periodica polytechnica

Social and Management Sciences
15/1 (2007) 23–30
doi: 10.3311/pp.so.2007-1.03
web: http://www.pp.bme.hu/so

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Subsidies in automotive industry CEOP in focus

Nóra Kemenczei

Received 2008-09-14

Abstract

In my essay I am going to examine the experiences of the National Development Plan I. This scheme is a document that concerns the development strategy of Hungary for the first three years' planning after joining the European Union (2004-2006). I concentrate on the short period effects on economy, and I focus on the specific purposes of a more competitive economy. I am also aiming at a short introduction of the objectives and the priorities of the Competitive Economy Operative Programme (CEOP) I lay special emphasis on the first three priorities of CEOP: investment incentives, improvement of small-and-middle-size enterprises (SME) and R&D. I skirt the issue of the fourth priority – the improvement of a society and an economy based on information – as the direct economic effects of the purposes can not be monitored in that field.

By my analysis I am seeking the answers for the question: what is the amount of financial support for the enterprises dealing with automobile industry – both in absolute and relative terms – from the provided frame of HUF 112,5 billion; and moreover: what are those structural short-term economic effects that can lead to the achievement of the objectives.

Keywords

automobile industry · vehicle production · subsidies · support · National Development Plan · economical impact ·

Nóra Kemenczei

Agricultural and Rural Development Agency, 1095 Budapest, Soroksári út 22-24.

e-mail: kemenczei.nora@mvh.gov.hu

1 Introduction CEOP

The main objective of the Competitive Economy Operative Programme)[1] is to close up the Hungarian economy to the European line. Directly, reinforcing the economic competitiveness, and indirectly, modernizing the enterprises, and developing an advanced economic environment can be conductive to the success of this objective. By definition, during the reinforcement of the economic competitiveness the principle of well-balanced regional development, the aims of easing the huge disparities of the state of development and the economic peculiarities of the different regions of the country should be considered.

Purposes:

- Development of the basic knowledge and the ability for innovation.
- Build up an economy based on high-tech and services.
- Dissolving the dual character of the economy by the improvement of small-and-middle-size enterprises.

The system of purposes is completed by some *horizontal aims* viz. environmental protection, sustainable energy resources and well-balanced regional development.

On the base of this strategy, also funded by the European Regional Development Funds (ERDF), the purposes of the Operative Programme (OP) are carried out through the *four priorities* below:

1 Investment incentives

2 Improvement of small-and-middle-size enterprises

3 R&D and innovation

4 Information-based economic improvement of the society.

The items above are completed with a *fifth priority* that supports the fulfilment of OP, called *experts' assistance priority*.

[1] The Hungarian name of it is: Gazdasági Versenyképességi Operatív Program (GVOP)

The form of the support in each case is a definitive allowance, not to be qualified as an operational allowance, not to be repaid, in short: *un-rebate subsidy*.[2]

The five operative programmes of The National Development Plan No. 1[3] provided the draw out of a sum of some 679.7bn HUF as un-rebate subsidy for entrepreneurs for a three year long planning period. About the three quarters of that sum come from EU sources. The second largest sum after the first Human Resources Development Operative Programme[4] came to the Competitive Economy Operative Programme examined in this paper. It is an amount of 162.4bn HUF, from which 117.1bn HUF come from EU. The expenditures on competitive economy reached the 24% of the whole outlay 'cake' to be spent on operative programmes. The whole amount enterprises were able to obtain in the field of my research was 112.5bn HUF.

2 Measurement of the subsidies compared to the national indexes

In the firs three priorities of CEOP – 1. Investment incentive; 2. Improvement of small-and-middle-size enterprises; 3. R&D and innovation – one can well find supports aiming investments. This can be the reason for the fact that the top five winning sectors come from processing industry (TEAOR D category[5]), considering both the figures of the competitors and winners and the required and obtained amount of support. The categories in TEAOR-order were as follows:

DG –Chemicals production
DH –Rubber and plastic production
DK –Machinery production
DL –Electric machine and appliance production
DM–Vehicle production

Throughout my examination I supposed that the best performing sectors, in terms of the value of their production and the drive of their development, are the most competitive ones in consider of their roles in both the domestic and the global division of labour.

Although metal industry was invited to tender for the supports, still it is not among the top five tenderers, however from the point of view of the figures of production value they could have stayed in the 3^{rd} position of the best performing sectors considering production (TEAOR DJ category, *i.e.* metal industry, 1,505,009 million HUF in 2006) or in the 4^{th} position of those considering caking-coal production, oil-refining, nuclear fuel production (TEAOR DF category, 1,206,403 million HUF in 2006). For this reason I avoid analyzing these sectors.

Examining the impact of the supports on macro-economy I audit the performance of the sectors in the first three priorities of CEOP not in absolute value, but in domestic economy indexes. The figures of the competitor- and winner applications compared to the figures of existing enterprises show us a picture of the tendering activity of the enterprises and that of the fitting in the tenders to the development needs of a given economy sector. Examining the measurable macro-economy impact I collated the values of the industrial production with the won financial supports.[6]

Enterprises dealing with vehicle production displayed high tendering activity in each of the three priorities, in spite of their low number. The ratio of the companies working in this sector and their tenders shows that the performance of the enterprises in vehicle industry was outstanding in comparison with the rest of the sectors in investment incentive priority. More than 4% of them ran for tender, and more than half of them got support.

The most of the tenderers could be found in the improvement of small-and-middle-size enterprises priority. More than 5% of the enterprises occupied in vehicle production sector got support. An outstandingly high tendering activity was displayed by the small-and-middle-size enterprises dealing with chemicals production. More than 20% of them ran for tendering, and almost 12% of them got support.

Enterprises displayed an extremely low activity in tendering for R&D supports. The most innovative enterprises can be found in chemicals production sector. Tenderers coming from this sector were almost three and a half times as much as those coming from the following vehicle production. There were only one and a half per cent of the enterprises from vehicle industry to tender, and there was only one per cent of them got support.

It is obvious at first sight that the ratio of the support in each of the sectors was under the half per cent of the total production of the industry during the examined three years. This value does not reach the boundary[7] where we can talk about an impact on the whole macro-economy. By the figures of the chart we can declare that the support/production ratio is so low, that in this respect we cannot think in terms of measurable domestic economy impacts.

On the basis of its production value the second best performing sector is vehicle production. In spite of that they got the least support in ratio both in the 2nd and in the 3rd priorities. The reason for that is that an extremely few enterprises produce an extremely high value in domestic economy, while the ceiling of support[8] for every single company is set up low. We can learn from the chart that the closest tenders to the needs of vehicle production are the investment tenders of the 1^{st} priority of CEOP. This industry shared fairly with its industrial importance from the investment incentive frame.

[2] This support is count as investment support by the Government Order No. 163/2001. (IX. 14.)

[3] Gazdasági Versenyképességi Operatív Program (GVOP), Humánerőforrás-Fejlesztés Operatív Program (HEFOP), Környezetvédelmi és Infrastruktúra Operatív Program (KIOP), Agrár- és Vidékfejlesztési Operatív Program (AVOP), Regionális Fejlesztési Operatív Program (ROP).

[4] Humán Erőforrás-fejlesztés Operatív Program (HEFOP)

[5] National code of statistics (the Hungarian statistic system is harmonized with the EU-system since 2003; TEÁOR'03 → NACE Rev. 1.1.)

[6] EMIR is a national Unified Information System for Monitoring (subsidies)

[7] In my estimation the value of the support we can reach a significant impact on domestic economy is about 1% of the industry production.

[8] The Hungarian can not calls it for 'supporting intensity'.

Tab. 1. Value of industrial production in the examined sectors, 2004-2006 (actual price, million HUF.)

	1st best performing sector	2nd best performing sector	3rd best performing sector	4th best performing sector	5th best performing sector
Nomination	Electric machine, appliance production	Vehicle production production	Chemicals production	Machinery production	Rubber, plastic production
TEAOR	DL	DM	DG	DK	DH
2004	4 211 315	2 048 239	974 604	714 789	498 523
2005	4 634 249	2 354 742	1 140 792	779 312	544 669
2006	5 259 754	3 186 532	1 325 203	980 646	657 284

Source: KSH

Tab. 2. Industrial production volume indexes in the examined sectors, 2004-2006 (the same period of the previous year = 100,0)

Nomination	Electric machine, appliance production	Vehicle production production	Chemicals production	Machinery production	Rubber, plastic production
TEAOR	DL	DM	DG	DK	DH
2004	123,3	107,2	104,5	103,7	104,8
2005	116,1	114,1	106,4	105,9	103,6
2006	112,9	125,6	103,8	119,0	111,9

Source: KSH

Tab. 3. Competitors/winners amount and ratio in comparison with the existing enterprises in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd priorities by the sectors

Sector's name	Electric machine, appliance production		Machinery production		Rubber, plastic production		Vehicle production		Chemicals production	
TEAOR	DL		DK		DH		DM		DG	
Existing enterprises 2005	7 315		6 571		2 337		846		690	
1st priority: Investment incentive										
Order	2	4	3	5	1	2	④	①	5	3
	db	%	db	%	db	%	db	%	db	%
Competitor applications' amount/ratio	54	0,74	37	0,56	86	3,68	36	4,25	8	1,16
Winner applications' amount /ratio	30	0,41	19	0,29	57	2,44	22	2,6	3	0,43
2nd priority: Improvement of small-and-middle-size enterprises										
Order	1	4	2	5	3	2	⑤	③	4	1
	db	%	db	%	db	%	db	%	db	%
Competitor applications' amount/ratio	500	6,83	390	5,93	351	15,02	91	10,76	147	21,3
Winner applications' amount /ratio	253	3,46	211	3,21	183	7,83	44	5,2	80	11,59
3rd priority: R & D										
Order	1	3	2	4	4	5	⑤	③	3	1
	db	%	db	%	db	%	db	%	db	%
Competitor applications' amount/ratio	109	1,49	49	0,75	16	0,68	13	1,54	36	5,22
Winner applications' amount /ratio	65	0,89	25	0,38	9	0,38	8	0,95	18	2,61

Source: KSH. EMIR

3 Measurement of the subsidies in absolute value

An examination on performances of the industrial sectors in absolute value shows us a picture if the studied sectors could share from the fund-cake similarly as they do from the industry production.

3.1 Investment incentives priority

The purposes of the investment incentive priority are to strengthen competitiveness of the enterprises, and to modernize them by development of the capacity of processing industry to produce up-to-date productions with special regard to the underdeveloped national regions having labour force surplus.

For the realization of the aims of the investment incentive priority an amount of 35,3bn HUF had been reserved for the three years of the planning period. The draw out of that sum in the case of this priority has been thoroughly completed too.

The tenders nominated in five different fields represent well the purposes of the investment incentive priority. Fitting to the needs and to the remained sources the following tenders had been nominated in the years.

Tab. 4. Contracted sums/ industry production ratio in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd priority (million HUF)

	Electric machine, appliance production	Vehicle production production	Chemicals production	Machinery production	Rubber, plastic production
TEAOR	DL	DM	DG	DK	DH
Industry production in 2004-2006	14 105 318	7 589 513	3 440 599	2 474 747	1 700 476
			1st priority: Investment incentive		
Order	4	③	5	2	1
Contracted sums	3 531	2 586	500	1 937	6 096
Ratio to industry production (%)	0,025%	0,034%	0,014%	0,078%	0,358%
			2nd priority: Improvement of SMEs		
Order	4	③	3	2	1
Contracted sums	1 233	230	693	1 249	1 524
Ratio to industry production (%)	0,009%	0,003%	0,020%	0,051%	0,089%
			3rd priority: R&D and innovation		
Order	3	⑤	2	1	4
Contracted sums	2 637	480	736	861	256
Ratio to industry production (%)	0,019%	0,006%	0,021%	0,035%	0,015%

Source: KSH

Tab. 5. Tenders in the 1st priority of CEOP in 2004, 2005, 2006 (ticked [✓] are nominated in the year)

Tender's code	Tender's name	2004	2005	2006
1.1.1.	Technology updating support	✓	✓	✓
1.1.2.	Foundation of Regional Headquarters	✓	✓	✓
1.1.3.A Since 2005	Increasing and strengthening the amount and members of suppliers and their integrators	✓	✓	✓
1.1.3.B	Improvement of services for clusters	✓	—	✓
1.2.1.A,B	Improvement of industrial and innovation services	✓	✓	—
1.2.2.	Improvement of logistic centres and their services	✓	✓	—

Source: Own compilation

3.1.1 Structural projection of the 1st priority

For the supports nominated under the name of the 1st (i.e. investment incentive) priority of CEOP the following enterprises signed by category codes were allowed to tender for. Category codes: TEAOR D 17.00-37.20, G, I, J, K, sub-sector codes: 72, 73, 74.12, 74.13, 74.14, 74.20, 74.30, 74.86. I have examined the above analyzed five categories and a sixth one, i.e. K73 – R&D.

Considering the volume indexes of the industry production vehicle production performed a slightly higher rise than 25% in 2006. This made it to be the most dynamic sector in growth amongst the mentioned ones. A considerable growth can be recognized in electric machine and appliance production and in the field of machinery production. In comparison to each-other these industries shared from CEOP's investment incentive priority as required – regarding their national economy importance.

An amazingly sharp rise in the number of tenderers from rubber and plastic production sector can be seen in CEOP's 1^{st} priority. The total rubber and plastic production increased almost with its three-half-times within the three years of the examined period, and it displayed a 12% growth in 2006 to 2005. Production rose as a result of placing production out of the more developed EU countries to the new-coming states for their 'environmental protection' reasons.

The chemicals production sector was under-represented in these tenders in spite of its importance in our national economy. Probably it is because of the incompatibility of the tenders with the development needs of this sector.

3.2 Improvement of small-and-middle-size enterprises priority

The purposes of this priority are the betterment of the market positions and the competitiveness of the small-and-middle-size enterprises that are able to improve by updating their technologies, the spreading the knowledge about enterprising and the increasing of quantity and quality of professional knowledge needed to maintain the companies. The key to the successful market appearance of the small-and-middle-size enterprises is their co-operation and improvement of their connections with their multinational and regional suppliers.

For the realization of the aims of this priority (SME) an amount of 43bn HUF had been reserved for the three years of the planning period. The draw out of that sum in the case of this priority has been thoroughly completed too.

Tab. 6. Sectors' Production in the 1^{st} priority of CEOP

1st best performing sector	2nd best performing sector	3rd best performing sector	4th best performing sector	5th best performing sector	6th best performing sector
The most tendering sectors (pc)					
Rubber, plastic production	Electric machine, appliance production	Machinery production	Vehicle production	R&D	Chemicals production
86	54	37	36	13	8
The most sectors having contracts (pc)					
Rubber, plastic production	Electric machine, appliance production	Vehicle production	Machinery production	R&D	Chemicals production
57	30	22	19	3	3
The most sectors tendering (million HUF.)					
Rubber, plastic production	Electric machine, appliance production	Vehicle production	Machinery production	Chemicals production	R&D
9 447	6 228	4 071	3 071	1 072	509
The most sectors winning (million HUF)					
Rubber, plastic production	Electric machine, appliance production	Vehicle production	Machinery production	Chemicals production	R&D
6 096	3 531	2 586	1 937	500	229

Source: EMIR, 31. August 2007.

Tab. 7. Tenders in the 2nd priority of CEOP in 2004, 2005, 2006 (ticked [✓] are nominated in the year)

Tender's code	Tender's name	2004	2005	2006
2.1.1.	Improvement of SME's technology background	✓	✓	✓
2.1.2.	Support of up-to-date management systems and know-how's for SME's	✓	✓	—
2.2.2.	Support of advanced-level and profession-oriented advices for SME's	✓	✓	—
2.3.1.	Support of arrangement of co-operation between SME's	✓	✓	—
2.3.2.	Supporting the development of common investments of co-operating enterprises	✓	✓	—

Source: Own compilation

3.2.1 Definition of small-and-middle-size enterprises

Dealing with SMEs it is interesting to find out which enterprises are encluded in this category. By the invitations to tenders the definition of the small-and-middle-size enterprises is all those business companies, co-operatives or individual entrepreneurs who meet the following conditions:

Tab. 8. Changes in the definition of SME's

	2004	2005	2006
All amount of employees is less than:	250 persons	250 persons	250 persons
Net income is not more than: (€million)	40	50	50
or			
The balance of trade is not more than: (€million)	27	27	43
If a smallholder, the last personal tax return's income is not more than (€million)	40	50	No restrictions

Source: Own compilation

The total share (either capital or vote) of the State, the local authorities or any companies that are over the above conditions is not allowed to be more than 25% jointly and severally. The above mentioned indexes were to be announced by the latest accepted annual report or the personal tax return. If the existence of the enterprise had been shorter than a year, the data should have been projected on a whole year.

In the definitions of the small-and-middle-size enterprises the sum of the annual net income or the annual balance total index rose year after year. In the very first year (2004) of this scheme the item of the former (€40 million *i.e.* some 10bn HUF) or that of the latter (€27 million *i.e.* some 7bn HUF) was so highly quantified, that it was not really an obstacle in tenderers' way. The same can be said about the item of setting a ceiling on the amount of employees in 249 persons. This stipulation excluded only 946 enterprises of the 708.307 existed in Hungary in 2004, and 924 of the 707.756 of those in 2005[9]!

[9] KSH data

3.2.2 Structural projection of the 2nd priority

The structural differentiation of the tenders of the small-and-middle-size enterprises shows us a picture about the characteristic industry presence of such enterprises, mostly owned by Hungarians. We can also come to conclusions regarding the development of the suppliers in different sectors of the background industry.

In the tenders provided for the small-and-middle-size enterprises vehicle production has rarely represented itself compared to the rest, and has won quite a small amount of support regarding its importance. It is due to the low number of the participating enterprises in vehicle production in comparison with the rest of the industries – except chemicals production. There are only a few Hungarian owned smaller enterprises which have been working in vehicle production since the System Change, because – in lack of capital – they can hardly join the suppliers' network of the multinational companies.

It is not surprising that in the 2nd priority tenders the 'electric machine and appliance production' has represented itself in the greatest number, since the most enterprises are working in this field. In spite of their industrial importance 'rubber and plastic production' companies have won an outstanding sum of money on these tenders, like on investment incentives tenders.

3.3 R&D and Innovation Priority

The purpose of this priority is to support the improvement of technology in the field of the most developing territories, based on applied research and experimental improvement of productions, equipments, know-hows and services. Another aim is the enhancement of the co-operation of the different workshops dealing with research both at companies and publicly financed institutions. For the sake of joining the European Research Region it is needed to modernize the relatively backward infrastructure of the budgetary and the non-profit research institutions. Foundation and strengthening of enterprises based on high level of knowledge and technology (spin-offs) are to be supported.

For the realization of the aims of this priority an amount of 34,2bn HUF had been reserved for the three years of the planning period. The draw out of that sum in the case of R&D and innovation has been thoroughly completed too.

3.3.1 Trends of innovation expenditures

Talking about R&D and Innovation Sector I am going to examine the impact of the awarded supports in the 3rd priority on the home R&D costs, on one hand, and I am examining the distribution of the R&D expenditures focusing on the sources, the other hand.

Obviously, the outgoings in the 3rd priority of CEOP increased the research and development expenditures in our country. Also the decrease of GDP-related R&D expenditures since 2003 could be successfully stopped and managed to set increase since 2005. This result can be called spectacular because the R&D and innovation expenditures' level is too low (less than 1% of the GDP) in our country. On top of that about the half of the R&D expenditures comes from the Government Budget.[10]

3.3.2 Structural projection of the 3rd priority

Enterprises dealing with vehicle production have been representing themselves in a very small extent in R&D tenders. It shows the lack of the first and second round, Hungarian, financially strong, i.e. integrator level of suppliers. It is due to the car factories that tend to let their R&D function to their suppliers[11]. Because of the need for capital in innovation Hungarian companies are not able to be equal rivals of the suppliers with a background of foreign firms with capital strength.

4 Conclusions

Vehicle production was one of the best performing sectors in Hungary by its productivity and in respect of the sector's drive in improvement between 2004 and 2006. This industry participated in tenders corresponding to its economy importance, and was able to cut its fair piece of cake desired. In spite of that accepted impact on macro-economy is missing. It is because of the sum devoted to strengthen the competitiveness of domestic economy has been fragmented and flown away among the sectors. Thus the additional funds vehicle production got are not enough to promote the production of the industry to a considerable macro-economy extent, neither short-term – and I suppose – nor long-term.

The conditions of the competitiveness of a sector can be changed only by long-term and consistent development programmes. Meanwhile a sectoral development can be accomplished also by a short-term, focused incentive scheme in the ratio of alignment with a policy of economy aiming. To create an efficient incentive system, the Hungarian economic policy must strive for putting the supports in the economy in a focused way that is concentrating on the impacts to be caused on macro-economy indexes of certain sectors. The industries to be supported should be assessed in ratio of the sum of supports in terms of the value of their production and the drive of their development and on the basis of other indexes so, that they would be able to display an improvement that is considerable during a seven year long EU planning period.

On the basis of tendering experiences of the Competitive Economy Operative Programme it is obvious that innovation in the automotive industry with lack of strength in capital small-and-middle-size enterprises can not be improved effectively from the part of the suppliers. The 850 enterprises working in this field displayed a high tendering activity from the point of view of investment, but definitely few enterprises shown up in the field of innovation and developing SMEs. The production is very concentrated in this sector, what means that it produces

[10] KSH, R&D in 2005 (publication)

[11] Kemenczei Nóra – Nikodémus Antal: Autóipari trendek a nagyvilágban és hazánkban, Külgazdaság, L. évfolyam 2006/3

Tab. 9. Sectors' Production in the 2nd priority of CEOP

1st best performing sector	2nd best performing sector	3rd best performing sector	4th best performing sector	5th best performing sector	6th best performing sector
The most tendering sectors (pc)					
Electric machine, appliance production	Machinery production	Rubber, plastic production	Chemicals production	Vehicle production	R&D
500	390	351	147	91	63
The most sectors having contracts (pc)					
Electric machine, appliance production	Machinery production	Rubber, plastic production	Chemicals production	Vehicle production	R&D
253	211	183	80	44	35
The most sectors tendering (million HUF.)					
Rubber, plastic production	Electric machine, appliance production	Machinery production	Chemicals production	Vehicle production	R&D
3 160	2 738	2 715	1 367	696	228
The most sectors winning (million HUF)					
Rubber, plastic production	Machinery production	Electric machine, appliance production	Chemicals production	Vehicle production	R&D
1 524	1 249	1 233	639	230	84

Source: EMIR, 31. August 2007.

Tab. 10. Tenders in the 3rd priority of CEOP in 2004, 2005, 2006 (ticked [✓] are nominated in the year)

Tender's code	Tender's name	2004	2005	2006
3.1.1.	Applied R&D Programmes (AKF)	✓	—	—
3.2.1.	Improvement of public-supported and non-profit research institutes' infrastructure (KMA)	✓	—	—
3.2.2.	Support partnership for building up a network among higher education and companies, aiming co-operating research and know-how-transfer (Co-operating Research Centres)	✓	—	—
3.3.1.	Support of spin-off and starting technology- and knowledge-based micro- enterprises	✓	✓	—
3.3.2.	Improvement of company-research infrastructure, needed for new employment	✓	✓	—
3.3.3.	Support of company innovation	✓	✓	✓

Source: Own compilation

Tab. 11. Home R&D expenditures in the 3rd priority of CEOP with respect to awarded supports

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
R&D costs (million HUF)	81 356	105 230	134 166	138 523	147 708	167 924	191 445
Investment (million HUF)	18 152	23 727	26 125	28 106	25 188	32 197	41 743
Total R&D expenditure (million HUF)	105 388	140 605	171 470	175 773	181 525	207 764	237 953
Total R&D expenditure in ratio of gross domestic production (GDP)	0,82	0,94	1,01	0,95	0,89	0,95	1,00
CEOP 3. priority awarded support (million HUF)	———	———	———	———	24,332	8,713	5,216
Total expenditure rise (base: previous year)	———	35,217	30,865	4,303	5,752	26,239	30,183

Source: KSH, EMIR, 31. August 2007.

an extremely high value, needed for the Hungarian economy, compared to the number of the enterprises and due to the ceiling set above the supports, the vehicle production sector won a relatively low support in respect of their value production.

It is given by the mobilizable nature of production and assembly that the investments tend to move towards the regions and countries with lower costs. It would not be impossible for Hungary today to set up an innovation and incentive scheme based on FDI that would not only force working capital to stay, but would attract it too in our country. The solution for that problem I can see in Individual Government Decisions[12] about the support of R&D and innovation needs.

[12] The Hungarian cant calls it for 'egyedi kormánydöntés (EKD)'

Tab. 12. Sectors' Production in the 3rd priority of CEOP

1. best performing sector	2. best performing sector	3. best performing sector	4. best performing sector	5. best performing sector	6. best performing sector
The most tendering sectors (pc)					
R&D	Electric machine, appliance production	Machinery production	Chemicals production	Rubber, plastic production	Vehicle production
485	109	49	36	16	13
The most sectors having contracts (pc)					
R&D	Electric machine, appliance production	Machinery production	Chemicals production	Rubber, plastic production	Vehicle production
285	65	25	18	9	8
The most sectors tendering (million HUF.)					
R&D	Electric machine, appliance production	Machinery production	Chemicals production	Vehicle production	Rubber, plastic production
17 732	4 308	1 702	1 310	804	478
The most sectors winning (million HUF)					
R&D	Electric machine, appliance production	Machinery production	Chemicals production	Vehicle production	Rubber, plastic production
10 096	2 637	861	736	480	256

Source: EMIR, 31. August 2007.

References

1 *Call for tenders in the Competitive Economy Operative Programme (2004-2006).*

2 *Consulting & Research for Industrial Economics Ltd., Vehicle part manufacturing*, 2002.

3 *ITDH, Vehicle production survey*, 2004. November.

4 **Kemény T, Vincze I**, *The Hungarian R&D expenditures in the mirror of the international trends*, Magyar Tudomány (Hungarian Science) (2006), no. 9.

5 *National Developing Plan I. (Nemzeti Fejlesztési Terv I.)*

6 Data from: KSH, EMIR.