日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges



Survey Report on Overseas Business Operations by Japanese Manufacturing Companies

JBIC 34th Survey, 2022 Strategic Research Department



We would like to express our deep gratitude to all the companies who cooperated in this survey. We hope that the results of this survey will serve as a reference for future business activities.

This report is published to serve as a reference for research and discussions of JBIC. The views expressed in this report do not represent the official position of JBIC. The views expressed in this report do not represent the official position of JBIC. Copying of this report without consent of JBIC is strictly prohibited. JBIC shall not be held liable for any damages that may occur from the use of this report.



1	Survey overview	p.4
2	Basic Data and Evaluation of Project Performance	p.8
3	Business Prospects and Promising Countries/Regions	p.13
4	Hot topics for Japanese Manufacturing Companies	p.35
5	Special Theme #1 Impact of the Invasion of Ukraine	p.38
6	Special Theme #2 Supply Chains and Geopolitical Risks	; p.42
7	Special Theme #3 Sustainability Initiatives	p.48
(App	endix #1) Detailed data	p.56
(App	endix #2) Supplementary Research of Text Mining	p.83





1. Japanese manufacturers' overseas business operations seem to have started to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic

The overseas business operations of Japanese manufacturers seem to have started to recover from the pandemic-induced slowdown and stagnation that was observed until the previous fiscal year. Both their overseas sales ratios and overseas production ratios are on the rise compared to the previous year. In FY2022, their overseas sales ratios are projected to be at pre-pandemic levels, and according to their medium-term plans, their overseas production ratios are expected to recover to almost pre-pandemic levels in 2025. Overseas earnings also increased in many regions, which is encouraging Japanese manufacturers, particularly the larger ones, to expand their operations again domestically and internationally.

2. India has returned as the top promising country after three years, pushing China down into second place

Seen by a wide range of industries to be the most promising country for the next three years, India is back to the top place after three years, while China has lost a large number of votes. China's decline is most likely attributable to its radical zero-COVID policy, which has brought its economy to a standstill. However, amid an ongoing US-China conflict, there are also various other growing concerns that could be the cause of this descent. The United States maintains its third place, backed by its solid expectations for further economic growth in the general machinery industry. Among the ASEAN members, those that ranked relatively high last year have stayed in the same places, partially regaining the votes they had lost due to the pandemic.

3. Nearly 90% of the respondents suffered a negative impact from the invasion in Ukraine

Almost 90% of the respondents said their business had been negatively affected by the Russian invasion of Ukraine. The most common impacts were indirect impacts such as "rising fuel prices," "logistics disruption," and an "increase in spending due to currency fluctuations." Direct influences, such as the "scaling back or discontinuing of operations" and "working around economic sanctions," were identified by a relatively small number of the respondents. In addition, there were many more respondents that anticipate they will accelerate their decarbonization efforts due to the invasion than the opposite. The high price of fossil fuels induced by the invasion seems to have heightened expectations for a widespread introduction of clean energy.

4. Japanese manufacturers view geopolitical risk as increasingly critical for their business strategy and are enhancing their information gathering and capacity for analysis

Approximately 90% of the respondents view geopolitical risk as "very significant" or "significant" for their business strategy. Many respondents said they were diversifying their suppliers and enhancing their information gathering capacity or risk analysis/evaluation capability in order to mitigate geopolitical risk, and few said they were changing their location strategy or investment plan, or discontinuing or selling their business. Concerning the US-China decoupling, fewer than the previous year's survey said they would enhance their operation in China, for the same reason for China's decline in the promising country rankings, and more said they would enhance their operation in US.

5. Approximately 80% of the respondents are considering sustainability, and 75% of these respondents are already working on decarbonization

Approximately 80% of the respondents are considering sustainability in their overseas business operations. Those respondents who aspired highly toward operations overseas or viewed geopolitical risk seriously tended to consider sustainability. Also, respondents are particularly concerned about climate change and decarbonization. 75% of them are already taking action, and more than 50% of respondents are making efforts that align with or exceed the Government of Japan's goal of achieving carbon neutrality by 2050. Furthermore, we found that those that have the aim of actively improving their brand image are more actively addressing decarbonization. Regarding human rights protections, the respondents are showing significant progress compared to the previous year.



日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges



1. Survey Overview





1. Research Objective and Targets

This survey aimed to research and analyze the current status and future prospects for overseas business development of Japanese manufacturing companies. The companies targeted in this survey are Japanese manufacturing companies which have three or more overseas affiliates (including at least one production base).

2. Methodology

(1) Number of surveyed companies: 946

(2) Methods: The questionnaires were sent via post and email. Questionnaires were sent either through email or physical mail. During the survey period, supplemental online interviews were also conducted.

3. Responses

(1) Number of respondents: 531 (105 by post, 426 by web)(2) Response rate: 56.1% (+2.7 points compared to last year)

4. Survey Period

July 12, 2022, to September 2, 2022 (*Responses received by September 12 were counted as valid)

5. Survey Items

(1) Survey Overview

(2) Overseas Business Performance

(3) Business Prospects and Promising Countries/Regions

- (4) Hot Topics for Japanese Manufacturing Companies
- (5) Impacts of the invasion of Ukraine*

(6) Supply chains and geopolitical risk*

(7) Sustainability initiatives*

(Items with asterisks (*) indicate this year's independent topics)

Copyright $\ensuremath{\textcircled{C}}$ Japan Bank for International Cooperation

Figure 1.1 Responding Companies (by sector)



Industry Type	FY2021	FY2022	Proportion
Automobiles	109	109	20.5%
Chemicals	80	88	16.6%
Electrical Equipment & Electronics	67	74	13.9%
General Machinery	59	63	11.9%
Precision Machinery	32	28	5.3%
Nonferrous Metals	21	24	4.5%
Food	23	21	4.0%
Textiles	23	21	4.0%
Metal Products	22	21	4.0%
Transportation Equipment (excl. Automobiles)	12	17	3.2%
Petroleum & Rubber	14	15	2.8%
Paper, Pulp & Wood	11	14	2.6%
Steel	12	11	2.1%
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	12	10	1.9%
Other	18	15	2.8%
Total	515	531	100.0%

(Note) In this study, Automobiles, Chemicals, Electrical and electronics and General machinery are collectively referred to as the 'four main industries'. The term 'Chemical' refers to the total of 'Chemicals (including plastic products)' and 'Pharmaceuticals', while the terms 'Automobiles', 'Electrical equipment and electronics', 'General machinery' and 'Precision machinery' refer to the total of 'Assembly' and 'Parts' in the respective industry sectors.

Figure 1.2 Number of Responding Firms (by Capitalisation, Non-consolidated)

(companies)							
Paid-in Capital	FY2021	FY2022	Proportion				
Less than ¥300 mn.	120	132	24.9%				
¥300 mn. up to ¥1 bn.	74	77	14.5%				
¥1 bn. up to ¥5 bn.	109	103	19.4%				
¥5 bn. up to ¥10 bn.	62	62	11.7%				
¥10 bn. or more	144	150	28.2%				
Holding company	6	7	1.3%				
No response	0	0	0.0%				
Total	515	531	100.0%				

(Note: For the purposes of this study, the definition of 'small and medium-sized enterprises' is enterprises with a capital of less than 1 billion yen.

Figure 1.3 Profile of Responding Companies

Headquarters Location

Tokyo 180, Osaka 69, Aichi 48, Kanagawa 29, Hyogo 26, Hiroshima 22, Saitama 17, Kyoto 16, Nagano 16, Shizuoka 13, Shiga 11, Okayama 8, Tochigi 8, Toyama 8, Chiba 7, Ishikawa 6, Kagawa 6, Gunma 6, Gifu 4, Fukui 4, Mie 4, Ehime 3, Fukuoka 3, Yamagata 3, Ibaraki 2, Tokushima 2, Niigata 2, Yamanashi 2, Tottori 1, Nara 1, Fukushima 1, Hokkaido 1, Miyazaki 1, Wakayama 1

Note: The head office addresses of the respondent companies are plotted.



Source: This map was created by JBIC based on "CraftMAP" (http://www.craftmap.box-i.net/)



Figure 1.4 Transition of Survey Methods



Figure 1.5 Distribution of Overseas Affiliates

(1) One or more overseas

affiliates for production

	Country/ Region	No. of respondents (company)	Proportion			Country/ Region	No. of respondents (company)
1	China	386	75.0%		1	China	302
2	Thailand	247	48.0%		2	US	247
3	US	216	41.9%		3	Thailand	202
4	Indonesia	167	32.4%		4	EU14	164
5	Vietnam	125	24.3%		5	Singapore	140
6	India	119	23.1%		6	Taiwan	136
7	Mexico	108	21.0%		7	Indonesia	115
8	EU14	102	19.8%		8	India	114
9	Malaysia	93	18.1%		9	Korea	113
10	Taiwan	88	17.1%			Hong Kong	113
11	Korea	84	16.3%	1	11	Vietnam	101
12	Philippines	74	14.4%	1	12	Malaysia	86
13	Central & Eastern Europe	52	10.1%	1	13	Mexico	83
14	Brazil	50	9.7%	1	14	UK	81
15	Singapore	43	8.3%	1	15	Brazil	59
	ик	43	8.3%				

(2) One or more overseas affiliates for sales

Proportion

58.6%

48.0%

39.2%

31.8%

27.2%

26.4%

22.3%

22.1%

21.9%

21.9%

19.6%

16.7%

16.1%

15.7%

11.5%

Note: The total number of companies responding to this guestion is 515.

< Definitions of regions in this study >

NIEs3 South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong ASEAN5 Singapore, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines ASEAN 10 ASEAN 5, Vietnam, Myanmar, Cambodia, Laos, Brunei North America USA, Canada EU14 Germany, France, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Greece, Luxembourg Denmark, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Finland, Sweden, Ireland Central and Eastern Europe Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia, Albania, Croatia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Republic of North Macedonia

Europe EU14, UK, Central and Eastern Europe, Turkey

*Taiwan and Hong Kong are counted as NIEs3.

< Regional classification of China in this study >

Northeast (Heilongjiang, Jilin and Liaoning provinces) North China (Beijing, Tianjin, Hebei and Shandong provinces) East China (Shanghai, Jiangsu, Anhui and Zhejiang provinces) **South China** (Fujian, Guangdong and Hainan provinces) Inland areas (provinces and autonomous regions other than those `'mentioned above)

XTaiwan and Hong Kong are included in the NIEs.



日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges



2. Basic Data and Evaluation of Project Performance





Figure 2.1 Trends in Overseas Production/Sales Ratios (FY2001 onwards, all industries)



Reference: Contribution to the increase in overseas sales ratio (FY2020-2021 / by industry)

Inductor Turne	(Contribution to
Industry Type		the increase
Petroleum & Rubber		-0.2
Food		-0.1
Metal products		-0.1
Ceramics, Cement & Glass		0.0
Paper, Pulp & Wood		0.0
Textiles		0.0
Transportation Equipment		0.0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics		0.0
Steel		0.1
Other		0.1
Automobiles		0.2
Nonferrous Metals		0.2
Chemicals		0.5
General Machinery		0.6
Precision Machinery		0.6
Total		2.1

Note: This is calculated by weighing the rate of increase from last year based on the number of companies responding to this year's survey.

Note 2: Each of the ratios in the graph is a simple average based upon the values reported by responding companies. Note 3: Surveys were not performed on overseas sales ratios in 2003 and 2005.

The overseas production/sales ratios have risen for the first time since the coronavirus pandemic.

- The ratio of overseas production in FY2021 recovered to 34.9%, exceeding the estimated FY2021 result (33.8%) in the previous year's survey, and turning upwards for the first time since the coronavirus pandemic. The estimated FY2022 result will remain almost unchanged, but in the medium-term plan (FY2025), the ratio will increase to 36.3%. The recovery trend is expected to continue.
- The ratio of overseas sales also bottomed out in the last financial year, with the FY2021 results recording the largest growth rate in the past decade, up 2.1 points to 37.9%. The FY2022 results forecast is for a further increase to 38.5%, close to the FY18 (38.7%) level before the coronavirus pandemic.





Export-oriented industries such as Chemicals and General Machinery have increased significantly in the overseas sales ratios.

- The overseas production ratios for Automobiles (41.4% to 41.3%) and Chemicals (26.4% to 26.4%) remained almost unchanged compared to the previous year's survey. In contrast, Electrical equipment & Electronics (41.8% to 45.5%) and General Machinery (25.2% to 28.9%) have started to recover and reached the level before the coronavirus pandemic. They are expected to rise further in the medium-term plan.
- As for the overseas sales ratio, 4 main industries* have turned to an increase compared to the previous year. Although the overseas sales ratio in Chemicals and General Machinery rose sharply, they did not reach the level before the coronavirus pandemic. The ratio of Electrical equipment & Electronics, which showed a rise with the increase of the telework-related demand in the previous year, it remained almost unchanged.

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation



Question

Please select the answer that best describes your company's FY2021 (until March 2022) profits when compared with the initial targets (by countries/regions).

Figure 2.3 Evaluation of Overseas Earnings Performance

		(%)
(FY)	2020	2021
Above the target	17.9	24.0(+6.1)
Mostly as planned	44.9	47.5(+2.6)
Below the target	37.2	28.5(▲8.7)

Note: This is a simple average of the evaluation scores for each destination region and country.

- There is a sign of recovery from the coronavirus in most countries.
- According to the overseas performance evaluations, slightly more companies chose 'below the target' (28.5%) than 'above the target' (24.0%). But in all countries/regions except China and Russia, the number of companies which chose 'above the target' has increased compared to the last year. The business environment appears to have improved significantly from the time of last year's survey, when India and South-East Asia and so on were experiencing a serious coronavirus pandemic. In the interviews, it was pointed out that 'Capital investment has increased and business performance has remained strong as a result of the recovery from the coronavirus pandemic'. (General Machinery)
- On the other hand, the business environment in China and Russia showed deterioration due to the strict lockdown and the invasion of Ukraine and so on. In addition, some companies had the problem of semiconductor shortages.

Figure 2.4 Overseas Performance Evaluation (by Country/Region)





Improvements in export and sales activities in many countries, but cost reductions and sluggish domestic demand remain challenges.

- As for the reasons for exceeding the target, 'Good performance of exports from the country/region' increased across the board in most countries from the previous
 year, indicating that export transactions are getting active as supply chain disruptions subsides. In India and ASEAN, 'Good performance of sales in the
 country/regions' increased, indicating a recovery in domestic consumer behavior.
- As for the reasons for falling below the target, 'Other temporary factors' decreased overall, indicating that the impact of the coronavirus is diminishing from the previous year. On the other hand, 'Cost cuts via consolidation of manufacturing' increased, especially in the US, which was greatly affected by high inflation. In the interviews, it was pointed out that "The rising cost of labour and materials in the US has become an issue, and we are restructuring our business" (Automobiles).

Performance Evaluations: Figure 2.5 Reasons for Exceeding the Target

Figure 2.6 Reasons for Falling Below the Target





日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges



3. Business Prospects and Promising Countries/ Regions



(1) Future Business Expansions: Stance Toward Strengthening/Expanding Business (Overseas/Domestic)





As for overseas business, 'Strengthen/Expand' is on a recovery trend.

- The number of companies which chose 'Strengthen/expand' recovered by 3.5 percentage points as 'Maintain present level' decreased. While until the previous year's survey, several companies said that it was difficult to make a forecast under the pandemic, this year's survey suggests that an increasing number of companies are making business plans with a view to the new normal with the pandemic.
- In terms of company size, large enterprises showed a steady increase, whereas SMEs showed a cautious trend, a turnaround from the previous year's survey.

In domestic business, 'Strengthen/Expand' rises due to resumption of capital investment with a recovery from the pandemic.

As for the domestic business, 'Strengthen/expand' rose for the second consecutive year due in part to the resumption of capital investment plans, including renewal investments and new investments for decarbonization-related measures, which were postponed due to the pandemic. It is the highest rate of 49.2% in the past 10 years. A firm from the metal industry pointed out that 'Assuming industry-academia collaboration, we would like to appeal from Japan to the rest of the world.'

3



Figure 3.3 Shift in Intentions to Strengthen/Expand Business (2003-2022)



Overseas "Strengthen/Expand" ratio

3

Willingness towards overseas business slowly recovering

• The proportion of companies which chose 'strengthen/expand' increased by 3.5 points from the previous year to 67.2%, showing a gradual recovery from the impact of the coronavirus pandemic. Although the upward trend continues, it is different from the V-shaped recovery seen at the time of the collapse of Lehman Brothers, and quite a few companies remain cautious about the future outlook.

Linkage between overseas and domestic business stances

 A total of 211 companies (41.3% (511 respondents)) chose to 'strengthen/expand' both their overseas and domestic businesses, the highest level in the past decade. In addition, the ratio of companies choosing to 'strengthen/expand' their domestic business has increased over the past few years among those that 'strengthen/expand' their overseas business (Chart 3.5). This suggests that the linkage between domestic and overseas business expansions has been stronger. Figure 3.4 Cross Analysis of Prospects for Overseas and Domestic Business

Mediu	Medium-term Prospects (next 3 yrs. or so)								
Overseas business	Domestic business	No. of respondent companies	Proportion						
	Strengthen/expand	211	61.5%						
Strengthen/expand	Maintain present level	132	38.5%						
(343 companies)	Scale back	0	0.0%						
	Strengthen/expand	37	22.8%						
Maintain present level	Maintain present level	124	76.5%						
(162 companies)	Scale back	1	0.6%						
	Strengthen/expand	3	50.0%						
Scale back/withdraw	Maintain present level	2	33.3%						
(6 companies)	Scale back	1	16.7%						

Note: For data by industry, please refer to the Appendix. (n= 511 companies)

Figure 3.5 Increasing Linkage between Overseas and Domestic Businesses



Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

(1) Future Business Expansions: Stances Toward Strengthening/Expanding Business by Industry



Figure 3.6 Prospects for Medium-term Overseas Business Expansions

3



Figure 3.7 Prospects for Medium-term Domestic Business Expansions



In overseas business, many industries are in a position to 'Strengthen/expand', but still cautious in automobiles.

- Although the percentage of companies choosing 'strengthen/expand' increased overall in this year's survey and showed a recovery trend, the automobile sector, which is one of the main industries, indicated a continued cautious attitude towards overseas business.
- In the interviews, one automobile company pointed out 'We have a backlog of orders due to delays in production caused by a shortage of semiconductors, which makes expansion difficult at the moment' and 'We want to focus on improving the quality of our products with an emphasis on 'quality over quantity' to respond to the current business transformation' (from engine cars to EV cars).

Attitudes to strengthen and expand domestic business are rising in many sectors.

- In terms of industry, all industries except precision machinery have taken a stronger stance to 'strengthen/expand' their domestic operations in the current financial year.
- In addition to the resumption of capital expenditure that had been postponed in the wake of the pandemic, it appears that more companies are increasing capital and research expenditure in order to respond to the current business transformation, including decarbonization.

Note 1: The option "undecided" was eliminated from the FY2021 survey.

Note 2: For detailed data, please refer to Appendix #1.



(2) Promising Countries: Potential Countries/Regions in the Medium-term - Ranking



Question | Please list up to five promising countries for business development in the medium-term (the next three years). (Multiple answers allowed, open-ended).

Figure 3.8 Promising Countries for Overseas Business over the Medium-term (Next 3 Years)

Percentage of votes	(%) =Number o	of votes for countr	y / Number of	respondent companies	
0	()			• •	

Ranking		na		INO	. 01	Percentage		
ranking			O sometrike s	Comp	anies	Shar	e(%)	
2022	\leftarrow	2021	Countries	2022	2021	2022	2021	
2022	-	2021	(Total)	367	345	2022	2021	
1		2	India	148	131	40.3	38.0	
2	₽	1	China	136	162	37.1	47.0	
3	—	3	US	118	113	32.2	32.8	
4	—	4	Vietnam	106	105	28.9	30.4	
5	—	5	Thailand	85	77	23.2	22.3	
6	_	6	Indonesia	77	67	21.0	19.4	
7		9	Malaysia	31	27	8.4	7.8	
8	$\mathbf{\bullet}$	7	Philippines	28	31	7.6	9.0	
9	-	8	Mexico	27	30	7.4	8.7	
10	—	10	Taiwan	23	19	6.3	5.5	
11	-	11	Germany	21	17	5.7	4.9	
12	-	12	Korea	17	16	4.6	4.6	
13	-	13	Brazil	15	13	4.1	3.8	
14	_	14	Australia	13	12	3.5	3.5	
15	₽	14	Singapore	12	12	3.3	3.5	
16	_	16	Bangladesh	10	10	2.7	2.9	
16		24	UK	10	4	2.7	1.2	
18	Ŷ	16	Turkey	9	10	2.5	2.9	
19		21	France	8	6	2.2	1.7	
20		21	Cambodia	7	6	1.9	1.7	

Note 1: Countries with the same rank were ordered based upon their rank in the previous survey. Note 2: See the appendix for the results prior to FY2021.

- India moves to the top of the list after three years, with China in second place.
- China and India swapped the top spot in the list of promising medium-term business destination countries, with India returning to first place for the first time in three years, since 2019, with an increase of 2.3 percentage points in the vote share. On the other hand, China fell significantly by -9.9 points in terms of vote share, dropping to second place.
- In contrast to India, where economic activity has recovered from the pandemic, China is thought to have suffered a significant drop in vote share, mainly due to the economic downturn caused by its strict zero COVID policy and other factors, as well as the escalation of the conflict between the US and China.
- The US retains third place, with most ASEAN countries also maintaining their rankings.
- The US remained in third place, with strong support from responding companies. The US is a
 mature, developed country with a huge market and high expectations for its growth potential; it
 has steadily increased its vote share since 2019 and it will be interesting to see where it goes
 from here.
- ASEAN countries, which fell across the board in the last financial year due to the Delta variant epidemic, have generally seen a slight increase in the number of votes received this year, while the ranking has remained unchanged among high-ranked ASEAN countries.
- European countries ranked amid invasion of Ukraine.
- It is important to note that the rankings from 11 to 20 onwards are likely to change due to the small number of votes received, but Germany continues to be the top European country, with the UK and France newly ranked in the top 20, and Eastern European countries can be found in the top 21 and below. It remains to be seen whether interest in Europe will continue in the future, even as the negative effects of the invasion of Ukraine become more prolonged.

<List of countries below 21st place>

Ranking	No. of Companies	Countries
21	5	Canada, Poland, UAE, Chile
25	4	Myanmar, Netherlands
27	3	Italy, Spain, Czech
30	2	Japan, Kenya, Egypt, Laos, South Africa, Hungary
36	1	Bahrain, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Slovenia, Colombia, Finland,
30	1	Morocco, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Slovak, Tanzania, Uzbekistan

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

(2) Promising Countries: Potential Countries/Regions in the Medium-term - Trends in Votes



Figure 3.9 Trends in Votes (1992-2022)



Polarised structure continues. Focus on future rankings of India and China

- In recent years, China and India have been competing for the top spot, with both countries going through cycles of ups and downs in vote share, with India coming out on top every three years since 2016. On the other hand, China's declining share of the vote appears to be a long-term trend, and it will be interesting to see how the rankings of the two countries change in the future.
- Of the other top 10 countries, Indonesia and Thailand have seen a slight recovery in turnout after falling last year, but neither has returned to the level in the prepandemic era.
- Overall, the bipolar structure, where the gap between the top six countries and the bottom countries widens, remains unchanged this year.

India is seen as promising in a wide range of industries, while China loses votes (see next page)

- India received support from a wide range of industries, including automobiles, electrical equipment and electronics. Conversely, China saw a decline in the number of votes in a wide range of industries, with the number of votes for automobiles in particular almost halved (from 42 to 22) from FY2020, with some saying that they would rather find a way forward in other markets than in China, where competition with local manufacturers and others is fierce (automotive parts).
- In the US, the percentage of votes cast in the four main industries had been on an increasing trend until last year's survey, but this time the drop in the number of votes cast for automobiles was offset by an increase for general machinery, resulting in the overall percentage of votes remaining unchanged.

<Notes on page 21 and following.

(Note 1) Source of data on direct investment: Ministry of Finance, Fiscal and Financial Statistics Monthly (Special Issue on Balance of Payments: Balance of Payments Statistics by Region) (1991-2004) Bank of Japan, "Balance of Payments Statistics (Direct Investment by Industry and Region)" (2005-2014).

Bank of Japan, "Balance of Payments Statistics (Direct Investment Flows)" (2015-2018).

Prior to 2005, data by industry sector did not exist, so the total amount is shown.

(Note 2) "Number of responding companies" here indicates the number of companies that responded to "reasons for promising" and "issues" out of the total. Therefore, it is not necessarily the same as the number of responding companies in Figure 3.17.

(Note 3) "Ratio" is calculated by dividing the number of companies that responded to each item (multiple responses allowed) by the number of companies.

(2) Promising Countries: Potential Countries/Regions in the Medium-term Trends in Votes (4 Main Industries)



Figure 3.10 Trends in Votes (4 Main Industries)

3

Note: Figures are calculated for countries for which industry data for the past 10 years are available.



Figure 3.11 Promising Countries for Overseas Business over the Medium-term (Next 3 Years) (4 Major Industries)

Autor	mobile			Elect	rical Equipm	nent & Elec	tronics		Chen	nicals			Gene	ral Machine	ry	
Donk	Country	FY2022	FY2021	Donk	Country	FY2022	FY2021		Ponk	Country	FY2022	FY2021	Ponk	Country	FY2022	FY2021
Nalik	Country	(Total 65)	(Total 67)	Nalik	Country	(Total 54)	(Total 45)		Rank	Country	(Total 64)	(Total 58)	Nalik	Country	(Total 49)	(Total 42)
1	India	34	31	1	China	23	23		1	China	31	30	1	US	22	14
2	China	22	31	1	India	23	17		2	India	26	22	2	China	16	20
3	US	14	23	3	Vietnam	15	19		3	US	23	23	2	India	16	17
3	Mexico	14	15	4	Thailand	14	9		4	Vietnam	19	18	4	Vietnam	15	15
3	Vietnam	14	11	5	Indonesia	13	10		5	Thailand	18	16	5	Thailand	13	9
6	Thailand	12	13	6	US	11	11		6	Indonesia	15	11	6	Indonesia	8	10
7	Indonesia	11	9	7	Philippines	10	6		7	Malaysia	10	6	7	Taiwan	7	5
8	Philippines	3	6	8	Malaysia	7	5		8	Taiwan	8	5	8	Malaysia	4	8
8	Malaysia	3	0	9	Brazil	5	4		9	Korea	7	7	8	Korea	4	3
10	Germany	2	2	9	Singapore	5	4		10	Germany	3	4	10	Turkey	3	3
				9	Germany	5	3		10	Australia	3	3	10	Germany	3	2
								-	10	Brazil	3	3	10	Mexico	3	1

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

0

3

10

UK

(3) Promising Countries/Regions over the Medium-term: Promising Reasons and Issues (Top 10)





20

(3) Promising Countries/Regions over the Medium-term: **Promising Reasons and Issues (Top 10)**





Vote Share: 37.1% (-9.9 pt from last year) Highest: 93.1% (2003) Lowest: 37.1% (2022)

Breakdown by Industry



Vote Share and Outward FDI of Japan



- Record low vote share due to Zero-COVID policy and other factors, falling to second place
- The percentage of votes received fell by about 10 percentage points from the previous year's survey, the lowest level ever since the start of this survey. Although the promising reasons for the country still show high expectations and future growth, it has lost the top spot to India, reflecting a difficult business environment affected by restrictions on economic activity due to the thorough implementation of the Zero-COVID policy.
- In terms of issues or challenges, the proportion of companies citing 'rising labour costs' and intense competition' has remained high, while the proportion of companies citing 'uncertainty over the operation of legislation' and 'insufficient protection of intellectual property rights' has risen to over 40%, coupled with the conflict between the US and China.















(3) Promising Countries/Regions over the Medium-term: Promising Reasons and Issues (Top 10)



No. 6 Indonesia (\rightarrow)

Vote Share: 21.0% (+1.6 pt from last year) Highest: 45.7% (2014) Lowest: 8.1% (2006)

Breakdown by Industry



Vote Share and Outward FDI of Japan



Maintains 6th position, showing recovery from the pandemic, with high expectations for continued market growth potential

- The vote share reversed the significant drop due to the pandemic in the previous year and maintained its sixth place. The reasons for the high expectations for the 'future growth potential of the local market' and 'current size' remained at the highest level in the past three years. In addition, 'profitability of the local market' has increased for the past 2 years.
- On the other hand, along with an increasingly competitive environment, 'uncertainty over the execution of legislation and taxation' continues to be the top issue, with the development of a system to accommodate foreign companies remaining a challenge.

Promising Reasons



Billion yen

4000

3000

(3) Promising Countries/Regions over the Medium-term: Promising Reasons and Issues (Top 10)

%

0

Promising Reasons





Vote Share: 8.4 % (+0.6 pt from last year) Highest: 23.9% (1994) Lowest: 4.1% (2007)

Breakdown by Industry



- The country moved up two places to seventh place in the rankings, with an increase in the vote rate due to the recovery from the pandemic, and a fall in the vote rates of other countries. As reasons for the promising results, along with expectations of market growth potential, there was a trend towards an increase in votes for 'as a third-country export base', 'as a supply base for assembly manufacturers', and 'as a source of risk' diversification to other countries' indicating high expectations as a base for business risk diversification amid the prolonged friction between the US and China.
- As for challenges, votes were cast for 'intense competition with other companies', 'rising labour costs' and 'difficulty in securing managerial and technical personnel'. The results show that, challenges exist in terms of profitability and human capital, while it is highly attractive as a business location.



2000 1000 0 2008 2010 966 998 000 002 004 9003 2012 2014 2016 1992 994 <u>∞</u> -1000 FDI (Manufacturing) FDI (Non-Manufacturing) Promising Country Percentage Share (right axis) Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

Increasing attractiveness as a base for diversifying business risks

²⁶

(3) Promising Countries/Regions over the Medium-term: Promising Reasons and Issues (Top 10)





Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

27











(4) Promising Countries/Regions: Potential Countries/Regions over the Medium-term - Existence of Business Plans



Question

Please select the answer that best describes your company's business plan in each of the countries/regions listed in the Promising Countries/Regions over the medium-term (next 3 years).



Note 1: The ratio in the graph is the number of companies that answered that they have a business plan in a certain country divided by the number of companies that answered that the country was promising. Note 2: The number in parentheses on the bar graph is the number of companies that answered that the country was promising in Figure 3.8.

In the US and Mexico, more than half of respondent companies have business plans.

- The top five countries with the highest "business planning rate", were the US (54.3%), Mexico (51.8%), China (46.3%), Malaysia (41.9%) and Taiwan (39.1%) in order.
- In India, as in Taiwan, the number of companies choosing 'A new business plan exists' increased significantly compared to the previous year's survey, but 'A business plan for additional investment exists' remained unchanged. India ranked only sixth in terms of the percentage with plans, which was the lowest among the top three countries (India, China and the US) in the ranking of promising countries over the medium term, at just under 40%. This can be seen as evidence that the reasons why the respondents chose India as a promising country are image-driven, and the future of the country will be a focus of attention.



Figure 3.13 Promising Countries/Regions in the Long-term (Next 10 Years)

(1) Results for FY2022

Ranking			Country/Region	No Comp	. of anies	Percentage Share(%)		
2022	\leftarrow	2021	(Total)	2022 235	2021 243	2022	2021	
1	_	1	India	119	120	50.6	49.4	
2	_	2	China	86	99	36.6	40.7	
3	_	3	US	69	71	29.4	29.2	
4	_	4	Vietnam	66	69	28.1	28.4	
5	-	5	Indonesia	53	57	22.6	23.5	
6	-	6	Thailand	45	46	19.1	18.9	
7		9	Philippines	22	17	9.4	7.0	
8		9	Mexico	19	17	8.1	7.0	
9		12	Malaysia	17	10	7.2	4.1	
10		13	Taiwan	14	9	6.0	3.7	

(2) Trends in Votes



India retains the top in long-term prospects, with the US in third closing in on China in second.

- Regarding promising countries over the next 10 years or so, India ranked first for the 13th consecutive year. While China maintains second place, the number of respondents has declined consecutively since the 2018 survey (164 respondents). The third-placed USA, which has consistently maintained around 70 votes since the same year's survey (76 respondents), closes in on China.
- The Philippines, Mexico, Malaysia and Taiwan all moved up in the rankings with an increase in the number of votes received. In terms of industry composition, the Philippines was dominated by Electrical Equipment & Electronics, Mexico by Automobiles and Malaysia by Chemicals. In Taiwan, votes were collected from the General machinery and Chemicals that handle semiconductor-related products.
- Despite some differences in ranking, the countries that ranked as promising in the long-term in this year's survey are the same as the top 10 in the mediumterm, suggesting that many companies have chosen the same promising countries and regions regardless of the difference in the medium- or long-term timeframe.
- On the other hand, Brazil and Myanmar, which were ranked in the top ten last year, have each dropped out of the list.

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation





Question Regarding the products you produce in the ASEAN region, to which country/region do you sell most of your products? Regarding EVs and EV-related components made in ASEAN, to which country/region do you expect more products to be sold? Please select one of each that is closest to your opinion.



■ Within the ASEAN region, there is a network of local production for local consumption.

The majority of companies chose "within the ASEAN" as the destination for products manufactured within the ASEAN region, indicating that Japanese
companies have formed supply chain networks for local production for local consumption within the ASEAN region, mainly within the countries where they have
manufacturing bases.

As for EVs and EV-related components, China's dominance as a sales destination stands out.

A large number of EVs and EV-related components are also expected to be sold to customers "within the ASEAN", and it appears that a certain supply chain
network has been formed within the ASEAN region. However, when looking at sales areas outside of ASEAN, China accounts for the next largest proportion,
suggesting that Japanese companies operating in the ASEAN region are being integrated into the China-centred supply chain against the backdrop of the size of
the EV market in China. In the interviews, some said that they would "expand their sales network in China for EV-related parts" (Automobiles).

(7) Promising Countries/Regions: African Countries (1)



Question Please select the answer that best describes your situation regarding business operations in Africa as a production or sales base.

Figure 3.15 The Responding Companies' Expectations on Business Development in Africa



Figure 3.16 Promising Countries in Africa

Ranking	Country	# companies	Percentage share
		85	(%)
1	South Africa	51	60.0
2	Nigeria	19	22.4
2	Kenya	19	22.4
4	Egypt	18	21.2
5	Morocco	10	11.8
6	Senegal	4	4.7
6	Tunisia	4	4.7
8	Tanzania	3	3.5
9	Ghana	2	2.4
9	Mozambique	2	2.4

South Africa got the first place in the ranking of promising African countries.

 Only about a quarter of the total number of respondents answered they are interested in African countries. Among them, South Africa got the first place, followed by Nigeria, Kenya and Egypt, all of which have large populations and economic scales.

Kenya and Nigeria's future growth potential attracts attention.

 Japanese companies are more interested in Africa from the perspective of sales destinations than from the perspective of labour, raw materials, infrastructure and institutions. Nigeria and Kenya, in particular, appear to have higher expectations of the 'future growth potential of local markets' than of the 'current size of local markets'.

Figure 3.17 Reasons for Showing Interest and Expectations



*Percentages are for each reason among the sample of companies that selected one of those 4 as a promising country in Africa.

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation



Africa attracts a lot of attention from the electrical and electronics industry.

• By an analysis by sector, companies in electrical equipment & electronics indicated that they would put attention on Africa, which was significantly higher than the overall average.

Differences in countries of interest by industry

• South Africa and Nigeria were evenly selected by the four main industries. On the other hand, the votes for Kenya was dominated by electrical equipment & electronics and chemicals, and for Egypt by automobiles and electrical equipment & electronics.

Figure 3.18 The Number of Companies Interested in African Business (by Sector)



(Note) Percentages are calculated using the number of responding companies in each industry as the population parameter.

Figure 3.19 Response to the Question of Promising African Countries (by Four Main Industries)

(Note) Percentages are calculated using the number of responding companies in each industry as the population parameter.



日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges



4. Hot Topics for Japanese Manufacturing Companies


(1) Hot Topics for Japanese Manufacturing Companies: What are the Hot Topics for Them?



Question Please choose news and events to which you are paying attention in planning your future overseas business strategy. (Multiple answers allowed).



(2) Hot Topics for Japanese Manufacturing Companies: Analysis by theme



-1

0

0

37

"Semiconductor" and "climate change" resulted in divergent views across sectors.

Regarding the keyword "semiconductor," a majority of the companies in the automobile sector viewed it negatively, whereas the result from the chemical industry showed that the positive and negative views were almost identical. In terms of "climate change" and "EV", while the majority of companies in the automobile sector viewed them negatively, a lot of companies in the other sectors viewed them positively.

Figure 4.3 Positive/Negative Topics by Each Sector (Note: Definition of positive and negative. Positive - business opportunities / Negative - risk/cost factors # companies Human Rights Semiconductor **Climate Change** EV Automobiles (78) -75 Automobiles (73) -27 3 Automobiles(40) 18 Automobiles (8) -22 Chemicals (30) Chemicals (48) -6 24 -24 24 Chemicals (10) Chemicals(47) 26 -21 30 Electrorical Equipment (40) Electrorical Equipment (55) Electrorical Equipment (14) -34 Electrorical Equipment (38) 38 -10 General Machinery (30) -5 25 General Machinery (38) -23 General Machinery (22) General Machinery (8) 18 Precision Machinery (8) -1 Precision Machinery (5) Precision Machinery (19) -13 6 Precision Machinery (12) Food (0) 0 0 Food (4) Food (0) 0 - 0 Food (11) Textile (5) -2 3 Textile (6) Textile (5) -4 Textile (9) Metal Products (7) -3 Metal Products (0) Metal Products (12) Metal Products (7) -12 Nonferous Metals (18) 15 -3 Nonferous Metals (6) Nonferous Metals (13) -6 7 Nonferous Metals (12) Petroleum & Rubber (9) -3 6 Petroleum & Rubber (2) Petroleum & Rubber (8) Petroleum & Rubber (5) -7 -3 Steel (5) 0 5 Steel (1) Steel (4) -1 3 Steel (6) -3 3 Cerammics & Cement (2) -1 1 Cerammics & Cement (1) Cerammics & Cement (4) Cerammics & Cement (6) -1 3 5 -1 Transportation equipment (6) 3 -3 Transportation equipment (5) Transportation equipment (6) -5 Transportation equipment (6) -2 Paper, Pulp & Wood (5) 2 -3 Paper, Pulp & Wood (1) Paper, Pulp & Wood (5) -2 -3 2 Paper, Pulp & Wood (5) 3 Other (0) 0 0 Other (2) -1 Other (2) -2 0 Other (2) 2 0 -40 -20 0 20 -20

20

0

Positive

-20

-40

40

Negative

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

-100

0

100

(#) indicates the number of responding companies in each industry.



日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges



5. Impact of the Invasion of Ukraine



🖉 J B I C

Question Regardless of the location of your overseas bases, has your business been affected by the invasion of Ukraine?



- Negative impact of the invasion of Ukraine was confirmed by around 90% of companies, but with characteristics depending on sector and company size
- Around 90% of all the respondents answered that the invasion of Ukraine have had a 'negative' or 'relatively negative' impact.
- By sector, the chemical industry was found to be the most negatively affected, which deals with products made from crude oil. This tendency indicates that they have been affected by the rising prices of raw materials and the instability of energy supplies.
- In the analysis by company size, the negative impact on large enterprises was more pronounced than on SMEs. It may be because large enterprises have more extensive operations
 around the world and are more likely to be affected by the suspension of local operations following the invasion of Ukraine and the subsequent supply chain disruption in raw material
 supplies.

(2) Impact of the Invasion of Ukraine: Reasons for Negative Impacts



Question What are the reasons for the negative impact of the invasion of Ukraine on your business? (Multiple answers allowed)

Figure 5.4 Reasons for Negative Impact of the Invasion of Ukraine

Figure 5.5 Reasons for Negative Impact (by Sector)



The invasion of Ukraine has led to a wide range of effects, including 'higher fuel prices,' 'logistics disruption,' and 'increased costs due to exchange rate fluctuations.'

- The top three specific negative impacts turned out to be 'Rising fuel prices,' 'Logistics disruption,' and 'Increased costs due to exchange rate fluctuations,' suggesting widespread indirect effects to Japanese manufacturers by the invasion of Ukraine. Meanwhile, it was confirmed that direct impacts such as 'Downsizing or withdrawal of business in Russia or Ukraine' and 'Increased burden to legal risks associated with economic sanctions and embargoes' gathered a relatively small number of votes.
- A cross-analysis by sector indicates that the impact of economic sanctions was relatively small in the automotive industry. Besides, the direct impact, including 'Downsizing and withdrawal of business in Russia or Ukraine' on parts suppliers in each industry was relatively small compared to assemblers. It may suggest that parts suppliers did not necessarily expand their business into Russia or Ukraine; the automobile's typical "local production for local consumption" business model has not been necessarily formed in the region.

(3) Invasion of Ukraine: Subsequent Effects on Decarbonization Initiatives

By industry, a particularly high proportion of companies in the electrical equipment/electronics and automobiles industries answered that they would 'accelerate the pace' toward their decarbonization goals. One company mentioned that 'industry-wide efforts are accelerating in line with requests from suppliers in Europe and elsewhere' (electrical equipment and electronics). Another one reflected that they were 'facing pressure to switch to alternative heat sources as coal prices soar, and as a result, decarbonization is accelerating' (ceramic industry).

By size, there was little difference between large and SMEs in terms of the proportion of firms that responded they would 'accelerate the pace' toward their decarbonization targets Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges

6. Supply Chains and Geopolitical Risks

(1) Supply Chain and Geopolitical Risks: Shock Factors

Question What are the factors that have had a significant impact on your production activities regarding the current supply chain shock? (Multiple answers allowed)

Widespread recognition of the impact of global inflation on business activity.

Increased production and transport costs' (383 companies) received the most votes as the supply chain shock has a significant impact on production activities, suggesting that the impact of global inflation on business activity has been widely recognized this year. In addition, the 'insufficient supply of parts and raw materials' continues to be recognized as the main shock factor. Some companies commented that "the reduction in the parent company's production plan due to the shortage of semiconductors is affecting the production as a result" (Automobile). The impact of 'Logistical disruption' continues to be widely recognized as a shock factor among manufacturing firms, although it was expected that this should have been resolved as a reasonable amount of time has passed since the spread of COVID-19.

Differences in perceived shock factors between assemblers and parts manufacturers.

A comparison between assemblers and parts manufacturers in the general machinery, electrical equipment and electronics, automobiles, and precision machinery sectors shows
that a relatively high proportion of the assemblers cited 'insufficient supply of parts and raw materials', while a relatively high proportion of parts manufacturers identified 'increased
production and transport costs' as a shock factor. This suggests that the assemblers continue to face difficulties in obtaining raw materials and intermediate goods, while parts
manufacturers are unable to pass on increased production and other costs to selling prices.

(2) Importance of Geopolitical Risk

Question How significant is the concept of geopolitical risk in your business strategy?

Figure 6.3 Importance of Geopolitical Risk in Business Strategy

population parameter.

Note: Percentages are calculated using the number of responding companies in each size as the population.

Figure 6.4 Importance of Geopolitical Risk (by Location)

- 85% of all companies, regardless of the location of their overseas bases, consider geopolitical risks to be significant in their business strategies, although there is some variation depending on the size of the company.
- With regard to the importance of geopolitical risk in business strategy, a total of 85% of responding companies answered that geopolitical risk was either 'very significant' or 'significant,' indicating that a large majority of companies recognize geopolitical risk as important when developing overseas business. A cross-analysis of the importance of geopolitical risk and overseas bases of the respondent companies shows that the importance of geopolitical risk is uniformly high regardless of which country or region the companies have their production bases in. It signifies that geopolitical risk is now widely recognized by Japanese companies as a global management issue that is not specific to any particular country or region.
- On the other hand, a comparison by size shows that 29.2% of large enterprises answered that geopolitical risk was 'very significant,' while the response rate from small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) for the same question was only 16.9%. It suggests that large enterprises with global operations are likely to regard geopolitical risks as more significant than SMEs.

The recent unstable international situation has resulted in domestic and international politics being the most perceived risk factor by companies in the countries where they operate.

- When asked about geopolitical risks that are highly relevant to their business activities, 'Domestic politics of overseas business location' received the highest votes, followed by 'international politics', 'non-tariff barriers' and 'tariff barriers'.
- A comparison by company size suggested that 'domestic politics' is regarded as a geopolitical risk that should be considered regardless of the size of the company, whereas 'international politics' tends to be perceived as a relatively important risk factor by large enterprises with a wide range of overseas operations, compared to SMEs.
- The interview result revealed the specific examples of geopolitical risk factors, which includes: 'Concerns about being subject to strict examination and regulation by CFIUS
 (Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States) when developing new business in the US' (Electrical equipment and electronics); 'Stagnation of licence renewal in China'
 (Chemicals); 'Impact of financial sanctions in Russia-related business' (Electrical equipment & electronics). These individual and regional concerns might imply that geopolitical risk
 is becoming a company-wide issue for all companies.

(4) Counter Measures against Geopolitical Risks

Question What measures do you currently have in place to deal with geopolitical risks? (Multiple answers allowed)

Increased awareness of the need for companies to actively collect and analyse information on geopolitical risks

• As measures to address geopolitical risks, 'strengthening information gathering functions', 'strengthening risk scenarios and BCPs' and 'strengthening risk analysis and assessment functions' as well as 'diversifying suppliers' collected a lot of votes, indicating a growing awareness among companies to actively gather and analyse information. As specific measures, some companies mentioned they would "set up a working group within the company to discuss geopolitical risks" (Electrical Equipment & Electronics) and "set up a secretariat focusing on economic sanctions-related geopolitical risks such as OFAC" (Chemicals). On the other hand, relatively few companies have taken concrete steps to change their bases, withdraw from business or change their investment plans. In the analysis between major industries, the degree of efforts to 'diversify suppliers' in the automotive industry remained relatively small, as in the previous year's survey, suggesting the difficulty of diversifying suppliers in normal times due to the complexity of the procurement structure of the automobile industry.

Size of companies makes a difference in their preparedness for geopolitical risks

By size, both SMEs and large enterprises are making progress in strengthening their information gathering functions and diversifying their suppliers, which are relatively easy for even SMEs to undertake from a cost perspective, but SMEs are less likely to take measures such as strengthening risk scenarios and BCPs, and strengthening risk analysis and assessment functions, which may require the development of internal systems and long-lasting HR development.

Question Regarding "US-China decoupling", which measures has your company taken? In which direction is your company moving?

Figure 6.10 Progress of US-China Decoupling

- Between 2020 and 2021, the number of votes for "uncertain' decreased significantly, indicating that discussions on decoupling measures have deepened within each company, but the
- Between 2020 and 2021, the number of votes for "uncertain' decreased significantly, indicating that discussions on decoupling measures have deepened within each company, but th trend did not change significantly between 2021 and 2022 (the current year).
- Compared to the previous year, the proportion of companies that answered they would strengthen their Chinese operations decreased, while those which would strengthen their US operations increased. The main reason appears to be the impact of topical and economic events, such as the slump in economic activity following China's strict zero-COVID policy. However, it seems that awareness of geopolitical risks, such as the possibility of a Taiwan contingency, also affects the trend.
- In last year's survey, a more significant proportion of companies in the chemical and electrical equipment and electronics industries answered they would strengthen their China operations
 than their US operations. However, this trend has reversed in this year's survey, with a clear shift from an emphasis on China to an emphasis on the US in all four major industries.

日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges

7. Sustainability

(1) Sustainability: Initiatives for Sustainability

Does your company take sustainability into consideration when operating its overseas business? Please select one that is most applicable in your company.

- Around 80% of companies take sustainability into consideration, and companies that are more active in overseas business development carry out business operations that take sustainability into account
- Overall, 76% of companies responded that they are "considering" sustainability in their overseas business operations. By company size, nearly 90% of large enterprises answered that they were "considering," while only about 60% of SMEs answered that they were "considering."
- We found that companies that are more willing to expand overseas business and those that recognize geopolitical risk as more significant are more likely to operate
 their overseas businesses with sustainability in mind. Companies that are eager to do global business are exposed to a wide variety of risks on a daily basis, and
 this shows that they are highly aware of and eager to address external factors and global issues that can significantly affect their business environment.

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

Question

(1) Sustainability: Hot Topics in Sustainability

Question For respondents who answered "1. Considering" in the previous question, please select the topics that are the most considered in your company when operating its overseas business. (Multiple answers allowed)

Japanese manufacturers are most concerned about decarbonization among sustainability-related topics

- When we asked companies that responded that they were "considering" sustainability about sustainability-related topics of interest, "climate change measures including decarbonization" received most votes, followed by "corporate governance", "diversity", and " human rights issue". It was found that Japanese companies, regardless of their size, place overwhelming importance on "climate change measures including decarbonization" in terms of sustainability.
- By main industry, we found that chemicals have relatively high business interest even in fields such as "marine plastics" and "biodiversity," which are not currently attracting interest in the manufacturing industry as a whole.

 $\label{eq:copyright} \ensuremath{\textcircled{C}} \ensuremath{\text{Japan Bank for International Cooperation}}$

Question The Government of Japan has set a goal of achieving carbon neutrality (greenhouse gas emissions of virtually zero) by 2050. Based on the goals of the Government of Japan, please select one that is close to your company's efforts for decarbonization.

75% of companies have implemented decarbonization efforts, and proactive motivation is the top

- In terms of the status of decarbonization efforts, 75% of the responding companies have already started some kind of decarbonization efforts, and a total of more than 50% of the companies are meeting or exceeding the government target (to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050), indicating a high level of commitment.
- As for their motivations for working on decarbonization, when we lined up options representing proactive or reactive attitudes toward various requests and pressures from outside the company, we found that "strengthening brand image, acquiring new customers" as the proactive motivation that collected the most votes.

(2) Motivations toward Initiatives for Decarbonization

Choose reasons that are close to your company's idea regarding the reason(s) of having interest on decarbonization. (Multiple answers allowed.)

Figure 7.8 Motivations for Decarbonization in Degree of Decarbonization Efforts

Figure 7.9 Proactive/Reactive Motivations for Decarbonization in Overseas Business Stance

Companies with more advanced decarbonization efforts have more active motivation and are more willing to expand overseas business

- Looking at the breakdown of motivations by the degree of decarbonization efforts, we found that the more companies that are actively working on decarbonization, the more likely they are to choose proactive motivations. The result shows the "aggressive" attitude of Japanese manufacturing companies related to decarbonization.
- In addition, in the survey conducted in FY 2020, the most popular response to the question about the motivation to work on the SDGs was the reactive answer, i.e., "increased interest from consumers, buyers and professional federations." Compared to the above, it seems that "sustainability" is rather used by companies in their strategic planning and initiatives to proactively expand business opportunities.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90%100%

- Strengthening production competitiveness
- Strengthening brand image, acquiring new customers
- Acquiring new financing (equity, loan) to the company
- Industry trends
- Requests from investors
- Requests from parent company or group company
- Requests from business partners
- Requests from consumers
- Request from the local government
- Others

Question

(2) Decarbonization: Expectations for Government Policies

Figure 7.10 Expectations for Government Policies

Figure 7.11 Expectations for Government Policies (4 Main Industries)

Expectations for government policies focus on ensuring profitability in the immediate future and on developing new markets in the medium- to long-term future

0%

20%

40%

60%

80%

100%

Regarding expectations for government policies, many companies answered with "introduction of equipment that contributes to energy saving and decarbonization of companies" and "technological development and innovation creation that contribute to decarbonization". It can be seen that there are expectations (especially from SMEs) for government policies to lead Japanese manufacturers' decarbonization business up to the next stage from the initial one.

There are expectations for "large-scale infrastructure investment such as next-generation power systems and hydrogen supply systems" that are to a certain extent from all major industries, suggesting that there are generally high expectations for the creation of new markets through decarbonization. There are high expectations from the electrical equipment and electronics industry, which expects to provide digital technologies. In addition, "presenting a concrete future image and fostering public understanding" received a relatively large number of votes from the chemicals industry, which is considered to have a large amount of carbon emissions and little room for emission reductions.

(3) Human Rights Issues

Question About your company's approach to "human rights (HR) issues" in its supply chain, please select one that is close to your company's status.

Figure 7.13 Initiatives for Human Rights Issues

Progress Made in Addressing Human Rights Issues by Japanese Manufacturers

In last year's survey, 76% of the responses regarding the status of efforts to address human rights issues chose "no action" ("no discussion" or "under discussion/nothing yet". The ratio of "no action" has decreased to less than 50% this year. In light of the developments in laws and regulations on business and human rights in Europe and the US since last year, and the formulation of the 'Guidelines on Respecting Human Rights in Responsible Supply Chains' by the Japanese Government in September 2022, it can be seen that considerable progress has been made in tackling HR issues in the Japanese manufacturing industry.

HR due diligence

By scale, initiatives on HR issues by large enterprises are far ahead.

(4) Sustainability in Each Subject (by Main Industry)

Figure 7.15 Initiatives for Sustainability (by Industry)

Figure 7.17 Initiatives for HR Issues (by Industry)

■ We have not formulated a HR policy and have not implemented HR due diligence

- HR due diligence has been implemented, although HR policy has not been formulated
- HR policy is being formulated, but HR due diligence has not been implemented
- \blacksquare We have formulated HR policies and conducted HR due diligence

Figure 7.16 Initiatives for Decarbonization

The company is interested in government goals, but hasn't started concrete its own efforts yet.
 Behind the government target, but implementing the initiative #companies: 315

Implementing efforts in line with government goals

Sustainability efforts are relatively ahead of Chemicals and Electrical

- Equipment and Electronics industries
- Comparing the status of various sustainability initiatives by main industry, the results show that chemical and electrical/electronic industries are relatively ahead.
- In terms of decarbonization efforts, the chemicals sector is particularly successful in creating business opportunities in the field of low-carbon and decarbonized materials, while the electronics and electrical machinery sector has a variety of B-to-C and B-to-B decarbonization business opportunities, and the relative ease of efforts to reduce CO_2 emissions in the manufacturing process. On the other hand, in the automotive sector, where companies have different stances on EVs depending on their product lineups, the extent of their decarbonization efforts varied.
- In terms of addressing HR issues, the electrical equipment and electronics industry, which has labor-intensive processes in their supply chains, and chemicals industry, which seems to have a relatively high social and environmental impact due to the procurement of raw materials, are urgently required to respond.

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges

Appendix #1: Detailed Data

			C)versea	as Produ	iction R	tio %1						Overs	eas Sa	les Ratio	o ※2		
	FY20	019	FY2)20	FY2	021	FY20)22	Medium	n-term	FY2	019	FY20)20	FY2	021	FY20)22
Industry	(actı	ual)	(acti	ual)	(act	ual)	(proje	cted)	plans(F`	Y2025)	(actı	ual)	(actu	ual)	(acti	ual)	(proje	cted)
		No. of Companies		No. of Companies		No. of Companies		No. of Companies		No. of Companies		No. of Companies		No. of Companies		No. of Companies		No. of Companies
Food	18.0%	20	21.3%	19	22.2%	18	22.2%	18	24.4%	18	16.4%	22	20.0%	22	16.6%	19	16.6%	19
Textiles	57.1%	19	52.7%	22	50.5%	20	50.5%	20	48.9%	18	32.0%	20	27.2%	23	26.5%	20	27.0%	20
Paper, Pulp & Wood	19.4%	9	13.2%	11	15.8%	13	16.5%	13	16.8%	11	18.3%	9	16.8%	11	15.0%	14	16.4%	14
Chemicals (total)	30.9%	64	26.4%	70	26.4%	76	26.7%	76	27.8%	68	35.1%	74	33.2%	79	36.2%	86	37.0%	84
Chemicals (incl. plastic products)	32.1%	58	27.2%	65	27.0%	71	27.1%	71	28.6%	64	35.7%	68	33.9%	74	36.6%	81	37.4%	79
Pharmaceuticals	20.0%	6	17.0%	5	19.0%	5	21.0%	5	15.0%	4	28.3%	6	23.0%	5	29.0%	5	31.0%	5
Petroleum & Rubber	41.7%	12	43.2%	11	29.5%	11	30.5%	11	30.5%	11	40.0%	12	40.0%	12	32.3%	11	33.2%	11
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	30.7%	7	43.2%	11	41.0%	10	41.0%	10	40.6%	9	35.0%	10	41.7%	12	40.0%	10	41.0%	10
Steel	25.0%	15	27.0%	10	18.3%	9	18.3%	9	19.4%	9	24.4%	16	24.0%	10	29.0%	10	28.3%	9
Nonferrous Metals	35.0%	14	38.0%	20	35.0%	19	33.3%	18	35.6%	17	32.1%	17	34.0%	21	39.3%	21	37.2%	18
Metal Products	31.7%	24	30.0%	20	32.4%	19	32.2%	18	33.2%	17	35.8%	25	38.5%	20	36.1%	19	38.2%	19
General Machinery (total)	26.3%	45	25.2%	55	28.9%	59	28.9%	57	29.4%	57	37.4%	46	35.0%	57	40.3%	62	41.9%	61
Assembly	23.7%	39	23.8%	42	25.2%	42	24.5%	40	24.5%	40	37.0%	40	36.6%	44	39.2%	45	40.7%	44
Parts	43.3%	6	29.6%	13	37.9%	17	39.1%	17	40.9%	17	40.0%	6	29.6%	13	43.2%	17	45.0%	17
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (total)	40.6%	57	41.8%	56	45.5%	66	45.5%	66	48.2%	62	43.8%	65	46.4%	66	46.5%	72	47.8%	72
Assembly	33.5%	27	31.5%	23	34.5%	22	34.5%	22	38.5%	20	36.3%	30	34.6%	27	36.3%	24	38.3%	24
Parts	47.0%	30	48.9%	33	50.9%	44	50.9%	44	52.9%	42	50.1%	35	54.5%	39	51.7%	48	52.5%	48
Transportation Equipment (excl. Automobiles)	32.1%	14	30.8%	12	36.8%	17	36.8%	17	43.6%	14	34.3%	14	42.5%	12	42.6%	17	44.4%	16
Automobiles (total)	42.1%	99	41.4%	105	41.3%	101	42.1%	100	42.7%	94	43.4%	104	40.1%	108	40.9%	105	40.4%	102
Assembly	58.3%	3	40.0%	4	55.0%	4	65.0%	3	60.0%	2	77.5%	4	55.0%	5	73.0%	5	70.0%	4
Parts	41.6%	96	41.4%	101	40.8%	97	41.4%	97	42.3%	92	42.0%	100	39.4%	103	39.3%	100	39.2%	98
Precision Machinery (total)	30.3%	30	25.7%	29	38.1%	26	38.1%	26	40.0%	26	41.8%	31	37.0%	30	47.1%	28	47.9%	28
Assembly	23.9%	19	20.6%	18	29.7%	15	29.7%	15	33.0%	15	43.9%	19	35.6%	18	49.4%	16	50.6%	16
Parts	41.4%	11	34.1%	11	49.5%	11	49.5%	11	49.5%	11	38.3%	12	39.2%	12	44.2%	12	44.2%	12
Other	23.6%	42	23.1%	16	24.2%	12	23.3%	12	25.0%	12	26.7%	48	19.7%	17	23.6%	14	23.6%	14
Overall	33.9%	471	33.6%	467	34.9%	476	35.0%	471	36.3%	443	36.2%	513	35.8%	500	37.9%	508	38.5%	497

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

Note 1: Overseas Production Ratio = Overseas Production / (Domestic Production + Overseas Production) Note 2: Overseas Sales Ratio = Overseas Sales / (Domestic Sales + Overseas Sales)

3

Future Business Expansions: Stances Toward Strengthening/Expanding **Business by Industry (Overseas/International)**

Overseas	Strer /ex	ngthen pand	Maiı preser	ntain nt level	Scale /with	back draw
Overseas	2021	2022	2021	2022	2021	2022
All Industries	63.7%	67.2%	34.7%	31.6%	1.6%	1.2%
Food	91.3%	75.0%	8.7%	25.0%	-	-
Textiles	56.5%	61.9%	43.5%	38.1%	-	-
Paper, Pulp & Wood	63.6%	69.2%	36.4%	30.8%	-	-
Chemicals (total)	63.6%	73.8%	36.4%	25.0%	-	1.2%
Chemicals (incl. plastic products)	63.9%	72.2%	36.1%	26.6%	-	1.3%
Pharmaceuticals	60.0%	100.0%	40.0%	-	-	-
Petroleum & Rubber	50.0%	61.5%	50.0%	38.5%	-	-
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	58.3%	60.0%	41.7%	40.0%	-	-
Steel	66.7%	54.5%	25.0%	45.5%	8.3%	-
Nonferrous Metals	57.1%	65.2%	38.1%	34.8%	4.8%	-
Metal Products	52.4%	52.6%	42.9%	42.1%	4.8%	5.3%
General Machinery (total)	75.9%	85.0%	24.1%	15.0%	-	-
Assembly	80.0%	86.0%	20.0%	14.0%	-	-
Parts	61.5%	82.4%	38.5%	17.6%	-	-
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (total)	81.5%	80.3%	18.5%	19.7%	-	-
Assembly	77.8%	79.2%	22.2%	20.8%	-	-
Parts	84.2%	80.9%	15.8%	19.1%	-	-
Transportation Equipment (excl. Automobiles)	72.7%	76.5%	27.3%	23.5%	-	-
Automobiles (total)	43.4%	45.8%	53.8%	50.5%	2.8%	3.7%
Assembly	20.0%	75.0%	60.0%	25.0%	20.0%	-
Parts	44.6%	44.7%	53.5%	51.5%	2.0%	3.9%
Precision Machinery (total)	81.3%	78.6%	15.6%	21.4%	3.1%	-
Assembly	80.0%	75.0%	15.0%	25.0%	5.0%	-
Parts	83.3%	83.3%	16.7%	16.7%	-	-
Other	50.0%	53.3%	44.4%	46.7%	5.6%	-

Domestic	Stren /exp	gthen band	Mair preser	ntain nt level	Scale	back
	2021	2022	2021	2022	2021	2022
All Industries	47.3%	49.2%	52.1%	50.4%	0.6%	0.4%
Food	47.8%	50.0%	52.2%	50.0%	-	-
Textiles	26.1%	33.3%	69.6%	66.7%	4.3%	-
Paper, Pulp & Wood	30.0%	71.4%	70.0%	28.6%	-	-
Chemicals (total)	54.5%	58.3%	45.5%	41.7%	-	-
Chemicals (incl. plastic products)	54.2%	55.7%	45.8%	44.3%	-	-
Pharmaceuticals	60.0%	100.0%	40.0%	-	-	-
Petroleum & Rubber	21.4%	46.2%	78.6%	53.8%	-	-
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	41.7%	30.0%	58.3%	70.0%	-	-
Steel	25.0%	18.2%	75.0%	81.8%	-	-
Nonferrous Metals	47.6%	47.8%	52.4%	52.2%	-	-
Metal Products	52.4%	44.4%	47.6%	55.6%	-	-
General Machinery (total)	55.2%	56.7%	44.8%	43.3%	-	-
Assembly	57.8%	60.5%	42.2%	39.5%	-	-
Parts	46.2%	47.1%	53.8%	52.9%	-	-
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (total)	58.5%	60.6%	41.5%	39.4%	-	-
Assembly	44.4%	50.0%	55.6%	50.0%	-	-
Parts	68.4%	66.0%	31.6%	34.0%	-	-
Transportation Equipment (excl. Automobiles)	54.5%	47.1%	45.5%	52.9%	-	-
Automobiles (total)	34.3%	36.4%	63.8%	61.7%	1.9%	1.9%
Assembly	20.0%	50.0%	80.0%	50.0%	-	-
Parts	35.0%	35.9%	63.0%	62.1%	2.0%	1.9%
Precision Machinery (total)	68.8%	60.7%	31.3%	39.3%	-	-
Assembly	65.0%	56.3%	35.0%	43.8%	-	-
Parts	75.0%	66.7%	25.0%	33.3%	-	-
Other	52.9%	33.3%	47.1%	66.7%	-	-

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

Note: The option "undecided" was eliminated from FY2021 survey.

³ Promising Countries/Regions: Time Series Data

Promising Countries/Regions over the Mid-term (Next 3 Years)

Rank	FY2022 Survey	No.of Companies 367	Percentage share (%)	FY2021 Survey	No.of Companies 345	Percentage share (%)	FY2020 Survey	No.of Companies 356	Percentage share (%)	FY2019 Survey	No.of Companies 404	Percentage share (%)	FY2018 Survey	No.of Companies 431	Percentage share (%)
1	India	148	40.3	China	162	47.0	China	168	47.2	India	193	47.8	China	225	52.2
2	China	136	37.1	India	131	38.0	India	163	45.8	China	180	44.6	India	199	46.2
3	US	118	32.2	US	113	32.8	Vietnam	131	36.8	Vietnam	147	36.4	Thailand	160	37.1
4	Vietnam	106	28.9	Vietnam	105	30.4	Thailand	111	31.2	Thailand	133	32.9	Vietnam	146	33.9
5	Thailand	85	23.2	Thailand	77	22.3	US	98	27.5	Indonesia	102	25.2	Indonesia	131	30.4
6	Indonesia	77	21.0	Indonesia	67	19.4	Indonesia	96	27.0	US	93	23.0	US	124	28.8
7	Malaysia	31	8.4	Philippines	31	9.0	Philippines	37	10.4	Philippines	48	11.9	Mexico	59	13.7
8	Philippines	28	7.6	Mexico	30	8.7	Malaysia	34	9.6	Mexico	47	11.6	Philippines	43	10.0
9	Mexico	27	7.4	Malaysia	27	7.8	Mexico	32	9.0	Myanmar	41	10.1	Myanmar	37	8.6
10	Taiwan	23	6.3	Taiwan	19	5.5	Myanmar	25	7.0	Malaysia 🤳			Malaysia	36	8.4
11	Germany	21	5.7	Germany	17	4.9	Germany	20	5.6	Taiwan	18	4.5	Germany	25	5.8
12	Korea	17	4.6	Korea	16	4.6	Taiwan	18	5.1	Korea	15	3.7	Brazil	24	5.6
13	Brazil	15	4.1	Brazil	13	3.8	Bangladesh	16	4.5	Singapore J			Korea	22	5.1
14	Australia	13	3.5	Australia	12	3.5	Australia	14	3.9	Germany	14	3.5	Taiwan	19	4.4
15	Singapore	12	3.3	Singapore J			Korea	12	3.4	Australia	13	3.2	Russia	16	3.7
16	Bangladesh	10	2.7	Myanmar	10	2.9	Singapore	11	3.1	Cambodia	12	3.0	Singapore	15	3.5
17	UK J			Bangladesh			Brazil ノ			Brazil	11	2.7	Cambodia	13	3.0
18	Turkey	9	2.5	Russia			UK	9	2.5	Russia	9	2.2	Australia	12	2.8
19	France	8	2.2	Turkey ノ			Russia	8	2.2	France J			Turkey	9	2.1
20	Cambodia	7	1.9	Canada	7	2.0	Turkey	7	2.0	Turkey	8	2.0	Laos	7	1.6
													France J		

Promising Countries/Regions in the Long-term (Next 10 Years)

Pank	FY2022	No.of	Percentage	FY2021	No.of	Percentage
INALIK	Survey	235	(%)	Survey	243	(%)
1	India	119	50.6	India	120	49.4
2	China	86	36.6	China	99	40.7
3	US	69	29.4	US	71	29.2
4	Vietnam	66	28.1	Vietnam	69	28.4
5	Indonesia	53	22.6	Indonesia	57	23.5
6	Thailand	45	19.1	Thailand	46	18.9
7	Philippines	22	9.4	Brazil	22	9.1
8	Mexico	19	8.1	Myanmar	21	8.6
9	Malaysia	17	7.2	Mexico	17	7.0
10	Taiwan	14	6.0	Philippines J		

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

Promising Countries/Regions for Overseas Business over the Mid-term (Next 3 Years) (SMEs)

Question	Please provide us with the names of up to 5 countries that you consider to have promising prospects for	R	lankir	ng		No	. of	Perce	ntage
	business operations over the mid-term (next 3 years). (Multiple answers allowed)	2022	\leftarrow	2021	Country/Region	2022	2021	2022	2021
			_		(Total)	129	122		
Note: Pe	rcentage of votes (%)	1		3	India	47	41	36.4	33.6
- Numbe		2	-	2	US	34	42	26.4	34.4
		2		4	Vietnam	34	31	26.4	25.4
		4	Ŷ	1	China	32	43	24.8	35.2
		5		6	Indonesia	30	21	23.3	17.2
		6	\downarrow	5	Thailand	29	22	22.5	18.0
		7	=	7	Mexico	15	16	11.6	13.1
		8	\uparrow	7	Philippines	13	16	10.1	13.1
		9	-	9	Malaysia	9	9	7.0	7.4
		10		14	Germany	6	3	4.7	2.5
		10		14	Taiwan	6	3	4.7	2.5
		12	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	11	Singapore	4	4	3.1	3.3
		12		18	Cambodia	4	2	3.1	1.6
		14	\mathbf{Q}	10	Australia	3	5	2.3	4.1
		14	\mathbf{Q}	11	Korea	3	4	2.3	3.3
		14	-	14	Bangladesh	3	3	2.3	2.5
		17	\mathbf{r}	14	Myanmar	2	3	1.6	2.5
		17		18	Brazil	2	2	1.6	1.6
		17		18	France	2	2	1.6	1.6
		17		18	Italy	2	2	1.6	1.6
		17		25	Laos	2	1	1.6	0.8
		17	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	25	Spain	2	1	1.6	0.8
		17	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	25	UK	2	1	1.6	0.8
		17	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	-	Poland	2	-	1.6	-

Question

Promising Countries/Regions: Details of Promising Reasons

Note 1: The number of responding companies refers to the number of companies that cited reasons for a country being promising. Note 2: The colored cell indicate the top three reasons most often cited for each country.

		1	:	2	:	3	4	4	į	5		6		7	8	3	ç	9	1	0
	Inc	dia	Ch	ina	U	IS	Viet	nam	Thai	land	Indo	nesia	Mala	aysia	Philip	pines	Me	xico	Taiv	wan
	# companies	Ratio																		
No. of responding companies	145	100%	134	100%	115	100%	104	100%	82	100%	76	100%	31	100%	27	100%	26	100%	21	100%
1. Qualified human resources	27	18.6%	22	16.4%	20	17.4%	21	20.2%	13	15.9%	8	10.5%	2	6.5%	7	25.9%	-	0.0%	3	14.3%
2. Inexpensive source of labor	45	31.0%	11	8.2%	1	0.9%	58	55.8%	27	32.9%	26	34.2%	8	25.8%	15	55.6%	9	34.6%	2	9.5%
3. Inexpensive components/raw materials	16	11.0%	13	9.7%	4	3.5%	14	13.5%	6	7.3%	5	6.6%	4	12.9%	1	3.7%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
4. Supply base for assemblers	28	19.3%	27	20.1%	21	18.3%	16	15.4%	16	19.5%	10	13.2%	5	16.1%	5	18.5%	14	53.8%	4	19.0%
5. Concentration of industry	22	15.2%	37	27.6%	38	33.0%	19	18.3%	24	29.3%	11	14.5%	3	9.7%	3	11.1%	5	19.2%	7	33.3%
6. Good for risk diversification to other countries	17	11.7%	2	1.5%	5	4.3%	32	30.8%	13	15.9%	9	11.8%	5	16.1%	11	40.7%	2	7.7%	3	14.3%
7. Base of export to Japan	7	4.8%	12	9.0%	3	2.6%	15	14.4%	15	18.3%	5	6.6%	4	12.9%	3	11.1%	-	0.0%	2	9.5%
8. Base of export to third countries	18	12.4%	7	5.2%	4	3.5%	18	17.3%	19	23.2%	12	15.8%	7	22.6%	9	33.3%	6	23.1%	3	14.3%
9. Current size of local market	63	43.4%	90	67.2%	84	73.0%	22	21.2%	27	32.9%	37	48.7%	8	25.8%	10	37.0%	6	23.1%	12	57.1%
10. Future growth potential of local market	124	85.5%	86	64.2%	64	55.7%	72	69.2%	45	54.9%	60	78.9%	17	54.8%	15	55.6%	16	61.5%	12	57.1%
11. Profitability of local market	13	9.0%	22	16.4%	42	36.5%	11	10.6%	13	15.9%	13	17.1%	4	12.9%	2	7.4%	3	11.5%	2	9.5%
12. Developed local infrastructure	3	2.1%	22	16.4%	43	37.4%	11	10.6%	17	20.7%	2	2.6%	4	12.9%	5	18.5%	2	7.7%	6	28.6%
13. Developed local logistics services	-	0.0%	12	9.0%	22	19.1%	6	5.8%	9	11.0%	3	3.9%	-	0.0%	5	18.5%	3	11.5%	3	14.3%
14. Tax incentives for investment	2	1.4%	5	3.7%	2	1.7%	9	8.7%	13	15.9%	4	5.3%	2	6.5%	2	7.4%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
15. Stable policies to attract foreign investment	4	2.8%	4	3.0%	2	1.7%	9	8.7%	13	15.9%	3	3.9%	1	3.2%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	1	4.8%
16. Social/political situation stable	5	3.4%	4	3.0%	30	26.1%	25	24.0%	10	12.2%	3	3.9%	2	6.5%	4	14.8%	-	0.0%	3	14.3%

		1		2		3		4		5		6	-	7		8		9	1	0
	Ch	nina	In	dia	U	IS	Viet	nam	Thai	iland	Indo	nesia	Philip	pines	Me	xico	Mala	aysia	Taiv	wan
112021301Vey	# companies	Ratio																		
No. of responding companies	162	100%	130	100%	113	100%	104	100%	77	100%	67	100%	30	100%	30	100%	27	100%	19	100%
1. Qualified human resources	21	13.0%	19	14.6%	13	11.5%	24	23.1%	6	7.8%	2	3.0%	3	10.0%	1	3.3%	3	11.1%	3	15.8%
2. Inexpensive source of labor	12	7.4%	43	33.1%	1	0.9%	48	46.2%	17	22.1%	24	35.8%	12	40.0%	11	36.7%	6	22.2%	-	0.0%
3. Inexpensive components/raw materials	24	14.8%	20	15.4%	3	2.7%	10	9.6%	4	5.2%	6	9.0%	3	10.0%	2	6.7%	3	11.1%	-	0.0%
4. Supply base for assemblers	36	22.2%	27	20.8%	19	16.8%	15	14.4%	17	22.1%	12	17.9%	7	23.3%	11	36.7%	3	11.1%	1	5.3%
5. Concentration of industry	47	29.0%	19	14.6%	31	27.4%	9	8.7%	23	29.9%	4	6.0%	3	10.0%	7	23.3%	2	7.4%	4	21.1%
6. Good for risk diversification to other countries	1	0.6%	12	9.2%	4	3.5%	26	25.0%	14	18.2%	6	9.0%	7	23.3%	1	3.3%	2	7.4%	2	10.5%
7. Base of export to Japan	12	7.4%	6	4.6%	-	0.0%	18	17.3%	16	20.8%	7	10.4%	7	23.3%	-	0.0%	2	7.4%	2	10.5%
8. Base of export to third countries	18	11.1%	18	13.8%	5	4.4%	23	22.1%	22	28.6%	14	20.9%	5	16.7%	8	26.7%	4	14.8%	5	26.3%
9. Current size of local market	107	66.0%	62	47.7%	83	73.5%	20	19.2%	22	28.6%	31	46.3%	14	46.7%	9	30.0%	7	25.9%	11	57.9%
10. Future growth potential of local market	109	67.3%	114	87.7%	63	55.8%	77	74.0%	43	55.8%	54	80.6%	14	46.7%	15	50.0%	17	63.0%	12	63.2%
11. Profitability of local market	26	16.0%	7	5.4%	37	32.7%	7	6.7%	8	10.4%	7	10.4%	1	3.3%	2	6.7%	3	11.1%	-	0.0%
12. Developed local infrastructure	23	14.2%	1	0.8%	33	29.2%	8	7.7%	16	20.8%	2	3.0%	2	6.7%	3	10.0%	8	29.6%	2	10.5%
13. Developed local logistics services	14	8.6%	-	0.0%	17	15.0%	2	1.9%	7	9.1%	-	0.0%	1	3.3%	3	10.0%	2	7.4%	-	0.0%
14. Tax incentives for investment	6	3.7%	2	1.5%	2	1.8%	7	6.7%	12	15.6%	5	7.5%	3	10.0%	2	6.7%	5	18.5%	1	5.3%
15. Stable policies to attract foreign investment	5	3.1%	-	0.0%	2	1.8%	7	6.7%	8	10.4%	3	4.5%	3	10.0%	-	0.0%	1	3.7%	-	0.0%
16. Social/political situation stable	10	6.2%	3	2.3%	27	23.9%	18	17.3%	6	7.8%	3	4.5%	1	3.3%	3	10.0%	5	18.5%	-	0.0%

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

3

3 Promising Countries/Regions: Details of Issues

Note 1: The number of respondent companies refers to the number of companies that cited issues. Note 2: The colored cell indicate the top three reasons most often cited for each country.

	In	1 dia	Ch	2 nina	I	3 JS	Viet	4 Inam	Tha	5 iland	(Indo	6 nesia	Mala	7 avsia	Philin	8 ppines	Me	9 xico	1 Taiv	0 wan
FY2022 Survey	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio	# companies	Ratio
Respondent companies	134	100%	130	100%	100	100%	93	100%	75	100%	67	100%	26	100%	26	100%	27	100%	20	100%
1. Underdeveloped legal system	23	17.2%	5	3.8%	-	0.0%	12	12.9%	3	4.0%	8	11.9%	-	0.0%	3	11.5%	2	7.4%	-	0.0%
2. Execution of legal system unclear	52	38.8%	64	49.2%	3	3.0%	37	39.8%	15	20.0%	30	44.8%	5	19.2%	11	42.3%	4	14.8%	1	5.0%
3. Complicated tax system	41	30.6%	11	8.5%	2	2.0%	10	10.8%	6	8.0%	6	9.0%	-	0.0%	1	3.8%	5	18.5%	1	5.0%
4. Execution of tax system unclear	35	26.1%	21	16.2%	1	1.0%	17	18.3%	7	9.3%	18	26.9%	3	11.5%	2	7.7%	4	14.8%	-	0.0%
5. Increased taxation	22	16.4%	26	20.0%	6	6.0%	10	10.8%	8	10.7%	10	14.9%	-	0.0%	2	7.7%	4	14.8%	2	10.0%
6. Restriction for foreign investment	23	17.2%	30	23.1%	1	1.0%	10	10.8%	12	16.0%	13	19.4%	2	7.7%	1	3.8%	1	3.7%	1	5.0%
7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission	18	13.4%	22	16.9%	2	2.0%	14	15.1%	5	6.7%	7	10.4%	3	11.5%	1	3.8%	3	11.1%	-	0.0%
8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights	18	13.4%	55	42.3%	-	0.0%	12	12.9%	5	6.7%	7	10.4%	2	7.7%	2	7.7%	1	3.7%	-	0.0%
9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas	19	14.2%	25	19.2%	-	0.0%	13	14.0%	5	6.7%	6	9.0%	4	15.4%	2	7.7%	1	3.7%	1	5.0%
10. Import restrictions/customs procedures	21	15.7%	26	20.0%	3	3.0%	10	10.8%	4	5.3%	10	14.9%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	5	18.5%	1	5.0%
11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff	26	19.4%	22	16.9%	21	21.0%	23	24.7%	15	20.0%	14	20.9%	8	30.8%	8	30.8%	15	55.6%	3	15.0%
12. Difficult to secure management-level staff	29	21.6%	23	17.7%	24	24.0%	29	31.2%	18	24.0%	20	29.9%	8	30.8%	7	26.9%	17	63.0%	3	15.0%
13. Rising labor costs	30	22.4%	83	63.8%	65	65.0%	38	40.9%	36	48.0%	23	34.3%	10	38.5%	8	30.8%	13	48.1%	7	35.0%
14. Labor problems	27	20.1%	14	10.8%	12	12.0%	10	10.8%	5	6.7%	11	16.4%	1	3.8%	2	7.7%	6	22.2%	1	5.0%
15. Intense competition with other companies	50	37.3%	77	59.2%	59	59.0%	30	32.3%	29	38.7%	29	43.3%	11	42.3%	5	19.2%	6	22.2%	12	60.0%
16. Difficulty in raising funds	11	8.2%	4	3.1%	-	0.0%	8	8.6%	2	2.7%	3	4.5%	2	7.7%	1	3.8%	1	3.7%	1	5.0%
17. Underdeveloped local supporting industries	15	11.2%	2	1.5%	2	2.0%	11	11.8%	2	2.7%	5	7.5%	1	3.8%	6	23.1%	6	22.2%	-	0.0%
18. Underdeveloped infrastructure	44	32.8%	3	2.3%	-	0.0%	20	21.5%	4	5.3%	11	16.4%	3	11.5%	4	15.4%	4	14.8%	-	0.0%
19. Security/social instability	33	24.6%	30	23.1%	6	6.0%	4	4.3%	11	14.7%	15	22.4%	3	11.5%	4	15.4%	15	55.6%	4	20.0%
20. Lack of information on the country	25	18.7%	2	1.5%	2	2.0%	11	11.8%	3	4.0%	9	13.4%	5	19.2%	3	11.5%	3	11.1%	-	0.0%
	1			_			1			_		_		_					· .	
		1		2		3	·	4		5	(6		7		В		9	1	0
FY2021 Survey	Cł	1 nina	In	2 dia	Vie	3 tnam	Tha	4 iland	ι	5 JS	Indo	6 nesia	Philip	7 opines	Mala	8 aysia	Ме	9 xico	1 Mya	0 nmar
FY2021 Survey	Cł # companies	1 nina _{Ratio}	In # companies	2 dia _{Ratio}	Vie # companies	3 tnam _{Ratio}	Tha # companies	4 iland _{Ratio}	# companies	5 JS _{Ratio}	Indo # companies	o nesia _{Ratio}	Philip # companies	7 opines Ratio	Mala # companies	8 aysia _{Ratio}	Me # companies	9 xico _{Ratio}	1 Mya # companies	0 nmar _{Ratio}
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies	Ch # companies 154	1 nina _{Ratio} 100%	In # companies 118	2 dia _{Ratio} 100%	Vie # companies 98	3 tnam _{Ratio} 100%	Tha # companies 92	4 iland _{Ratio} 100%	# companies 67	5 JS ^{Ratio}	Indo # companies 60	6 nesia _{Ratio} 100%	Philip # companies 28	7 ppines _{Ratio} 100%	Mala # companies 28	8 aysia _{Ratio} 100%	Me # companies 20	9 xico _{Ratio} 100%	1 Mya # companies	0 nmar _{Ratio} 100%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system	Cł # companies 154 7	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5%	In # companies 118 19	2 dia ^{Ratio} 100% 16.1%	Vie # companies 98 2	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0%	Tha # companies 92 17	4 iland _{Ratio} 100% 18.5%	t companies 67 1	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5%	Indo # companies 60 10	6 nesia _{Ratio} 100% 16.7%	Philip # companies 28 6	7 ppines Ratio 100% 21.4%	Mala # companies 28 2	8 aysia ^{Ratio} 100% 7.1%	Me # companies 20 1	9 exico Ratio 100% 5.0%	1 Mya [#] companies 16 -	0 nmar _{Ratio} 100% 0.0%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear	Cf # companies 154 7 67	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5%	In # companies 118 19 51	2 dia ^{Ratio} 100% 16.1% 43.2%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 2	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0%	Tha # companies 92 17 38	4 iland ^{Ratio} 100% 18.5% 41.3%	# companies 67 1 12	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9%	Indo # companies 60 10 29	6 nesia ^{Ratio} 100% 16.7% 48.3%	Philip # companies 28 6 10	7 ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7%	Mala # companies 28 2 4	8 aysia ^{Ratio} 100% 7.1% 14.3%	Me # companies 20 1 2	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 10.0%	1 Mya # companies 16 - 1	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system	Cł # companies 154 7 67 19	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3%	In # companies 118 19 51 43	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 2 3	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0%	# companies 67 1 12 4	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4	7 ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3%	Mala # companies 28 2 4 4	8 aysia Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3%	Me # companies 20 1 2 2 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 10.0% 5.0%	1 Mya # companies 16 - 1 1	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear	Cł # companies 154 7 67 19 31	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 -	3 tnam Ratio 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7%	# companies 67 1 12 4 2	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0%	# companies 60 10 29 8 17	6 Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7	7 Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 25.0%	Mala # companies 28 2 4 4 4 4 2	8 Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1%	Me # companies 20 1 2 1 1 1	9 Ratio 100% 5.0% 10.0% 5.0% 5.0%	1 Mya * companies 16 - 1 1 - -	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation	Ct # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33	1 Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12	2 dia ^{Ratio} 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 - 12	3 tnam Ratio 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9%	# companies 67 1 12 4 2 7	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4%	# companies 60 10 29 8 17 10	6 Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 3	7 Ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 25.0% 10.7%	Mala # companies 28 2 4 4 4 4 2 2 2	8 Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1%	Me # companies 20 1 2 1 1 1 1	9 Ratio 100% 5.0% 10.0% 5.0% 5.0%	1 Mya ¢ companies 16 - 1 1 - - -	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0% 0.0%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment	Cł # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48	1 Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 23 12 18	2 dia ^{Ratio} 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 3 - 12 12 1	3 rnam Ratio 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9%	# companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 7	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 10 12	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 3 3 4	7 Ratio 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 25.0% 10.7% 14.3%	Mala # companies 28 2 4 4 4 2 2 2 2 2	8 Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1%	Me # companies 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1	9 Ratio 100% 5.0% 10.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0%	1 Mya * companies 16 - 1 - - - - 1	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission	Cł # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48 26	1 Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 23 12 18 21	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 17.8%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 3 - - 12 1 1	3 Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 14	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 15.2%	L # companies 67 1 12 4 2 4 2 7 7 7 6	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 9.0%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 12 13	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 3 4 3 4 3	7 Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 25.0% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7%	Mala # companies 28 2 4 4 4 2 2 2 2 3	8 aysia Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7%	Me * 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0%	1 Mya companies 16 - 1 1 - - 1 1 1	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights	Cł # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48 26 58	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 20.1% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 37.7%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 17.8% 11.9%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 2 3 3 - - 12 1 1 -	3 tnam Ratio 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 0.0%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 14 12	4 Iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 15.2% 13.0%	L # companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 7 6 6 6	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 10.4% 9.0%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 12 13 6	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 3 4 3 4 3 2	7 ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 25.0% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 7.1%	Mala # companies 28 22 4 4 4 22 22 22 3 3 1	B Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 3.6%	Me * 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 -	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 0.0%	1 Mya * companies 16 - - - - - 1 1 1 1	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system unclear 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas	Cł # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 33 48 26 58 48	1 Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 31.2%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 23 12 18 21 14 14 19	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 17.8% 11.9% 16.1%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 2 3 3 - - 12 1 1 - -	3 tham Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 1.0% 1.0% 0.0% 0.0%	Tha companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 14 12 19	4 Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 15.2% 13.0% 20.7%	# companies 67 1 12 2 4 4 2 7 7 7 6 6 6 1	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 10.4% 9.0% 9.0% 1.5%	Indo # companies 60 100 29 8 17 100 122 133 6 4	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 7 3 3 4 3 4 3 2 2 2	7 ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 25.0% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 10.7% 7.1%	Mala # companies 28 22 4 4 4 22 22 22 33 1 1	B Ratio 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6%	Me * 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5	1 Mya * companies 16 - - - - - 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures	Cł # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 33 48 26 58 48 35	1 Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 37.7% 31.2% 22.7%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 14 19 22	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 17.8% 11.9% 16.1% 18.6%	Vie # companies 98 22 23 - 12 12 1 1 - 5	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0% 0.0% 5.1%	Tha * 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 14 12 19 15	4 Ratio Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 15.2% 13.0% 20.7% 16.3%	4 companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 7 6 6 6 1 1	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 9.0% 9.0% 1.5%	Indo # companies 60 10 299 8 17 10 12 13 6 4 10	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 7 3 3 4 4 3 2 2 2 4	7 Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 25.0% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 7.1% 7.1% 14.3%	Mala # companies 28 2 4 4 4 2 2 2 3 3 1 1 1 3	B Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6% 10.7%	Me * 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0%	1 Mya companies 16 - - - - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 mmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.3% 6.3% 6.3%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system unclear 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff	Cł # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48 26 58 48 35 26	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 31.2% 22.7% 16.9%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 18 21 14 19 22 21	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 15.3% 15.3% 10.2% 15.3% 10.2% 15.3% 10.2% 15.3% 10.2% 15.3% 10.2% 1	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 - 12 12 1 1 - 5 31	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 3.1.6%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 14 12 19 15 17	4 Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 15.2% 13.0% 20.7% 16.3% 18.5%	L # companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 6 6 6 1 1 1 17	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 6.0% 6.0% 10.4% 10.4% 9.0% 9.0% 1.5% 1.5% 25.4%	Indoo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 12 13 6 6 4 4 10 11	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7% 16.7% 18.3%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 3 3 4 3 3 2 2 2 2 4 5	7 Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 14.3% 10.7% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 7.1% 14.3% 1.1% 14.3% 1.1% 14.3% 1.1	Mala # companies 28 2 4 4 4 2 2 2 2 3 3 1 1 1 3 3 5	B Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 10.7% 53.6%	Me # companies 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 - 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5	1 Mya * companies 16 - - - - - - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 3	0 mmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 12. Difficult to secure management-level staff	Cl # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48 26 58 48 26 58 48 35 26 6 27	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 4.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 37.7% 31.2% 22.7% 16.9% 17.5%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 19 51 43 23 12 12 18 21 12 18 21 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 24 24 24 25 24 25 25 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 17.8% 10.2% 17.8% 11.9% 16.1% 18.6% 25.4%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 2 3 - 12 1 1 - - 5 31 24	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0% 0.0% 0.0% 3.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.5% 2.5% 0.0% 0	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 14 12 19 15 17 24	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.3% 10.3% 20.7% 13.0% 20.7% 16.3% 26.1%	L # companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 7 6 6 6 6 1 1 1 77 19	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 9.0% 9.0% 1.5% 1.5% 25.4% 28.4%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 12 13 6 6 4 10 11 11 20	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7% 16.7% 18.3% 33.3%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 7 3 3 4 4 3 2 2 2 4 4 5 5 6	7 Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 14.3% 10.7% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 21.4%	Mala * companies 28 22 4 4 4 22 22 22 33 11 1 1 3 3 15 19	B Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6% 10.7% 53.6% 67.9%	Me * companies 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 7	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5	1 Mya * companies 16 - 1 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 3 3 1	0 Ratio 100% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 12. Difficult to secure management-level staff 13. Rising labor costs	Cl # companies 154 7 67 19 31 1 33 3 48 26 58 48 26 58 48 35 26 27 7 104	1 Ratio Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 37.7% 31.2% 22.7% 16.9% 17.5% 67.5%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 19 22 21 30 18	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.6% 17.8% 11.9% 17.8% 17.8% 17.8% 17.8% 15.3%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 3 - 12 1 1 - 5 5 31 24 37	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 1.2.2% 1.0% 1.0% 0.0% 5.1% 31.6% 24.5% 37.8%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 14 12 19 15 17 24 35	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 20.7% 13.0% 20.7% 20.7% 20.7% 13.0% 20.7% 20.7% 13.0% 20.7%	L # companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 7 6 6 6 6 1 1 17 19 34	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 9.0% 10.4% 9.0% 1.5% 25.4% 28.4% 28.4% 50.7%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 17 10 12 13 6 4 10 11 11 20 22	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7% 18.3% 33.3% 36.7%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 7 3 3 4 4 3 3 2 2 4 4 3 3 2 2 2 4 4 5 6 6 4	7 Ratio 100% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 14.3% 10.7% 10.7% 10.7% 7.1% 10.7% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 25.0% 14.3% 14.3% 17.9% 14.3% 17.9% 14.3% 1	Mala * companies 28 2 4 4 4 2 2 2 2 2 3 1 1 3 5 19 9	B aysia Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6% 10.7% 53.6% 67.9% 32.1%	Me * companies 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 7 7 7	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.	1 Mya * companies 16 - 1 1 - - - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 18.8% 6.3% 37.5%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system unclear 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 12. Difficult to secure management-level staff 13. Rising labor costs 14. Labor problems	Cl # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 348 26 58 48 35 26 27 7 104 26	1 Ratio Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 31.2% 31.2% 31.2% 31.2% 6.9% 31.7% 67.5% 16.9%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 19 22 21 14 19 22 21 30 30 18 22 21 18 22 21 21 22 21 22 21 23 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 11.9% 15.3% 11.9% 16.1% 17.8% 25.4% 25.4% 21.2%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 - 12 1 - - 5 31 24 37 13	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0% 0.0% 5.1% 31.6% 24.5% 37.8% 13.3%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 14 12 19 15 17 24 35 16	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.3% 10.3% 20.7% 38.0% 17.4%	L # companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 7 6 6 6 1 1 17 19 34 3	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 10.4% 9.0% 9.0% 1.5% 25.4% 28.4% 28.4% 50.7% 4.5%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 7 7 10 10 12 13 6 4 4 10 11 20 0 22 14	6 hesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7% 10.0% 6.7% 10.0% 33.3% 36.7% 23.3%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 4 7 7 3 4 4 3 2 2 2 4 4 5 6 6 4 4 1	7 Ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 7.1% 14.3% 17.9% 21.4% 3.6%	Mala * companies 28 2 4 4 4 2 2 2 2 2 3 1 1 1 3 15 9 9 6	B aysia Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6% 10.7% 53.6% 67.9% 32.1% 21.4%	Me * companies 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 7 7 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5	1 Mya * companies 16 - 1 1 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 0.0% 0.
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 12. Difficult to secure management-level staff 13. Rising labor costs 14. Labor problems 15. Intense competition with other companies	Cl # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48 26 58 48 35 26 27 104 26 98	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 21.4% 31.2% 22.7% 16.9% 67.5% 67.5% 63.6%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 19 22 21 30 18 25 55	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 11.9% 16.1% 17.8% 25.4% 15.3% 21.2% 46.6%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 2 3 3 - 12 1 1 1 - 5 5 31 24 24 37 7 13 63	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0% 0.0% 5.1% 3.16% 24.5% 37.8% 13.3% 64.3%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 10 10 14 12 19 15 17 24 35 16 32	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.3% 20.7% 16.3% 20.7% 18.5% 26.1% 38.0% 17.4% 34.8%	L # companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 7 7 6 6 6 6 6 1 1 1 7 7 9 34 4 3 3 5	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 9.0% 1.5% 1.5% 25.4% 28.4% 50.7% 50.7% 52.2%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 12 13 6 4 4 10 11 20 22 14 25	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7% 10.0% 6.7% 18.3% 33.3% 23.3% 41.7%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 3 4 4 3 3 4 4 3 3 2 2 2 4 4 5 6 6 4 1 7 7	7 Ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 7.1% 14.3% 10.7% 21.4% 14.3% 3.6% 25.0%	Mala * companies 28 2 4 4 4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 1 1 1 3 15 19 9 6 10	B Ratio Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6% 10.7% 53.6% 67.9% 32.1% 21.4% 35.7%	Me * companies 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 7 7 1 7 7	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5	1 Mya * companies 16 - 1 1 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 mmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 37.5% 0.0%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 12. Difficult to secure management-level staff 13. Rising labor costs 14. Labor problems 15. Intense competition with other companies 16. Difficulty in raising funds	Ct # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48 26 58 48 26 58 58 26 27 27 104 26 98 8 8	1 ina Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 37.7% 22.7% 16.9% 17.5% 67.5% 16.9% 5.2%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 19 22 21 30 18 25 55 12	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 11.9% 16.1% 16.1% 16.1% 16.3% 25.4% 15.3% 21.2% 46.6% 10.2%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 - 12 1 1 - 5 31 24 37 13 63 2	3 tnam Ratio 2.0% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 5.1% 31.6% 24.5% 37.8% 13.3% 64.3% 2.0%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 10 10 14 12 19 15 17 24 35 16 32 7	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 15.2% 13.0% 20.7% 16.3% 18.5% 26.1% 38.0% 17.4% 34.8% 7.6%	L * companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 6 6 6 1 1 17 19 34 3 5 2	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 10.4% 9.0% 9.0% 9.0% 1.5% 1.5% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 3.0%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 8 17 10 12 13 6 6 4 4 10 11 20 22 14 4 4 25 2	6 hesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7% 16.7% 18.3% 33.3% 36.7% 23.3% 41.7% 3.3%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 4 7 3 3 4 4 7 3 3 4 4 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 4 4 5 5 6 6 4 4 1 7 7 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 4 4 3 2 8 5 5 7 7 8 5 7 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	7 Ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 25.0% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 14.3% 17.9% 21.4% 14.3% 21.4% 21.4% 14.3% 21.4% 14.3% 21.4% 14.3%	Mala # companies 28 2 4 4 2 2 2 2 3 1 1 1 3 15 19 9 6 10 2	B aysia Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6% 53.6% 67.9% 32.1% 21.4% 7.1%	Me # companies 20 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5	1 Mya * companies 16 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	0 Ratio 100% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. 3. Complicated tax system unclear 4. 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. 5. Increased taxation 6. 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 12. 12. Difficult to secure management-level staff 13. 13. Rising labor costs 14. 14. Labor problems 15. 15. Intense competition with other companies 16. 16. Difficulty in raising funds 17. 17. Underdeveloped local supporting industries 10.	Ct # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48 26 58 48 26 58 26 27 104 26 27 104 26 88 8 8	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 4.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 31.2% 16.9% 16.9% 16.9% 67.5% 16.9% 63.6% 5.2% 1.9%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 19 22 21 30 18 25 55 55 12 16	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 10.2% 15.3% 16.1% 18.6% 17.8% 25.4% 15.3% 21.2% 46.6% 10.2% 13.6%	Vie # companies 98 2 3 3 - 12 1 1 1 - 5 31 24 37 13 63 2 1	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0% 3.1% 3.1% 0.0% 0.0% 3.1% 1.0% 3.1% 0.0% 0.0% 1.0% 0.0% 0.0% 1.0% 0	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 14 12 19 10 10 14 12 19 15 17 24 35 16 32 7 17 24 35 12 17 17 17 17 10 10 12 17 17 10 10 12 17 17 10 12 17 10 12 17 10 12 17 10 12 17 10 10 12 17 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 13.0% 26.1% 38.0% 17.4% 38.8% 17.4% 34.8% 7.6% 13.0%	L * companies 67 1 1 2 4 4 2 7 7 6 6 6 1 1 1 1 7 7 6 6 3 4 3 3 5 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 1.5% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 10.4% 9.0% 10.4% 9.0% 10.4% 9.0% 1.5% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 50.7% 4.5% 50.2% 3.0% 1.5%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 12 13 6 4 4 10 11 20 22 14 25 2 6	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7% 18.3% 33.3% 36.7% 23.3% 41.7% 3.3% 10.0%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 7 3 3 4 4 3 3 4 4 3 2 2 2 4 4 5 6 6 4 4 1 7 7 2 2 3	7 Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 14.3% 10.7% 10.7% 14.3% 17.9% 21.4% 14.3% 3.6% 21.4% 14.3% 14.3% 17.9% 14.3% 15.3% 15.3% 1	Mala * companies 28 28 24 4 4 2 2 2 2 3 1 1 1 3 15 19 9 6 0 2 5 5	B aysia Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6% 53.6% 67.9% 32.1% 21.4% 35.7% 7.1% 17.9%	Me # companies 20 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 35.0% 35.0% 35.0% 0.0% 10.0%	1 Mya * companies 16 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	0 Ratio 100% 0.0% 6.3% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 18.8% 6.3% 0.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0%
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. 3. Complicated tax system unclear 4. 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. 5. Increased taxation 6. 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 12. 12. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 13. 13. Rising labor costs 14. 14. Labor problems 15. 15. Inficulty in raising funds 17. 17. Underdeveloped local supporting industries 18. 18. Underdeveloped local supporting industries 18.	Cl # companies 154 7 67 19 31 33 48 26 58 48 26 58 48 355 26 6 27 104 26 98 8 8 3 3 5	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 4.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 37.7% 31.2% 22.7% 16.9% 16.9% 67.5% 16.9% 5.2% 1.9% 3.2%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 19 22 21 30 18 25 55 12 16 54	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 10.2% 15.3% 17.8% 17.8% 25.4% 15.3% 21.2% 46.6% 10.2% 46.6% 13.6% 45.8%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 3 - 12 1 1 - 5 31 24 37 13 63 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0% 3.16% 24.5% 37.8% 13.3% 64.3% 2.0% 1.0%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 14 12 19 10 10 14 12 19 15 17 24 35 16 32 7 7 12 18 18 19 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 15.2% 10.9% 15.2% 13.0% 26.1% 38.0% 17.4% 38.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 19.6%	L * companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 6 6 6 1 1 17 19 34 35 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 1.5% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 1.5% 10.4% 9.0% 9.0% 1.5% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 1.5% 3.0% 50.7% 4.5% 50.7% 4.5% 50.7% 50.	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 12 13 6 4 10 12 13 6 4 10 22 14 25 6 18	6 hesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 33.3% 36.7% 23.3% 41.7% 3.3% 3.3% 30.0%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 7 3 3 4 4 3 3 4 4 3 3 2 2 2 4 4 5 5 6 6 4 4 1 7 7 2 2 3 8	7 Ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 35.7% 14.3% 14.3% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 14.3% 21.4% 14.3% 21.4% 14.3% 21.4% 14.3% 21.4% 14.3% 25.0% 7.1% 21.4% 25.0% 7.1% 28.6% 28.6%	Mala # companies 28 22 4 4 4 4 2 2 2 2 3 3 1 1 1 3 3 15 19 9 9 6 6 10 2 5 5 4	B aysia Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 10.7% 53.6% 67.9% 32.1% 21.4% 35.7% 7.1% 17.9% 14.3%	Me # companies 20 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 7 7 7 1 7 2 2 7 7 1 2 7 7 1 2 7 7 1 2 7 7 1 2 2 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 10.0% 35.0% 35.0% 0.0% 10.0%	1 Mya * companies 16 - 1 1 - - - - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.0% 0.
FY2021 Survey Respondent companies 1. Underdeveloped legal system 2. Execution of legal system unclear 3. Complicated tax system 4. Execution of tax system unclear 5. Increased taxation 6. Restriction for foreign investment 7. Complicated/unclear procedures for investment permission 8. Insufficient protection for intellectual property rights 9. Restrictions on foreign currency/ transfers of money overseas 10. Import restrictions/customs procedures 11. Difficult to secure technical/engineering staff 12. Difficult to secure management-level staff 13. Rising labor costs 14. Labor problems 15. Intense competition with other companies 16. Difficulty in raising funds 17. Underdeveloped local supporting industries 18. Underdeveloped infrastructure 19. Security/social instability	Cl # companies 154 7 67 19 31 1 33 48 26 58 48 26 58 48 26 58 27 104 26 27 104 26 98 8 3 3 5 5 27	1 nina Ratio 100% 4.5% 43.5% 12.3% 20.1% 21.4% 31.2% 16.9% 37.7% 31.2% 22.7% 16.9% 16.9% 67.5% 16.9% 67.5% 16.9% 3.2% 1.9% 3.2% 1.9% 3.2% 1.5%	In # companies 118 19 51 43 23 12 18 21 14 19 22 21 30 18 25 55 12 16 54 31	2 dia Ratio 100% 16.1% 43.2% 36.4% 19.5% 10.2% 15.3% 10.2% 15.3% 17.8% 25.4% 15.3% 21.2% 46.6% 10.2% 13.6% 45.8% 26.3%	Vie # companies 98 2 2 3 - 12 1 1 - 5 31 24 37 13 63 21 1 1 6	3 tnam Ratio 100% 2.0% 2.0% 3.1% 0.0% 12.2% 1.0% 1.0% 0.0% 24.5% 31.6% 24.5% 37.8% 13.3% 64.3% 2.0% 1.0% 6.1%	Tha # companies 92 17 38 12 19 10 10 10 10 14 12 19 15 17 24 35 16 32 7 12 18 4	4 iland Ratio 100% 18.5% 41.3% 13.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 10.9% 13.0% 26.1% 38.0% 17.4% 38.0% 17.4% 38.0% 17.4% 38.0% 13.0% 26.1% 38.0% 13.0% 26.1% 38.0% 13.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 26.1% 38.0% 20.7% 10.9% 10.7% 10.9% 10.7% 10.9%	L * companies 67 1 12 4 2 7 7 6 6 6 1 1 17 19 34 35 2 1 1 14	5 JS Ratio 100% 1.5% 17.9% 6.0% 3.0% 10.4% 9.0% 10.4% 9.0% 10.4% 9.0% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 25.4% 1.5% 3.0% 1.5% 3.0% 1.5% 20.9%	Indo # companies 60 10 29 8 17 10 12 13 6 4 10 12 13 6 4 10 22 14 25 2 6 18 14	6 nesia Ratio 100% 16.7% 48.3% 13.3% 28.3% 16.7% 20.0% 21.7% 10.0% 6.7% 10.0% 33.3% 41.7% 3.3% 10.0% 30.0% 23.3%	Philip # companies 28 6 10 4 7 7 3 3 4 3 2 2 2 4 4 5 6 6 4 4 5 6 6 4 4 1 7 7 2 2 3 8 8 13	7 Ppines Ratio 100% 21.4% 21.4% 14.3% 14.3% 10.7% 14.3% 10.7% 7.1% 14.3% 21.4% 21.4% 14.3% 21.4% 14.3% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4% 21.4% 21.4% 25.0% 21.4%	Mala * companies 28 22 4 4 4 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 1 1 1 1 3 3 15 19 9 6 6 10 2 5 5 4 4 9	B aysia Ratio 100% 7.1% 14.3% 14.3% 7.1% 7.1% 10.7% 3.6% 3.6% 10.7% 3.6% 67.9% 32.1% 21.4% 35.7% 7.1% 17.9% 7.1% 14.3% 32.1%	Me * companies 20 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 7 7 7 1 7 2 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9 xico Ratio 100% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 35.0% 35.0% 35.0% 0.0% 10.0% 5.0%	1 Mya * companies 16 - 1 1 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	0 nmar Ratio 100% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

Existence of Business Plans in Promising Countries

Note: Each ratio refers to the number of companies answering "A new business plan exists", "A business plan for additional investment exists", "No plans" or "No response", divided by the total number of respondent companies for the respective countries.

	No.	1	No.	2	No.	3	No.	4	No.	5	No.	6	No.	7	No.	8	No.	9	No. '	10
	Ind	ia	Chir	na	US	\$	Vietn	am	Thail	and	Indon	esia	Mala	/sia	Philipp	ines	Mexi	со	Taiwa	an
	Respondent companies	Ratio																		
Total	148	100%	136	100%	118	100%	106	100%	85	100%	77	100%	31	100%	28	100%	27	100%	23	100%
A new business plan exist	18	12.2%	11	8.1%	12	10.2%	9	8.5%	4	4.7%	6	7.8%	5	16.1%	3	10.7%	2	7.4%	3	13.0%
A business plan for additional	38	25.7%	52	38.2%	52	44.1%	27	25.5%	27	31.8%	21	27.3%	8	25.8%	6	21.4%	12	44.4%	6	26.1%
No plans	90	60.8%	71	52.2%	57	48.3%	69	65.1%	53	62.4%	50	64.9%	18	58.1%	19	67.9%	13	48.1%	15	65.2%
No response	3	2.0%	3	2.2%	1	0.8%	1	0.9%	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%

	No.	11	No. '	12	No.	13	No.	14	No.	15	No.	16	No.	16	No.	18	No.	19	No.	20
	Germ	any	Kore	a	Bra	zil	Austr	alia	Singa	oore	Bangla	Idesh	U	(Turk	ey	Fran	се	Camb	odia
	Respondent companies	Ratio																		
Total	21	100%	17	100%	15	100%	13	100%	12	100%	10	100%	10	100%	9	100%	8	100%	7	100%
A new business plan exist	0	0.0%	2	11.8%	1	6.7%	1	7.7%	2	16.7%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
A business plan for additional	9	42.9%	6	35.3%	5	33.3%	3	23.1%	3	25.0%	4	40.0%	5	50.0%	2	22.2%	4	50.0%	2	28.6%
No plans	12	57.1%	9	52.9%	9	60.0%	9	69.2%	7	58.3%	4	40.0%	5	50.0%	6	66.7%	4	50.0%	5	71.4%
No response	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Promising Countries/Regions (Number of Respondent Companies)

		No. of res	spondent	Change from
Rank	Country	comp	anies	lastsurvey
		FY2022	FY2021	('22-'21)
1	US	64	66	▲ 2
2	China	63	72	▲ 9
3	India	56	43	13
4	Vietnam	36	34	2
5	Thailand	31	30	1
6	Indonesia	27	21	6
7	Mexico	14	16	▲ 2
8	Malaysia	13	9	4
9	Germany	9	12	▲ 3
9	Philippines	9	11	▲ 2
9	Taiwan	9	7	2

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

Promising Countries Survey :

Sales Areas for Products Produced in the ASEAN (by industry)

Promising Countries Survey :

Sales Areas for EV Products Produced in the ASEAN

# of respondent companies	ASEAN	Japan	US	China	Hard to answer depends on production bases in each ASEAN country	No production in ASEAN	No bussiness related to EVs and EV-related components	Other
461	110	28	19	52	63	73	108	8
17	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	(
19	5	2	1	3	0	2	6	C
13	1	0	4	0	1	4	3	C
78	15	5	2	11	15	12	17	1
74	14	5	2	11	15	12	14	1
4	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	(
13	2	0	1	4	3	2	1	(
9	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	(
7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	(
21	9	0	1	2	3	2	2	2
17	3	0	1	2	0	3	8	(
54	12	4	1	2	2	16	16	1
39	7	4	0	1	0	13	14	(
15	5	0	1	1	2	3	2	1
64	11	4	2	9	12	11	13	2
21	2	1	0	1	5	4	8	(
43	9	3	2	8	7	7	5	2
13	3	1	1	1	3	2	2	(
101	42	8	5	10	19	11	4	2
5	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	(
96	39	8	5	9	18	11	4	2
22	4	2	0	3	2	4	7	(
13	4	1	0	1	1	3	3	(
9	0	1	0	2	1	1	4	(
13	0	1	0	2	0	0	10	(
	# of respondent companies 461 17 19 13 78 74 4 4 13 78 74 4 4 13 78 74 4 13 78 74 4 13 78 74 4 13 78 74 4 13 78 74 4 13 79 64 21 17 54 39 55 64 22 13 101 55 96 222 13 99 13	# of respondent companies ASEAN 461 110 17 0 19 5 13 1 78 15 74 14 4 1 13 2 9 1 77 2 9 1 7 2 21 9 17 3 54 12 39 7 15 5 64 11 21 2 43 9 13 3 101 42 5 3 96 39 22 4 13 4 9 0 13 0	# of respondent companies ASEAN Japan 461 110 28 17 0 0 19 5 2 13 1 0 78 15 5 74 14 5 74 14 5 74 14 0 13 2 0 13 2 0 13 2 0 13 2 0 13 2 0 14 5 0 15 5 0 16 11 4 39 7 4 15 5 0 64 11 4 21 2 1 43 9 3 13 3 1 101 42 8 5 3 0 9 39 8	# of respondent companies ASEAN Japan US 461 110 28 19 17 0 0 0 19 5 2 1 13 1 0 4 78 15 5 2 4 1 0 0 0 13 2 0 1 1 9 1 1 0 0 13 2 0 1 0 13 2 0 1 0 13 2 0 0 1 9 1 1 1 0 13 2 0 1 1 15 5 0 1 1 164 11 4 2 2 13 3 1 1 1 101 42 8 5 5 13 3	# of respondent companies ASEAN Japan US China 461 110 28 19 52 17 0 0 0 2 19 5 2 1 3 13 1 0 4 0 78 15 5 2 11 74 14 5 2 11 4 1 0 0 0 13 2 0 1 4 9 1 1 0 0 0 13 2 0 0 1 2 14 1 0 0 1 2 13 2 0 0 1 2 14 1 4 2 9 1 2 13 2 4 1 1 1 1 15 5 0 1 1 1	# of respondent companiesASEANJapanUSLeft to answer chinalHard to answer depends on production bases in each ASEAN country461110281952631170002111952213013104011652211111517414452211115174144000013201115141010111151514101101101132011111401111115141001111111514101101101161210110110117301112210116121011011021011510110110110110116101101101101101161331111110110116300111131011713311111113111181011011011011011910110110110111119101101101101111 <tr< td=""><td># of respondent companiesASEANJapanUSChinalHendents on poduction bases in each ASEAN countryNo production in ASEAN10100263731100026311100002113101000101131010001011410510211110151410000001310101011012141000101101215101010110121610101011010172000001011610101011010173000101101016101010110101730001011010161010101101016101010110101610101011011173000101101016101010110111730001011011180000101101119000010110111011010001011011160000<!--</td--><td># or seponents companiesAseANJapanUSChinalHard to anweak base in each ASEAN countyNo production base and EV-related components46111022101231081111001001021011013101611210010010010010010161131011001001011014101611410010010110111011210111151011100100100101110111161011101010111011101110111171001100110011001101110111181011100010011001101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011</td></td></tr<>	# of respondent companiesASEANJapanUSChinalHendents on poduction bases in each ASEAN countryNo production in ASEAN10100263731100026311100002113101000101131010001011410510211110151410000001310101011012141000101101215101010110121610101011010172000001011610101011010173000101101016101010110101730001011010161010101101016101010110101610101011011173000101101016101010110111730001011011180000101101119000010110111011010001011011160000 </td <td># or seponents companiesAseANJapanUSChinalHard to anweak base in each ASEAN countyNo production base and EV-related components46111022101231081111001001021011013101611210010010010010010161131011001001011014101611410010010110111011210111151011100100100101110111161011101010111011101110111171001100110011001101110111181011100010011001101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011</td>	# or seponents companiesAseANJapanUSChinalHard to anweak base in each ASEAN countyNo production base and EV-related components46111022101231081111001001021011013101611210010010010010010161131011001001011014101611410010010110111011210111151011100100100101110111161011101010111011101110111171001100110011001101110111181011100010011001101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011101110111191011101110111011

3

Promising Countries/ Regions: African Countries (1) (by industry)

	# of respondent companies	Interested and already have a business development	Interested and currently considering	Interested but not yet have a business	Not interested	
Total	481	39	12	67	363	
Food	18	2	1	1	14	
Textiles	21	1	0	0	20	
Paper, Pulp & Wood	13	0	2	2	9	
Chemicals (subtotal)	84	5	2	12	65	
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	80	4	2	11	63	
Pharmaceuticals	4	1	0	1	2	
Petroleum & Rubber	13	2	0	0	11	
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	1	0	0	9	
Steel	9	0	0	1	8	
Nonferrous Metals	21	2	0	3	16	
Metal Products	18	1	0	3	14	
General Machinery	57	6	0	14	37	
General Machinery (assembler)	41	5	0	10	26	
General Machinery (parts)	16	1	0	4	11	
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	66	8	3	10	45	
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	22	4	2	4	12	
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	44	4	1	6	33	
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	13	1	0	4	8	
Automobiles (subtotal)	100	6	1	12	81	
Automobiles (assembler)	5	4	0	0	1	
Automobiles (parts)	95	2	1	12	80	
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	25	4	3	2	16	
Precision Machinery (assembler)	14	3	3	1	7	
Precision Machinery (parts)	11	1	0	1	9	
Others	13	0	0	3	10	

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

	# of respondent companies	Qualified human resources	Inexpensive source of labor	Inexpensive components/ raw materials	Supply base for assemblers	Receiver of risk diversification to other countries	Export Base to third countries	Current size of local market	Future growth potential of local market	Future growth potential of the intra- African market (including AfCFTA)	Developed local infrastructure (Electricity, Communications, Transportation, etc.)	Developed local logistics	Stable policies to attract foreign investment	Stable social/political situation
Total	133	6	21	10	17	6	15	53	88	49	18	6	2	14
South Africa	51	2	3	4	7	2	6	24	29	17	8	2	1	3
Nigeria	19	1	4	3	1	0	1	6	16	8	1	0	0	1
Egypt	17	0	2	0	2	2	1	7	11	6	4	2	0	3
Kenya	17	2	3	1	1	0	2	4	16	8	0	0	0	3
Morocco	9	0	2	0	3	1	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	0
Senegal	4	1	2	2	2	0	2	2	3	3	0	0	0	1
Tunisia	4	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	1
Tanzania	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Ghana	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2
Mozambique	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0
Congo	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Ethiopia	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Sudan	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Zambia	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0

(1) Impact of the Invasion of Ukraine (by industry)

	# of respondent companies	Negative	Relatively negative	No influence	Relatively positive	Positive
Total	513	225	232	52	4	0
Food	20	12	8	0	0	0
Textiles	21	10	10	1	0	0
Paper, Pulp & Wood	14	6	8	0	0	0
Chemicals (subtotal)	86	44	36	6	0	0
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	81	43	32	6	0	0
Pharmaceuticals	5	1	4	0	0	0
Petroleum & Rubber	13	8	4	1	0	0
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	5	2	3	0	0
Steel	11	4	6	1	0	0
Nonferrous Metals	22	9	6	5	2	0
Metal Products	19	7	9	2	1	0
General Machinery	61	26	29	6	0	0
General Machinery (assembler)	44	20	19	5	0	0
General Machinery (parts)	17	6	10	1	0	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	71	29	32	9	1	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	24	10	10	4	0	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	47	19	22	5	1	0
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	17	8	8	1	0	0
Automobiles (subtotal)	106	34	61	11	0	0
Automobiles (assembler)	5	5	0	0	0	0
Automobiles (parts)	101	29	61	11	0	0
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	27	14	10	3	0	0
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	8	6	1	0	0
Precision Machinery (parts)	12	6	4	2	0	0
Others	15	9	3	3	0	0

(2) Impact of the invasion of Ukraine: Reasons for Negative Impacts (by industry)

0	J	B		С
---	---	---	--	---

	# of respondent companies	Downsizing or withdrawal of Russian/ Ukraine business	Logistics disruption	Insufficient supply of parts and RM produced in Russia/Ukraine	Rising fuel prices	Rising mineral prices	Rising grain prices	Increased costs due to exchange rate fluctuations	Increased burden to legal risks associated with economic sanctions and embargoes	Increased burden of responding to reputation risk	Change of business plan in the region adjacent to Ukraine	Others
Total	455	101	278	60	355	138	25	158	62	14	16	14
Food	19	3	11	3	15	2	13	13	3	2	0	1
Textiles	20	1	10	0	20	1	0	10	1	0	0	1
Paper, Pulp & Wood	14	2	8	3	14	2	0	6	2	0	1	0
Chemicals (subtotal)	80	13	58	15	67	22	3	27	7	1	2	0
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	75	12	54	14	65	22	3	26	7	1	2	0
Pharmaceuticals	5	1	4	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Petroleum & Rubber	12	3	9	2	9	3	0	5	2	1	1	1
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	7	1	3	0	7	2	0	3	4	2	0	0
Steel	10	0	3	2	9	5	0	4	0	0	0	0
Nonferrous Metals	15	3	10	5	12	6	0	4	1	0	1	0
Metal Products	16	2	9	2	11	10	0	6	2	0	1	1
General Machinery	54	18	34	7	36	18	2	16	13	3	3	2
General Machinery (assembler)	39	15	26	6	26	13	1	13	11	3	2	2
General Machinery (parts)	15	3	8	1	10	5	1	3	2	0	1	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	61	20	36	7	44	20	3	21	12	4	6	2
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	20	9	12	2	14	6	2	7	2	3	4	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	41	11	24	5	30	14	1	14	10	1	2	2
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	16	4	9	3	13	5	0	2	4	0	0	1
Automobiles (subtotal)	95	14	55	10	72	34	1	30	6	1	1	4
Automobiles (assembler)	5	3	4	1	4	2	0	2	3	1	0	0
Automobiles (parts)	90	11	51	9	68	32	1	28	3	0	1	4
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	24	11	15	1	17	7	2	8	5	0	0	1
Precision Machinery (assembler)	14	9	7	1	9	2	2	3	3	0	0	1
Precision Machinery (parts)	10	2	8	0	8	5	0	5	2	0	0	0
Others	12	6	8	0	9	1	1	3	0	0	0	0

(3) Invasion of Ukraine: Subsequent Effects on Decarbonization Initiatives (by industry)

	# of respondent companies	Accelerate the pace toward your decarbonization goals	Slow down the pace toward your decarbonization goals	Not significantly changed	Uncertain
Total	499	112	38	230	119
Food	17	2	1	8	6
Textiles	21	5	3	9	4
Paper, Pulp & Wood	14	4	1	7	2
Chemicals (subtotal)	84	17	5	43	19
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	80	17	5	41	17
Pharmaceuticals	4	0	0	2	2
Petroleum & Rubber	13	4	1	6	2
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	2	1	4	3
Steel	11	0	1	8	2
Nonferrous Metals	22	5	2	11	4
Metal Products	19	0	3	6	10
General Machinery	57	6	4	30	17
General Machinery (assembler)	41	5	3	24	9
General Machinery (parts)	16	1	1	6	8
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	69	22	5	29	13
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	24	8	3	11	2
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	45	14	2	18	11
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	16	5	1	8	2
Automobiles (subtotal)	106	29	10	46	21
Automobiles (assembler)	5	2	0	2	1
Automobiles (parts)	101	27	10	44	20
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	25	9	0	8	8
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	4	0	5	6
Precision Machinery (parts)	10	5	0	3	2
Others	15	2	0	7	6

Copyright © Japan Bank for International Cooperation

(1) Supply Chain and Geopolitical Risks: Shock Factors (by industry) **() JBIC**

	# of respondent companies	Logistics disruption	Insufficient supply of parts and raw materials (e.g., semiconductors)	Increased production and transportation costs	Labor shortage	Others
Total	513	340	374	383	63	5
Food	20	17	9	19	2	0
Textiles	21	12	8	17	5	0
Paper, Pulp & Wood	13	8	9	10	2	0
Chemicals (subtotal)	87	62	55	68	10	3
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	82	59	55	64	10	3
Pharmaceuticals	5	3	0	4	0	0
Petroleum & Rubber	13	8	8	10	1	0
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	7	6	10	1	0
Steel	10	1	4	8	2	0
Nonferrous Metals	24	19	18	16	3	0
Metal Products	18	9	13	12	0	0
General Machinery	61	41	50	39	6	1
General Machinery (assembler)	44	28	38	27	6	1
General Machinery (parts)	17	13	12	12	0	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	71	51	64	48	9	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assemble	24	20	24	15	4	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	47	31	40	33	5	0
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	17	10	14	11	1	0
Automobiles (subtotal)	108	69	88	82	13	1
Automobiles (assembler)	5	5	5	4	1	0
Automobiles (parts)	103	64	83	78	12	1
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	27	18	24	22	6	0
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	10	14	12	4	0
Precision Machinery (parts)	12	8	10	10	2	0
Others	13	8	4	11	2	0


(2) Importance of Geopolitical Risk (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Very significant	Significant	Neither	Less significant	Not significant	Uncertain
Total	509	124	309	40	4	0	32
Food	20	4	12	3	0	0	1
Textiles	21	2	16	1	1	0	1
Paper, Pulp & Wood	13	5	6	2	0	0	0
Chemicals (subtotal)	87	20	61	4	0	0	2
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	82	18	58	4	0	0	2
Pharmaceuticals	5	2	3	0	0	0	0
Petroleum & Rubber	13	1	9	3	0	0	0
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	4	3	2	1	0	0
Steel	10	3	7	0	0	0	0
Nonferrous Metals	22	7	14	1	0	0	0
Metal Products	18	4	10	2	0	0	2
General Machinery	61	19	33	6	0	0	3
General Machinery (assembler)	44	17	20	5	0	0	2
General Machinery (parts)	17	2	13	1	0	0	1
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	70	20	42	4	0	0	4
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	24	8	12	1	0	0	3
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	46	12	30	3	0	0	1
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	17	4	11	0	0	0	2
Automobiles (subtotal)	106	21	61	12	1	0	11
Automobiles (assembler)	5	2	3	0	0	0	0
Automobiles (parts)	101	19	58	12	1	0	11
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	26	7	15	0	1	0	3
Precision Machinery (assembler)	14	5	7	0	1	0	1
Precision Machinery (parts)	12	2	8	0	0	0	2
Others	15	3	9	0	0	0	3



(3) Geopolitical Risk Factors Relevant to Business Activities (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Domestic politics of overseas business location (e.g., policy uncertainty, authoritarian regime, civil war etc.)	International politics (e.g., diplomatic issues, interstate conflicts etc.)	Tariff barriers (e.g., increased tariff etc.)	Non-tariff barriers (e.g., import/export regulation, license system, quantity limit, standard certification system, etc.)	Financial sanctions (e.g., restrictions on currency exchange, restrictions on remittance methods, asset freezing, etc.)	Not fully discussed	Others
Total	502	256	232	171	188	70	63	3
Food	19	10	13	9	5	1	1	0
Textiles	21	13	9	7	5	3	5	0
Paper, Pulp & Wood	13	5	6	3	4	1	1	1
Chemicals (subtotal)	85	54	39	30	36	10	8	1
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	80	51	38	29	35	10	7	1
Pharmaceuticals	5	3	1	1	1	0	1	0
Petroleum & Rubber	13	4	7	6	5	2	1	0
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	6	6	2	3	3	2	0
Steel	9	5	4	5	4	0	0	0
Nonferrous Metals	22	9	11	7	9	4	1	0
Metal Products	17	8	9	4	7	3	2	0
General Machinery	61	28	30	18	26	11	8	0
General Machinery (assembler)	44	22	24	14	22	10	4	0
General Machinery (parts)	17	6	6	4	4	1	4	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	70	38	38	21	28	10	6	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	24	11	10	8	10	5	4	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	46	27	28	13	18	5	2	0
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	16	10	7	5	3	2	2	0
Automobiles (subtotal)	105	52	33	43	39	14	16	1
Automobiles (assembler)	5	4	3	2	3	1	0	0
Automobiles (parts)	100	48	30	41	36	13	16	1
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	27	10	16	7	10	5	4	0
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	7	9	5	5	4	1	0
Precision Machinery (parts)	12	3	7	2	5	1	3	0
Others	14	4	4	4	4	1	6	0

(4) Counter Measures against Geopolitical Risks (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Strengthening functions of gathering information	Strengthening functions of risk analysis and evaluation	Strengthening risk scenarios and BCP	Diversification of Supplier countries/areas	Change of base placement strategy	Changes / postponements of already existing investment plans	Implementation of new investment	Business withdrawal / sale-offs	Aspired to implement countermeasures without any idea	No plan to implement countermeasures	Others
Total	494	252	116	151	207	39	26	9	25	33	55	4
Food	19	12	3	3	5	2	0	0	2	3	1	0
Textiles	21	13	1	7	8	2	0	1	0	1	3	0
Paper, Pulp & Wood	12	6	2	4	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	0
Chemicals (subtotal)	86	52	33	31	47	6	6	1	3	0	5	1
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	81	50	32	31	44	5	5	1	3	0	5	0
Pharmaceuticals	5	2	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Petroleum & Rubber	12	6	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	9	6	2	4	5	1	2	1	2	0	2	0
Steel	9	6	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	2	0
Nonferrous Metals	21	10	5	8	6	2	0	1	1	1	1	0
Metal Products	17	9	4	2	7	0	1	0	0	1	3	0
General Machinery	60	32	12	14	29	6	2	1	2	7	5	1
General Machinery (assembler)	43	26	12	10	26	4	1	1	2	5	2	1
General Machinery (parts)	17	6	0	4	3	2	1	0	0	2	3	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	70	28	14	29	34	7	4	0	4	6	5	1
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	23	9	3	8	11	1	2	0	0	4	2	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	47	19	11	21	23	6	2	0	4	2	3	1
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	15	8	5	4	6	1	0	1	2	0	1	0
Automobiles (subtotal)	103	46	20	33	28	7	10	1	6	10	19	0
Automobiles (assembler)	4	3	1	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Automobiles (parts)	99	43	19	30	26	7	9	1	6	10	19	0
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	26	13	9	7	11	2	0	0	1	2	4	0
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	7	4	3	4	2	0	0	1	1	2	0
Precision Machinery (parts)	11	6	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	0
Others	14	5	3	2	5	2	0	1	1	0	2	1

6



(5) US-China Decoupling (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Already decoupled	Under procedure	Under consideration	No need to decouple	Uncertain
Total	496	95	28	42	65	266
Food	19	4	1	1	1	12
Textiles	20	2	2	1	2	13
Paper, Pulp & Wood	12	1	0	1	2	8
Chemicals (subtotal)	86	11	5	11	14	45
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	81	11	5	10	12	43
Pharmaceuticals	5	0	0	1	2	2
Petroleum & Rubber	13	6	1	1	0	5
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	0	2	1	1	6
Steel	9	3	0	0	1	5
Nonferrous Metals	20	5	1	0	0	14
Metal Products	18	3	0	0	2	13
General Machinery	58	13	3	4	8	30
General Machinery (assembler)	41	9	2	4	5	21
General Machinery (parts)	17	4	1	0	3	9
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	69	9	6	8	11	35
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	24	6	1	1	4	12
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	45	3	5	7	7	23
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	17	5	1	3	0	8
Automobiles (subtotal)	104	23	4	8	16	53
Automobiles (assembler)	5	3	0	0	1	1
Automobiles (parts)	99	20	4	8	15	52
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	26	9	0	3	7	7
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	4	0	3	4	4
Precision Machinery (parts)	11	5	0	0	3	3
Others	15	1	2	0	0	12

6 (5) US-China Decoupling (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Strengthen China operations	Strengthen US operations	Strengthen both of China and US operations	Under consideration/ not sure
Total	164	18	40	84	22
Food	6	1	0	4	1
Textiles	5	3	2	0	0
Paper, Pulp & Wood	2	0	1	1	0
Chemicals (subtotal)	26	4	6	13	3
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	26	4	6	13	3
Pharmaceuticals	0	0	0	0	0
Petroleum & Rubber	8	2	1	3	2
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	3	0	1	2	0
Steel	3	1	2	0	0
Nonferrous Metals	6	0	3	3	0
Metal Products	3	0	1	2	0
General Machinery	20	1	4	10	5
General Machinery (assembler)	15	0	4	6	5
General Machinery (parts)	5	1	0	4	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	23	1	8	10	4
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	8	1	3	3	1
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	15	0	5	7	3
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	9	0	2	4	3
Automobiles (subtotal)	35	3	8	20	4
Automobiles (assembler)	3	0	1	2	0
Automobiles (parts)	32	3	7	18	4
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	12	2	1	9	0
Precision Machinery (assembler)	7	1	0	6	0
Precision Machinery (parts)	5	1	1	3	0
Others	3	0	0	3	0



(1) Sustainability: Initiatives for Sustainability (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Considering	Not considering	Not sure
Total	512	391	44	77
Food	20	14	1	5
Textiles	21	19	2	0
Paper, Pulp & Wood	13	12	0	1
Chemicals (subtotal)	86	70	4	12
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	81	66	4	11
Pharmaceuticals	5	4	0	1
Petroleum & Rubber	14	12	1	1
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	8	1	1
Steel	10	6	1	3
Nonferrous Metals	23	20	0	3
Metal Products	19	11	2	6
General Machinery	62	41	8	13
General Machinery (assembler)	45	32	4	9
General Machinery (parts)	17	9	4	4
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	70	57	7	6
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	24	20	3	1
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	46	37	4	5
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	17	12	2	3
Automobiles (subtotal)	105	74	13	18
Automobiles (assembler)	5	5	0	0
Automobiles (parts)	100	69	13	18
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	27	25	1	1
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	14	1	0
Precision Machinery (parts)	12	11	0	1
Others	15	10	1	4



(1) Sustainability : Hot Topics in Sustainability (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Climate change measures including decarbonization	Biodiversity	Water resources	Marine plastics	Circular economy	Human rights issues	Diversity	Corporate governance	Others
Total	388	310	44	44	56	94	150	159	227	3
Food	14	11	2	4	5	4	6	6	7	0
Textiles	19	13	1	2	5	3	8	5	10	0
Paper, Pulp & Wood	12	7	3	1	7	6	5	6	8	0
Chemicals (subtotal)	70	56	15	10	15	18	29	24	43	1
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	66	54	15	10	14	18	28	21	40	1
Pharmaceuticals	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	0
Petroleum & Rubber	12	10	1	2	1	2	7	5	7	0
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	8	6	0	2	0	3	3	4	6	0
Steel	6	5	1	1	0	2	3	2	4	0
Nonferrous Metals	20	19	3	4	2	8	13	11	15	0
Metal Products	11	8	0	1	0	1	3	5	5	0
General Machinery	40	27	3	2	2	8	14	18	25	2
General Machinery (assembler)	31	22	3	2	2	7	11	15	20	1
General Machinery (parts)	9	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	1
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	57	49	7	7	7	12	26	29	29	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	20	16	4	2	5	5	7	8	10	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	37	33	3	5	2	7	19	21	19	0
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	11	10	1	1	0	3	3	4	6	0
Automobiles (subtotal)	74	65	6	5	3	15	16	24	44	0
Automobiles (assembler)	5	5	2	2	1	3	3	3	4	0
Automobiles (parts)	69	60	4	3	2	12	13	21	40	0
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	24	18	0	1	6	5	9	11	13	0
Precision Machinery (assembler)	14	10	0	0	4	3	5	6	7	0
Precision Machinery (parts)	10	8	0	1	2	2	4	5	6	0
Others	10	6	1	1	3	4	5	5	5	0



(2) Decarbonization : Initiatives/Motivations (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Implementing own setted initiatives beyond government goals	Implementing efforts in line with government goals	Behind the government target, but implementing the initiative	Interested in government goals, but hasn't started concrete its own efforts yet.	Not discussed
Total	502	32	230	113	82	45
Food	20	2	10	3	3	2
Textiles	21	2	7	7	2	3
Paper, Pulp & Wood	13	1	10	1	0	1
Chemicals (subtotal)	85	5	42	22	12	4
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	81	5	39	22	12	3
Pharmaceuticals	4	0	3	0	0	1
Petroleum & Rubber	14	0	10	2	2	0
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	1	4	1	1	3
Steel	11	0	8	1	0	2
Nonferrous Metals	22	0	13	3	4	2
Metal Products	19	0	7	4	5	3
General Machinery	60	4	25	13	11	7
General Machinery (assembler)	44	4	18	12	7	3
General Machinery (parts)	16	0	7	1	4	4
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	68	5	36	15	6	6
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	23	1	13	7	0	2
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	45	4	23	8	6	4
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	16	2	6	4	4	0
Automobiles (subtotal)	102	9	32	32	22	7
Automobiles (assembler)	5	1	4	0	0	0
Automobiles (parts)	97	8	28	32	22	7
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	26	1	14	2	5	4
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	1	7	1	3	3
Precision Machinery (parts)	11	0	7	1	2	1
Others	15	0	6	3	5	1



7 (2) Motivations toward Initiatives for Decarbonization (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Strengthen production competitiveness	Strengthen brand image, acquire new customers	Acquisition of new financing (equity, loan) to the company	Requests from investors	Requests from parent company or group company	Requests from parent company or group company	Requests from business partners	Requests from consumers	Request from the local government	Others
Total	372	160	246	28	143	90	40	162	35	27	13
Food	14	4	10	2	7	4	0	4	6	2	0
Textiles	14	5	8	1	7	3	2	7	1	1	0
Paper, Pulp & Wood	10	7	6	1	3	0	0	6	2	0	0
Chemicals (subtotal)	66	31	51	3	22	18	4	30	5	3	3
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	65	31	50	3	21	17	4	30	5	3	3
Pharmaceuticals	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Petroleum & Rubber	11	4	8	1	3	3	0	6	0	1	0
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	5	2	5	3	1	3	0	2	1	2	0
Steel	8	2	6	1	6	6	0	3	3	1	0
Nonferrous Metals	15	6	8	1	6	5	1	9	1	1	2
Metal Products	13	3	10	2	4	0	2	5	0	1	0
General Machinery	46	20	34	2	10	7	3	14	4	2	4
General Machinery (assembler)	34	13	26	2	7	6	3	10	3	0	4
General Machinery (parts)	12	7	8	0	3	1	0	4	1	2	0
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	47	24	33	8	19	20	5	20	6	4	1
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	15	5	12	2	4	8	2	3	2	1	1
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	32	19	21	6	15	12	3	17	4	3	0
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	13	7	9	1	4	4	2	5	1	1	0
Automobiles (subtotal)	81	38	38	1	39	11	17	46	1	6	2
Automobiles (assembler)	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Automobiles (parts)	79	36	36	1	38	10	17	45	1	6	2
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	20	6	15	1	9	5	4	5	2	1	1
Precision Machinery (assembler)	10	3	8	0	3	3	2	2	0	0	1
Precision Machinery (parts)	10	3	7	1	6	2	2	3	2	1	0
Others	9	1	5	0	3	1	0	0	2	1	0



(2) Decarbonization : Expectations for Government Policies (by industry)



	# of respondent companies	Support for introduction of equipment that contributes to energy saving and decarbonization of companies	Support for technological development and innovative creation that contribute to decarbonization	Development of carbon pricing system (carbon offset, carbon credit market expansion)	Promotion of transition finance	Large-scale infrastructure investment such as next- generation power systems and hydrogen supply systems	Active climate change diplomacy (support for overseas expansion of decarbonized technologies and products, involvement in international rulemaking)	Presenting a concrete future vision and fostering public understanding
Total	485	343	240	93	30	168	72	13
Food	18	17	6	3	0	5	3	
Textiles	21	12	9	3	2	6	2	
Paper, Pulp & Wood	13	12	7	2	2	3	1	
Chemicals (subtotal)	83	59	39	16	4	29	13	34
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	79	59	39	15	4	27	13	3
Pharmaceuticals	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	:
Petroleum & Rubber	14	8	9	4	1	6	2	
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	7	7	2	3	5	2	
Steel	9	6	4	2	0	3	2	
Nonferrous Metals	21	14	8	5	1	10	3	
Metal Products	17	13	7	2	0	3	2	1
General Machinery	55	33	24	13	3	13	7	1:
General Machinery (assembler)	40	26	18	13	3	9	6	1:
General Machinery (parts)	15	7	6	0	0	4	1	:
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	67	52	39	12	3	34	12	1
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	22	13	12	2	1	13	5	
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	45	39	27	10	2	21	7	-
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	16	12	12	5	3	4	4	
Automobiles (subtotal)	101	77	49	15	6	35	13	2
Automobiles (assembler)	4	2	4	1	1	3	3	:
Automobiles (parts)	97	75	45	14	5	32	10	1
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	25	15	13	7	1	7	6	
Precision Machinery (assembler)	14	7	5	3	0	3	4	
Precision Machinery (parts)	11	8	8	4	1	4	2	:
Others	15	6	7	2	1	5	0	





	# of respondent companies	We have formulated human rights policies and conducted human rights due diligence.	Human rights policy is being formulated, but human rights due diligence has not been implemented	Human rights due diligence has been implemented, although human rights policy has not been formulated	We have not formulated a human rights policy and have not implemented human rights due diligence.
Total	486	100	129	47	210
Food	18	7	3	2	6
Textiles	21	1	7	4	9
Paper, Pulp & Wood	13	1	8	1	3
Chemicals (subtotal)	81	13	32	8	28
Chemicals (incl. plastics)	77	12	31	8	26
Pharmaceuticals	4	1	1	0	2
Petroleum & Rubber	13	2	2	2	7
Ceramics, Cement & Glass	10	3	2	0	5
Steel	10	2	3	0	5
Nonferrous Metals	22	10	4	1	7
Metal Products	19	3	3	5	8
General Machinery	57	10	12	5	30
General Machinery (assembler)	41	7	11	5	18
General Machinery (parts)	16	3	1	0	12
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (subtotal)	66	21	19	4	22
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (assembler)	22	5	5	2	10
Electrical Equipment & Electronics (parts)	44	16	14	2	12
Transportaion Equipment (excl. automobiles)	15	2	3	2	8
Automobiles (subtotal)	101	13	23	8	57
Automobiles (assembler)	4	3	0	0	1
Automobiles (parts)	97	10	23	8	56
Precision Machinery (subtotal)	25	8	7	2	8
Precision Machinery (assembler)	15	4	3	2	6
Precision Machinery (parts)	10	4	4	0	2
Others	15	4	1	3	7



日本の力を、世界のために。

Supporting Your Global Challenges



Appendix #2: Supplementary Research Using Text Mining

In parallel with the questionnaire survey, we also conducted a text-mining analysis using big data. News articles from around the world were used to analyse a wide range of industries from the same angle as the questionnaire survey. We hope you will find this information useful for better understanding the results of the questionnaire survey.



Comparison: The Attention Given to Each Theme in the Global News Media and the Result of this Survey (see page 36-37 of this report)

	Industry	News		
	In foreign languages	In Japanese	JBIC survey	
Ukraine	2.71%	1.54%	80%	
US-China conflict	0.18%	0.05%	79%	r
Semiconductor	1.55%	3.21%	89 <mark>%</mark>	
EV	0.87%	1.77%	71%	
DX	0.26%	2.85%	45%	
Fuel price	0.72%	0.54%	100%	
Mineral prices	0.34%	0.02%	58%	
Grain prices	0.76%	0.04%	6%	
Critical minerals	0.19%	0.08%	14%	
Cyber security	0.28%	0.19%	24%	
Geopolitical risks	0.69%	0.28%	60%	
Export control	0.28%	0.03%	49%	
RCEP	0.01%	0.03%	32%	
CPTPP	0.01%	0.00%	16%	
QUAD	0.06%	0.01%	9%	
PEF	0.01%	0.02%	8%	
Climate change	1.31%	0.57%	68%	
Biodiversity	0.13%	0.11%	13%	
Circular economy	0.20%	0.08%	24%	
Human rights	0.67%	0.28%	21%	
Solar, wind	1.06%	1.54%	41%	
Hydrogen	0.63%	0.80%	29%	
Anmonia	0.14%	0.20%	13%	
Bio fuel	0.05%	0.07%	19%	
Battery	1.29%	0.33%	33%	
Sample size	4,576,362	473,380	339	

Regarding the US-China conflict, there is a significant gap between the proportion of appearances in domestic/ international articles and the high level of interest of the surveyed companies.

Keywords related to the manufacturing industry, such as semiconductors, EV, and DX, have been more widely reported by Japanese media.

International news reports are more interested in Issues related to the invasion of Ukraine, such as rising inflation and geopolitical risks.

International news reports are more interested in releasing stories about climate change.

We analyzed the extent to which the themes covered in this survey received attention in the coverage of corporate activities in the world's major media.

- Specifically, news articles (4.58 million in English and 470,000 in Japanese) from July to September 2022 analysed by Dow Jones Factiva ('Factiva') as 'related to corporate activities' were counted for each keyword (1.1 million in English and 140,000 in Japanese).
- Regarding the reports released in English, there are many articles on inflation (incl. price trends in natural resources) and geopolitical risks, which became buzzwords after the invasion of Ukraine. On the contrary, Japanese reports focus more on manufacturing-related topics (e.g., semiconductors, EVs, DX).
- "Climate change" is more of an interest in English-language news reports.
- There are differences in interest between the Japanese reports and the result of this survey in terms of keywords "geopolitical risks" or "export control." This indicates the general difference in interest between news media and corporate stakeholders.

Copyright $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ Japan Bank for International Cooperation

2

Impact of the Invasion of Ukraine on Main Industries in Each Country and Region 🕢 J B I C (see page 40 of this report)

A sentiment analysis (positive-negative analysis) on the impact of the invasion of Ukraine revealed that chemical and general machinery sectors in Japan, the US, and Europe were negatively affected by the event. At the same time, the effects on each sector in the Chinese industry seem relatively neutral.

Data



Impact of the Invasion of Ukraine on Decarbonisation (see page 41 of this report) 🕖 J B I C

The results of a regional breakdown of the number of articles on 'climate change' and 'energy security' before and after the invasion of Ukraine show a decrease in articles on 'climate change' and a sharp increase in articles on 'energy security', particularly in Europe.







DataTarget article# ArticlesArticles about 'Climate change' or 'Energy
security' on Dow Jones Factiva.
(Target period:
24 Aug 2021 - 23 Feb 2022 before the invasion,
24 Feb 2022 - 23 Aug 2022 after the invasion).434,224 cases

Figure: Number of articles on Climate Change before and after the invasion of Ukraine, by main industry



Survey Report on Overseas Business Operations by Japanese Manufacturing Companies

JBIC 34th Survey, 2022

KIDA Masahiro (Supervisor) NARUMIYA Jin (Lead Author) OGAWA Natsuka (Chapter 2, 3) KOBAYASHI Reina (Chapter 2, 3) MORI Kenjiro (Chapter 4, Appendix #2) TSUKAMOTO Ryo (Chapter 1, 5, 6) NAKAHARA Erika (Chapter 7) NIWATA Urara (Proofread) TSUJI Nao (Proofread)

JAPAN BANK for INTERNATINOAL COOPERATION

December 2022

©2022 Japan Bank for International Cooperation Website: https://www.jbic.go.jp

(For further information) JAPAN BANK for INTERNATINOAL COOPERATION (JBIC) 4-1, Ohtemachi 1-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8144, Japan Strategic Research Department, Corporate Planning Group Telephone: +81-3-5218-9244 (Group direct line) Facsimile: +81-3-5218-9696 E-mail: fdi@jbic.go.jp

If you have a request for some interview, lecture etc., please contact the Press and External Affairs Division (+81-3-5218-3100)