EIBIS 2021 – Sweden

KEY RESULTS

Investment Dynamics and Focus

EIBIS 2021 shows that while fewer Swedish firms invested in 2020, they have become more optimistic for 2021, with more expecting to increase rather than decrease investment. This represents a substantial positive shift from EIBIS 2020. On average firms in Sweden spent almost a third (32%) of their investment on replacement. This is very similar to EIBIS 2020 (31%) but below the EU average (50%). Out of the six investment areas considered, the highest share of investment went into machinery and equipment (45%)

Impact of COVID-19

In Sweden two-fifths of the firms (39%) report that the impact of COVID-19 on their sales was negative, compared to half (49%) of firms in the EU. COVID-19 also had an impact on investment. In Sweden, over a quarter (27%) of firms have revised their investment downwards, while only 3% have revised it upwards. Large firms were more likely than small firms to cut investment plans, possibly reflecting the greater impact of the pandemic on their sales. Services firms (37%) are more likely than the EU average (46%) to have become more digital as a response to COVID-19.

Investment Needs and Priorities

Swedish firms are more likely to believe that COVID-19 will have a long-term impact on needs and priorities. Digitalisation again stands out, with the majority of firms indicating that they expect COVID-19 to lead to an increased use of digital technologies (78%), well above the EU average (55%). Swedish firms do not perceive major gaps in their investment activities. In spite of difficult circumstances, three-quarters of Swedish firms believe their investment over the last three years was about right (76%). The share of Swedish firms that operated at or above full capacity (48%) is virtually unchanged since EIBIS 2020 (50%) and is close to the current EU average (49%).

Innovation Activities

Nearly a quarter (23%) of Swedish firms can be classified as an “active” innovator. The share of leading innovators is 9%, meaning one in eleven Swedish firms introduced a product or process that was new either to the country or the world. In contrast, at EU-level, 29% of SMEs innovated compared to 43% of large firms. Two-thirds of Swedish firms (66%) have implemented at least one advanced digital technology. This is slightly lower than what was reported in EIBIS 2020 (71%) but above the EU average (61%).

Drivers and Constraints

On balance Swedish firms are pessimistic about the political and regulatory climate. Nevertheless, expectations for the overall economic climate have turned back positive (rising from -61% to +38%,) as have perceptions of business prospects in the sector (rising from -12% to +51%).

Generally, Swedish firms are far less concerned about barriers to investment than firms in the EU overall. Availability of skilled staff (78%) and uncertainty about the future (65%) remain the most frequently mentioned long-term barriers to investment. Uncertainty about the future has eased since EIBIS 2020 (72%) and is below the EU average (73%).

Investment Finance

Access to finance conditions remain very benign, as only 4% of all firms in Sweden can be considered financially constrained in terms of external finance. This is similar to the EU average (5%) and the same as the share reported in EIBIS 2020. Moreover, firms in Sweden that used external finance in 2020 are far more likely to be satisfied than dissatisfied with the finance received. The greatest level of dissatisfaction is with the cost of external finance (11%), double the EU average (5%).

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, 8% of Swedish firms have increased their debt position. This is half the EU average (16%). Two-thirds (65%) of firms report receiving some form of financial help, above the EU average of 56%. Primarily this support has come in the form of subsidies or other financial support that do not need to be paid back, with 53% of Swedish firms receiving them. This may have contributed to more robust investment in Sweden during the pandemic.

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency

The majority of Swedish firms (55%) do not perceive physical risk. This is similar to EIBIS 2020 (53%) but more than ten percentage points above the EU average (42%). Overall the share of Swedish firms seeing the transition to tighter climate standards and regulations as an opportunity over the next five years is above the share of firms perceiving it as a risk (41% and 27% respectively).

Two-fifths (40%) of Swedish firms have already invested to deal with climate change and almost half (49%) have plans to invest more in the next three years. Both figures are close to the current EU average. 38% of firms in Sweden invested in measures to improve energy efficiency in 2020 and 64% set and monitored emissions and energy consumption targets, more than in the EU overall.

Firm management, gender balance and employment

Swedish firms were more likely than those across the EU overall to strive for gender balance (74% versus 60%). Conversely, Sweden has a smaller proportion of firms using strategic monitoring systems (45% versus 55%). There has been virtually no change in the overall size of the Swedish workforce since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, with the reported change (-0.3%) being very close to the EU average.
Investment Dynamics and Focus

INVESTMENT DYNAMICS BY INSTITUTIONAL SECTOR

Despite the COVID-19 crisis abruptly affecting the economy, investment levels remained relatively stable. Government and household investment were most resilient, never falling during the pandemic. With the recovery of corporate investment in Q2 2021 total, investment in CESEE countries jumped to 1.8% above the pre-crisis level, and 10% above the level recorded in the same quarter of 2020. In Q3 2021 the recovery continued, as total investment was 4% above the pre-pandemic 2019 level.

INVESTMENT CYCLE AND EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS

EIBIS 2021 shows that while fewer Swedish firms invested in 2020, they have become more optimistic for 2021, with more expecting to increase rather than decrease investment. This represents a substantial positive shift from EIBIS 2020.

Large and manufacturing firms are the most likely to have invested. Infrastructure firms have the highest expectations for increasing investment, instead.

Looking into the evolution over time, investment expectations have bounced back to pre EIBIS 2020 levels.

The graph on the left shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation (in real terms); by institutional sector. The data are transformed into four-quarter sums, deflated using the implicit deflator for total GFCF. The four-quarter sum of total GFCF in 2019 Q4 is normalized to 0. Source: Eurostat

The graph on the right shows the year-on-year growth of total gross fixed capital formation (in real terms); by institutional sector. The data are deflated using the implicit deflator for total GFCF. Source: Eurostat.

Shore 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 EIBIS 2021.

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

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

On average firms in Sweden directed almost a third (32%) of their investment in 2020 to replacement. This is very similar to the share reported in EIBIS 2020 (31%) but below the current EU average (50%). Just over a quarter (26%) of investment made by Swedish firms was classified as “other” and this is far higher than the EU average (8%).

There are notable differences by sector, with almost half (49%) the investment made by construction firms classified as “other”. Their share of investment in new products and services (9%) is much lower than the one made by firms in other sectors and almost a third of similar investments by firms in manufacturing (24%).

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, the highest share of investment in Sweden went into machinery and equipment (45%), followed by software, data, IT and website activities (15%), land, business buildings and infrastructure (14%) and training of employees (11%). The investment pattern is broadly in line with what was reported in EIBIS 2020 and the EU average.

Manufacturing (58%) and infrastructure firms (46%) allocated a larger share of their investment to machinery and equipment than firms in other sectors, while services firms (28%) allocated the highest share of investment to software, data, IT networks and website activities.

Large firms invested a higher share than SMEs in ‘tangible assets’ (land, buildings, infrastructure and machinery) and a lower share in ‘intangible assets’ such as software, training and business processes.

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?

**Caution small base size

Base: All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Impact of COVID-19

IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON SALES

COVID-19 hit firms in various ways and in Sweden two-fifths (39%) of the firms report a negative sales impact. However, the negative impact of COVID-19 on sales is lower than in the EU overall (49%) and for over a quarter (26%) of Swedish firms the impact is positive.

Large firms (44%) are more likely than SMEs (35%) to report that COVID-19 has negatively impacted their sales.

Q. What has been the impact so far of the COVID-19 pandemic on your company’s sales or turnover compared to the beginning of 2020?

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

SHORT-TERM ACTIONS AS A RESULT OF COVID-19

In Sweden two-thirds (66%) of firms have taken action or made investments in at least one of the aspects they were asked about, as a result of COVID-19, above the EU average (57%).

Firms in Sweden (58%) are more likely than the EU average (46%) to have become more digital as a response to COVID-19. Similar to the EU average, a quarter (25%) of Swedish firms have developed new products while 13% have shortened the supply chain.

Q. As a response to the COVID-19 pandemic, have you taken any actions or made investments to...?

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Impact of COVID-19

IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON INVESTMENT

COVID-19 had an impact on investment plans. In Sweden, over a quarter (27%) of firms have revised their investment plans downwards, while only 3% have revised them upwards. Nevertheless, a large majority (70%) has not changed their investment plans as a result of COVID-19. All figures are in line with the EU average.

A very large majority (84%) of construction firms report that they have not adjusted their investment plan as a result of COVID-19.

Swedish firms whose sales or turnover had been negatively impacted by COVID-19 are more likely to have revised their investment plans downwards compared to firms whose sales or turnover had been buoyant.

More than a third (36%) of Swedish firms who had experienced a negative sales impact revised their investment plans downwards, the same proportion of firms as across the EU as a whole (36%). The respective Swedish and EU figures among those whose sales or turnover had not been negatively affected were 21% and 16%.

DIFFERENCES IN IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON INVESTMENT

Swedish firms whose sales or turnover had been negatively impacted by COVID-19 are more likely to have revised their investment plans downwards compared to firms whose sales or turnover had been buoyant.

More than a third (36%) of Swedish firms who had experienced a negative sales impact revised their investment plans downwards, the same proportion of firms as across the EU as a whole (36%). The respective Swedish and EU figures among those whose sales or turnover had not been negatively affected were 21% and 16%.

Q. Has your company taken any of the following actions as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?

Q. You mentioned revising your investment plans due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Did you revise them upward or downward?

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

Q. Do you expect the COVID-19 outbreak to have a long-term impact on any of the following?

Q. What has been the impact so far of the COVID-19 pandemic on your company’s sales or turnover compared to the beginning of 2020? Has it...

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

The majority of Swedish firms do not perceive gaps in their investment. In spite of difficult economic circumstances, three-quarters of Swedish firms believe their investment over the last three years was about right (76%). A fifth (20%) believe they may have invested too little over the past three years, above the EU average (14%).

Manufacturing firms are the most likely to say they invested too little (28% compared to 15% or 16% in other sectors). The figures for large firms and SMEs are remarkably similar.

SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY

The share of Swedish firms that operated at or above full capacity (48%) in 2020 is virtually unchanged since EIBIS 2020 (50%) and is close to the current EU average (49%).

In most of the sectors, the proportion of firms that have operated at or above capacity has fallen since EIBIS 2020, and manufacturing firms (42%) remain the least likely to have done so. Swedish firms in the construction sector (59%) were the most likely to operate at or above full capacity, even though the share has fallen since EIBIS 2020 (70%).

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

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

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

Q. In the last financial year, was your company operating above or at maximum capacity attainable?

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, expanding capacity for existing products and services is the most commonly cited investment priority among Swedish firms (39%). This is 10 percentage points higher than the share reported in EIBIS 2020. Capacity expansion is followed by the development or introduction of new products, processes or services (30%) and the replacement of capacity for existing buildings, machinery and equipment (23%).

The share of firms with no investment planned (8%) is lower than the one reported in EIBIS 2020 (14%) and now in line with the EU average (9%). In Sweden, construction firms (18%) and SMEs (13%) are the most likely not to have investment planned over the next three years. Almost half (49%) of firms in the manufacturing sector say they will prioritise capacity expansion. This compares to 28% in infrastructure where replacement is a bigger priority (38%).

COVID-19 LONG-TERM IMPACT

The large majority of Swedish firms (83%) believe COVID-19 will have an impact in at least one of the ways they were asked about, more so than the EU average (72%).

The Swedish figure for ‘any impact’ is virtually unchanged from EIBIS 2020, but the proportion of firms that anticipates an increased use of digital technologies has risen sharply (from 62% to 78%). This is much higher than the EU average of 55%.

A quarter of Swedish firms foresee a long-term impact on their service or product portfolio (26%), or their supply chain (24%).

One in ten (10%) expect a long-term reduction in employment as a result of COVID-19, a figure that has almost halved since EIBIS 2020 (18%).
Innovation Activities

INNOVATION ACTIVITY

Two-fifths (41%) of Swedish firms developed or introduced new products, processes or services, as part of their investment activities in 2020. This is identical to what was reported in EIBIS 2020 and above the current EU average (36%).

As part of their investment activities, a quarter of Swedish firms (26%) developed or introduced new products, processes or services that were new to the company. This increases to 40% among manufacturing firms. Construction firms were the least likely to innovate (29% compared to 54% in manufacturing).

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 firms’ innovation and research and development behaviour is profiled more widely, 23% of firms in Sweden can be classified as ‘active innovators’, and a further 3% are ‘developers’.

The share of leading innovators is 9%, meaning that next to investments in R&D, almost 1 in 10 Swedish firms introduced a product, process or service that was new to either the country or the world.

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)

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 or services but allocated a significant part of their investment activities to research and development. ‘Incremental’ and ‘Leading innovators’ have introduced 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.

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?
Innovation Activities

IMPLEMENTATION OF ADVANCED DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Two-thirds of Swedish firms (66%) have implemented at least one advanced digital technology. This is slightly lower than the share reported in EIBIS 2020 (71%) but above the current EU average (61%). In particular, Swedish firms (415%) are more likely than the EU average (33%) to have implemented multiple advanced technologies.

Firms in the construction sector (43%) are the least likely to have implemented any advanced digital technologies within their business. This figure compares to 71% of services firms and 70% within the manufacturing sector. Large firms are more likely than SMEs to have implemented advanced digital technologies. The difference is greatest for the implementation of multiple technologies (54% versus 28%).

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)

ADVANCED DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Not every digital technology was asked of each 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?

Sample size SE: Manufacturing (153); Construction (90); Services (111); Infrastructure (121)

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

SHORT-TERM FIRM OUTLOOK

On balance Swedish firms are pessimistic about the political and regulatory climate. Nevertheless, expectations for the overall economic climate have turned back positive (rising from -61% to +38%) as have perceptions of business prospects in the sector (rising from -12% to +51%).

Since EIBIS 2020 Swedish firms’ expectations for the availability of both external and internal finance have risen. From -7% to +12% for the former and from -21% to +31% for the latter.

On all factors, the short-term outlook in Sweden is very similar to the one in the EU overall.

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

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

With the exception of the services sector, where pessimists and optimists are balanced equally, firms in each sector and of every size are more negative than positive about the political and regulatory climate.

The balance of firms that is optimistic about business prospects for their sector is above 50% in manufacturing (59%), services (55%) and also among large firms (59%). These firms are also the most likely to be positive about the overall economic climate.

A balance of 4% of large firms is optimistic about the availability of external finance. While this is lower than for SMEs, this may reflect that financing conditions for these firms are already favourable.

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
Availability of skilled staff (78%) and uncertainty about the future (65%) remain the most frequently mentioned long-term barriers to investment. The figures for skilled staff have increased since EIBIS 2020 (72%) and are very similar to the EU average (79%). Uncertainty about the future (65%) has eased since EIBIS 2020 (75%) and is below the EU average (73%).

Generally, Swedish firms are far less concerned about barriers to investment than in the EU overall. Access to digital infrastructure, labour market regulations and availability of finance are considered much less of a long-term barrier to investment in Sweden. Swedish firms are also more likely to perceive these as minor than major obstacles.

LONG-TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Sweden, 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)

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Sweden, 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)
As in 2019, firms in Sweden continued to fund the majority of their investment in 2020 through internal financing (67%), a little higher than the EU average and a little lower than the share reported in EIBIS 2020 (63% and 70% respectively).

On average, external finance represented 29% of Swedish firms' investment (below the EU average of 35%). There are differences across sectors, with external finance representing a much larger share of investment capital for infrastructure firms (42%) than for service firms (17%).

In Sweden intra-group finance accounted for approximately 4% of investment. Even among large firms (8%) it accounted for less than a tenth of investment finance.

In Sweden, bank loans continued to make up the highest share of external finance (52%). This is in line with what was reported in EIBIS 2020 (52%) and with the EU average (56%).

Leasing or hire purchase accounted for the second highest share of external finance (29%), above the EU average (20%).

While the figure is negligible for other sectors, 10% of manufactures’ external finance consisted of bonds. Almost 58% of infrastructure firms’ and 68% of large firms’ external finance took the form of bank loans.
Investment Finance

ACTIONS TAKEN AS A RESULT OF COVID-19

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, one in twelve Swedish firms (8%) have increased their debt position, half the EU average of 16%.

A similar proportion of Swedish firms have raised new equity from the current owners (8%), while 2% have raised fresh equity from a new source.

SHARE OF FIRMS RECEIVING FINANCIAL SUPPORT IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Public support was important: two-thirds (65%) of firms in Sweden report that they have received some form of financial help, above the EU average of 56%.

Primarily this support has come in the form of subsidies that do not need to be paid back, with 53% of Swedish firms receiving them. This is above the EU average (36%). Fewer than one in ten Swedish firms have received deferral of payments or new subsidised or guaranteed credit (9% and 4%). Both figures are below the EU average (16% and 17%).
Access To Finance

**DISSATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED**

Firms in Sweden that have used external finance in 2020 are far more likely to be satisfied than dissatisfied with the finance received.

The greatest level of dissatisfaction is with the cost of external finance (11%), double the EU average (5%).

After cost, fewer than one in ten firms expressed dissatisfaction with any aspect of the external finance they had received. These low levels of dissatisfaction are in line with the EU average.

With the exception of the cost, dissatisfaction levels are low across all sectors and size classes. Almost a fifth (19%) of manufacturing firms are dissatisfied with the cost of external finance as are 14% of SMEs.

One in ten (11%) manufacturing firms also expressed dissatisfaction with the collateral required to secure external finance.
Access To Finance

SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS

Just 4% of all firms in Sweden can be considered finance constrained in terms of external finance, which is in line with the EU average of 5%, and the same as EIBIS 2020.

Services firms are more likely to be finance constrained: 6% report issues in obtaining external finance, with half of these saying finance is too expensive.

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 (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

FINANCING CONSTRAINTS OVER TIME

Since EIBIS 2020 there has been little change in the share of Swedish firms that are finance constrained.

Firms in Sweden are slightly less likely to be finance constrained than those across the EU, but the gap between Swedish firms and the EU average appears to be narrowing.

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Climate Change and Energy Efficiency

IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE – PHYSICAL RISK

The majority of Swedish firms (55%) believe climate change has no impact on their business. This is similar to EIBIS 2020 (53%) but more than ten percentage points above the EU average (42%).

Manufacturing firms in particular believe climate change has no impact (62%), and are highly unlikely to think it has a major impact (3% compared to between 13% and 19% across other sectors).

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)

IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE – RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRANSITION TO A NET ZERO EMISSION ECONOMY OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

The share of Swedish firms seeing the transition to stricter climate standards and regulations as an opportunity over the next five years is above the share of firms who perceive it as a risk (41% and 27% respectively). The proportion of Swedish firms regarding this as an opportunity is well above the EU average of 28%.

A third (32%) of firms did not expect the transition to have an impact on their company.

Large firms in Sweden are more likely than SMEs to see the transition to a net zero emission economy as an opportunity (48% compared to 34%).

Q. Thinking about your company, what impact do you expect this transition to stricter climate standards and regulations will have on your company over the next five years?

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know / refused responses)
Climate Change and Energy Efficiency

INVESTMENT PLANS TO TACKLE CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT

Two-fifths (40%) of Swedish firms have already invested to deal with climate change and almost half (49%) have plans to invest more in the next three years. Both figures are close to the current EU average.

The actions and intentions of large firms indicate a greater willingness than SMEs to invest to deal with climate change. The respective figures for already invested are 51% and 29%, while for plan to invest they are 59% and 39%.

Services firms in Sweden are the least likely to have plans to invest in the next three years to tackle climate change (37% compared to 53% or 54% in sectors).

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

SHARE OF FIRMS INVESTING IN MEASURES TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND SHARE OF TOTAL INVESTMENT

Just over one-third (38%) of firms in Sweden invested in measures to improve energy efficiency in 2020, similar to share reported in EIBIS 2020 (43%) and in line with the EU average (37%).

At 9%, the average share of investment in measures to improve energy efficiency is the same in Sweden as among EU firms.

A higher proportion of large firms (45%) have invested in energy efficiency measures than SMEs (30%), although the average share of investment is similar for both (8% and 9% respectively).
Firm management, climate targets, gender balance and employment

FIRM MANAGEMENT, CLIMATE TARGETS AND GENDER BALANCE

Swedish firms were more likely than the EU average to strive for gender balance (74% versus 60%) or to set and monitor emissions and energy consumption targets (64% versus 46%). Conversely, Sweden has a smaller proportion of firms who have used strategic monitoring systems (45% versus 55%)

There is a large difference between large firms and SMEs on these measures. Large firms were twice as likely as SMEs to use strategic monitoring systems (64% versus 28%) and to set and monitor internal targets on carbon emissions and energy consumption (86% versus 44%). In the construction sector only a quarter (24%) of firms used a strategic monitoring system.

In Sweden there has been virtually no change in the overall size of the workforce since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. The change (-0.3%) is very close to the EU average.

There is no meaningful difference between SMEs (-0.2%) and large firms (-0.3%) in the change of the size of workforce.
EIBIS 2021 – 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 Sweden, 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>SE</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>EU vs SE</th>
<th>Constr Vs Manuf</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11920)</td>
<td>(802)</td>
<td>(482)</td>
<td>(153)</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>(409)</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(11920 vs 482)</td>
<td>(90 vs 153)</td>
<td>(409 vs 73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10% or 90%  | 1.1% | 3.5% | 3.2% | 5.3% | 6.5% | 6.7% | 6.2% | 2.6% | 6.0% | 3.4% | 8.4% | 6.5% |

30% or 70%  | 1.7% | 5.3% | 4.9% | 8.2% | 9.9% | 10.3% | 9.5% | 4.0% | 9.1% | 5.1% | 12.8% | 9.9% |

50%         | 1.8% | 5.8% | 5.3% | 8.9% | 10.8% | 11.2% | 10.4% | 4.3% | 9.9% | 5.6% | 13.9% | 10.8% |

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.

Note: the EIBIS 2021 country overview refers interchangeably to ‘the past/last financial year’ or to ‘2020’. Both refer to results collected in EIBIS 2021, where the question is referring to the past financial year, with the majority of the financial year in 2020 in case the financial year is not overlapping with the calendar year 2020.
The country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 482 firms in Sweden (carried out between March and July 2021).

## BASE SIZES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All firms, p. 2, p. 6, p. 7, p. 10, p. 11</td>
<td>11920/11971</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>482/480</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding 'Company didn't exist three years ago' responses), p. 6</td>
<td>11910/11949</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>482/480</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11620/11634</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>476/474</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 4 (top)</td>
<td>11860/NA</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>478/NA</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 4 (bottom)</td>
<td>11891/NA</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>482/NA</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 5 (top)</td>
<td>11814/11971</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>481/480</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 5 (bottom)</td>
<td>11765/11727</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>473/469</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 7 (top)</td>
<td>11648/11720</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>467/456</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 7 (bottom)</td>
<td>8780/9039</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>381/357</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 8 (top)</td>
<td>11891/11938</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>481/477</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 8 (bottom)</td>
<td>11220/11262</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>482/480</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 9 (top)</td>
<td>11882/NA</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>482/NA</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 9 (bottom)</td>
<td>11857/NA</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>481/NA</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 10 (top)</td>
<td>11518/11477</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>471/467</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 10 (bottom)</td>
<td>11849/11898</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>482/480</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 11 (top)</td>
<td>11384/NA</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>459/NA</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 11 (bottom)</td>
<td>11659/11739</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>470/471</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 12 (top)</td>
<td>11616/NA</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>474/NA</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 12 (bottom)</td>
<td>11664/11402</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>477/459</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 3 (top)</td>
<td>9670/10138</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>401/411</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 3 (bottom)</td>
<td>9523/9874</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>418/406</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 4</td>
<td>8675/9255</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>236/265</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don't know/refused responses), p. 12</td>
<td>11920/11971</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>482/480</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>409</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>4003/4354</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>107/112</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>96</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>3964/4310</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>105/110</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sweden
Overview