the least likely to have implemented digital technologies, either fully or partially, within their business (37%) while those operating in infrastructure are the most likely to have done so (82%).

Large firms are also much more likely than SMEs to have implemented at least one digital technology (82% versus 57%).

Implementation of platform technologies in Italy is relatively high in the infrastructure sector (73% versus 52% EU average), while implementation of 3-D printing lags behind the EU manufacturing average (17% versus 27% EU-wide).

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)
Drivers And Constraints

**SHORT TERM FIRM OUTLOOK**

More firms in Italy expect a deterioration rather than an improvement across four out of the five business outlook factors in the next twelve months. Firms are the most pessimistic about the economic climate (-43%, down from -31% EIBIS 2019). Conversely, fewer firms are pessimistic about the political/regulatory climate than in EIBIS 2019 (-22% versus -33%).

Firms in Italy remain optimistic about the availability of external finance and the share of firms expecting an improvement rather than deterioration has increased since EIBIS 2019 (21% versus 14%).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political / regulatory climate</th>
<th>Economic climate</th>
<th>Business prospects in the sector</th>
<th>Availability of external finance</th>
<th>Availability of internal finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU net balance*</td>
<td>US net balance</td>
<td>IT net balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of firms

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

Overall, SMEs are much more pessimistic than large firms about the political/regulatory climate, the economic climate, business prospects and the availability of internal financing of their businesses.

Firms in the construction and services sectors are more negative than positive about both the political and regulatory climate, as well as the economic climate, when compared with firms in the manufacturing and infrastructure sectors.

Overall, the net balance for firms in construction and infrastructure is more positive than negative about business prospects.

The perception for the external finance availability is also positive across all sectors and sizes of firms.

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

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

The most common barrier to investment remains the uncertainty about the future and this is a growing concern among firms (96% up from 85% in EIBIS 2019).

Labour market regulations remain the second most frequently cited barrier to investment (78%) with similar shares to those recorded in EIBIS 2019 (75%).

Overall there has been an increase in the share of firms citing a number of barriers since EIBIS 2019: demand for product or service (70% compared with 52%), energy cost (69% compared with 61%), access to digital infrastructure (63% compared with 53%), availability of finance (69% compared with 60%).

LONG TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

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

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

More than half of the investment activity is financed by internal sources (55%). This is broadly in line with EIBIS 2019 (54%) and remains below the EU average (62%).

Conversely, external finance makes up more than two fifths (43%) of the investment finance, which is broadly similar to EIBIS 2019 (44%) and the EU average (35%).

The pattern of finance share is broadly similar across sector and size of firm.

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)

TYPE OF EXTERNAL FINANCE USED FOR INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES

Bank loans continue to account for the highest share of external financing (62%). This is in line with the reported share in EIBIS 2019 and the EU average (both 59%).

Leasing and hire purchases continue to make up the second highest share of external finance in the country (15%).

Firms in the service sector report the highest share of external finance coming from bank loans (71%) while those in construction report the lowest (55%).

Large firms report a higher share of external finance from grants compared with SMEs (13% versus 2%).
Investment Finance

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

One-fifth of firms report the main reason for not applying for external finance is because they are happy to use internal funds or do not have a need for it (20%). This is broadly in line with EIBIS 2019 (16%) and the EU average (17%).

One-fifth of manufacturing and SME firms (21% and 22% respectively) were happy to rely exclusively on internal sources to finance investment and for both groups this has increased since EIBIS 2019 (13% and 16% respectively).

SHARE OF PROFITABLE FIRMS

Nearly four fifths of firms in Italy (78%) report making a profit, in line with EIBIS 2019 (81%) and the EU average (80%).

Specifically, one-fifth (20%) of firms claim to have been highly profitable in the last financial year, with profits of 10% or more. Again, this is broadly similar to EIBIS 2019 (21%) and higher than the EU average (16%).

Large firms are more likely to be making a profit than SMEs (84% versus 74%).
Access To Finance

**DISSATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED**

Firms using external financing were on balance satisfied with the amount, cost, maturity, collateral or the type of financing received. The highest proportion of dissatisfaction in Italy remains with the cost of finance (8%) followed by the collateral requirements (7%) and maturity (6%).

**Share of dissatisfied firms**

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

Whilst overall dissatisfaction levels are low, SMEs display higher levels of dissatisfaction than large firms for collateral requirements imposed on external financing (11% compared to 3%). Overall, firms operating in the manufacturing sector are relatively less dissatisfied than those in other sectors.
Access To Finance

SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS

In 2019 only five per cent of all firms could be considered as financially constrained, in line with the average for the EU (6%).

The main reasons highlighted by financially constrained firms in Italy was rejection (3% saying they have sought external finance but did not receive it) and dissatisfaction with the amount of financing obtained (2% saying they have received less).

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 and gradual decline in the share of financially constrained firms since EIBIS 2017 (from 12% to 5% in EIBIS 2020). In the latest reading, the proportion of constrained firms is on average in line with the EU share (6%).

Base: All firms
EIB Group survey on investment and investment finance 2020.
Country overview: Italy

Energy Efficiency

SHARE OF FIRMS INVESTING IN MEASURES TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY

More than one-third (37%) of firms are investing in measures to improve energy efficiency, this is broadly similar to EIBIS 2019 (44%) but well below the EU average (47%).

The share of service sector firms investing in measures to improve energy efficiency has declined since EIBIS 2019 (23% down from 39% in EIBIS 2019) and this sector now has the smallest share of firms investing in measures to improve energy efficiency.

SMEs continue to have a much smaller share of firms investing in measures to improve energy efficiency than large firms (24% compared to 56% respectively).

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

AVERAGE SHARE OF INVESTMENT IN MEASURES TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY

The average share of investment in measures to improve energy efficiency in Italy is at 8%, broadly similar to EIBIS (10%) and the EU average (12%).

The average share of investment across all sectors and sizes is broadly similar. There have been no significant changes in the share of investment since EIBIS 2019,
Energy Efficiency

ENERGY TARGETS, MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL AUDIT

Q. In 2019 and under normal conditions, did your company set and monitor internal targets on carbon emissions and energy consumption?
Q. In 2019 and under normal conditions, did your company have a designated person responsible for defining and monitoring climate change strategies?
Q. And can I check, in the past four years has your company had an energy audit? By this, I mean an assessment of the energy needs and efficiency of your company’s building or buildings

Base: All firms

ENERGY TARGETS, MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL AUDIT BY SECTOR AND SIZE

Firms in Italy are less likely than EU firms to have set internal targets on carbon and energy (37% versus 41%) and to have had an energy audit in the past four years (46% versus 55%). They are also less likely to have a designated person to develop their climate change strategies (7% versus 23%).

Large firms are nearly twice as likely as SMEs to have set targets on carbon and energy (26% compared with 53%), to have had an energy audit in the past 4 years (35% compared with 63%) and to have a designated person for climate change (12% compared with 4%).

Base: All firms
Climate Change

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT

More than three fifths (63%) of firms feel their business has been impacted by climate change and the related changes in weather patterns, including 23% who said it had a major impact. This is similar to the EU average (58% and 23% respectively).

Firms operating in construction (40%) and service (34%) sectors are much more likely to have been impacted in a major way than firms in infrastructure (20%) and manufacturing (16%).

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

More firms in Italy are expecting a positive rather than negative impact on their business from the transition to a low-carbon economy—overall, more than a third said it would have a positive impact on their reputation (+38%), around one-fifth (+21%) on market demand and six per cent on the firms’ supply chain over the next five years.

Construction sector firms are the most likely to say it will have a positive impact on market demand (+36%) compared with other sectors (ranging from +18% to +23%). Whilst infrastructure firms are more likely to think that it will have a positive impact on their supply chain than infrastructure and manufacturing firms (+15% compared with +3% and +1% respectively).

SMEs are less likely than large firms to think that it will have positive impact on their reputation (+32% compared with +47% 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)

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?

*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

Sixty five per cent of firms in Italy have already invested or plan to invest in the next three years in measures to tackles the impact of weather events and reduction in carbon emissions. This is in line with the EU average (67%).

Construction and services sector firms (54% and 50% respectively) are less likely than manufacturing and infrastructure firms (70% and 72% respectively) to have invested or plan to invest.

Large firms are more likely to have invested or plan to invest than SMEs (74% compared to 59%).

Fewer firms in the services and infrastructure sectors cite uncertainty about climate change impacts and availability of staff with the right skills as barriers to investing in activities to tackle climate change.

<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 activities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of finance</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about climate change impacts</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about regulatory environment and taxation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about new technologies to help tackle climate change</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of staff with the right skills to identify and implement investments related to climate change</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</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

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 account for the greatest share of value-added (39%) in Italy. This is below the EU average (48%). Micro and small firms with 5-49 employees contribute 39% of value-added in Italy, compared to 30% across the EU overall.

By sector, firms in manufacturing contribute with highest share of value-added (42%). However, all sectors contribute with a similar value added as firms across the EU.

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

More than two thirds (66%) of firms in Italy report linking individual performance to pay, in line with the EU average (70%). Similarly, the share of firms that report the use of a strategic business monitoring system (59%) is also in line with the EU average (55%).

Around two thirds of firms (65%) are owner managed which is higher than the EU average (57%).

Large firms are more likely to use a strategic monitoring system than SMEs (80% compared with 46%), as well as to link individual performance to pay (76% compared with 60% for SMEs).

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)
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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 Italy, 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>IT</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>EU vs IT</th>
<th>Manuf vs Constr</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1971)</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>(601)</td>
<td>(207)</td>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>(157)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>(497)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>(11971 vs 601)</td>
<td>(130 vs 207)</td>
<td>(497 vs 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or 70%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</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.
The country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 601 firms in Italy (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, p. 3, p. 4, p. 6, p. 10, p.11, p. 13, p. 15, p. 16, p. 17, p. 18, p. 19, p. 20</td>
<td>11971/12071</td>
<td>800/803</td>
<td>601/600</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11634/11417</td>
<td>748/711</td>
<td>599/590</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>104</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>426/NA</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>95</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>525/539</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>99</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>499/509</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>93</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>601/600</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>104</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>599/599</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>104</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>595/0</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>102</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>599/597</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>104</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>495/501</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 9</td>
<td>11938/11937</td>
<td>799/800</td>
<td>600/594</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>104</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>475/504</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>86</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>311/325</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 13</td>
<td>10711/10490</td>
<td>637/605</td>
<td>535/563</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>99</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>301/309</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 18</td>
<td>11898/NA</td>
<td>794/NA</td>
<td>601/NA</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 19</td>
<td>11739/NA</td>
<td>772/NA</td>
<td>593/NA</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 20*</td>
<td>11740/11627</td>
<td>777/762</td>
<td>598/586</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>