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## Abstract

This paper analyzes barriers for energy efficiency investments for small-and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in China. Based on a survey of 480 SMEs in Zhejiang Province, this study assesses financial, informational, and organizational barriers for energy efficiency investments in the SME sector. The conventional view has been that the lack of appropriate financing mechanisms particularly hinders SMEs to adopt cost-effective energy efficiency measures. As such, closing the financing gap for SMEs is seen as a prerequisite in order to promote energy efficiency in the sector. The econometric estimates of this study, however, suggest that access to information is an important determinant of investment outcomes, while this is less clear with respect to financial and organizational factors. More than 40 percent of enterprises in the sample declared that that they are not aware of energy saving equipments or practices in their respective business area, indicating that there are high transaction costs for SMEs to gather, assess, and apply information about energy saving potentials and relevant technologies. One implication is that the Chinese government may assume an active role in fostering the dissemination of energy-efficiency related information in the SME sector.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Secure energy resources and their intelligent use are important to China’s continued, rapid development. China recently overtook the United States as the world’s largest energy consumer (IEA, 2010) and, as China’s citizens become wealthier, rising energy consumption growth has important implications for China and the world. Furthermore, in 2002 a trend of continuous energy efficiency improvements was reversed and China’s energy intensity actually increased on average five percent per year during 2002-2005 (Price et al., 2011), and now considerably exceeds the global average.

Current national programs and policies related to energy efficiency improvement in China target larger, predominantly state-owned, enterprises. The same holds for the corresponding body of research literature. Previous studies analyzed state-owned enterprises joining the Top-1000 program (see for example, Price et al. 2010; Yang, 2010), yet, very little is known about energy efficiency efforts by small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in China. Broadening our gaze to include SMEs is needed for several reasons. First, China’s 2.4 million SMEs make up 99% of all enterprises in contemporary China, accounting for more than half of all emissions and pollutants in the country (Teng et al., 2007). Second, SMEs are typically less energy efficient than large enterprises (Cagno et al., 2010), meaning that there is a large energy saving potential in this segment of the economy.

This paper takes a first step toward filling this research gap by analyzing barriers to energy efficiency investments for SMEs in China. Based on survey data of 480 SMEs in Zhejiang Province, this study assesses financial, informational, and organizational barriers for energy efficiency investments in the SME sector. The conventional view has been that a lack of appropriate financing mechanisms particularly hinders SMEs to adopt cost-effective energy efficiency measures. As such, it has been assumed that closing the financing gap for SMEs is a prerequisite of improving energy efficiency in the sector. The results of this study, however, emphasize the role of information as an important driver of investment outcomes, while statistical evidence for the impact of financial and organizational factors is less clear. One implication is that the Chinese government may maximize its impact on energy efficiency investments by assuming an active role in fostering the dissemination of related information in the SME sector.

The paper is structured as follows: In the next section we provide an overview of current policies aiming to improve the energy efficiency of the Chinese economy and review previous studies on barriers to energy efficiency investments in general and for SMEs in China specifically. The subsequent section discusses the methodology and data and is followed by the results and a discussion. We conclude by summarizing the key barriers for SMEs in China and offering possible policy implications.

---

1 Energy intensity is the energy consumption per unit GDP
2. ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENT IN CHINA

2.1. POLICIES TO PROMOTE ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENTS IN CHINA

In response to rising energy demand, the central government has rolled out a series of ambitious energy savings programs starting from 2005. In its 11th Five-Year Plan (FYP), covering the period 2006-2010, China introduced energy intensity reduction targets, including setting the self-imposed national target of a 20 percent reduction in energy intensity against 2005 levels by 2010. As one of the core measures to meet this national target, the central government initiated the Top-1000 Energy-Consuming Enterprises program in 2006. This program sets energy saving targets for China’s 1,000 most energy-consuming companies, accounting for about one-third of the country’s energy consumption (Lewis, 2011). The program required the Top-1000 enterprises to invest in energy efficiency improving measures and to develop energy reporting and auditing systems to report results quarterly to the National Bureau of Statistics. By 2010, reported outcomes show that the Top-1000 program met its national target of saving 100 Mtce energy (or 2.93 EJ) (Price et al., 2011). The Top-1000 program is generally seen as a successful program since it laid the foundation for China’s largest enterprises to initiate energy saving measures.

The 12th FYP (2011-2015) builds directly on the energy intensity target and associated programs outlined in the 11th FYP, including a new national target to reduce energy intensity by an additional 16 percent by 2015 and extending the scope of the Top-1000 program to a Top-10000 program. While the latest target may seem less ambitious than the 20 percent reduction targeted in the 11th FYP, it likely represents a much more substantial challenge since many of the low cost improvement options—the ‘low-hanging fruit’ as it were—have already been implemented. The largest and least efficient enterprises have already undertaken substantial efficiency improvements under the Top-1000 program.

Smaller or more efficient enterprises are to be targeted in this second round. The new Top-10000 program – currently still in the planning phase and modeled after the Top 1000 program – still includes only a tiny fraction of China’s 2.4 million SMEs. Further efforts are necessary if the programs and initiatives are to be extended to an even wider scope of enterprises that includes China’s large industrial SME sector. The key challenge will be to incentivize SMEs to invest in cost-effective energy saving measures while at the same time limiting the bureaucratic efforts and supervision involved.

2.2. BARRIERS TO ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENTS – GLOBALLY, AND IN CHINA

The literature has widely debated the energy ‘efficiency paradox’ (DeCanio, 1998), which refers to the puzzle of why business firms do not undertake energy-saving investments even though these investments would be cost-effective from the companies’ economic perspective. Previous studies

---


3 The classification system defines SMEs as enterprises with sales between 30-400 million RMB and with a workforce between 400-3,000 employees.
have identified a wide range of barriers to explain this paradox. Barriers that hinder investments in cost-effective, energy efficient practices and technologies can be classified into the following three categories: financial, informational, and organizational barriers.

Financial barriers include limited access to capital and lack of appropriate loan conditions and are often considered one of the most important investment barriers (DeCanio, 1998). That is, firms do not undertake possible investments in energy efficiency improvements because they cannot access required investment capital at prices sufficiently low to offer the necessary returns. Typically, SMEs in China have limited access to credit, especially since the banking sector in China remains dominated by four large state-owned banks that devote less than ten percent of loans to SMEs.

Informational barriers exist because high transactions costs can hinder firms from making energy saving investments. In our understanding, high transaction costs include the costs of gathering, assessing and applying information about energy saving potentials and relevant technologies. Previous studies have shown that firms did not undertake cost-effective energy efficiency measures because managers are often unaware of pertinent technologies or because managers did not recognize the savings potential as they failed to measure energy consumption systematically (Velthuijsen et al., 1993; Harris et al., 2000). As a result, if firms do not have the relevant information on energy-efficient measures available to them, the potential savings remain unknown and investments are miscalculated or misjudged.

Empirical analyses exploring the nature of barriers to energy efficiency also point out the importance of organizational barriers. For instance, DeCanio’s (1998) analysis of the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s Green Lights program shows that besides financial factors, a mix of organizational and institutional factors strongly influence firms’ investment behavior.

Existing research suggests that investment barriers might vary systematically between larger and smaller enterprises. For one, since SMEs often do not have an internal structure comparable to larger enterprises, financial barriers might be higher as banks are biased in favour of larger enterprises and loan pay-back times are too long for SMEs (Nagesha et al., 2006; Thollander et al., 2007). Cagno et al. (2010) stress that SMEs, since they tend to be smaller, also have fewer options available to save energy in terms of technologies and innovative processes available to them. In comparison to larger enterprises, SMEs also lack the practical know-how of energy efficiency practices since their staff are often less well trained and less technically skilled. SME entrepreneurs often perform multiple roles within a firm, and, as a result, no one single person is in charge of energy efficiency management such that only a limited amount of time is devoted to the cause of energy efficiency.

Turning to the analysis of energy efficiency in China, several China-specific studies on barriers to energy efficiency and decision-making behavior in industry provide additional insights (Andrews-Speed, 2009; Zhou et al., 2010; Price et al., 2011). Previous studies use document analysis or company case studies to pinpoint existing barriers at the firm level. Yang (2010) examines one of the Top-1000 enterprises, a large footwear manufacturer in Guangdong Province. The in-depth analysis of one company shows that large enterprises often lack knowledge about energy efficiency benchmark standards in their relevant sectors and are also ill-informed about energy savings techniques. The company also lacked clear managerial responsibilities wherein one full-time professional is in charge of energy efficiency. Zhao and Ortolano (2010) study one state-owned electric power generation plant and detail the difficulties large enterprises face in raising capital for energy conservation projects because local governments often prioritize economic development over energy conservation.

---

4 Barriers are defined hereafter as all factors that hamper the adoption of energy-efficient investments and technologies (Sorrell et al., 2004).
5 Other barriers discussed in the literature but not elaborated in detail in this paper include market barriers, policy barriers, technological barriers, uncertainty about future energy prices/economic uncertainty. For a more complete literature review, see Schleich and Gruber (2008) and Sardianou (2008).
While existing China-specific studies are informative, the basis for generalizing in a statistical sense, is still lacking. And, as noted, previous studies have focused on large, mainly state-owned enterprises. This is a significant omission given that China's industrial SME sector is one of the main energy-consuming segments of the economy. Since SMEs in China are less well connected and more localized than larger state-owned enterprises one would expect SMEs to face quite different barriers.

This study aims to illuminate the investment barriers for adopting energy-saving technologies and equipment for Chinese SMEs. Our hypotheses are derived from three themes highlighted in the academic literature—financial, informational and organizational barriers:

**H1 - Financial barriers:** Financial factors hamper the adoption of energy-efficient investments and technologies.

**H2 - Informational barriers:** Lack of information and high transaction costs hinder SMEs from adopting energy-efficient investments and technologies. Relevant information that could be used to gather, assess, and apply know-how about energy saving potentials and relevant technologies is lacking or insufficient.

**H3 - Organizational barriers:** Small and medium-sized firms that lack clear management responsibilities for energy efficiency show less investment activity in energy-efficient practices and technologies.
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA

Following the methodology used by previous studies (DeGroot, 2001; Sardianou, 2008) we apply cross-section analysis (OLS and LOGIT regressions) to survey data to deepen our understanding of investment barriers to energy efficiency. The data is based on questionnaires completed in September 2010 by 479 Chinese SMEs in Zhejiang Province. The province is well known as the cradle for private, smaller and medium-sized enterprises in China. In Zhejiang alone, there are more than 500 industrial clusters each of which has gross industrial output of over RMB 100 million. Within Zhejiang, we focused on SMEs in Wenzhou and Taizhou, since the majority of industrial enterprises center in these two cities. Wenzhou’s private-sector driven development path has become known as the “Wenzhou Model” (Wenzhou moshi). By 2010, Wenzhou had become home to over 4,300 enterprises of shoes and leather products, 1,200 enterprises in low voltage electrical equipment enterprises, 800 enterprises engaged in processing of spectacles, and 500 enterprises in light manufacturing. Similarly, Taizhou City is also home to many small industries that have established production facilities in automobiles and automobile components, motorcycles, plastics, chemicals, home appliances, and textiles. The survey was completed in the following phases:

1. Questionnaires were administrated by managers working in a local bank using face-to-face interviews with one manager from a small or medium-sized local enterprise. Bank officials received prior training that instructed them to identify industrial SMEs, using sector-specific guidelines.

2. Enterprises were randomly selected from thousands of local enterprises in the bank’s database. The 480 industrial SMEs selected span the following sectors: metal manufacturing (97 enterprises or 20 percent), transport vehicles and specialized equipment (9 percent), non-ferrous (7 percent), specialized equipment manufacturing (3 percent), glass or art manufacturing (10 percent), plastic production (12 percent), general equipment manufacturing (9 percent), and others (30 percent).

3. The questionnaire included 47 questions related to an enterprise’s business and perceived core barriers to energy efficiency: type of business; company size; number of employees; years in business; energy cost as a percentage of total costs; main usage of energy; presence or not of an energy manager; existing awareness of energy-saving measures and equipment; age of existing equipment; existing energy saving projects; future energy saving projects; financing; access to loans, amongst others.

4. The final sample of fully completed surveys size includes 479 enterprises. Questionnaire data were analyzed using the STATA statistics package.

To empirically assess why certain firms have or have not invested in energy efficient practices and technologies in the past, OLS and LOGIT models were estimated. The dependent variable is a dummy (ENERGYINVEST), where 1 indicated that a company has previously invested in energy efficiency equipment, and 0 indicated that it did not. The survey data show that only 21% of surveyed enterprises have installed energy efficient equipment in their premises to date, begging the question of why this number is so low. OLS has been used since it is a simple and transparent model and the size of the resulting coefficients are easily interpreted. LOGIT (as a logistical model) has been used in parallel, since it is conceptually more appropriate, if the dependent variable is a dummy. Table 1 summarizes the selected dependent and independent variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXPECTED SIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY INVEST</td>
<td>Measures if a company has previously invested in energy efficiency equipment: if yes = 1; if no = 0</td>
<td>Dep. variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOANFIN</td>
<td>Measures how whether a company typically finances existing machineries &amp; facilities with a bank loan, if yes = 1 (loan); if no = 0 (other)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORM</td>
<td>Measures if business manager is familiar with latest energy efficiency practices/equipments in their respective business area, if yes=1; if no = 0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>Measures if SME has appointed an energy manager, if yes = 1; if no = 0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZEREV</td>
<td>Actual amount of revenues in RMB.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROWTH</td>
<td>Measures if a company plans to expand current capacities in the new future.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Measures age of a company. If older than 10 years = 1, else: 0.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTOR</td>
<td>Measures if company is machine-intensive or labor intensive industry. If machine intensive = 1, if labor intensive = 0.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGYCOST</td>
<td>Measures the share of energy costs relative to total production costs. 0-5%: 0; 5-10%: 1; 10-20%: 2; &gt;20%: 3.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGYLOAN</td>
<td>Measures if a company has previously received a bank loan for energy efficiency improvements, if yes = 1; if no = 0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. RESULTS

The estimation results for OLS and LOGIT models are shown in Table 2. The coefficient of determination (R²) ranges from 9% to 12%. This is relatively high, given that the data is cross-sectional and that selected SMEs are quite heterogeneous. All variables show the expected signs, with the exception of ORG.

The estimation results lend strong support to Hypothesis 2 (information barriers) developed in Section 2. In other words, the lack of information about energy saving technologies and practices – as captured by the variable INFORM – constitutes a statistically significant barrier.

Hypotheses 1 (financial barriers) and 3 (organizational barriers) are, as such, not confirmed based on our dataset. Access to finance – captured by the variable FINANCE – and organizational barriers – captured by the variable ORG – are statistically insignificant. At first glance, it is surprising that financial barriers are not significant. Two possible factors may explain this. First, the enterprises for the survey were selected from a bank’s database, i.e. they were already customers at a bank. So the dataset may just contain enterprises who actually had the choice whether to use debt finance or not. Second, 46 percent of SMEs used cash accruals and 15 percent used own funds to finance existing equipment. This suggests that many of the SMEs who took part in the survey make use of their own savings. This would, in fact, be typical for Chinese SMEs.

The finding that the presence of an energy manager is statistically insignificant is similarly surprising. But again a closer look at the realities in Chinese SME provides more insight: Of the 480 enterprises forming the dataset only 13 (less than 3 per cent) had actually appointed an energy manager. This is just too small a number from which to generate statistically significant results. The survey data show that for roughly half (7) of those 13 enterprises with an energy manager, energy costs constituted more than ten percent of the production costs. This is notable given that, in the whole sample, energy accounted for more than ten percent of costs for just 20 percent of all enterprises. The average number of employees in firms with an energy manager is only marginally higher (about 31.8) than for the whole sample (about 28.6). The low number of employees may also suggest that, most enterprises – being small and predominantly privately-owned – see organizational tasks including energy usage still manageable without specialized personnel. Whether this view is justified can actually be challenged by our data, since 43 percent of all enterprises admitted that they are not aware of energy saving equipments or practices in their respective business area, indicating that there are high transaction costs for SMEs to gather, assess, and apply information about energy saving potentials and relevant technologies. On the whole, we can conclude that energy managers are, as yet, very uncommon in Chinese small and medium sized enterprises.

The parameters associated with an enterprise’s revenue size (SIZREV) or with its growth ambitions (GROWTH) are both found to be statistically significant in explaining whether a company has invested in energy efficient equipment. This stands to reason, since larger and growing firms will typically be investing more in general, and they might in fact also be more concerned with rising energy prices or applying state of the art technology in general.

Likewise, the parameter associated with energy costs (ENERGYCOST) was found to be statistically significant. Again, this is unsurprising since higher energy costs introduce an immediate incentive to care about reducing energy use and invest accordingly. The question about whether or not a company had previously accessed energy finance (ENERGYLOAN) is also plausibly significant. To test whether a correlation between previous access to energy finance (ENERGYLOAN) or sector-specific characteristics (SECTOR) with the finance-access (LOANFIN) is driving the insignificance of the latter we run three regression scenarios for each model: the regressions with all variables (column 1) but also without SECTOR and ENERGYLOAN, (columns 2 and 3, respectively). Signs and significances are robust across these scenarios.
Table 2: Regression Results. (Note, that coefficients for LOGIT estimations cannot be interpreted as in OLS models. For our purpose, sign and statistical significance matter.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>OLS Regression (1)</th>
<th>OLS Regression (2)</th>
<th>OLS Regression (3)</th>
<th>LOGIT Regression (1)</th>
<th>LOGIT Regression (2)</th>
<th>LOGIT Regression (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All variables</td>
<td>w/o loan-access</td>
<td>Without sector</td>
<td>All variables</td>
<td>w/o loan-access</td>
<td>Without sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI: LOANFIN</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>LOANFIN</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: INFORM</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>INFORM</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.23)*</td>
<td>(2.66)**</td>
<td>(2.41)*</td>
<td>(2.16)*</td>
<td>(2.56)*</td>
<td>(2.31)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: ORG</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZEREV</td>
<td>8.7*10^{-7}</td>
<td>8.6*10^{-7}</td>
<td>8.3*10^{-7}</td>
<td>SIZEREV</td>
<td>5.8*10^{-6}</td>
<td>5.7*10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.98)**</td>
<td>(6.56)**</td>
<td>(6.91)**</td>
<td>(4.09)**</td>
<td>(3.98)**</td>
<td>(4.00)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROWTH</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>GROWTH</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.55)*</td>
<td>(2.76)**</td>
<td>(2.65)**</td>
<td>(2.41)*</td>
<td>(2.54)*</td>
<td>(2.48)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
<td>-0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
<td>(1.36)</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>(1.51)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTOR</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td></td>
<td>SECTOR</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGYCOST</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>ENERGYCOST</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.76)**</td>
<td>(2.61)**</td>
<td>(2.82)**</td>
<td>(2.90)**</td>
<td>(2.74)**</td>
<td>(3.00)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGYLOAN</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td></td>
<td>Energyloan</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>1.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.01)**</td>
<td>(3.08)**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.04)**</td>
<td>(3.13)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.925</td>
<td>-2.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(7.90)**</td>
<td>(8.06)**</td>
<td>(8.21)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust t statistics in parentheses
* significant at 5%; **significant at 1%

Robust z statistics in parentheses
* significant at 5%; **significant at 1%
5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on survey data this study establishes insights into barriers to energy efficiency investment in Chinese small-and-medium-sized enterprises, a relatively neglected topic to date. A primary finding is that only a minority of SMEs in China have had direct involvement with any decision related to investment or implementation of energy saving projects. For example, just 21 percent of surveyed enterprises have installed energy efficient equipment in their premises to date, while only four percent of SMEs have ever taken a loan for financing energy-efficient measures, and less than three percent have appointed an energy manager. A more promising finding is that 54 percent of firms plan to either purchase additional or replace existing equipment, suggesting that there is a demand for energy-efficiency-related investments in the SME sector. The findings thus reinforce the view that there is a potential for cost-effective, energy-saving investments that is not being realized because of barriers specific to smaller enterprises. Informational barriers would seem to be the core bottleneck inhibiting energy efficiency improvements in China’s SME sector.

Several policy implications can be drawn from these results. First, since energy costs are a major driver of energy efficiency investments, keeping energy subsidies to a minimum will incentivize enterprises to economize on energy use. Second, the finding that growth ambitions are a significant driver of energy-efficiency investments suggests that growing SMEs may be particularly open to introducing energy reduction measures; as such, it may be wise to target this group expressly in policy initiatives. Third, given that SME managers tend to feel poorly-informed about energy-efficient investment opportunities, policy makers may aim to find systematic means for disseminating energy-efficiency information to SMEs. Helpful efforts might include distribution of energy-efficiency handbooks, software tools, technology-specific databases, and general informational campaigns. In addition, free training could be offered to personnel in SMEs to improve their technical know-how and skill level. Fourth, the government could also work with Energy Saving Companies (ESCOs) that specialize on China’s SME sector. Although ESCOs tend to have a preference for larger projects, they may be able to realize economies of scale when dealing with larger numbers of SMEs. Finally, along with efforts to help SMEs modernize their financing structure, it may also be beneficial for the government to cooperate directly with financial institutions working with the SMEs in particular geographic regions. Loan officers need a high degree of specialized local knowledge in order to offer and understand appropriate loan products for energy efficiency investments.
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