

Chinese government hints at removing limit on foreign shareholdings of local vehicle production JVs

28-Jun-2016 16:11 GMT

S&P Global

Supply Chain and Technology, Automotive

Second time in recent months that the government has hinted that the regulation may be lifted.

Chinese officials have hinted that the authorities are considering relaxing the regulation that limits international automakers to owning no more than 50% of vehicle production joint ventures (JVs) in China. Speaking at an industry event in Tianjin, a senior official of the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC), which imposes the policy, stated that the state body was considering lifting the current regulation. Xu Shaoshi, chairman of the NDRC, stated at the World Economic Forum in Tianjin that the government is looking at lifting the 50% cap that has limited foreign automakers' stakes in their JVs with local Chinese players since 1994, reports Bloomberg.



This is the second time in recent months that the government has hinted that the regulation may be lifted. In April, another senior official from a government body claimed that the law's restrictions were against bilateral trade agreements. In April, Miao Wei, the head of the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT), said, "The restrictions are severely questioned by the US side." He gave a general timetable of when the lifting of the law was likely to take place. "What we can do is to resist the questioning for as long as possible. We will have to remove the restrictions in three to five years at the earliest, in eight years at the latest," he said.

Outlook and implications

The question is whether the Chinese government would actually relax this policy and, if it did, would Chinese automakers be able to stand their ground and maintain their market shares of their domestic market. The Chinese government is under international pressure to relax the policy, which safeguards the interests of local automakers in their JVs with international players by mandating that the Chinese automaker must have a majority stake or an equal 50% stake in the joint venture. This means that control of the JV, as well as majority financial revenues, rest with the local player.

Changing the policy to relax the 50% cap on foreign ownership implies that foreign automakers could then own a majority stake in a JV, or indeed create a wholly owned foreign enterprise (WFOE) in China if the law was completely relaxed. The China Association of Automobile Manufacturers (CAAM) has vociferously stated its concerns about the suggested relaxation of the policy, stating that Chinese brands would be "killed in the cradle" if the law was relaxed.

However, there is also growing optimism regarding Chinese automakers, as they currently have gained share in the domestic market with products offered at a cheaper price point, but with the attributes to entice local Chinese consumers. On a year-to-date basis, the volume of Chinese-brand passenger vehicle (PV) sales hit 4.02-million units in May, up 10.9% year on year (y/y) and accounting for 43.4% of the PV market. Of these sales, Chinese-brand sedan sales totalled 891,000 units, down 17.7% y/y and accounting for 19.2% of the segment's sales. Chinese-brand sport utility vehicle (SUV) sales hit 1.82-million units, up 50.5% y/y and accounting for 56.7% of segment's sales. Chinese-brand multipurpose vehicle (MPV) sales totalled 936,000 units, up 18.3% y/y and accounting for 90.9% of the segment. When compared with the preceding month's data, the share of Chinese brands edged down in most segments in May.

On the one hand, Chinese brand products operate at a lower price point on average compared with international models produced by JVs in China. As they do not compete directly against each other, some market analysts believe that relaxing the policy would not completely eliminate the local brands from the market. However, others voice concern that technologically Chinese brands are still behind their international counterparts. International automakers are already planning major product offensive strategies in China to gain back lost market share, and they are planning models to meet the lower price point as well.

There is also the question of subsidies, as there is currently a series of subsidies on offer to automakers in China. The new energy vehicle (NEV) segment is one area where the government offers substantial monetary subsidies to promote product development and sales. NEVs include pure battery electric vehicles (EVs) and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs), and funds are also available for fuel-cell vehicles (FCVs). In addition, there is the reduction in the vehicle purchase tax, which was introduced 1 October 2015 and which is expected to expire this year, under which

cars with engines of 1.6 litres or smaller are given a 50% reduction in the new-car purchase tax, while for NEVs this tax of 10% is completely abolished.

Additionally, there are the special annual research-and-development (R&D) funds allocated on a case-by-case basis to Chinese automakers. Consequently, should the Chinese policy limit of 50% ownership for foreign OEMs in local production JVs be relaxed, these R&D funds will continue to work to strengthen the local players. Funds are given annually to local automakers depending on the products they are developing. The government gave Chery Automobile subsidies worth CNY633 million (USD95 million) in 2009, CNY1.12 billion in 2010, and CNY594 million in 2011 – and the annual subsidies are continuing and to a range of automakers.

Chinese players have also begun a major talent recruitment drive in recent years with the hiring of international talent, from engineers to car designers, thereby strengthening their in-house capabilities and subsequently their product line-ups. Optimists in the market believe that the now-stronger Chinese brands should be pushed to stand on their own now. Li Shufu, founder and chairman of Chinese automaker Geely and owner of Swedish automaker Volvo, is a major advocate for relaxing the policy. He insists that Chinese manufacturers have been given a "sugar-coated bomb". In an interview with the *Financial Times* in 2015, Li reportedly said that Chinese automakers have become complacent and that the policy is not constructive for their growth as it limits their aspirations for developing a competitive edge.

Meanwhile, in 2004 the Chinese government relaxed the policy that limited international supplier companies to owning a 50% stake in local JVs. Following a relaxation of the law, international suppliers have been able to form WOFE companies in China.

CONTACTS

The Americas

+1 877 863 1306

Europe, Middle East & Africa

+44 20 7176 1234

Asia-Pacific

+852 2533 3565

www.spglobal.com/mobility

Copyright © 2025 S&P Global Inc. All rights reserved.

These materials, including any software, data, processing technology, index data, ratings, credit-related analysis, research, model, software or other application or output described herein, or any part thereof (collectively the “Property”) constitute the proprietary and confidential information of S&P Global Inc its affiliates (each and together “S&P Global”) and/or its third party provider licensors. S&P Global on behalf of itself and its third-party licensors reserves all rights in and to the Property. These materials have been prepared solely for information purposes based upon information generally available to the public and from sources believed to be reliable.

Any copying, reproduction, reverse-engineering, modification, distribution, transmission or disclosure of the Property, in any form or by any means, is strictly prohibited without the prior written consent of S&P Global. The Property shall not be used for any unauthorized or unlawful purposes. S&P Global’s opinions, statements, estimates, projections, quotes and credit-related and other analyses are statements of opinion as of the date they are expressed and not statements of fact or recommendations to purchase, hold, or sell any securities or to make any investment decisions, and do not address the suitability of any security, and there is no obligation on S&P Global to update the foregoing or any other element of the Property. S&P Global may provide index data. Direct investment in an index is not possible. Exposure to an asset class represented by an index is available through investable instruments based on that index. The Property and its composition and content are subject to change without notice.

THE PROPERTY IS PROVIDED ON AN “AS IS” BASIS. NEITHER S&P GLOBAL NOR ANY THIRD PARTY PROVIDERS (TOGETHER, “S&P GLOBAL PARTIES”) MAKE ANY WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, FREEDOM FROM BUGS, SOFTWARE ERRORS OR DEFECTS, THAT THE PROPERTY’S FUNCTIONING WILL BE UNINTERRUPTED OR THAT THE PROPERTY WILL OPERATE IN ANY SOFTWARE OR HARDWARE CONFIGURATION, NOR ANY WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO ITS ACCURACY, AVAILABILITY, COMPLETENESS OR TIMELINESS, OR TO THE RESULTS TO BE OBTAINED FROM THE USE OF THE PROPERTY. S&P GLOBAL PARTIES SHALL NOT IN ANY WAY BE LIABLE TO ANY RECIPIENT FOR ANY INACCURACIES, ERRORS OR OMISSIONS REGARDLESS OF THE CAUSE. Without limiting the foregoing, S&P Global Parties shall have no liability whatsoever to any recipient, whether in contract, in tort (including negligence), under warranty, under statute or otherwise, in respect of any loss or damage suffered by any recipient as a result of or in connection with the Property, or any course of action determined, by it or any third party, whether or not based on or relating to the Property. In no event shall S&P Global be liable to any party for any direct, indirect, incidental, exemplary, compensatory, punitive, special or consequential damages, costs, expenses, legal fees or losses (including without limitation lost income or lost profits and opportunity costs or losses caused by negligence) in connection with any use of the Property even if advised of the possibility of such damages. The Property should not be relied on and is not a substitute for the skill, judgment and experience of the user, its management, employees, advisors and/or clients when making investment and other business decisions.

The S&P Global logo is a registered trademark of S&P Global, and the trademarks of S&P Global used within this document or materials are protected by international laws. Any other names may be trademarks of their respective owners.

The inclusion of a link to an external website by S&P Global should not be understood to be an endorsement of that website or the website’s owners (or their products/services). S&P Global is not responsible for either the content or output of external websites. S&P Global keeps certain activities of its divisions separate from each other in order to preserve the independence and objectivity of their respective activities. As a result, certain divisions of S&P Global may have information that is not available to other S&P Global divisions. S&P Global has established policies and procedures to maintain the confidentiality of certain nonpublic information received in connection with each analytical process. S&P Global may receive compensation for its ratings and certain analyses, normally from issuers or underwriters of securities or from obligors. S&P Global reserves the right to disseminate its opinions and analyses. S&P Global Ratings’ public ratings and analyses are made available on its sites, www.spglobal.com/ratings (free of charge) and www.capitaliq.com (subscription), and may be distributed through other means, including via S&P Global publications and third party redistributors.