1 “Net totals of the revenues and expenditures” are the ordinary net account totals of 3,081 organizations (47 prefectures, 1,718 municipalities, 23 special wards, 1,227 partial administrative associations and 113 wide-area local public bodies).

2 Figures for each item that are less than the given unit are rounded off. Therefore, they do not necessarily add up exactly to the total.

3 In FY2011, the revenues and expenditures of ordinary accounts were divided into the regular portion (Overall settlement figures less the Great East Japan Earthquake portion) and the Great East Japan Earthquake portion (Covering the revenues and expenditures related to recovery and reconstruction work and nationwide disaster prevention work).
Prefectures and municipalities (cities, towns, and villages) are the central actors in various areas of public services, including school education, public welfare and health, police and fire services, and public works such as roads and sewage systems, thereby fulfilling a major role in the lives of the citizens of the nation. This brochure describes the status of local public finance (which comprises collectively the finances of individual local governments), the state of settlements for FY2014, and the initiatives of local governments towards sound public finances (mainly the status of the ratios for measuring their financial soundness), with particular attention given to ordinary accounts (Public enterprises, such as water supply, transportation, and hospitals are described in the section on Local Public Enterprises).

### Classification of the Accounts of Local Governments Applied in the Settlement Account Statistics

The accounts of local governments are divided into the general accounts and the special accounts, but classification of these accounts varies between local governments. Therefore, the accounts are classified in a standardized manner into ordinary accounts, which cover the general administrative sector, and other accounts (public business accounts). This makes it possible to clarify the financial condition of local governments as a whole and to make a statistical comparison between local governments.

#### Local Government Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinary accounts</th>
<th>General administrative sector accounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="school.png" alt="School" /></td>
<td><img src="wheelchair.png" alt="Wheelchair" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="traffic_light.png" alt="Traffic Light" /></td>
<td><img src="fire_engine.png" alt="Fire Engine" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other accounts (Public business accounts)</th>
<th>Public enterprise accounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="nhi.png" alt="National Health Insurance" /></td>
<td>Water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="ltemc.png" alt="Latter-stage Elderly Medical Care" /></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="nci.png" alt="Nursing Care Insurance" /></td>
<td>Electrical power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>Residential land development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How large is local public finance?

The ratio of expenditure by local governments in gross domestic product (expenditure) is 11.9%, about 2.5 times that of the central government.

Gross Domestic Product (Expenditure) and Local Public Finance (FY2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (expenditure, at current prices)</td>
<td>¥489,623.4 billion</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government</td>
<td>¥43,827.9 billion</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governments</td>
<td>¥58,098.3 billion</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security funds</td>
<td>¥22,790.7 billion</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate sector</td>
<td>¥73,280.0 billion</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household sector</td>
<td>¥302,971.5 billion</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government sector</td>
<td>¥376,251.5 billion</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net export of goods and services</td>
<td>¥11,345.0 billion</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How large is local government expenditure in total public expenditure?

Looking at the breakdown of public expenditure classified by final expenditure entity, local government expenditure accounts for 41.1% of Government final consumption expenditure, and 69.8% of Public gross capital formation. As a final expenditure entity, local governments above the central government and play a major role for the national economy.
In which areas is the share of local expenditures high?

The share of local governments’ expenditures is higher in areas that are deeply related to daily life, such as public health and sanitation, school education, police and fire services, and social education.

Share of Expenditures by Purpose of Central and Local Governments (final expenditure based)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation expenses</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School education expenses</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial, police, and fire service expenses, etc.</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social education expenses, etc.</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public welfare expenses (excluding pension expenses)</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land development expenses</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land conservation expenses</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and industrial expenses, etc.</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster recovery expenses, etc.</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt services</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishery expenses</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing expenses, etc.</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onkyu pension expenses</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension expenses (of public welfare expenses)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense expenses</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative expenses, etc.</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Public Finance, 2016 -Illustrated-
1 **Revenues**

¥102,083.5 billion (up ¥983.6 billion, 1.0% year on year)

Regular portion: ¥97,490.4 billion (up ¥1,261.5 billion, 1.3% year on year)

Great East Japan Earthquake portion: ¥4,593.1 billion (down ¥277.8 billion, 5.7% year on year)

Revenues in the regular portion increased despite a decrease in National treasury disbursements, as general revenue resources were boosted by the increase in Local taxes caused by the raise in Two corporate taxes and Local consumption tax, and the increase in Local transfer taxes caused by the raise in Local corporation special transfer tax.

The decrease in revenues in the Great East Japan Earthquake portion resulted from a decrease in National treasury disbursements (Disaster recovery project expenses disbursements), etc.

2 **Expenditures**

¥98,522.8 billion (up ¥1,110.8 billion, 1.1% year on year)

Regular portion: ¥94,511.2 billion (up ¥1,344.7 billion, 1.4% year on year)

Great East Japan Earthquake portion: ¥4,011.6 billion (down ¥233.9 billion, 5.5% year on year)

The increase of expenditures in the regular portion resulted from an increase of Social assistance expenses, Ordinary construction work expenses, etc.

The decrease in expenditures in the Great East Japan Earthquake portion resulted from a decrease in Goods expenses (expenses related to disaster waste disposal), etc.

3 **Revenue and Expenditure Settlement**

The real balance showed a surplus of ¥1,838.3 billion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Settlement Period</th>
<th>No. of local governments with a deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>FY2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real balance</td>
<td>¥1,838.3 billion</td>
<td>¥1,957.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single year balance</td>
<td>¥119.8 billion</td>
<td>¥190.9 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real single year balance</td>
<td>¥231.9 billion</td>
<td>¥763.7 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Real balance refers to the amount calculated by subtracting the revenue resources that should be carried over to the next fiscal year from the income expenditure balance. Single year balance refers to the amount calculated by subtracting the real balance of the previous fiscal year from the real balance of the relevant fiscal year. Real single year balance refers to the amount calculated by adding reserves and advanced redemption of local loans for the public finance adjustment fund to the single year balance and subtracting public finance adjustment fund reversals.
**4. Trend in Scale of Account Settlement**

Both revenues and expenditures of the regular portion have increased for two consecutive years.

**5. Major Financial Indices**

Ordinary balance ratio rose 0.5 percentage points year on year, to 92.1%.
Real debt service ratio declined 0.5 percentage points, to 10.4%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary balance ratio</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real debt service ratio</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>▲0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6. Outstanding Borrowing Borne by Ordinary Accounts**

Outstanding borrowing, which includes outstanding local government borrowing as well as borrowing from the special accounts for Local allocation tax and Outstanding public enterprise bonds (borne by ordinary accounts), amounted to ¥200,525.9 billion (down ¥835.8 billion, 0.4% year on year).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>Change amount</th>
<th>Change rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding local government bonds</td>
<td>¥145,984.1 billion</td>
<td>¥145,918.9 billion</td>
<td>¥65.2 billion</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding local government bonds (excluding Bonds for the extraordinary financial measures)</td>
<td>¥97,500.1 billion</td>
<td>¥100,955.4 billion</td>
<td>▲¥3,455.3 billion</td>
<td>▲3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding borrowing from the special accounts for Local allocation tax</td>
<td>¥33,117.3 billion</td>
<td>¥33,317.3 billion</td>
<td>▲¥200.0 billion</td>
<td>▲0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding public enterprise bonds (borne by ordinary accounts)</td>
<td>¥21,424.5 billion</td>
<td>¥22,125.5 billion</td>
<td>▲¥701.0 billion</td>
<td>▲3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>¥200,525.9 billion</td>
<td>¥201,361.7 billion</td>
<td>▲¥835.8 billion</td>
<td>▲0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Outstanding public enterprise bonds (borne by ordinary accounts) are estimates based on settlement account statistics.
What are the revenue sources for local governments’ activities?

Revenue Breakdown

The revenue of local governments consists mainly of Local taxes, Local allocation tax, National treasury disbursements, and Local bonds, in order of share size. Among them, revenue resources which can be spent for any purpose, such as Local taxes and Local allocation tax, are called General revenue resources. It is important for local governments to ensure sufficient General revenue resources in order to handle various administrative needs properly. In FY2014, General revenue resources accounted for 56.1%.

Composition of Revenues (FY2014 settlement)

- **General revenue resources**: ¥57,272.9 billion (56.1%)
  - Local taxes: ¥36,785.5 billion (36.0%)
  - Local transfer tax: ¥2,396.9 billion (2.9%)
  - Special local grants: ¥119.2 billion (0.1%)
  - Local allocation tax: ¥17,431.4 billion (17.1%)

- **Local bonds**: ¥11,518.5 billion (11.3%)
  - Bonds for the extraordinary financial measures: ¥5,464.7 billion (5.4%)

- **National treasury disbursements**: ¥15,518.9 billion (15.2%)
  - Special grants to measures for traffic safety: ¥1,341.4 billion (1.3%)
  - Grants to cities, towns and villages where national institutions are located: ¥14,177.5 billion (14.1%)

- **Other revenue resources**: ¥17,773.2 billion (17.4%)
  - Local transfer tax: ¥2,936.9 billion (2.9%)
  - Special local grants: ¥119.2 billion (0.1%)
  - Local allocation tax: ¥17,431.4 billion (17.1%)
  - General revenue resources: ¥57,272.9 billion (56.1%)

Note: "National treasury disbursements" includes "special grants to measures for traffic safety" and "grants to cities, towns and villages where national institutions are located."
Revenues in Regular Portion and Great East Japan Earthquake Portion

**Net Total**

- **Other revenue resources** ¥15,822.0 billion (16.3%)
  - National treasury disbursements ¥13,758.0 billion (14.1%)
    - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥1,457.0 billion (1.5%)
    - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥178.1 billion (0.2%)
  - Local bonds ¥11,232.9 billion (11.5%)
  - General revenue resources ¥56,677.5 billion (58.1%)

- **Great East Japan Earthquake portion** ¥4,593.1 billion
  - National treasury disbursements ¥7,103.9 billion (15.1%)
    - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥1,431.9 billion (4.0%)
    - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥260.7 billion (6.3%)
    - Of this amount, grants to measures for earthquake disaster reconstruction were ¥309.9 billion (11.8%)
  - Local bonds ¥285.5 billion (6.2%)
  - General revenue resources ¥8,593.2 billion (16.3%)
    - Of this amount, earthquake disaster reconstruction allocation tax was ¥514.4 billion (11.2%)
  - Other revenue resources ¥15,822.0 billion (33.7%)

**Regular portion** ¥97,490.4 billion

- **National treasury disbursements** ¥1,703.9 billion (37.1%)
  - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥979.0 billion (5.6%)
  - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥128.4 billion (0.7%)
- **Local bonds** ¥28,947.8 billion (58.9%)
  - Of this amount, earthquake disaster reconstruction allocation tax was ¥274.1 billion (10.7%)
- **Other revenue resources** ¥2,008.3 billion (43.7%)

**Great East Japan Earthquake portion** ¥2,567.9 billion

- **National treasury disbursements** ¥5,505.2 billion (11.2%)
  - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥478.0 billion (0.9%)
  - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥49.7 billion (0.1%)
- **Local bonds** ¥6,080.9 billion (12.4%)
  - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥128.4 billion (0.2%)
- **General revenue resources** ¥8,593.2 billion (16.3%)
  - Of this amount, earthquake disaster reconstruction allocation tax was ¥274.1 billion (10.7%)
- **Other revenue resources** ¥15,822.0 billion (33.7%)

**Prefectures**

- **Other revenue resources** ¥6,593.2 billion (17.5%)
  - National treasury disbursements ¥5,505.2 billion (11.2%)
    - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥933.9 billion (1.9%)
    - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥128.4 billion (0.3%)
  - Local bonds ¥6,080.9 billion (12.4%)
  - General revenue resources ¥29,047.9 billion (58.9%)

**Great East Japan Earthquake portion** ¥2,567.9 billion

- **National treasury disbursements** ¥890.9 billion (34.7%)
  - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥53.3 billion (2.1%)
  - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥237.0 billion (9.2%)
  - Of this amount, grants to measures for earthquake disaster reconstruction were ¥73.3 billion (2.9%)
- **Local bonds** ¥6,080.9 billion (12.4%)
- **General revenue resources** ¥308.9 billion (12.0%)
  - Of this amount, earthquake disaster reconstruction allocation tax was ¥240.3 billion (11.2%)
- **Other revenue resources** ¥790.1 billion (50.9%)

**Regular portion** ¥49,127.1 billion

- **National treasury disbursements** ¥813.0 billion (32.3%)
  - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥130.0 billion (5.2%)
  - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥53.7 billion (2.1%)
  - Of this amount, grants to measures for earthquake disaster reconstruction were ¥466.6 billion (18.5%)
- **Local bonds** ¥785.5 billion (2.4%)
- **General revenue resources** ¥286.6 billion (12.0%)
  - Of this amount, earthquake disaster reconstruction allocation tax was ¥240.3 billion (11.2%)
- **Other revenue resources** ¥1,305.4 billion (50.9%)

**Municipalities**

- **Other revenue resources** ¥9,107.8 billion (16.4%)
  - National treasury disbursements ¥8,252.7 billion (14.8%)
    - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥978.0 billion (0.9%)
    - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥48.7 billion (0.1%)
  - Local bonds ¥5,173.9 billion (9.3%)
  - Prefectural disbursements ¥3,313.1 billion (6.0%)
  - General revenue resources ¥29,766.3 billion (53.5%)

**Great East Japan Earthquake portion** ¥2,516.7 billion

- **National treasury disbursements** ¥131.0 billion (32.3%)
  - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥130.0 billion (5.2%)
  - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥53.7 billion (2.1%)
  - Of this amount, grants to measures for earthquake disaster reconstruction were ¥466.6 billion (18.5%)
- **Local bonds** ¥242.1 billion (16.0%)
- **Prefectural disbursements** ¥402.1 billion (16.0%)
- **General revenue resources** ¥286.6 billion (11.4%)
  - Of this amount, earthquake disaster reconstruction allocation tax was ¥240.3 billion (9.5%)
- **Other revenue resources** ¥790.1 billion (31.4%)

**Regular portion** ¥55,613.8 billion

- **National treasury disbursements** ¥13,758.0 billion (14.1%)
  - Of this amount, ordinary construction expenses were ¥1,457.0 billion (1.5%)
  - Of this amount, recovery and reconstruction expenses were ¥178.1 billion (0.2%)
- **Local bonds** ¥11,232.9 billion (11.5%)
- **General revenue resources** ¥56,677.5 billion (58.1%)
  - Of this amount, earthquake disaster reconstruction allocation tax was ¥514.4 billion (11.2%)
- **Other revenue resources** ¥15,822.0 billion (33.7%)
3 Revenue Trends

The ratio of general revenue resources turned upward in FY2010, but declined again in FY2012. There was a year on year increase in FY2014.
4 Ratio of National Taxes and Local Taxes

The total of taxes collected as national and local taxes amounted to ¥94,634.7 billion. Of this amount, national and local taxes accounted for 61.1% and 38.9% respectively.

5 Local Taxes

Local taxes consist of prefectural taxes and municipal taxes.

Composition of Revenue from Prefectural Taxes (FY2014 settlement)

- Automobile acquisition tax ¥86.3 billion (0.6%)
- Prefectural tobacco tax ¥155.3 billion (1.0%)
- Real estate acquisition tax ¥371.7 billion (2.4%)
- Light oil delivery tax ¥935.6 billion (6.0%)
- Automobile tax ¥1,556.2 billion (9.9%)
- Local consumption tax ¥3,106.4 billion (19.8%)
- Other taxes ¥91.4 billion (0.5%)
- Prefectural inhabitant tax ¥6,177.4 billion (39.4%)
- On interest paid ¥112.4 billion (0.7%)
- Individual ¥9,104.4 billion (32.5%)
- Corporate ¥962.6 billion (3.1%)
- Enterprise tax ¥3,203.2 billion (20.4%)
- Corporate ¥3,016.8 billion (19.2%)
- Individual ¥186.4 billion (1.2%)

Composition of Revenue from Municipal Taxes (FY2014 settlement)

- Other taxes ¥579.9 billion (2.7%)
- Municipal tobacco tax ¥950.2 billion (4.5%)
- City planning tax ¥1,243.9 billion (5.9%)
- Fixed asset tax ¥8,768.6 billion (41.6%)
- Municipal inhabitant tax ¥9,559.4 billion (45.3%)
- Individual ¥7,114.3 billion (33.7%)
- Corporate ¥2,445.1 billion (11.6%)
Prefectural tax revenues had been on a downward trend since FY2008, but have increased for three consecutive years since they turned upward in FY2012.

Municipal tax revenues had remained at almost the same level since FY2009, but increased 2.4% year on year in FY2014.
In order for local governments to provide public services in response to local needs on their own responsibility and at their own discretion, it is necessary to build a less imbalanced and stable local tax system. Comparing local tax revenue amounts, with the national average set at 100, Tokyo, the highest, was approximately 2.6 times the amount for Okinawa Prefecture, which was the lowest.

### Index of Per Capita Revenue in Local Tax Revenue (with national average as 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local taxes total</th>
<th>Individual inhabitant tax</th>
<th>Two corporate taxes</th>
<th>Local consumption tax (post settlement)</th>
<th>Fixed asset tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¥36.0 trillion</td>
<td>¥11.8 trillion</td>
<td>¥5.8 trillion</td>
<td>¥3.1 trillion</td>
<td>¥8.7 trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max/Min 2.6</td>
<td>Max/Min 2.7</td>
<td>Max/Min 6.1</td>
<td>Max/Min 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkaido</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aomori</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwate</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyagi</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akita</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamagata</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukushima</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibaraki</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokushima</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunma</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitama</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiba</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014 settlement amount</td>
<td>166.5</td>
<td>1129.5</td>
<td>246.0</td>
<td>257.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanagawa</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>129.5</td>
<td>129.7</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niigata</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>105.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyama</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishikawa</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukui</td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>110.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamagashi</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagano</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunma</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shizuoka</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>109.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aichi</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>116.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mie</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiga</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>105.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niigata</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakayama</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottori</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimine</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okazaki</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshima</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamaguchi</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokushima</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagawa</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehime</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kochi</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saga</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagasaki</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumamoto</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oita</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyazaki</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagoshima</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. "Max/Min" indicates the value obtained by dividing the maximum value of per-capita tax revenue for each prefecture by the minimum value.
2. Local tax revenue amounts do not include local corporation special transfer taxes and also exclude overassessment and discretionary taxes, etc.
3. Individual inhabitant tax revenue is the total of the prefectural individual inhabitant tax (on a per-capita basis and an income basis) and the municipal individual inhabitant tax (on a per-capita basis and an income basis), and excludes overassessment.
4. Revenue from the two corporate taxes is the total of the corporate prefectural inhabitant tax, the corporate municipal inhabitant tax, and the corporate business tax, and excludes overassessment.
5. Calculations were made in accordance with the basic resident register population as of January 1, 2015.
From the perspective of local autonomy, it would be the ideal for each local government to ensure the revenue sources necessary for their activities through Local tax revenue collected from their residents. However, there are regional imbalances in tax sources, and many local governments are unable to acquire the necessary tax revenue. Accordingly, the central government collects revenue resources that would essentially be attributable to Local tax revenue and reallocates them as Local allocation tax to local governments that have weaker financial capabilities.

1. Determining the total amount of Local allocation tax

The total amount of the Local allocation tax is determined in accordance with estimates of standard revenue and expenditures in local public finance as a whole, based on a fixed percentage for national taxes (in FY2014 32% for Income tax and Liquor tax, 34% for Corporate tax, 22.3% for Consumption tax, 25% for Tobacco tax, and the total amount of Local corporate tax).

The total amount of the Local allocation tax in FY2014 was ¥17,431.4 billion, down 0.9% year on year.

2. How regular Local allocation taxes are calculated for each local government

The Regular local allocation tax for each local government is calculated through the following mechanism.

\[
\text{Regular allocation tax amount} = \left( \left( \frac{\text{standard financial requirements}}{\text{standard financial revenues}} \times \text{calculation rate (75%)} + \text{local transfer tax, etc.} \right) \times \text{correction coefficient} \right) \times \text{measurement unit (national census population, etc.)} \times \text{unit cost (gradated correction, etc.)}
\]

Notes: 1. Standard financial requirements are figured out based on the rational and appropriate service standards for each local government. For this reason, the local share of the services, such as compulsory education, benefits for livelihood protection, and public works which are subject to national obligatory share, is mandatorily included. Beginning in FY2001, part of the Standard financial requirements is being transferred to special local bonds (bond for temporary substitution for local allocation tax) as an exception to Article 5 of the Local Finance Law.

2. Normal local tax revenue does not include Non-act-based tax or over-taxation that sets tax rates above the standard tax rate stipulated in the Local Tax Act.

3. Function of the Local allocation tax

The function of the Local allocation tax is to adjust imbalances in revenue resources between local governments and to ensure their financial capacity to provide standard public services and basic infrastructure to residents across the country. The adjustment of revenue resources through Local allocation tax makes the ratios of General revenue resources to the total revenues between local governments practically flat regardless of the size of population.

Note: A “Midsize city” refers to a city with a population of 100,000 or more excluding Government-ordinance-designated cities, Core cities, and Special cities, and a “Small city” refers to a city with a population of less than 100,000.
What are expenses spent on?

1 Expenses Classified by Purpose

Classifying the expenses by purpose demonstrates that much of public money is appropriated for Public welfare expenses, Education expenses, and Debt service. In prefectures, Education expenses, Public welfare expenses, and Debt service have the highest shares in that order. In municipalities, Public welfare expenses, General administrative expenses, and Civil engineering work expenses account for the largest amounts in that order.

Composition of Expenditure Classified by Purpose (FY2014 settlement)

- **Public welfare expenses**: ¥24,450.9 billion (24.8%)
- **Education expenses**: ¥16,658.1 billion (16.9%)
- **Debt service**: ¥13,365.5 billion (13.6%)
- **General administrative expenses**: ¥9,870.0 billion (10.0%)
- **Civil engineering work expenses**: ¥12,050.5 billion (12.2%)
- **Sanitation expenses**: ¥6,143.4 billion (6.2%)
- **Agriculture, forestry and fishery expenses**: ¥3,348.6 billion (3.4%)
- **Other expenses**: ¥7,126.3 billion (7.3%)

Prefectures total: ¥50,215.4 billion

- **Public welfare expenses**: ¥19,809.3 billion (35.3%)
- **Educational expenses**: ¥10,916.9 billion (21.7%)
- **Debt service**: ¥5,925.6 billion (11.0%)
- **Civil engineering work expenses**: ¥6,708.2 billion (12.0%)
- **Sanitation expenses**: ¥4,654.5 billion (8.3%)
- **Commerce and industry expenses**: ¥3,738.0 billion (7.4%)
- **General administrative expenses**: ¥6,962.8 billion (13.4%)
- **Other expenses**: ¥3,007.2 billion (6.0%)

Local Public Finance, 2016 –Illustrated–

Local Public Finance, 2016 –Illustrated–

Local Public Finance, 2016 –Illustrated–
Expenditures in Regular Portion and Great East Japan Earthquake Portion (Expenses Classified by Purpose)

**Net total**

- **Recovery and reconstruction expenses**: ¥315.2 billion (0.3%)
- **Agriculture, forestry and fisheries expenses**: ¥3,152 billion (3.3%)
- **Sanitation expenses**: ¥6,060.8 billion (6.4%)
- **Commerce and industry expenses**: ¥5,134.6 billion (5.4%)
- **General administrative expenses**: ¥8,862.1 billion (9.4%)
- **Public welfare expenses**: ¥16,308.5 billion (17.3%)
- **Debt service**: ¥13,359.1 billion (14.1%)
- **Civil engineering work expenses**: ¥11,197.1 billion (11.8%)

**Prefectures**

- **Recovery and reconstruction expenses**: ¥196.5 billion (0.4%)
- **Agriculture, forestry and fisheries expenses**: ¥2,286.9 billion (4.8%)
- **Sanitation expenses**: ¥1,605.1 billion (3.3%)
- **Commerce and industry expenses**: ¥3,372.3 billion (7.0%)
- **General administrative expenses**: ¥3,089.8 billion (6.4%)
- **Public welfare expenses**: ¥7,064.9 billion (14.7%)
- **Educational expenses**: ¥10,869.9 billion (22.7%)
- **Debt service**: ¥7,484.3 billion (15.6%)
- **Civil engineering work expenses**: ¥5,238.2 billion (10.9%)

**Municipalities**

- **Recovery and reconstruction expenses**: ¥159.9 billion (0.3%)
- **Agriculture, forestry and fisheries expenses**: ¥1,228.5 billion (3.3%)
- **Sanitation expenses**: ¥4,666.2 billion (8.0%)
- **Commerce and industry expenses**: ¥1,794.7 billion (3.3%)
- **General administrative expenses**: ¥6,330.8 billion (11.8%)
- **Public welfare expenses**: ¥19,451.8 billion (36.2%)
- **Educational expenses**: ¥5,518.8 billion (10.3%)
- **Debt service**: ¥5,910.5 billion (11.0%)
- **Civil engineering work expenses**: ¥6,134.2 billion (11.4%)
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3 Breakdown of Expenses Classified by Purpose

While Civil engineering work expenses and Agriculture, forestry and fishery expenses were on a downward trend, Public welfare expenses significantly rose.

Trends in Expenditures Classified by Purpose (Net total)

Trends in Breakdown of Public Welfare Expenses by Purpose

Indices use FY2004 as base year of 100
Expenditures

Breakdown of Public Welfare Expenses by Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Prefectures</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¥24,450.9 billion</td>
<td>¥7,601.8 billion</td>
<td>¥19,809.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥555.5 billion (2.3%)</td>
<td>¥520.0 billion (6.8%)</td>
<td>¥351.7 billion (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥4,015.8 billion (16.4%)</td>
<td>¥721.7 billion (9.6%)</td>
<td>¥3,798.5 billion (19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥7,745.1 billion (31.7%)</td>
<td>¥1,547.1 billion (20.4%)</td>
<td>¥7,072.8 billion (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥5,903.3 billion (24.1%)</td>
<td>¥2,931.5 billion (38.6%)</td>
<td>¥3,604.8 billion (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥6,231.2 billion (25.5%)</td>
<td>¥2,331.6 billion (30.7%)</td>
<td>¥4,981.5 billion (25.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of Educational Expenses by Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Prefectures</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¥16,658.1 billion</td>
<td>¥10,916.9 billion</td>
<td>¥5,830.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥1,311.4 billion (7.8%)</td>
<td>¥1,003.9 billion (9.2%)</td>
<td>¥151.5 billion (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥2,843.0 billion (17.1%)</td>
<td>¥2,091.0 billion (19.2%)</td>
<td>¥1,249.4 billion (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥1,368.0 billion (8.2%)</td>
<td>¥1,220.2 billion (11.6%)</td>
<td>¥1,056.3 billion (18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥2,246.7 billion (13.5%)</td>
<td>¥2,094.1 billion (19.2%)</td>
<td>¥1,056.4 billion (24.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥2,844.8 billion (17.1%)</td>
<td>¥2,021.4 billion (18.5%)</td>
<td>¥827.7 billion (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥4,824.0 billion (29.0%)</td>
<td>¥3,396.6 billion (31.1%)</td>
<td>¥1,432.9 billion (24.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of Civil Engineering Work Expenses by Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Prefectures</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¥12,050.5 billion</td>
<td>¥5,528.6 billion</td>
<td>¥6,708.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥670.4 billion (5.5%)</td>
<td>¥326.7 billion (6.0%)</td>
<td>¥361.9 billion (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥1,334.7 billion (11.1%)</td>
<td>¥522.1 billion (9.4%)</td>
<td>¥843.8 billion (12.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥2,252.1 billion (35.3%)</td>
<td>¥411.6 billion (7.0%)</td>
<td>¥1,369.6 billion (50.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥439.3 billion (3.6%)</td>
<td>¥297.6 billion (5.4%)</td>
<td>¥163.2 billion (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥1,309.9 billion (10.9%)</td>
<td>¥1,146.7 billion (20.7%)</td>
<td>¥178.1 billion (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥4,044.1 billion (33.6%)</td>
<td>¥2,293.9 billion (41.5%)</td>
<td>¥1,791.6 billion (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expenses are also classified, according to their economic nature, into “Mandatory expenses” (consisting of Personnel expenses, Social assistance expenses, and Debt service), the payment of which is mandatory and the amount of which is difficult to reduce at the discretion of individual local governments, “Investment expenses” including Ordinary construction work expenses, and “Other expenses,” (such as Goods expenses, Subsidizing expenses, Reserves, Transfers to other accounts).

### Net total
¥98,522.8 billion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (Billions)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory expenses</td>
<td>¥48,776.0 billion (49.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment expenses</td>
<td>¥15,511.7 billion (15.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>¥6,457.1 billion (6.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mandatory expenses
- Personnel expenses: ¥22,148.3 billion (44.1%)
- Social assistance expenses: ¥1,038.1 billion (2.1%)
- Debt service: ¥7,464.0 billion (14.9%)

### Investment expenses
- Ordinary construction work expenses: ¥7,183.8 billion (14.3%)
- Non-subsidized public works expenses: ¥2,425.6 billion (4.8%)

### Other
- Subsidizing expenses: ¥12,436.6 billion (24.8%)
- Reserves: ¥1,965.0 billion (3.9%)
- Transfers to other accounts: ¥204.7 billion (0.4%)

---

### Prefectures total
¥50,215.4 billion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (Billions)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory expenses</td>
<td>¥22,148.3 billion (44.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment expenses</td>
<td>¥7,669.3 billion (15.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>¥4,132.5 billion (8.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Municipals total
¥56,049.4 billion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (Billions)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory expenses</td>
<td>¥7,419.7 billion (13.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment expenses</td>
<td>¥8,592.7 billion (15.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>¥2,359.5 billion (4.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Composition of Expenditures Classified by Type (FY2014 settlement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (Billions)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory expenses</td>
<td>¥48,776.0 billion (49.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment expenses</td>
<td>¥15,511.7 billion (15.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>¥6,457.1 billion (6.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Net total

- **Other**: ¥11,517.3 billion (12.1%)
- **Reserves**: ¥2,886.1 billion (3.1%)
- **Subsidizing expenses**: ¥11,517.3 billion (12.1%)
- **Investment expenses**: ¥13,614.4 billion (14.4%)
  - Ordinary construction work expenses: ¥13,299.3 billion (14.1%)
  - Disaster recovery project expenses: ¥315.0 billion (0.3%)

**Expenditures in Regular Portion and Great East Japan Earthquake Portion (Expenses Classified by Type)**

**Municipalities**

- **Regular portion**: ¥94,511.2 billion
  - **Mandatory expenses**: ¥48,725.2 billion (51.6%)
  - **Reserves**: ¥2,886.1 billion (3.1%)
  - **Subsidizing expenses**: ¥11,517.3 billion (12.1%)
  - **Investment expenses**: ¥13,614.4 billion (14.4%)
    - Ordinary construction work expenses: ¥13,299.3 billion (14.1%)
    - Disaster recovery project expenses: ¥315.0 billion (0.3%)

- **Great East Japan Earthquake portion**: ¥4,011.6 billion
  - **Mandatory expenses**: ¥322.5 billion (8.1%)
  - **Reserves**: ¥1,464.3 billion (3.1%)
  - **Subsidizing expenses**: ¥11,909.0 billion (24.8%)
  - **Investment expenses**: ¥6,859.1 billion (14.3%)
    - Ordinary construction work expenses: ¥6,662.8 billion (13.9%)
    - Disaster recovery project expenses: ¥196.4 billion (0.4%)

**Prefectures**

- **Regular portion**: ¥47,984.4 billion
  - **Mandatory expenses**: ¥22,124.0 billion (46.1%)
  - **Reserves**: ¥1,464.3 billion (3.1%)
  - **Subsidizing expenses**: ¥11,909.0 billion (24.8%)
  - **Investment expenses**: ¥6,859.1 billion (14.3%)
    - Ordinary construction work expenses: ¥6,662.8 billion (13.9%)
    - Disaster recovery project expenses: ¥196.4 billion (0.4%)

- **Great East Japan Earthquake portion**: ¥2,310.0 billion
  - **Mandatory expenses**: ¥279.6 billion (12.6%)
  - **Reserves**: ¥1,464.3 billion (3.1%)
  - **Subsidizing expenses**: ¥11,909.0 billion (24.8%)
  - **Investment expenses**: ¥6,859.1 billion (14.3%)
    - Ordinary construction work expenses: ¥6,662.8 billion (13.9%)
    - Disaster recovery project expenses: ¥196.4 billion (0.4%)

**Municipalities**

- **Regular portion**: ¥53,777.3 billion
  - **Mandatory expenses**: ¥26,645.7 billion (49.5%)
  - **Reserves**: ¥1,421.8 billion (2.6%)
  - **Subsidizing expenses**: ¥3,713.0 billion (6.9%)
  - **Investment expenses**: ¥7,454.7 billion (13.9%)
    - Ordinary construction work expenses: ¥7,294.8 billion (13.6%)
    - Disaster recovery project expenses: ¥159.8 billion (0.3%)

- **Great East Japan Earthquake portion**: ¥2,272.0 billion
  - **Mandatory expenses**: ¥27.9 billion (1.2%)
  - **Reserves**: ¥1,383.0 billion (50.1%)
  - **Subsidizing expenses**: ¥119.1 billion (27.2%)
  - **Investment expenses**: ¥71.9 billion (3.2%)
    - Ordinary construction work expenses: ¥988.9 billion (44.0%)
    - Disaster recovery project expenses: ¥139.1 billion (6.1%)
Breakdown of Expenses Classified by Type

While Investment expenses and Personnel expenses were on a downward trend, Social assistance expenses, Subsidizing expenses and Transfers to other accounts rose.
Personal expenses for FY2014 increased year on year due mainly to the completion of initiatives taken by each local government in accordance with the national government's measures to reduce salary payments to national public servants.
Ordinary construction work expenses increased year on year due to an increase in Non-subsidized public works, expenses related to recovery and reconstruction work, etc.

### Trends in Breakdown of Ordinary Construction Work Expenses Classified by Type (Net total)

- **Subsidized public works**
- **Non-subsidized public works**
- **Obligatory share of public works directly carried out by the national government**

### Breakdown of Ordinary Construction Work Expenses by Purpose

**Net total**
- **¥14,778.6 billion**
  - General administrative expenses: ¥1,065.8 billion (7.1%)
  - Public welfare expenses: ¥2,282.4 billion (15.4%)
  - Sanitation expenses: ¥7,357.8 billion (49.8%)
  - Agriculture, forestry and fishery expenses: ¥1,389.8 billion (9.3%)
  - Other expenses: ¥3,533.3 billion (23.1%)

**Prefectures**
- **¥7,183.8 billion**
  - General administrative expenses: ¥395.9 billion (5.6%)
  - Public welfare expenses: ¥423.4 billion (5.9%)
  - Sanitation expenses: ¥4,119.8 billion (57.3%)
  - Agriculture, forestry and fishery expenses: ¥288.8 billion (4.0%)
  - Other expenses: ¥212.8 billion (4.0%)

**Municipalities**
- **¥8,293.7 billion**
  - General administrative expenses: ¥694.7 billion (8.4%)
  - Public welfare expenses: ¥1,386.6 billion (22.6%)
  - Sanitation expenses: ¥736.1 billion (40.6%)
  - Agriculture, forestry and fishery expenses: ¥121.9 billion (2.2%)
  - Other expenses: ¥269.6 billion (4.1%)
### Trends in Breakdown of Subsidizing Expenses by Purpose

#### (trillion yen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General administrative expenses</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and industry expenses</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public welfare expenses</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil engineering work expenses</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education expenses</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trends in Breakdown of Transfers to Other Accounts

#### (trillion yen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local public enterprise accounts (Enterprise to which the Local Public Enterprise Law is not applied)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National health insurance accounts</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly health care accounts</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latter-stage elderly healthcare accounts</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly nursing care insurance accounts</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flexibility of the Financial Structure

How financially capable are local governments to respond to local demands?

It is necessary that local governments have financial resources for not only the Mandatory expenses but also for the expenses for projects to properly address challenges caused by changes in the social economy and administrative needs so that they can adequately meet the needs of their residents. The extent to which the resources for such purposes are secured is called the “flexibility of the financial structure.”

### Ordinary Balance Ratio

The FY2014 Ordinary balance ratio rose 0.5 percentage points year-on-year, to 92.1%, staying above 90% for the eleventh consecutive year.

### Trends in the Ordinary Balance Ratio

![Graph showing Trends in the Ordinary Balance Ratio](image)

### Breakdown of the Ordinary Balance Ratio (Total)

![Graph showing Breakdown of the Ordinary Balance Ratio](image)

- Ordinary balance ratio = General revenue resources allotted to personnel expenses, Social assistance expenses, Debt service, etc. 
  
  Ordinary general revenue resources, etc. (Local tax + Regular local allocation tax, etc.) 
  + Special exception portion of loans for covering decreases in Local tax revenues 
  + Bonds for temporary substitution of local allocation tax 

Special wards and partial administrative associations, etc., are not included in total and municipalities.
Real Debt Service Ratio and Debt Service Payment Ratio

Close attention should be paid to the trend of the Debt service, which is the expense required to repay the principal and interest of the debts of local governments and has an especially negative impact on financial flexibility. The Real debt service ratio and the Debt service payment ratio are indices that measure the extent of the burden of the Debt service.

Trends in the Real Debt Service Ratio

* Real debt service ratio: The real debt service ratio is an index of the size of the redemption amount of debts (local bonds) and similar expenditure, and represents the cash-flow level.

Trends in the Debt Service Payment Ratio

* Debt service payment ratio: The Debt service payment ratio indicates the ratio of general revenue resources allocated for debt service (amount of repayment of the principal and interest on local bonds) in the total amount of General revenue resources. This index is used to measure the flexibility of the financial structure by assessing the degree to which Debt service restricts the freedom of use of General revenue resources.
What is the status of debt in local public finance?

1. Trends in Outstanding Local Government Bonds

Outstanding local government borrowing amounted to approximately ¥146 trillion at the end of FY2014, and has been increasing in recent years with the growing issue of Bonds for the extraordinary financial measures. The figure is 1.43 times larger than the total revenue and about 2.55 times larger than the Total general revenue resources.

![Bar chart showing trends in outstanding local government bonds]

Note: Outstanding local government bonds excludes special fund public investment bonds.

2. Trends in Outstanding Borrowing Borne by the Ordinary Accounts

Outstanding local public finance borrowing—which includes borrowing in the special account for Local allocation tax and Transfer tax for addressing revenue resource shortages, as well as the redemption of Public enterprise bonds borne by the Ordinary accounts, remains at a high level, amounting to approximately ¥201 trillion at the end of FY2014.

![Bar chart showing trends in outstanding borrowing borne by ordinary accounts]

Notes:
1. Outstanding local government bonds excludes special fund public investment bonds.
2. Outstanding public enterprise bonds (borne by the ordinary accounts) are estimates based on settlement account statistics.
What is the status of local public enterprises?

1 Presence of Local Public Enterprises

Local public enterprises play a major role in improving the standard of living of residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current Water-Supply Population</th>
<th>Sewage Disposal Population</th>
<th>No. of Passengers per Year</th>
<th>No. of Hospital Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out of 125.10 million</td>
<td>Out of 112.75 million</td>
<td>Out of 23,600 million</td>
<td>Out of 1,568,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124.49 million (99.5%)</td>
<td>102.99 million (91.3%)</td>
<td>3,198 million (13.6%)</td>
<td>188,000 (12.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. The graph shows the ratio of local public enterprises when the total number of business entities nationwide is set at 100.

2. Figures for the total number of enterprises nationwide have been compiled from statistical materials of related organizations. Figures for local public enterprises have been compiled from figures for the total number of enterprises and settlements for the same fiscal year.
2. Number of Businesses Operated by Local Public Enterprises

8,662 businesses are operated by local public enterprises. By type of business, sewerage accounts for the largest ratio, followed, in order, by water supply, hospitals, care services, and residential development.

3. Scale of Financial Settlement

The scale of total financial settlement is ¥18,778.9 billion. By type of business, sewerage accounts for the largest ratio, followed, in order, by hospitals, total water supply, residential development, and transportation.
Local public enterprises had a deficit of ¥525.2 billion due mainly to an increase in the total costs associated with the review of local public enterprise accounting standards. By type of business, water supply, electricity, gas and sewages showed a surplus.
1. Specified Disaster-Struck Prefectures

In FY2014, the total revenues of the nine specified disaster-struck prefectures amounted to ¥11,115.5 billion, increasing by ¥45.7 billion year on year, or 0.4% (0.2% national increase). Total expenditures of the entities amounted to ¥10,577.2 billion, rising by ¥72.8 billion year on year, or 0.7% (0.3% national increase).

Specified disaster-struck prefectures: Prefectures stipulated in Article 2, Paragraph 2 of the Act on Special Public Finance Support and Assistance to Deal with the Great East Japan Earthquake (Act No. 40 of 2011). These prefectures are Aomori, Iwate, Miyagi, Fukushima, Ibaraki, Tochigi, Chiba, Niigata, and Nagano prefectures.
2. Specified Disaster-Struck Municipalities

In FY2014, the total revenues of the 227 municipalities designated as specified disaster-struck municipalities amounted to ¥8,388.6 billion, increasing by ¥236.0 billion year on year, or 2.9% (1.9% national increase). Total expenditures of the entities amounted to ¥7,855.3 billion, rising by ¥234.1 billion year on year, or 3.1% (2.2% national increase).

Specified disaster-struck municipalities: Municipalities designated in Appended Table 1 and those designated in Appended Tables 2 and 3 that are other than specified disaster-struck local public bodies of the Japanese government ordinance (No. 127, 2011) concerning Article 2, Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Act on Special Public Finance Support and Assistance to Deal with the Great East Japan Earthquake. (A total of 227 organizations in 11 prefectures, including, 33 organizations within Iwate Prefecture, 35 organizations within Miyagi prefecture, and 59 organizations within Fukushima prefecture.)

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Local tax</th>
<th>Local allocation tax</th>
<th>Earthquake disaster reconstruction allocation tax</th>
<th>National treasury disbursements</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>¥2,186.9 billion (26.8%)</td>
<td>¥1,279.6 billion (15.7%)</td>
<td>¥1,645.7 billion (20.2%)</td>
<td>¥3,040.3 billion (37.3%)</td>
<td>¥231.9 billion (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>¥2,245.3 billion (26.8%)</td>
<td>¥1,255.0 billion (15.0%)</td>
<td>¥1,523.7 billion (18.2%)</td>
<td>¥3,364.6 billion (40.0%)</td>
<td>¥239.8 billion (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures Classified by Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General administrative expenses</th>
<th>Public welfare expenses</th>
<th>Disaster relief expenses</th>
<th>Sanitation expenses</th>
<th>Disaster recovery expenses</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>¥1,251.8 billion (16.4%)</td>
<td>¥2,409.5 billion (31.6%)</td>
<td>¥3,218.9 billion (42.2%)</td>
<td>¥157.9 billion (2.0%)</td>
<td>¥551.1 billion (7.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>¥1,384.7 billion (17.6%)</td>
<td>¥2,291.9 billion (29.2%)</td>
<td>¥3,469.7 billion (44.2%)</td>
<td>¥155.9 billion (2.0%)</td>
<td>¥551.1 billion (7.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures Classified by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mandatory expenses</th>
<th>Investment expenses</th>
<th>Ordinary construction expenses</th>
<th>Disaster recovery project expenses</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Reserves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>¥2,699.7 billion (35.4%)</td>
<td>¥1,425.8 billion (18.7%)</td>
<td>¥3,495.7 billion (45.9%)</td>
<td>¥667.1 billion (8.8%)</td>
<td>¥232.4 billion (3.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>¥2,767.7 billion (35.2%)</td>
<td>¥1,609.3 billion (20.5%)</td>
<td>¥3,478.3 billion (44.3%)</td>
<td>¥795.0 billion (10.1%)</td>
<td>¥155.9 billion (2.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Status of Businesses of Local Public Enterprises of Disaster-Struck Organizations

Total revenues and expenditures of local public enterprises of disaster-struck organizations amounted to a deficit of ¥59.2 billion, a decrease of ¥118.2 billion year on year, or 200.3%, due mainly to an increase in the total costs associated with the review of local public enterprise accounting standards. There were 826 businesses with surpluses, or 88.5% of all businesses, while 107 businesses had deficits, or 11.5%.
Overview of the Act on Assurance of Sound Financial Status of Local Governments

A number of drawbacks were pointed out with the conventional system of financial reconstruction of local governments, including the lack of a legal obligation to disclose comprehensible financial information and of rules for early warning. In response, the Act on Assurance of Sound Financial Status of Local Governments was enacted and has been in force since April 2009. The act establishes new indexes and requires local governments to disclose them thoroughly, aiming to quickly achieve financial soundness or rebuild.

Outline of the Act on Assurance of Sound Financial Status of Local Governments

1. Sound stage
   - Establishment of indexes and thorough disclosure
     - Flow indexes: Real deficit ratio, Consolidated real deficit ratio, Real debt service ratio
     - Stock indexes: Future burden ratio = indexes by real liabilities, including public enterprises, third-sector enterprises, etc.
     - Subject to auditor inspection, reported to the council and publicly announced

2. Early financial soundness restoring stage
   - Restoring financial soundness through their own efforts
     - Formulation of financial soundness plan (approval by the council), mandatory requests for external auditing
     - Report on progress of implementation to the council and public announcement every fiscal year
     - If the early achievement of financial soundness is deemed to be significantly difficult, the Minister for Internal Affairs and Communications or the prefectural governor makes necessary recommendations

3. Financial rebuilding stage
   - Solid rebuilding through involvement of the central government, etc.
     - Formulation of financial rebuilding plan (approval by the council), mandatory requests for external auditing
     - Agreement on the financial rebuilding plan can be sought through consultation with the Minister for Internal Affairs and Communications
     - If financial management is deemed not to conform with the plan, the Minister for Internal Affairs and Communications makes necessary recommendations, such as budget changes

Financial soundness of public enterprise

- Real deficit ratio
  - Prefectures: 3.75%
  - Municipalities: 11.25% ~ 15%

- Consolidated real deficit ratio
  - Prefectures: 8.75%
  - Municipalities: 16.25% ~ 20%

- Real debt service ratio
  - 25%

- Future burden ratio
  - Prefectures, Government-ordinance-designated city: 400%
  - Municipalities: 350%

- Finance shortfall ratio (for each public enterprise)
  - 20%

Public announcement of indexes began with FY2007 settlement of accounts. Obligatory formulation of financial soundness plan was applied as of FY2008 settlement of accounts.
2 Status of the Ratios for Measuring Financial Soundness and Financial Shortfall Ratio

Real Deficit Ratio

The following graph shows the trend in the number of local governments with a real deficit. Based on FY2014 account settlements, there were no local governments with a real deficit (i.e., a Real deficit ratio that exceeds 0%), and none had a Real deficit ratio that equals or exceeds the Early financial soundness restoring standards.

![Graph showing trend in number of local governments with real deficit](image_url)
Promotion of the Soundness of Local Public Finance

Consolidated Real Deficit Ratio

The following graph shows the trend in the number of local governments with a consolidated real deficit. Based on FY2014 account settlements, there was one local municipal government with a consolidated real deficit (i.e., a consolidated Real deficit ratio that exceeds 0%). Of those local governments, none had a Consolidated real deficit ratio that equals or exceeds the Early financial soundness restoring standard.

Consolidated Real Deficit Ratio = Consolidated real deficit / Standard financial scale

The consolidated real deficit ratio is an index of the deficit level for a local government as a whole by taking the sum of the deficits and surpluses of all accounts, and represents the extent to which financial administration has worsened for a local government as a whole.

Real Debt Service Ratio

The following graph shows the trend in the number of local governments with a Real debt service ratio equal to or exceeding 18%. Based on FY2014 account settlements, there was one local municipal government with a Real debt service ratio equal to or exceeding the financial rebuilding standard.

Real debt service ratio (3-year average) = (Redemption of principal and interest of local bonds + quasi-redemption of principal and interest) – (special revenue resources + amount included in standard financial requirements pertaining to redemption and quasi-redemption of principal and interest) / (Standard financial scale – (amount included in standard financial requirements pertaining to redemption and quasi-redemption of principal and payments))

The real debt service ratio is an index of the size of the redemption amount of debts (local bonds) and similar expenditure, and represents the cash-flow level. Local governments with a Real debt service ratio equal to or exceeding 18% require the approval of the Minister of Internal Affairs and Communications, etc., to issue local government bonds.
**Future Burden Ratio**

The following graph shows the trend in the number of local governments with a Future burden ratio equal to or exceeding the Early financial soundness restoring standard. Based on FY2014 account settlements, there was one local municipal government with a Future burden ratio equal to or exceeding the Early financial soundness restoring standard.

![Future Burden Ratio Graph](image)

**Financial Shortfall Ratio**

The following graph shows the trend in the number of local public enterprises with a financial shortfall. Based on FY2014 account settlements, there were 58 local public enterprises with a financial shortfall (i.e., with a Financial shortfall ratio that exceeds 0%). Of these, 13 local public enterprises had a Financial shortfall ratio that equals or exceeds the Management soundness standard.

![Financial Shortfall Ratio Graph](image)