

CIGI Papers No. 225 – September 2019

The Belt and Road Initiative

Motivations, Financing, Expansion and Challenges of Xi's Ever-expanding Strategy

Alex He



CIGI Papers No. 225 – September 2019

The Belt and Road Initiative

Motivations, Financing, Expansion and Challenges of Xi's Ever-expanding Strategy

Alex He

About CIGI

We are the Centre for International Governance Innovation: an independent, non-partisan think tank with an objective and uniquely global perspective. Our research, opinions and public voice make a difference in today's world by bringing clarity and innovative thinking to global policy making. By working across disciplines and in partnership with the best peers and experts, we are the benchmark for influential research and trusted analysis.

Our research initiatives focus on governance of the global economy, global security and politics, and international law in collaboration with a range of strategic partners and have received support from the Government of Canada, the Government of Ontario, as well as founder Jim Balsillie.

À propos du CIGI

Au Centre pour l'innovation dans la gouvernance internationale (CIGI), nous formons un groupe de réflexion indépendant et non partisan doté d'un point de vue objectif et unique de portée mondiale. Nos recherches, nos avis et nos interventions publiques ont des effets réels sur le monde d'aujourd'hui car ils apportent de la clarté et une réflexion novatrice pour l'élaboration des politiques à l'échelle internationale. En raison des travaux accomplis en collaboration et en partenariat avec des pairs et des spécialistes interdisciplinaires des plus compétents, nous sommes devenus une référence grâce à l'influence de nos recherches et à la fiabilité de nos analyses.

Nos projets de recherche ont trait à la gouvernance dans les domaines suivants : l'économie mondiale, la sécurité et les politiques internationales, et le droit international. Nous comptons sur la collaboration de nombreux partenaires stratégiques et avons reçu le soutien des gouvernements du Canada et de l'Ontario ainsi que du fondateur du CIGI, Jim Balsillie.

Credits

Director, Global Economy **Robert Fay**
Program Manager **Heather McNorgan**
Publisher **Carol Bonnett**
Senior Publications Editor **Jennifer Goyder**
Graphic Designer **Brooklynn Schwartz**

Copyright © 2019 by the Centre for International Governance Innovation

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Centre for International Governance Innovation or its Board of Directors.

For publications enquiries, please contact publications@cigionline.org.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution — Non-commercial — No Derivatives License. To view this license, visit (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/). For re-use or distribution, please include this copyright notice.

Printed in Canada on Forest Stewardship Council® certified paper containing 100% post-consumer fiber.

Centre for International Governance Innovation and CIGI are registered trademarks.

67 Erb Street West
Waterloo, ON, Canada N2L 6C2
www.cigionline.org

Table of Contents

vi	About the Author
vi	About Global Economy
vii	Acronyms and Abbreviations
1	Executive Summary
1	Introduction
2	The Policy-making Process of the BRI
5	China's Investment in the BRI: Priorities and Achievements
13	BRI Financing
17	Ever-expanding Themes of the BRI
19	Problems and Risks Facing the BRI
22	Conclusion: The Future of the BRI
24	Works Cited

About the Author

Xingqiang (Alex) He is a CIGI research fellow. His work focuses on China and global economic governance, the Group of Twenty, domestic politics in China and their role in China's foreign economic policy making and Canada-China economic relations.

Prior to joining CIGI in 2014, Alex was a senior fellow and associate professor at the Institute of American Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) and a visiting scholar at the Paul. H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University in Washington DC (2009-2010). Alex was also a guest research fellow at the Research Center for Development Strategies of Macau (2008-2009) and a visiting Ph.D. student at the Centre of American Studies at the University of Hong Kong (2004).

Alex is the author of *The Dragon's Footprints: China in the Global Economic Governance System under the G20 Framework* (2016) (in both English and Chinese) and co-author of *A History of China-U.S. Relations* (2009). He has published dozens of academic papers, book chapters and newspaper and magazine articles.

Alex's upcoming book will examine China's economic policy-making process under President Xi Jinping. He has a Ph.D. in international politics from the Graduate School of CASS and previously taught at Yuxi Normal University in Yunnan Province, China. Alex is fluent in Chinese and English.

About Global Economy

Addressing the need for sustainable and balanced economic growth, the global economy is a central area of CIGI expertise. The Global Economy initiative examines macroeconomic regulation (such as fiscal, monetary, financial and exchange rate policies), trade policy and productivity and innovation policies, including governance around the digital economy (such as big data and artificial intelligence). We live in an increasingly interdependent world, where rapid change in one nation's economic system and governance policies may affect many nations. CIGI believes improved governance of the global economy can increase prosperity for all humankind.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AEI	American Enterprise Institute	NDB	New Development Bank
AIB	Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank	NDRC	National Development and Reform Commission
BRF	BRI Forum	ODI	outward direct investment
BRI	Belt and Road Initiative	PBoC	People's Bank of China
CADF	China-Africa Development Fund	PBSC	Politburo Standing Committee
CAF	China-ASEAN Investment Cooperation Fund	RCIF	Russia-China Investment Fund
CAFIC	China-Africa Fund for Industrial Cooperation	Sino-CEEF	China-Central and Eastern Europe Fund
CCB	China Construction Bank	SOEs	state-owned enterprises
CDB	China Development Bank	UAE	United Arab Emirates
CEF	China-Eurasian Economic Cooperation Fund		
China-CEE Fund	China Central and Eastern Europe Investment Cooperation Fund		
CIC	China Investment Corporation		
CLCF	China-LAC Cooperation Fund		
CLFIC	China-LAC Fund for Industrial Cooperation		
CQJIF	China-Qatar Joint Investment Fund		
CUJIF	China-United Arab Emirates Joint Investment Fund		
G7	Group of Seven		
ICBC	Industrial and Commercial Bank of China		
IMF	International Monetary Fund		
MoF	Ministry of Finance		
MOFCOM	Ministry of Commerce		
MoU	memorandum of understanding		

Executive Summary

This paper argues that with more objectives added since its inception in 2013, China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) has evolved into a much more expansive grand strategy that includes a package of themes and goals. Chinese state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and state-owned banks have dominated investment and financing for BRI projects, which explains the root of the problems and risks facing the initiative, such as unsustainable debt, non-transparency, corruption and low economic efficiency. Measures taken by China to tackle these problems, for example, mitigating the debt distress and improving debt sustainability, are unlikely to make a big difference anytime soon due to the tenacity of China's long-held state-driven investment model.

The BRI is China's global investment plan to build a complex infrastructure network connecting the world through land-based and maritime facilities such as rail, highways, bridges and ports. Initially, it was designed to address China's overcapacity and promote economic growth in both China and in countries along the "belt" and "road" through infrastructure investment and industrial capacity cooperation. It took into account China's strategic transition in its opening-up policy and foreign policy to pay more attention to neighbouring countries in Southeast Asia and central and west Asia when facing greater strategic pressure from the United States in East Asia and the Pacific region.

More themes have been added to the initiative's original framework, including the vision of the BRI as China's major solution to improve international economic cooperation and practice to build a "community of shared future for mankind" (President Xi Jinping's concept for global governance), and the idea of the Green Silk Road and the Digital Silk Road. The ever-expanding themes of the BRI have attracted suspicion from the United States and most of its major Western allies, who have expressed concern that the initiative is China's geopolitical and geo-economical strategy to reshape the world economic and political order. In any case, the BRI represents a typical state-driven investment model for growth that is distinctly different from the Western or American free market economy for economic growth and multilateral international economic cooperation.

The widespread accusation of debt-trap diplomacy misses the crux of the problem facing the BRI, since it is based on a misreading of the initiative and lacks solid evidence. Most of the problems and risks originate from China's state-driven investment model, which intensifies the risk of debt distress in some of the BRI countries. While the BRI has boosted economic growth and created job opportunities in receiving countries, the Chinese state-driven investment model has nevertheless generated many concerns and risks, including debt sustainability, non-transparency, corruption, lower economic efficiency, a lower degree of localization, and a lack of participation of the private sector and international investors. China has recognized the negative impacts of debt distress and tried to respond with measures to improve the debt sustainability in countries that have received a large amount of Chinese investment over a short period of time.

It remains to be seen whether China's efforts to reduce debt distress and improve debt sustainability in BRI countries will make any difference. The crucial issue to watch is how these announced measures could be implemented in practice. It is not going to be a smooth process as political considerations and the soft budget constraints and guaranteed government bail-outs for Chinese SOEs and state-owned banks would continue to foster the existing problems and risks and thus stand in the way of improving debt sustainability. The participation of multilateral institutions in the BRI projects would be limited as China would essentially stay in control of policy making in terms of the BRI projects. All of these factors contribute to overwhelming obstacles for improving the financial sustainability of China's BRI investment and debt sustainability in receiving countries.

Introduction

The BRI, China's investment plan to build a complex global infrastructure network connecting Asia, Europe and Africa, has attracted extensive attention in the six years since its initiation in 2013. Chinese capital-dominated investment in a large number of infrastructure projects in Southeast Asia, central Asia, eastern Europe and Africa brought about

economic growth and job opportunities in recipient countries while receiving lots of controversy and criticism, such as being called a “debt trap” and “new colonialism,” from Western countries. In any case, the BRI has stirred the global economic and political order in a very Chinese way by signing up 131 countries to participate in China’s global infrastructure investment project by the end of April 2019 (Belt and Road Portal 2019). It drew even wider attention and a more intense response from the world when Italy signed a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with China on March 23, 2019, and became the first Group of Seven (G7) major economy to officially join China’s ambitious infrastructure project.

Enlisting Italy in the BRI just before the second international BRI Forum (BRF), held in April 2019, was deemed a symbolic victory and landmark achievement for China. As the first G7 country to join the BRI, Italy’s enrollment makes the forum look more appealing in the international community. The second BRF officially indicated the end of phase one of the BRI expanding into the world and the beginning of a new stage featuring careful review, assessment, practices and risk management for BRI projects. Before that, President Xi’s remarks on the fifth anniversary of the BRI in 2018 implicitly announced the beginning of this transition. Using a metaphor, Xi described the BRI’s first five years of development as freehand brushwork in traditional Chinese painting and the next phase of the BRI as a *Gongbi* painting, which is characterized by close attention to detail and a realistic style. At this juncture, a review of the development and evolution of the BRI over the past six years provides a full-scale view of the initiative and sheds light on how China might respond to future controversy and criticism.

The paper will first examine the policy-making process of the BRI by exploring the motivations behind the plan President Xi proposed and how the initial Silk Road projects have developed into China’s package of strategies over the past few years. The second part of the paper will discuss the priorities and performance of China’s investments in the BRI from the angle of geographical distribution, routes and projects, priority sectors and the connection between the BRI and the previous “going out” strategy China started at the beginning of the twenty-first century. The model and the specific ways China finances and invests in BRI projects, to a great extent, decided the nature

of the China-led global infrastructure investment plan. The third part of the paper will review BRI financing in detail. Based on the geopolitical and geo-economic analysis of the BRI in the previous parts, the fourth part will reveal the implications of the BRI for global governance as it goes beyond the ambitious infrastructure investment plan. The fifth part of the paper will address the risks and problems facing the BRI and the controversy and criticism it has encountered. The final part of the paper will summarize the BRI’s ever-expanding themes and the problems and risks it faces, and their implications for the future of the BRI.

The Policy-making Process of the BRI

Motivations

The origins of the BRI can be traced back to 2012, when overcapacity emerged as a serious challenge to China’s industrial and economic structure (Xinhua 2012). The huge stimulus package adopted in 2008 has created and exacerbated the existing issue of excessive capacity, although it helped sustain the country’s economic growth through the global financial crisis. During the period of 2008–2012, Chinese economists (Xu 2009; Jin 2012; Lin 2012) talked about a new Marshall Plan or a Chinese version of the Marshall Plan — a global infrastructure investment proposal in which China can actively participate and help boost the world economy and take a lead in infrastructure investment in developing countries while providing a solution to its domestic overcapacity. The new Party chief Xi Jinping listed overcapacity as the top priority for strategic economic restructuring (Xinhua 2012) at the first Central Economic Work Conference in December 2012, two months after the Party’s 18th National Congress was held.

The idea of a Chinese version of the Marshall Plan only gained momentum when it was combined with the strategic changes in China’s opening-up policy and foreign policy, as well as the existing domestic development project, the Western Development Strategy. Wang Jisi’s 2012 article was the first to combine the concerns of domestic economic growth and national security into one strategic move by suggesting China “march

westward” to address both concerns (Wang 2012). The idea expressed in this article was regarded as the academic source for the ideas of the Silk Road Economic Belt and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road proposed in the following year.

Reform and opening up has been China’s fundamental national policy since the end of the 1970s, with its priority of opening up to developed economies to gain access to export markets, technology and investment. Opening economically and strategically toward its western border was a revolutionary change in China’s foreign economic policy and global strategy when China became the world’s second-largest economy in 2010, with excessive capacity and capital. The focus of the opening-up policy on the bordering countries in central Asia, south Asia and Southeast Asia aligns with China’s goals of outward investment, capacity export, “good neighbour” foreign policy and the Western Development Strategy.

The performance of the Western Development Strategy, announced in 1999 when China’s top leaders began to push the country’s backward remote regions to catch up economically with its developed coast areas, had not been impressive. Under the changed circumstances, the western development program was resurrected in the name of advancing an all-round opening-up policy and became the domestic component of the new Silk Road plan aiming to develop the western region of China, which lagged behind the rest of the country, as a solution to the imbalanced economic development.

China’s new Silk Road plan also takes into account the efforts to ensure national security and energy supply security. Maintaining stability and security in Xinjiang and guaranteeing oil and gas supply security from central Asia have long been two priorities in China’s policy in this area.

Since 2009, the security situation in Xinjiang has been deteriorating, with growing radicalization and national separatism among the majority Muslim population there. Anti-national separatism and upholding national unity have become the ongoing top priority in Xinjiang since then. A series of violent attacks in Xinjiang in April and June 2013, just three months before President Xi proposed the new Silk Road plan in September in Kazakhstan, caused extreme concern for top Chinese leaders about the stability and security in Xinjiang (Xinhua 2013a). In December 2013, Xi

convened the second Politburo Standing Committee (PBSC) exclusive meeting on Xinjiang issues after two more violent attacks happened in Xinjiang (Takungpao 2013). Xinjiang was designated as the core region for the Silk Road Economic Belt, and Xinjiang’s development was integrated into this national strategy after Xi paid a visit to Xinjiang in April 2014. During his visit, Xi called for the whole Party and state to support Xinjiang’s development and stability. Xi and other Chinese senior leaders believed that being underdeveloped is the biggest potential threat to stability and security.¹ They maintained that the new Silk Road plan would be beneficial to the stability and security in Xinjiang by promoting economic growth and integration with its bordering central Asia countries (*People’s Daily* 2014).

The Silk Road plan was expected to integrate the elements of investment, trade, energy and national security into one project to meet all goals. The Western Development Strategy contains elements of addressing the security and stability in Xinjiang through infrastructure investment and economic growth. The Silk Road plan also overlaps with the crucial routes and energy pipelines to guarantee China’s energy supply in central Asia, in particular, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. Since it shares geographical borders with central Asian countries, Xinjiang is a key region in guaranteeing the smooth operation of these pipelines and energy transport routes for shipping oil and gas into China.

A Chinese version of the Marshall Plan as China’s overseas infrastructure plan was not built from nothing. Through its rapid increased investment in energy- and resource-rich countries in central Asia, the Middle East and Africa, the existing “going-out” strategy since the beginning of the twenty-first century had already laid a solid foundation for China’s new Silk Road plan, which could be a version 2.0 of the outward investment strategy.

The idea of a new Silk Road plan was believed to be an adjustment of China’s grand strategy in foreign policy in response to the US “pivot to Asia” policy since 2010. The United States proposed a new Silk Road plan for strategically important central Asia in fall 2011, and US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had actively advocated for the

1 Chinese Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Le Yuchen expressed this opinion when interviewed by the *Financial Times* in 2018. See the transcripts of the interview on the website of China’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs: www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/wjbxw_673019/t1598794.shtml.

US version of the Silk Road plan. Under pressure both from the US pivot to Asia policy and the Trans-Pacific Partnership initiative, as well as the direct impact of the United States' new Silk Road plan, Chinese policy makers needed to think of ways to respond strategically. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs invited scholars to discuss how to respond to the US new Silk Road plan in 2012.²

A meaningful adjustment in China's foreign policy to devote more attention to its peripheral diplomacy and build what President Xi described as community diplomacy among China's neighbouring countries in central Asia, south Asia and Southeast Asia is believed to have inspired the proposal of the new Silk Road plan. It does not seem a coincidence that President Xi proposed the new Silk Road plan in September and early October of 2013 and then unprecedentedly convened China's first high-level meeting on peripheral diplomacy at the end of October. The adjustment demonstrated Xi's strategic pivot to China's Asian neighbours, forging an Asian community based on connectivity in infrastructure, trade, currency, policy coordination and cultural exchanges. This policy pivot was expected to ease neighbouring countries' worries and fears of China's rise and help China promote regional economic integration with neighbouring nations.

All things considered, the proposal of the new Silk Road plan represented a significant rise in the importance of peripheral diplomacy in China's foreign policy and constituted an important part of its domestic economic growth strategy. The new Silk Road plan eventually evolved into a significant foreign economic policy and grand strategy, i.e., the BRI in 2015, and many other factors and elements were added to the initial ideas of the new Silk Road plan in the following years. The years 2013 to 2015 were the key period to observe how the initial Chinese-version Marshall Plan evolved into Xi's grand outward investment plan to address both economic growth and national security concerns.

Timeline of the Policy-making Process

President Xi Jinping proposed the idea of the Silk Road Economic Belt in a speech in Kazakhstan on September 7, 2013. Less than one month later, Xi

raised the idea of the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road in Indonesia when attending the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation meeting on October 3, 2013. In hindsight, Kazakhstan — a typical country on the belt — and Indonesia — a symbolic nation for the road — were purposely chosen beforehand to announce China's ambitious Silk Road plan.

One month later, the Silk Road Economic Belt and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road were written into the Decision of the Third Plenary Session of the 18th Party Congress (Xinhua 2013b), Xi's economic growth blueprint since he assumed the presidency of China in March 2013, meaning the Silk Road plan became the party's official policy. This demonstrated that the initial idea of the BRI was an approach to China's close relations with its neighbouring countries via close economic connections and marked the beginning of the Silk Road plan's evolution into President Xi's signature foreign policy in the coming years.

On November 6, 2014, the Central Leading Group on Financial and Economic Affairs, the highest body in China's economic policy making and headed by President Xi, convened a meeting on the Silk Road Economic Belt and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road. The establishment of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and Silk Road Fund were declared at the meeting. This meeting at the highest level used the name "One Belt and One Road" instead of Silk Road, indicating that the BRI had evolved into China's new grand plan and included goals in both economic integration and foreign policy adjustment with countries along the belt and road (Xinhua 2014).

Noticeably, at the meeting Xi described the AIIB as a multilateral bank to finance the infrastructure in countries in the BRI and the Silk Road Fund as China's direct financial support for the BRI. It turned out, however, that the establishment of the two financial institutions was more symbolic for BRI financing. They only accounted for a small part of the financial resources supporting BRI projects in the following years. The China Development Bank (CDB) and Exim Bank of China became the major financing sources for the BRI, together with support from the other four big state-owned commercial banks, in particular the Bank of China and the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China (ICBC).

The following year, the party's highest executive agency of the BRI was set up and the road map for the BRI was announced. On February 1, 2015,

² The author was invited to a dialogue with senior officials from the Bureau of Asian Affairs under the Ministry of Finance (MoF) in 2012.

the establishment of the Central Leading Group for Advancing the Development of the BRI was announced. Headed by Vice Premier Zhang Gaoli and including three other members of the PBSC, the leading group was to implement the BRI by serving as the coordinating mechanism. The office of the leading group was established at the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) and four working groups were established under it. On March 28, 2015, the NDRC, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Commerce, with State Council authorization, announced the official road map of the BRI: *The Vision and Proposed Actions Outlined on Jointly Building Silk Road Economic Belt and 21st-Century Maritime Silk Road*.

In 2016, the BRI was further integrated into China's national economic blueprint. It was designated as the leading program for the new vision of China's opening-up policy outlined in China's 13th Five-Year Plan (2016–2020) in March. There is one chapter in the plan that exclusively focuses on the BRI (NDRC 2016). Four months after the first BRF was held in May 2017, the BRI was written into the constitution of the Communist Party of China at the Party's 19th Congress in October. This action implied that the BRI is one of the key foreign policies in the Party's long-term grand plan, and that politically it will be carried out even after President Xi is no longer in power.

During a government reshuffle in March 2018, a new ministerial-level agency, the China International Development Cooperation Agency, was established, with implementing the BRI as one of its goals. This development indicates that the BRI was further established as a part of China's grand plan of global governance and is a key component of China's efforts to contribute to international development.

China's Investment in the BRI: Priorities and Achievements

Priorities

The Vision and Proposed Actions Outlined on Jointly Building Silk Road Economic Belt and 21st-Century Maritime Silk Road listed five priorities in principle:

policy coordination, facilities connectivity, unimpeded trade, financial integration and people-to-people bonds (NDRC 2015). Based on where the money actually goes, the priority is on infrastructure connectivity and capacity cooperation, with particular focus on infrastructure projects in transport (rail, highway, port, shipping) and energy (hydro, oil and gas, coal) (see Table 1). The top two priorities of infrastructure connectivity and capacity cooperation are also in accordance with the directions for outward investment defined in the Guiding Opinions on Further Directing and Regulating the Direction of Overseas Investment that was jointly issued by the NDRC, the Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM), the People's Bank of China (PBoC) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in August 2017 (State Council 2017). Infrastructure connectivity — which includes economic corridors; land-based, sea-based and air passages; information highways; and grand projects in rail, port and pipeline networks — is the core and fundamental part of the BRI.

Geographically, the belt consists of the northern route, China-Central Asia-Russia-Europe (the Baltic Sea); the middle route, China-Central Asia-

Table 1: China's Investment and Construction Contracts in BRI Countries by Sector, 2014–2018

	Sector	Value (US\$ billion)
1	Energy	225.48
2	Transport	156.44
3	Real estate	59.76
4	Metals	37.72
5	Others	19.45
6	Utilities	15.24
7	Agriculture	13.5
8	Logistics	12.92
9	Technology	11.18
10	Chemical	10.06
11	Finance	8.55
12	Entertainment	8.49
13	Tourism	7.34
14	Health	2.72
All sectors		588.85

Data source: American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and Heritage Foundation (2019).

West Asia (Middle East)-Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean; and the southern route, China-South Asia and Southeast Asia-Indian Ocean. The road includes the route of China-South China Sea-Indian Ocean-Europe and the route via the South China Sea to the South Pacific Region (see Figure 1).

Judging by the developments in the first five years of the BRI, the priority regions for infrastructure connectivity are located along six economic cooperation corridors in Southeast Asia, central Asia and south Asia. They include the China-Pakistan economic corridor; Bangladesh-China-India-Myanmar; the Eurasian Land Bridge; China-Mongolia-Russia; China-Central Asia-West Asia; and the China-Indochina Peninsula (see Figure 2), as well as some key railways and ports connecting countries alongside the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road.

Statistics shows that Pakistan, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Laos, Israel, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Egypt and Nigeria are the top 10 countries in which China's total value of investment and construction contracts increased greatly between 2014 and 2018, compared to the eight years (2005–2013) before the BRI was established (see Tables 2 and 3). Nine of the 10 countries are all located within the six economic cooperation corridors. In Pakistan, the total number of China's investment and construction contracts tripled in the first five years of the BRI, compared to the previous eight years, and the absolute number of China's total investment and construction contracts in Pakistan is at the top among all other countries along the belt and road. In Malaysia, Laos, Singapore and the UAE, the total number of China's investment and construction contracts almost doubled or more than doubled, and in Indonesia, the number increased by 57 percent. The biggest surge happened in Bangladesh and Israel, where the number of China's investments and construction contracts increased six times or almost six times, as the base number in the two countries in 2005–2013 were small. Russia and Kazakhstan are regarded as priority countries, although the total value of China's investment and construction contracts did not increase significantly or even decreased remarkably there, compared with the numbers of the previous eight years. This is because China had already invested heavily in Russia and Kazakhstan before the BRI began in 2013.

Several symbolic projects in these priority regions and countries were mentioned by President Xi in

his speech at the first BRF: Karakoram Highway through the China-Pakistan corridor; Jakarta-Bandung High Speed Rail, China-Laos Railway and China-Thailand Railway down the China-Indochina Peninsula economic corridor; Gwadar Port, Port of Piraeus and Hambantota Port and Mombasa-Nairobi Standard Gauge Railway and Addis Ababa-Djibouti Railway connecting countries in eastern Africa and the Indo-Pacific region and Mediterranean region across the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road; and the Trans-Eurasia Railway (operated by Trans-Eurasia Logistics) and the Hungary-Serbia Railway that constitute part of the Eurasian Land Bridge. Railway and port projects seemed to be the top priority by sector in the first five years.

Achievements

Outward direct investment (ODI) and construction contracts are the two major forms of China's investment in the BRI countries. The value of China's total investment and construction contracts in BRI countries during 2014–2018 amounts to \$573.31 billion (see Table 4).³ Both ODI and construction contracts experienced a rapid increase⁴ in the first five years of the BRI (see Figure 3).

China's ODI stock in BRI countries in 2014–2018 accounted for half of China's total ODI stock in these countries as of 2017 (see Figure 5). This indicates that China's ODI in BRI countries since 2014 is quite significant in both amount and growth rate. Most of China's ODI went to priority countries along the belt and road such as Indonesia, Malaysia, Russia and Singapore (see Tables 2, 5 and 6). Southeast Asia remains the region that received most of China's ODI among the BRI countries. Singapore has been the country that received most of China's ODI either in flow or stock among all BRI countries, and leasing and business service is the sector that attracted most of the BRI investment in this country.⁵ This can be explained by the fact that Singapore mainly acted as a transfer station from where a large number of these investments

3 All dollar amounts are in US dollars unless otherwise stated.

4 A possible explanation for the drop in both ODI and construction contracts in 2016 and 2018 is that the SOEs held their investment and contracts until 2017, the year in which the first BRI summit convened, to claim merit for themselves and please President Xi.


5 See MOFCOM (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018). Hong Kong, rather than Singapore, received the most of China's ODI either in flow or stock. However, Hong Kong is not a country and is not included in the statistics on China's ODI on the BRI countries in the MOFCOM reports.

Figure 1: Routes of the BRI



Source: Author/CIGI.

Figure 2: The BRI's Six Economic Corridors and 14 Priority Countries



Source: Author/CIGI.

Table 2: China's Construction Contracts and ODI – Top 10 BRI Countries, 2014–2018 (US\$ billion)

	Country	Contract Value	Country	ODI Value
1	Pakistan	31.41	Singapore	24.27
2	Nigeria	24.21	Malaysia	14.09
3	Bangladesh	17.54	Russia	10.44
4	Indonesia	16.77	Indonesia	9.35
5	Malaysia	15.8	Israel	7.88
6	Egypt	14.95	Pakistan	7.63
7	UAE	14.03	Laos	6.68
8	Russia	11.13	UAE	6.55
9	Laos	11.06	Nigeria	6.54
10	Iran	10.63	Bangladesh	5.3

Data source: AEI and Heritage Foundation (2019).

Table 3: China's Investment and Construction Contracts before (2005–2013) and after (2014–2018) the BRI – Top 15 Countries (US\$ billion)

	Before	Value	After	Value
1	Russia	22.93	Pakistan	39.51
2	Kazakhstan	22.19	Nigeria	30.75
3	Saudi Arabia	21.56	Malaysia	29.89
4	Nigeria	19.21	Singapore	28.03
5	Indonesia	16.6	Indonesia	26.12
6	Ethiopia	16.57	Russia	24.25
7	Vietnam	16.49	Bangladesh	22.84
8	India	16.17	UAE	21.22
9	Malaysia	15.77	Laos	17.86
10	Angola	14.92	Israel	16.67
11	Iraq	14.71	Egypt	15.69
12	Iran	12.97	Saudi Arabia	13.83
13	Pakistan	12.44	Iran	12.97
14	Singapore	11.51	India	10.93
15	Turkey	10.85	Kazakhstan	10.44

Data source: AEI and Heritage Foundation (2019).

went to other countries. Even excluding the part of transferred investment, Singapore still attracted the largest amount of Chinese ODI in BRI countries between 2014 and 2018 (see Table 2), and most of this part of ODI in Singapore went to sectors in logistics, online shopping, technology, finance and real estate (AEI and Heritage Foundation

2019). China's ODI increased at the fastest growth rate in Malaysia (see Tables 2, 5 and 6).

China's construction contracts in BRI countries tell a different story. Pakistan, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Malaysia are the top five countries for Chinese construction contracts; Pakistan, as the top-priority country

of China's BRI, is, unsurprisingly, the country that received the greatest value of China's construction contracts (see Table 2).

In China's official narrative, the BRI made great achievements in the first five years after it was initiated in 2013. China's ODI in BRI countries totalled \$84.54 billion in 2014–2018. Rapid growth was achieved in construction contracts in terms of numbers of contracts, value of contracts and accomplished turnover (see Figure 4 and Table 5). The total value of China's construction contracts in BRI countries amounted to \$488.77 billion in 2015–2018 (see Table 4). Trade is another aspect of these achievements: newly added volume of


trade in goods between China and BRI countries in 2014–2018 is more than \$5 trillion, with an annual growth of one percent. The number of jobs created in BRI countries by June 2018 was 244,000 (State Council Information Office 2018). Two typical cases highlight this type of achievement: the Mombasa-Nairobi Standard Gauge Railway project with investment by China Communications Construction Company created 37,000 jobs; and China National Petroleum Corporation-owned Aktobe Oil Company in Kazakhstan hired more than 30,000 local people and accounts for 70 percent of local tax revenue. China's investment has generated \$2.01 billion of tax revenue for the BRI countries (State Council Information Office 2017).

Table 4: China's Total BRI Investment and Construction Contracts (2014–2018, US\$ billion)

Investment (ODI)	84.54	190.23
Construction contracts	488.77 (2015–2018)	387.69
Accomplished turnover	320.1	N/A
Total (ODI and contract value)	573.31	577.92
	Data from MOFCOM	Data from AEI


Data sources: MOFCOM (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018); AEI and the Heritage Foundation (2019).

Figure 3: China's ODI in BRI Countries (US\$ billion)



Data source: MOFCOM (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018).

Figure 4: China's Construction Contracts (US\$ billion)



Data source: Ibid.

Table 5: China's ODI in Top 10 BRI Countries by Year

2017		2016		2015		
Country	US\$ million	Country	US\$ million	Country	US\$ million	
1	Singapore	6,320	Singapore	3,710	Singapore	10,450
2	Kazakhstan	2,070	Israel	1,840	Russia	2,960
3	Malaysia	1,720	Malaysia	1,830	Indonesia	1,450
4	Indonesia	1,680	Indonesia	1,460	UAE	1,270
5	Russia	1,550	Russia	1,290	India	710
6	Laos	1,220	Vietnam	1,280	Turkey	630
7	Thailand	1,060	Thailand	1,120	Vietnam	560
8	Vietnam	760	Pakistan	630	Laos	520
9	Cambodia	740	Cambodia	630	Malaysia	490
10	Pakistan	680	Kazakhstan	490	Cambodia	420

Data source: MOFCOM (2016, 2017 and 2018).

Table 6: China's ODI Stock – Top 10 BRI Countries as of 2017

	Country	US\$ million
1	Singapore	44.57
2	Russia	13.87
3	Indonesia	10.53
4	Kazakhstan	7.57
5	Laos	6.65
6	Pakistan	4.97
7	Myanmar	5.52
8	Cambodia	5.45
9	UAE	5.37
10	Thailand	5.36

Data source: MOFCOM (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018).

Beyond the official data, the huge investment in BRI infrastructure projects created great opportunities for Chinese industries in the transportation, energy, hydro, telecommunication and manufacturing sector. In the name of international capacity cooperation, these industrial sectors, led by large SOEs in each sector, expanded into countries alongside the belt and road.

As shown in the 13th Five-Year Plan in 2015, the BRI was defined as the leading project in China's new phase of foreign economic policy, and international cooperation on capacity and equipment manufacturing was listed as one of the four development strategies in the new all-around economic opening-up master plan. The Five-Year Plan specifically lists the priority sectors for international cooperation on capacity and equipment manufacturing, including steel, nonferrous metal, building materials, railway, electricity, chemical, textiles, autos, telecommunication, engineering machinery, shipping, aerospace and ocean engineering. Most of these are sectors with overcapacity. The plan also listed the ways for capacity cooperation, including direct investment, contract construction, technological cooperation and equipment export. Both the sectors and ways of cooperation listed in the plan basically coincide with the ones in the BRI; however, the emphasis of the BRI in the

Figure 5: ODI Stock before and after BRI Inception



Data source: MOFCOM (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018).

Five-Year Plan is specifically given to cooperation on energy and resources and value chains.

Xi described industrial cooperation as the fundamental way for economic cooperation between China and countries through the belt and road, and stressed international cooperation on capacity and equipment manufacturing at the first BRF in May 2017. By that point, China had engaged more than 30 countries in institutionalized capacity cooperation (Xi 2017a). China-Kazakhstan capacity cooperation and the China-Belarus Industrial Park represented two flagship projects in international industrial capacity cooperation.

China's industries with overcapacity, such as steel, coal, metal and hydro, benefit greatly from international capacity cooperation under the framework of the BRI as the majority of the BRI investment and contracts went to the energy and transport sectors. In the MoU between China and Kazakhstan on strengthening capacity and investment cooperation in March 2015, the agreement on capacity cooperation in steel, hydro, auto, nonferrous metal and flat glass was included. The China-Belarus Industrial Park is an example of China's preferred typical policy to set up a platform for industry agglomeration, in which all sectors can converge and form a scale effect.

The huge demand from the BRI project means that Chinese enterprises in steel and other sectors

related to transport are in a prime position (Balhuizen 2017). Analysts in China's steel sector predicted in 2017 that demand for steel products in regions along the belt and road, in particular in countries in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, would be huge. As a priority sector, capacity cooperation would provide room for structural reform in the domestic steel sector (Wang 2017). The BRI will expand overseas markets for China's steel sector and enhance China's status in the value chain for steel (Liu 2019).

The BRI as the "Going Out" Strategy 2.0

When the BRI began to get into full swing in 2015, China's "going-out" strategy had been carried out for a decade. There is obvious consistency between the going-out strategy and the BRI as they both focused a great amount of China's overseas outward investment and construction contracts on infrastructure, especially in the transportation and energy sectors. Statistics show this consistency. A large percentage of contracts and investments goes to countries with many previously existing projects, including countries in south and central Asia such as Pakistan and Kazakhstan; Southeast Asian countries such as Indonesia and Malaysia; East African countries such as Kenya, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zambia; and Nigeria in West Africa. For the SOEs that dominated China's outward investment and construction contracts in both the going-out strategy and the BRI, increasing their investment in these regions and countries where the going-out strategy and the BRI overlap is convenient. It is beneficial and advantageous for them to do so to show the government that they made noticeable progress for Xi's signature foreign policy initiative in a short period.

Following the same model as the going-out strategy, the principal enterprises that carried out projects of the BRI are the central-government-owned giant SOEs in key sectors such as transportation, energy and telecommunication. In the first three years of the BRI, 47 central-government-owned enterprises participated in 1,767 projects by May 2017 (State Council Information Office 2017). These SOEs dominate investments and construction contracts in the BRI countries. By April 2019, there were more than 80 central SOEs (Yuan 2019) participating in the 3,120 BRI projects, accounting for more than 60 percent of total projects and close to 80 percent of total project value (Wang 2019;

Dong 2019). This means the projects and project value by private sector are about 40 percent and 20 percent, respectively. According to the statistics by the AEI, the private share of investment in the BRI reached 49 percent by 2017, an increase from 28 percent in 2014, 17 percent in 2015 and 28 percent in 2016 (AEI and Heritage Foundation 2019).

The financial support the SOEs received from CDB, one of two major policy banks to provide loans to the BRI, offers a clue to the SOEs' dominance in BRI investment and construction contracts: in 2017, CDB provided \$13.4 billion in BRI loans to SOEs out of its total BRI loans of \$17.6 billion (CDB 2017). This is in line with the assumption that only a small portion of China's financing for the BRI went to the private sector.

A few large private enterprises participated in the investment on BRI infrastructure projects, including Huawei, e-commerce and internet giants such as Alibaba and Tencent, auto manufacturer Geely, consumer electronics company TCL and heavy-equipment manufacturer Sany Heavy Industry. Some large real estate companies have begun to invest in Southeast Asian countries in recent years. SOEs' huge investment in infrastructure created opportunities for the Chinese private sector to engage in trade and economic cooperation between China and countries along the belt and road.

The private sector is increasingly getting involved in the BRI by investing in trade and economic cooperation with countries along the belt and road. This constitutes the mainstream way for the private sector's investment in the BRI. Private enterprises dominated most of the China-led overseas industrial parks for economic and trade cooperation along the belt and road (Ma and Zhang 2019). Trade volume by private sector accounts for 43 percent of China's total trade volume with countries along the belt and road in 2017 (Dong 2019). Among China's top 500 private enterprises, more than half of them (274) had participated in the BRI by 2017 (ibid).

BRI Financing

Financing from China's State-owned Banks

China's state-owned policy banks and state-owned commercial banks are the major sources of BRI financing. They account for the majority of BRI funding, providing 81 percent of total BRI funding (see Figure 6). They are also the major capital providers for the Chinese government-sponsored bilateral funds and the major issuers of the BRI bonds. Including the six percent provided by the government-sponsored bilateral funds (two percent) and the BRI bonds (four percent), Chinese state-owned banks account for about 87 percent of total BRI funding (see Figure 6). The other 13 percent of BRI funding is supported by enterprises' equity financing in Chinese capital markets (nine percent), multilateral financial institutions (two percent),⁶ and the Silk Road Fund (two percent) (see Figures 6 and 7).

Two large state-owned policy banks, the CDB and Exim Bank of China, are the main sources of BRI financing, accounting for 45 percent of the total. Of the two, the CDB is the largest funding source for the BRI and had provided about \$196 billion in loans by the end of 2018, accounting for 26 percent of the total amount of the BRI financing (see Figure 7). Exim Bank supplied more than \$145 billion on 1,800 projects by the same year-end, representing 19 percent of the total amount of BRI financing (see Figure 7).

Four big state-owned commercial banks, the ICBC, Bank of China, the China Construction Bank (CCB) and the Agricultural Bank of China constitute another significant source for BRI financing. They provided a total of \$227.2 billion by year-end 2018. Among them, Bank of China and the ICBC provided most of the credit lines. By the end of 2018, Bank of China provided a total of \$130 billion in credit line support on 600 projects; ICBC provided \$114 billion on 441 projects; and CCB signed loan agreements worth \$20.6 billion on 29 projects in 29 countries. The Agricultural Bank of China helped Chinese enterprise financing in the form of issuing loans,

insuring and issuing bonds overseas, and the total amount of financing it provided for investment in BRI countries was \$12.6 billion from 2014 until the first half of 2018 (see Figures 6 and 7).

Government-owned Investment Fund


The Silk Road Fund was established by the Chinese government in 2014 as the state-owned fund exclusively focusing on investment for the BRI. Its total assets are \$40 billion, and 65 percent of it was supplied by China's foreign reserve through the investment company Buttonwood Investment Holding Co. Ltd owned by China's State Administration of Foreign Exchange. China's sovereign wealth fund, China Investment Corporation (CIC), owned 15 percent of the Silk Road Fund through a subsidiary. Exim Bank of China accounts for 15 percent of its ownership and another five percent is owned by the CDB.⁷ The Silk Road Fund got an extra 100 billion RMB (≈\$14.7 billion) capital injection from the Chinese government in May 2017. By the end of 2018, the Silk Road Fund provided \$11 billion for 30 projects (see Figures 6 and 7).

There are some bilateral and multilateral funds jointly sponsored by the Chinese government and other governments on the BRI. They are essentially jointly funded in name only, however, and China's state-owned banks are usually the major sponsors behind them. Some of them were set up before the BRI was initiated but counted in the initiative after the BRI's inception. Data for the total amount of investment by these funds on BRI projects is difficult to obtain. The author tried to track the major bilateral funds (with a fund size above \$1 billion) for the BRI, and the total capital of these funds amounted to \$84.6 billion by the end of 2018 (see Table 7). Assuming that 20 percent of each fund has already been spent (as the case of the China-Africa Fund for Industrial Cooperation [CAFIC] below shows), the amount invested on BRI projects is about \$16.9 billion by the end of 2018. Major funds of this type include the China-ASEAN [Association of Southeast Asian Nations] Investment Cooperation Fund (CAF), the China-Central and Eastern Europe Investment Cooperation Fund (China-CEE Fund), the China-Central and Eastern Europe Fund (Sino-CEEF),

⁶ The AIIB and the New Development Bank (NDB) are not exclusively focusing on BRI funding. The loans they provided for projects in the BRI countries are counted as part of the total amount of the BRI funding in the paper.

⁷ See the website of the Silk Road Fund for the shareholder structure: www.silkroadfund.com.cn/enweb/23775/23767/index.html.

Figure 6: BRI Funding by Source Type at the End of 2018 (US\$ billion)



Data sources: The State Council Information Office of China, www.scio.gov.cn; CDB (2017, 2018); Xinhua, www.xinhuanet.com/fortune, www.xinhuanet.com/money; Bank of China (2018); ICBC (2017, 2018); www.ccb.com; <https://finance.sina.com.cn/money/bank>; www.china-asean-fund.com, www.china-ceefund.com; www.china-eurasian-fund.com; www.sinoceef.com; *21st Century Business Herald*, <https://m.21jingji.com>; Belt and Road Energy Cooperation, <http://obor.nea.gov.cn>; Russia-China Investment Fund, <https://cn.investinrussia.com>; MOFCOM, www.mofcom.gov.cn; China-LAC Cooperation Fund, www.clacfund.com.cn; www.the.paper.cn; yicai.com; Yi (2019); AIIB (2019); NDB (2018); PBoC (2019); Economic Information Daily, www.jjckb.cn; Climate Bonds Initiative, <https://cn.climatebonds.net>; www.eximbank.gov.cn; www.ce.cn⁸; <https://zaobao.com>.

Note: The number of Chinese government-sponsored bilateral funds is estimated. To avoid double counting, the renminbi overseas funds for the BRI are excluded from the figure as the major issuers of these funds are Chinese financial institutions listed here, and the renminbi overseas funds are already included in the numbers by these financial institutions.


the China-Eurasian Economic Cooperation Fund (CEF), the Russia-China Investment Fund (RCIF), the CAFIC, the China-Africa Development Fund (CADF), the China-LAC Cooperation Fund (CLCF), the China-LAC Fund for Industrial Cooperation (CLFIC), the China-United Arab Emirates Joint Investment Fund (CUJIF) and China-Qatar Joint Investment Fund (CQJIF) (see Table 7).

Chinese provincial governments also sponsored local Silk Road funds, each with about 10 billion RMB. However, there are not significant amounts

of these funds invested in projects in countries along the belt and road. Only a small portion of the capital from these funds had been invested by 2018. For example, the Guangdong Silk Road Fund, with about 20 billion RMB initiated in 2016, had invested in two projects worth 4.599 billion RMB by February 2018 (Dai and Chen 2018, 7). Enterprises' investment funds for the BRI began to emerge in 2015, but usually focused on domestic projects and did not invest in great numbers by year-end 2018. They typically go with a scale of 10 billion RMB and a first phase of

⁸ Calculated based on the news release on the website of Exim Bank of China. www.eximbank.gov.cn/tm/m-newinfo/index.aspx?nodeid=454&contentid=30527; www.eximbank.gov.cn/tm/Newlist/index_343_30615.html.

Figure 7: BRI Funding by Source at the End of 2018 (US\$ billion)



Data sources: Ibid.

Note: The number of Chinese-sponsored bilateral government funds is estimated.

1 billion RMB. Funding from Chinese provincial governments and enterprises is not counted in the total amount of BRI financing in the paper.

Financing from Multilateral Financial Institutions

The AIIB and the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) NDB, the two multilateral development banks China initiated were not established to exclusively provide financial support for the BRI. However, most of the projects they provide loans for are in countries and regions along the belt and road. The geographical overlapping justifies the inclusion of these multilateral development banks in BRI financing. The AIIB has provided loans and other forms of lending totalling close to \$7.5 billion as of the end of 2018 (AIIB 2019). This amount includes financing for a number of projects outside Asia (ibid.), but the majority of the loans and lending it has committed are located in countries along the belt and road.⁹ The NDB's total lending commitment by the end of 2018 reached approximately \$8 billion (NDB 2018). Of this, the

total lending commitment to India, Russia and China, three BRI countries, is \$5.98 billion.¹⁰

The PBoC has cooperated with the African Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Finance Corporation (a member of the World Bank Group) and established co-financing funds with a total worth of \$7 billion and contributed €0.25 billion to the Equity Participation Fund of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. By the first quarter of 2019, these financing mechanisms had already invested more than \$3 billion on nearly 200 projects (PBoC 2019).

Bond Financing

A number of China's financial institutions and enterprises have issued a few bonds for BRI projects since 2015. But the total amount of the capital

⁹ Jin Liqun, the president of the AIIB, mentioned that by July 2018, all projects the AIIB invested in were located in countries and regions along the belt and road. See Han and Wen (2018).

¹⁰ The number is the result of calculations based on the list of all projects on the website of the NDB.

Table 7: Major Bilateral Funds for the BRI (US\$ billion)

Fund	Fund Size	Phase I	Phase II	Realized Investment by 2018	Year of Initiative	Major Sponsors
CAF	10	1	3	N/A	2009	China Exim Bank, CIC, Bank of China
China-CEE Fund	1.435	0.435	1	N/A	2013	China Exim Bank
Sino-CEEF	€10 (\$11.12)			N/A	2016	ICBC
CEF	5	1		N/A	2014	China Exim Bank, Bank of China.
RCIF	2			N/A	2012	RDIF, CIC
CAFIC	10			1.795	2015	Buttonwood, China Exim Bank
CADF	5*	1	2	N/A	2007	CDB
CLCF	10	5	5	N/A	2014	China Exim Bank
CLFIC	10			N/A	2015	Buttonwood, CDB
CUJIF	10	4		N/A	2015	CDB, Mubadala
CQJIF	10			N/A	2014	CITIC, Qatar Investment Authority
Total	84.555			16.911 (estimated)		

Data sources: China-asean-fund.com; obor.nea.gov.cn; China-ceefund.com; 16plus1-thinktank.com¹¹; China-eurasian-fund.com; cn.investinrussia.com; 21st Century Business Herald; mofcom.gov.cn; clacfund.com.cn; thepaper.cn; yicai.com.

* In 2017 it was announced that another \$5 billion would be added to this fund.

Note: The China-Kazakhstan Industrial Cooperation Fund is funded by the Silk Road Fund and is not included here to avoid double counting. The China-Russia Regional Cooperation and Development Fund is excluded here as it was only announced in September 2018 and is not yet operating.

via bond financing is still quite small, compared to the loans provided by financial institutions such as CDB and other state-owned commercial banks. Among them, Bank of China topped other institutions and has issued bonds worth a total of close to \$15 billion in RMB, Hong Kong dollars, US dollars and euros from 2015 to the end of 2018. Agriculture Bank of China was the first in China's "big four" state-owned commercial banks to issue a green bill. It issued a \$1 billion green bill on the London Stock Exchange in October 2015. The total of bonds issued by other banks exclusively on the BRI is relatively smaller. Altogether, bonds issued by China's state-owned banks in the name of the BRI (including green bonds that claimed they

would invest in the BRI) totalled about \$21.31 billion (calculated based on the number below). If the bonds issued overseas by Exim Bank and the CDB are included, the total is \$50.31 billion (see Table 8).

Panda bonds issued by countries and companies in the BRI in Chinese capital markets amounted to 65 billion RMB (~\$9.3 billion) by April of 2019 (Yi 2019).

As the main entities that invested in BRI projects, the capital of Chinese SOEs are also an important sources for BRI funding. However, the total capital raised by the SOEs themselves and invested in BRI countries is not available. Yi Gang, governor of the PBoC, mentioned in a

¹¹ <http://16plus1-thinktank.com/1/20180305/1587.html>.

Table 8: BRI Bonds Issued by Chinese Financial Institutions by 2018 (US\$ billion)

Issuer	Size	Exclusive BRI Bonds	Green Bonds	Issued Overseas	Time of Issue
Bank of China	15	Y	N/A	Y	2015–2018
CDB	16.4	N	N/A	Y	2015–2018
CDB	1.67	Y	Y	Y	2017
China Exim Bank	11.6	N	N	Y	2015–2018
China Exim Bank	0.3*	Y	Y	N	2017
CCB	0.16**	Y	N	Y	2015
CCB	0.45***	Y	N	Y	2016–2018
ICBC	3.73	Y	Y	Y	2017–2018
Agriculture Bank of China	1	N	Y	Y	2015
Total	50.31	21.31			

Data sources: Economic Information Daily; Shanghai Securities News, <http://news.cnstock.com/>; Climate Bonds Initiative; www.eximbank.gov.cn; www.ccb.com; ce.cn; www.xinhuanet.com; www.zaobao.com; and www.abchina.com.

* 2 billion RMB in November 2017, ** 1 billion RMB in November 2015, *** 3 billion RMB between 2016 and 2018.

speech that China’s capital market had provided about \$71.4 billion for enterprises via equity financing for BRI projects by April 2019 (ibid.)

Ever-expanding Themes of the BRI

The BRI’s core idea is to promote economic growth in both China and countries along the belt and road through connectivity via land-based and maritime infrastructure, as well as industrial capacity cooperation between China and these countries. By April 2017, when the first BRF was held in Beijing, several themes had been added to the framework of the BRI and demonstrated President Xi’s and China’s growing ambition in many respects, including the Green Silk Road initiative, the Digital Silk Road, the Polar Silk Road (the Arctic shipping route) and the BRI as the road map to promote Xi’s idea of building a community of shared future for mankind. In this sense, the BRI as President Xi’s signature foreign policy has evolved into a much more expansive package of national strategies that contains a series of goals in both foreign policy and domestic economic growth.

Among them, the idea of the BRI as China’s major initiative to participate in global cooperation is President Xi’s favourite. Xi described three components on how the BRI would contribute to global economic cooperation in his opening speech at the first BRF. The first is a new type of international relations of win-win cooperation among BRI countries. The second is economic co-development and prosperity through cooperation in industry, finance and infrastructure connectivity that includes connectivity in policies, rules and standards. The third is maintaining an open world economy through global governance and providing public goods and encouraging free trade and investment in a multilateral trade system.

Xi further defined the BRI as “the great practice for the community of shared future for mankind.” He personally confirmed this at the dialogue between the Communist Party of China and leaders of major parties in the world in December 2017 by saying, “I proposed the BRI to practise the idea of the community of shared future” (Xi 2017b). The Party later defined the BRI as the great platform for the practice of the community of shared future for mankind at the fifth anniversary of the BRI in August 2018.

Through these actions, the BRI was solidified as a key component of Xi’s vision for global governance.

As he put it at the meeting on the fifth anniversary of the BRI in 2018, “the BRI is becoming China’s approach to participate in global economic cooperation, improve models of global development and global governance, promote a healthy economic globalization, and build the community of shared future for mankind” (Xinhua 2018).

Xi did not explain in detail how the BRI can improve global economic governance but has been advocating a principle of achieving shared growth through discussion and collaboration for China’s version of global governance. In China’s official narrative, the BRI follows the principle and answers the request for reforming the global governance system and highlights the significance of a shared future and shared rights and responsibilities in global governance by emphasizing the promotion of projects with host countries in a consultative, cooperative, win-win way. In his speech at the China-France Forum for Global Governance in March 2019, Xi added that the BRI enhanced the concept of multilateralism and international economic cooperation as it is an important way to promote world economic growth and co-development.

While there has been some focus on Xi’s enthusiasm and efforts to describe the BRI as a solution for China’s efforts to improve global economic cooperation with a moral high ground, the green BRI and the digital BRI have attracted more global attention in recent years.

Green and low-carbon development was mentioned in the BRI road map in 2015. Xi advocated green, low-carbon and sustainable development at the first BRF opening speech in 2017 and proposed to jointly establish the BRI International Green Development Coalition with the United Nations Environment Programme. The Chinese government issued the Guidance on Promoting Green Belt and Road and the Belt and Road Ecological and Environmental Cooperation Plan after the first BRF. The BRI International Green Development Coalition was officially established in 2019 at the second BRF and will act as a platform for policy communication, environmental knowledge sharing and green technology transfer. China’s National Green Development Fund and other state-sponsored funds for the BRI, as well as green bonds issued by China’s state-owned banks, are encouraged to invest more in green BRI projects.

The rapid development of the digital economy in the last 10 years was officially absorbed into the

BRI at the first BRF in 2017. President Xi proposed building the BRI as a road of innovation and the idea of the Digital Silk Road at the BRI summit through “intensify[ing] cooperation in frontier areas such as digital economy, artificial intelligence, nanotechnology and quantum computing, and advance[ing] the development of big data, cloud computing and smart cities” (Xi 2017a). Over the next two years, the NDRC’s Center for International Cooperation led the efforts to promote cooperation among BRI countries on the Digital Silk Road. By May 2019, when the second BRI was held, China had already signed MoUs with 16 countries on building the Digital Silk Road (Huang 2019). China has advantages in internet, wireless internet (5G) technology and telecommunication, and is providing key digital infrastructures in these sectors. SOEs are setting global standards for technology and equipment through their investments in BRI countries, which is part of what Xi meant by “connectivity in rules and standards” at the first BRF. For instance, State Grid, China’s state-owned power company, is actively promoting China’s standards at the International Electrotechnical Commission and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers through its participation in BRI projects.

The idea of the BRI is not bounded by geographic restrictions or limited to expansion into the Western Hemisphere. It extended into Latin America in 2017, defining the area as a natural extension of the BRI. China had signed MoUs with 19 countries in Latin America by the first half of 2019 (Belt and Road Portal 2019), including Panama, Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela. China has also been encouraging Western developed economies to join the BRI since 2015. In March 2019, Italy became the first G7 member to join the BRI. In addition to the crucial land-based and maritime Silk Roads, the Polar Silk Road through the development of the Arctic shipping routes has been raised in the years since 2013. The idea of sector-based Silk Roads such as an air Silk Road, an energy Silk Road and an electricity Silk Road were suggested as well by relevant Chinese government agencies and sectors.

In summary, the evolution since 2013 has shown that the BRI is an ever-expanding package of strategies. President Xi has continued to inject new meanings into it to serve his newly emerging moral-high-ground ideas and ambition in global economic governance.

Problems and Risks Facing the BRI

Debt-trap diplomacy has become a common accusation against China's BRI since 2017, when Indian scholar Brahma Chellaney (2017) first linked the BRI with being a debt trap. It has become a buzzword among China bashers in political, business, media and academic circles around the world in the past two years.

However, the allegation that the Chinese government deliberately put countries in the BRI into a debt trap is not based on solid evidence. Academic studies on China's overseas lending by three institutions have provided data that suggests this claim may be inaccurate. The Center for Global Development finds the "BRI is unlikely to cause a systemic debt problem in the regions of the initiative's focus" (Hurley, Morris and Portelance 2018, 5). The data from the China-Africa Research Initiative at Johns Hopkins University shows that non-Chinese lenders still held the majority of the debt in 17 countries the International Monetary Fund (IMF) identified as in or at risk of "debt distress" (Brautigam 2019). Based on their studies of China's investment in Latin America and the Caribbean, researchers at the Global Development Policy Center concluded that Chinese loans alone did not cause these countries to go above the IMF's debt-sustainability thresholds. Venezuela is the only exceptional case (Ray and Wang 2019).

Venezuela, however, is a case that proves that China does not want to put countries in the BRI into debt crisis.¹² As a result of its unwise decision to invest heavily in Venezuela, China became a victim of its misjudgement and fanciful strategic thinking in making Venezuela the country's major alternative oil supplier in the future. It is reasonable for China to expect Venezuela to resolve the debt crisis and pay China back sooner.

The case of Sri Lanka is often cited to epitomize China's debt-trap diplomacy. However, a close look at China's investment in Sri Lanka tells a different story. The case study of Sri Lanka in Box 1 shows that there are insufficient grounds for the intentional debt-trap allegation against China.

The debt-trap accusation fails to understand the essential part of why China's investment in BRI projects caused debt distress, as it is based on a misreading of China's BRI. The problems and risks in BRI projects originated in China's long-established overseas investment model, in which the NDRC takes charge of project approval, the central government-owned SOEs are responsible for implementing projects and state-owned policy banks and commercial banks provide financial support. Most of the investment usually goes to huge projects on transport, energy and other resources, and the Chinese government provides high-level policy communication with governments in receiving countries to smooth the process of investment. This model is inherited from China's long-standing domestic practices of state-driven investment. It is basically an upper-level route instead of a grassroots' level, market-oriented way of investment, which typically can lead to many problems and risks, including non-transparency, corruption, lower economic efficiency, lower degree of localization, and lack of participation by private sector and international investors.

Lack of transparency in bidding, financing and effective dispute settlement are the problems that are immediately generated by the state-driven investment model. Projects that follow this model will certainly experience local dissatisfaction and resistance because of wide criticism on corruption, negligence of environmental sustainability, lack of local participation and lack of matched social projects for an inclusive development goal. As the case of Sri Lanka showed, a transparent process of Chinese investment under the BRI could have benefited both receiving countries and China itself. Being transparent in project selection, bidding and financing is an effective way to avoid over lending and thus prevent aggravating debt distress in receiving countries, in particular those that are already heavily indebted. In this way, receiving countries could avoid unwise large investment, thereby staying away from debt crisis, and Chinese SOEs and banks could take a more cautious approach and circumvent risky investments that would not profit for years, thus helping to improve the financial sustainability for the BRI as a whole.

Low economic efficiency and debt risks for the Chinese SOEs and state-owned banks that dominated the investment are inherently caused by soft budget constraints and guaranteed government bail-out, the long-existing unsolved

¹² See Ferchen (2018) for more on this topic.

Box 1: Case Study of Sri Lanka

The Hambantota Port project is the focus of public opinion on China's debt-trap diplomacy in Sri Lanka. The project began in 2007-2008, six years before the BRI's inception. It was Sri Lanka that took the initiative to ask for financial help from China to support the project in the first place (Zhou 2019), and China provided the funding with good intentions, while India and multinational development banks turned their backs on the project (Kee 2019).

China tried to satisfy Sri Lanka's requests for concessional loans. Exim Bank is the only Chinese bank providing concessional loans and preferential export buyer's credit, and it provided most of the concessional loans Sri Lanka received from China. Reports show that Exim Bank of China provided \$306 million for phase one of Hambantota Port, 85 percent of the total cost in 2007, with a fixed rate of 6.3 percent in a 15-year commercial loan agreement. Later, Exim Bank provided \$900 million for the second phase with a concessional loan with a two percent fixed rate (ibid.).

Hambantota Port incurred heavy losses in 2016, making debt repayment difficult. The fundamental reason that underlines the heavy losses is bad judgement or negligence of profitability and the financial sustainability of the project in the years to come. The deficiency in project selection, plus poor governance and lack of matching commercial and industrial activities around the port, led to its inability to attract passing vessels to dock at the port and caused significant losses (\$304 million) between 2010 and 2016 (Kee 2019). Both the Chinese government as the investor and the Sri Lankan government as the receiver of the investment are to blame for this poor investment.

The Sri Lankan government has offered China Merchants Ports Holdings a public-private partnership deal that puts Hambantota Port under a 99-year concession lease. China Merchants invested \$1.12 billion to revive the port under the deal and to take charge of developing and operating the port.

Sri Lanka's debts owing to China was about \$4.6 billion, accounting for only 10 percent of

\$46.5 billion, the total external debts of this country at the end of 2016, according to the IMF (2018). Data from the annual reports of the Central Bank of Sri Lanka showed that outstanding Chinese loans made up about 9.2 percent at the end of 2017 and 9.1 percent at the end of 2018 of Sri Lanka's total external debt (Central Bank of Sri Lanka 2017, 2018).¹³ About 61.5 percent of China's loans to Sri Lanka were concessional loans at the end of 2017 (*Daily FT* 2018). This number is 16.5 percent higher than 45 percent, the percentage of Sri Lanka's concessional loans to its total external debts (MOFCOM, Chinese Embassy in Sri Lanka 2018).

China's involvement in Hambantota Port demonstrated a deeply rooted problem in China's model of investment: political consideration prevails over economic calculation, which brought great hidden risks and problems of losing money and being "white elephant" projects, thus intensifying debt distress in receiving countries. Chinese loans only account for 10 percent of Sri Lanka's total external debts. However, for Sri Lanka, a small economy that is already heavily indebted, China's huge amount of investment over a short period nonetheless would push it to the brink of a debt crisis.

In any case, the fact that China took over Hambantota Port under a 99-year concession lease has already had a significant negative impact on how the intention behind China's huge investment in Sri Lanka is viewed. Although the new investment by China Merchants helped mitigate the debt problems of the port and is keeping it alive and growing, a lack of transparency in project proposal, decision making, project bidding and financing contributed to this twisted perception of China's intention for its investment in Hambantota Port. An important lesson China should learn is how to take steps to improve transparency, as China does not participate in certain conventions such as the Paris Club that intend to inform creditors and avoid over lending.

¹³ Data does not include the outstanding loans of projects under the SOEs.

problems of SOEs and state-owned banks. As a result, economic returns and the debt sustainability of the investment are not the top priorities for the SOEs and state-owned banks. For officials in the government, SOEs and banks, treating the BRI as a political task is the most important thing, and the unwritten principle for BRI decision making and implementing involves political considerations. In other words, the essential goal for these officials is pleasing China's paramount leader with their records of contribution to the BRI and increasing their chances for promotion.


An unfavourable investment environment in most of the BRI countries further put China's investment in a disadvantageous position, with a higher political and economic cost and thus exacerbating the problem of low economic efficiency and debt unsustainability. Low sovereign credit ratings, poor performance in domestic governance and an unstable political environment underline the adverse investment environment in most of the BRI countries. The majority of the BRI countries have a sovereign credit rating of highly speculative grade, non-investment grade and lower-medium grade, ranging from B to triple B categories (see Figure 8). These countries run a high risk of a

default. To make it worse, Chinese banks did not show a convincing record that they have adequate capacity to identify profitable projects and manage risks. For the purpose of winning contracts when facing competition from other international investors, Chinese investors would drop some necessary requirements, which added extra risks to Chinese investments. For example, Chinese enterprises gave up the protection of government guarantee from receiving countries for their investment in high-speed rail projects in Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia in order to win contracts over highly competitive Japanese companies.

The majority of projects are invested in by SOEs and financed by state-owned banks, which makes the BRI appear to be official aid from China and explains the weak or infrequent participation of the private sector and the small portion of funding from international development financing institutions.

The asymmetric structure between the size of China's huge economy and the smaller economies in most of the receiving countries along the BRI makes the latter vulnerable to problems such as debt distress. Plus, the rapid growth of China's investment in BRI projects over a short period

Figure 8: Sovereign Credit Ratings for BRI Countries



Data sources: Trading Economics, <https://tradingeconomics.com/country-list/rating>; www.yidaiyilu.gov.cn.

Note: The ratings are from Standard & Poor's, Moody's and Fitch, based on the data from Trading Economics. The figure here includes 132 countries. For each country, the highest rating from any of the three rating agencies is used. The 131 countries that signed documents for cooperation with China on the BRI are counted in here. Israel is counted, although there are no official cooperative documents signed between China and Israel on the BRI.

of time further intensified the accumulation of debt problems. Some receiving countries, such as Malaysia and Sri Lanka, simply could not absorb the huge amount of Chinese loans and investment over a short span of time, which led to debt problems.

Conclusion: The Future of the BRI

China's interactions with recipient countries and its response to critical opinions have a significant impact on the future advancement of the BRI. The accusation of debt-trap diplomacy, although it is not based on solid proof, has contributed to serious concerns over debt sustainability in BRI countries around the world. China has denied that it has ever intentionally set a debt trap in any of the BRI countries, and there is no evidence to prove it did so. The Sri Lanka case study showed that the Chinese did not use debt-trap diplomacy to get control of Hambantota Port.

However, debt sustainability remains a crucial problem in China's investment on BRI projects. The debt problem exists widely in developing countries in their endeavour for stable and sustainable economic growth. The huge amount of Chinese investment in a short period of time did increase the risk for debt distress in some of the BRI countries, including, but not limited to, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Cambodia, Bangladesh, Nepal, Indonesia, the Maldives, Pakistan, Ethiopia and Kenya, where China invested a lot under the BRI. These countries generally do not have many options when provided with a large sum of Chinese capital as their governments have long been preoccupied by serious economic, political, social and environmental problems. If China failed to pay enough attention to the problem of debt sustainability when investing in large projects, its huge amount of investment could push these countries closer to the brink of debt crisis.

China has realized the importance of debt sustainability and responded with measures to improve it in receiving countries. As one of the key measures to mitigate the debt risks, the MoF, based on the analysis by the IMF and the World Bank on the debt sustainability of low-income economies, has worked on developing the Debt Sustainability

Framework for Participating Countries of the BRI since 2017 and eventually released it in April 2019. Together with the cooperation of its counterparts from 28 partner countries, China tried to improve the quality of decision making concerning investment and financing, as well as debt management for a high-quality, high-standard and sustainable system for financing. The MoF led the establishment of the Multilateral Cooperation Center for Development Financing as well, together with eight multilateral development banks and financial institutions. As a coordination mechanism, the centre is expected to improve project financing through information sharing, project preparation and capacity building.

Seen from a domestic perspective, China's financial sustainability for the BRI has emerged as the fundamental concern among all the problems and risks facing the BRI. Apparently, the model of Chinese investment in the BRI projects, which relies heavily on government financing, faces great challenges in keeping the initiative financially sustainable. Among these challenges, the low economic efficiency and debt risks facing Chinese SOEs and state-owned banks that invested heavily in the BRI countries posed potentially the greatest risk to financial sustainability. If things continue this way, low economic efficiency would hurt China's capacity for BRI financing, which is highly dependent on loans from CDB and Exim Bank of China, as well as other state-owned commercial banks. China's foreign reserves are important sources of capital in the CDB and Exim Bank, and the decline of foreign reserves in recent years indicates the unsustainability facing the current model of BRI financing.

Domestic constraints on financing and investment, together with criticisms on debt sustainability from both outside and within China, will push China to seek cooperation with foreign companies, international organizations and foreign capital and substantial support from multilateral financial institutions to sustain BRI projects in the coming years. This has the potential to create win-win cooperation on the BRI between China and other developed economies.

Diversifying the means of BRI financing for stable and sustainable financing arrangements has been under way in recent years. China's capital market has provided about \$71.4 billion for enterprises via equity financing, and panda bonds in China's capital market issued by

countries and enterprises along the belt and road amount to \$9.3 billion (Yi 2019). But still, the majority of BRI financing is provided by China's state-owned policy and commercial banks.

The ever-expanding themes for the BRI have already attracted strong suspicion from the United States and most of its major Western allies on China's geopolitical and geo-economical strategy to reshape the world economic and political order. China continues to deny that its geopolitical strategy is to overthrow the existing global economic and political order. The advancement of the BRI, with its huge investment, however, will certainly allow China to have profound impacts on the current global economic order by setting the rules and standards in infrastructure and many other sectors and providing public goods to countries along the belt and road.

Furthermore, defining the BRI as the road map for building a community of shared future for mankind, Xi's idea on global governance, has strengthened this suspicion instead of easing it. In any case, the BRI represents an alternative model for development across the world, a path of state-driven investment and development. The BRI constitutes China's idea and practices to promote world economic growth through state-dominated investment on infrastructure connectivity and trade promotion, which is different from the Western or American way of liberal democracy and free market economy. In the eyes of the Western established powers, the state-driven model of development China provided to advance economic growth in emerging markets and underdeveloped economies should be scrutinized carefully for its potential risks and problems.

The real challenge to China's measures to improve debt sustainability lies in whether China would make the BRI a true multilateral arrangement. China has opaquely been advocating the principle of achieving shared growth through discussion and collaboration on China's investment in BRI projects. Basically, the principle means China would welcome the involvement of multilateral institutions and other relevant countries and would share the decision making with them through discussion and reaching consensus. But China would not cede control of the final say to multilateral institutions or receiving countries on decision making in terms of BRI projects. In China's view, the BRI is a China-dominated multilateral network that is based on

bilateral cooperation between China and other receiving countries. In this respect, the best-case scenario would be the AIIB, which provided a good example of China's cooperation with international organizations and other countries in financing the BRI projects. China initiated the AIIB and has remained the largest donor; the AIIB has developed a good reputation as a high-standard multilateral development institution.

The BRI is, however, not the AIIB. Whether China's measures to mitigate the debt distress and improve debt sustainability on the BRI projects would make any differences remains to be seen. The key issue is how much China can change its state-driven model of investment in the BRI — i.e., how serious are the promises by China on mitigating debt distress and improving debt sustainability for BRI projects, and perhaps most importantly, how could these promises be implemented in practice. What is certain is that it is not going to be a smooth process, given many the political considerations in the BRI and the soft budget constraints and the guaranteed government bail-out for Chinese SOEs and state-owned banks. These factors could create insurmountable difficulties for efforts to improve the financial sustainability of China's BRI investment and debt sustainability in receiving countries.

Works Cited

- AEI and Heritage Foundation. 2019. "China Global Investment Tracker." www.aei.org/china-global-investment-tracker/.
- AIIB. 2019. *Asian Infrastructure Finance Report 2019: Bridging Borders: Infrastructure to Connect Asia and Beyond*.
- Balhuizen, Arnoud. 2017. "China's Belt and Road Initiative, episode two: A vision encased in steel." BHP. September 26. www.bhp.com/media-and-insights/prospects/2017/09/belt-and-road-initiative.
- Bank of China. 2018. *2018 Annual Report*. <http://pic.bankofchina.com/bocappd/report/201903/P020190329601110675116.pdf>.
- Belt and Road Portal. 2019. "已同中国签订共建‘一带一路’合作文件的国家一览" [List of countries that signed cooperation documents with China on the BRI]. www.yidaiyilu.gov.cn/xwzx/roll/77298.htm.
- Brautigam, Deborah. 2019. "Is China the World's Loan Shark?" *The New York Times*, April 29. cn.nytimes.com/opinion/20190429/china-belt-road-initiative/dual/.
- CDB. 2017. *2017 Annual Report*.
- . 2018. *2018 Annual Report*.
- Central Bank of Sri Lanka. 2017. *Annual Report 2017*. www.cbsl.gov.lk/en/publications/economic-and-financial-reports/annual-reports/annual-report-2017.
- . 2018. *Annual Report 2018*. www.cbsl.gov.lk/en/publications/economic-and-financial-reports/annual-reports/annual-report-2018.
- Chellaney, Brahma. 2017. "China's debt-trap diplomacy." *Project Syndicate*, January 23. www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/china-one-belt-one-road-loans-debt-by-brahma-chellaney-2017-01?barrier=accesspaylog.
- Dai, Chunchen and Ruomeng Chen. 2018. "广东省财政厅负责人: 创新财政支持方式, 鼓励企业双向投资" [Department of Finance of Guangdong Province: Using creative fiscal ways to encourage enterprises making two-way investment]. *21世纪经济报道* [21st Century Business Herald], February 8.
- Daily FT. 2018. "No debt trap; China says its loans are 10.6% of SL's total and over 60% concessionary." *Daily FT*, July 6. www.ft.lk/front-page/No-debt-trap--China-says-its-loans-are-10-6--of-SL-s-total-and-over-60--concessionary/44-658460.
- Dong, Xin. 2019. "'一带一路' 沿线项目央企承担3120个" [Central SOEs undertook 3120 projects along the BRI]. *北京青年报* [Beijing Youth Daily], April 25.
- Ferchen, Matt. 2018. "China, Venezuela, and the illusion of debt-trap diplomacy." Carnegie-Tsinghua Center for Global Policy. carnegietsinghua.org/2018/08/16/china-venezuela-and-illusion-of-debt-trap-diplomacy-pub-77089.
- Han, Jie and Xin Wen. 2018. "金立群: 亚投行积极支持‘一带一路’倡议 已批准投资超53亿美元" [Jin Liqun: AIIB has approved more than \$5.3 billion to support the BRI]. *新华网* [Xinhuanet], July 2. www.xinhuanet.com/fortune/2018-07/02/c_1123066145.htm.
- Huang, Yong. 2019. "数字丝绸之路建设成为亮点" [The digital silk road initiative becomes a new bright spot] 人民日报-人民网 [People's Daily-people.cn], April 22. finance.people.com.cn/n1/2019/0422/c1004-31041928.html.
- Hurley, John, Scott Morris and Gailyn Portelance. 2018. "Examining the debt implications of the Belt and Road Initiative from a policy perspective." *Center for Global Development*. www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/examining-debt-implications-belt-and-road-initiative-policy-perspective.pdf.
- ICBC. 2017. *2017 Annual Report*. www.icbc-ltd.com/icbcltd/investor%20relations/financial%20information/financial%20reports/2017annualreport20180423.htm.

- . 2018. *2018 Annual Report*. www.icbc-ltd.com/icbc-ltd/investor%20relations/financial%20information/financial%20reports/2018annualreport.htm.
- IMF. 2018. “Sri Lanka: 2018 Article IV Consultation and Fourth Review under the Extended Arrangement under the Extended Fund Facility — Press Release; Staff Report; and Statement by the Executive Director for Sri Lanka.” IMF Country Report. No. 18/175. www.imf.org/~media/Files/Publications/CR/2018/cr18175.ashx.
- Jin, Zhongxia. 2012. “中国版马歇尔计划—探讨中国对外基础设施投资战略” [Chinese version of Marshall Plan: An exploration of China’s outward investment strategy on infrastructure]. *国际经济评论* [International Economic Review], no. 11.
- Kee, Koh King. 2019. “An ungrounded accusation: The real story of China’s involvement in Sri Lanka’s Hambantota Port.” *Beijing Review*, no. 34. August 23.
- Lin, Yifu. 2012. “以‘新马歇尔计划’带动全经济复兴” [A new Marshall Plan-driven global economic recovery]. *文汇报* [Wenhui Bao], October 16. www.yicai.com/news/2159058.html.
- Liu, Yiqian. 2019. “钢铁十年振兴: 迎来柳暗花明后仍需破浪前行破浪前行” [Revival of the steel sector over ten years: Great efforts still needed for moving forward]. *中国产经新闻网* [China Industrial Economy Network], March 8. www.cien.com.cn/2019/0308/56216.shtml.
- Ma, Changyan and Yi Zhang. 2019. “央企和民企在一带一路建设中力量有多大? 数据告诉你” [Data tells you how powerful the central SOEs and private enterprises respectively in the BRI]. *经济日报 中国经济网* [Economic Daily-www.ce.cn], April 25. www.ce.cn/xwzx/gnsz/gdxw/201904/25/t20190425_31936040.shtml.
- MOFCOM. 2014. *Report on Development of China’s Outward Investment and Economic Cooperation*.
- . 2015. *Report on Development of China’s Outward Investment and Economic Cooperation*.
- . 2016. *Report on Development of China’s Outward Investment and Economic Cooperation*.
- . 2017. *Report on Development of China’s Outward Investment and Economic Cooperation*.
- . 2018. *Report on Development of China’s Outward Investment and Economic Cooperation*.
- MOFCOM, Chinese Embassy in Sri Lanka. 2018. *对外投资合作国别(地区)指南——斯里兰卡(2018版)* [Guide for Countries and Regions on Overseas Investment and Cooperation of the 2018: Sri Lanka].
- NDB. 2018. “NDB’s lending commitment in 2018 increased by 167%, bringing aggregate approval volume to USD 8 billion.” Press release, December 29. www.ndb.int/press_release/ndbs-lending-commitment-2018-increased-167-bringing-aggregate-approval-volume-usd-8-billion/.
- NDRC. 2015. *Vision and Actions on Jointly Building Silk Road Economic Belt and 21st-Century Maritime Silk Road*. Beijing, China: Foreign languages Press.
- . 2016. *The 13th Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development of the People’s Republic of China (2016–2020)*. Translated by Compilation and Translation Bureau, Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Beijing, China.
- PBoC. 2019. “通过第三方合作实现‘1+1+1>3’” [The third-party cooperation for “1+1+1>3”]. www.pbc.gov.cn/goutongjiaoliu/113456/113469/3815484/index.html.
- People’s Daily. 2014. “把祖国的新疆建设得越来越美好——习近平总书记新疆考察纪实” [General Secretary Xi Jinping’s visit to Xinjiang]. People’s Daily, May 4. <http://cpc.people.com.cn/n/2014/0504/c64094-24968577.html>.
- Ray, Rebecca and Kehan Wang. 2019. “China-Latin America Economic Bulletin, 2019 Edition.” Global Development Policy Center. www.bu.edu/gdp/files/2019/02/GCI-Bulletin-Final-2019-1-1.pdf.
- State Council. 2017. *关于进一步引导和规范境外投资方向指导意见的通知* [Notice on Further Directing and Regulating the Direction of Overseas Investments]. www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2017-08/18/content_5218665.htm.
- State Council Information Office. 2017. “国新办举行中央企业参与‘一带一路’共建情况发布会图文实录” [Transcript of the press conference held by the State Council Information Office on the central SOEs participation in the BRI]. www.scio.gov.cn/xwfbh/xwfbfh/wqfbh/35861/36605/wz36607/Document/1550762/1550762.htm?flag=1.

- . 2018. “国新办举行共建‘一带一路’5年进展情况及展望发布会图文实录 [Transcript of the press conference held by the State Council Information Office on the progress and outlook of the 5-five BRI anniversary]. www.scio.gov.cn/xwfbh/xwbfhbh/wqfbh/37601/38866/wz38868/Document/1636162/1636162.htm.
- Takungpao. 2014. “政治局常委听取新疆工作汇报习近平作指示” [Members of PBSC debriefed on Xinjiang issue and Xi Jinping gave instructions]. <http://news.takungpao.com/mainland/focus/2014-01/2159498.html>.
- Wang, Jisi. 2012. “‘西进’：中国地缘战略的再平衡” [‘March westward’: the rebalance of China’s geostrategy]. *国际战略研究简报* [International and Strategic Studies Report], no. 73.
- Wang, Shifeng. 2017. “‘一带一路’沿线中国钢材出口：越南居首，出口印度阻力大” [China’s steel exports to the BRI countries: Leads by Vietnam and drops in India]. *第一财经* [China Business Network], April 25. www.yicai.com/news/5272914.html.
- Wang, Wenbo. 2019. “央企‘三个共赢’助力‘一带一路’建设持续深化” [Central SOEs’ three ‘win-wins’ helped a further development of the BRI]. *经济参考报* [Economic Information Daily], April 30. www.sasac.gov.cn/n2588025/n2588139/c11145195/content.html.
- Xi, Jinping. 2017a. “Speech at the opening ceremony of the Belt and Road Forum for International Cooperation.” *Xinhua*, May 14. www.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-05/14/c_136282982.htm.
- . 2017b. “在中国共产党与世界政党高层对话会上的主旨讲话” [Keynote speech at the dialogue between the Communist Party of China and leaders of parties in the world]. *新华网* [Xinhuanet], December 1. www.xinhuanet.com/politics/leaders/2017-12/01/c_1122045658.htm.
- Xinhua. 2012. “中央经济工作会议举行” [The Central Economic Work Conference was held]. *Xinhua*, December 16. www.xinhuanet.com/politics/2012-12/16/c_114044452.htm.
- . 2013a. “俞正声在新疆干部大会上传达中共中央政治局常委会会议精神” [Yu Zhengsheng communicates the spirit of the PBSC meeting at the conference of Xinjiang cadres]. *Xinhua*, June 29. www.xinhuanet.com/politics/2013-06/29/c_116339959.htm.
- . 2013b. “中共中央关于全面深化改革若干重大问题的决定” [Decision of Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Major Issues Concerning Comprehensively Deepening Reforms]. *Xinhua*, November 15. www.gov.cn/jrzq/2013-11/15/content_2528179.htm.
- . 2014. “习近平：加快推进丝绸之路经济带和21世纪海上丝绸之路建设” [Xi Jinping: Accelerating the development of the Silk Road Economic Belt and 21st-Century Maritime Silk Road]. *Xinhua*, November 6. www.xinhuanet.com/politics/2014-11/06/c_1113146840.htm.
- . 2018. “习近平：推动共建‘一带一路’走深走实造福人民” [Xi Jinping: Promoting an in-depth and pragmatic development of the BRI to benefit people]. August 27. www.xinhuanet.com/politics/leaders/2018-08/27/c_1123336562.htm.
- Xu, Shanda. 2009. “中国版马歇尔计划需要5000亿美元外储支持” [Chinese version of Marshall Plan needs US\$500 billion of foreign reserves to support]. *每日经济新闻* [National Business Daily], August 6. www.nbd.com.cn/articles/2009-08-06/233434.html.
- Yi, Gang. 2019. “深化投融资合作 推动共建设一带一路高质量发展” [Deepening cooperation on investment and financing to promote a high-quality development for the BRI]. *上海证券报·中国证券网* [Shanghai Securities News-cnstock.com], April 25. <http://news.cnstock.com/news/bwqx-201904-4368266.htm>.
- Yuan, Shimeng. 2019. “央企‘一带一路’履责情况分析” [An analysis on the central SOEs performance in the BRI]. *国资报告* [State-Owned Assets Report], No. 2.
- Zhou, Laura. 2019. “Sri Lanka rejects fears of China’s ‘debt-trap diplomacy’ in belt and road projects.” *South China Morning Post*, April 22. www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy/article/3007175/sri-lanka-rejects-fears-chinas-debt-trap-diplomacy-belt-and.

**Centre for International
Governance Innovation**

67 Erb Street West
Waterloo, ON, Canada N2L 6C2
www.cigionline.org

 @cigionline

