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## INTRODUCTION

The growth of international trade is one of the defining trends of our time. While trade has shaped societies and economies for as long as societies and economies have existed, its impact over the past half century has been nothing short of extraordinary. During this time, trade volumes of goods and services increased 20-fold and now top $\$ 23$ trillion. As a percentage of global GDP, exports now account for nearly one-third of global economic activity, a 100 percent increase since 1970¹.

Technology plays a unique role in the international trade landscape. As a category, it represents one of the largest segments of U.S. trade. This reflects the insatiable demand of consumers and businesses for the latest and greatest in devices, applications, content - and by extension, the underlying digital infrastructure to make it all work. Additionally, as an enabling force, trade in technology goods and services creates its own virtuous cycle. The more technology is put into use, the more businesses and consumers have the tools to communicate, create, and exchange, thereby encouraging even more trade.

## $\$ 338$ binom

Estimated value of U.S. exports of technology products and services in 2018

858,000
Number of U.S. jobs directly supported by U.S. technology exports to overseas customers

## 50\%

Exports directly support approximately $50 \%$ U.S. tech manufacturing jobs

39
Number of states recording positive exports-supported jobs growth in 2018
2.5\%

Growth rate in U.S. technology exports in 2018

## $\$ 1$ in $\$ 4 \quad 2^{\text {nd }}$

Exports account for approximately \$1 in every \$4 generated in the U.S. tech sector

## 340 billion

U.S. trade surplus in tech services

Rank of technology services exports among all U.S. services export categories

## $2^{\text {nd }}$

Rank of technology product exports among all U.S. goods export categories

## ABOUT COMPTIA

The Computing Technology Industry Association (CompTIA) is a leading voice and advocate for the \$5 trillion global information technology ecosystem; and the more than 50 million industry and tech professionals who design, implement, manage, and safeguard the technology that powers the world's economy. Through education, training, certifications, advocacy, philanthropy, and market research, CompTIA is the hub for advancing the tech industry and its workforce.

CompTIA champions industry innovation, a skilled workforce and solutions that drive business at the federal, state, local and international levels. CompTIA gives eyes, ears and a voice to technology companies, informing them of policy developments - and providing the means to do something about it.

CompTIA advocates for trade policies that expand export destinations and open new markets for the U.S. technology sector. For more details on CompTIA's trade work, visit:
https://www.comptia.org/advocacy/policy-issues/global-trade-and-market-access.

## ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report provides data, analysis, and insight into the international trade market for information technology products and services. The underlying import and export statistics are compiled by the Foreign Trade Division of the U.S. Census Bureau, the U.S. International Trade Administration of the Department of Commerce, and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. The export-supported employment figures are compiled by The Trade Partnership's CDxports database. Additional CompTIA sources referenced in the report include Cyberstates and the IT Industry Outlook.

See Methodology page of this report for additional context, caveats, and details of the NAICS categories used to represent technology products and services. Questions can be directed to the CompTIA Research and Market Intelligence Department at research@comptia.org.

Copyright © 2019 CompTIA, Inc. and its Affiliates.
Any data or content used from this report should be properly sourced to CompTIA Tech Trade Snapshot.

## OVERVIEW

U.S. information technology exports reached an estimated $\$ 338$ billion in 2018, an increase of 2.5 percent over the previous year. Growth slowed slightly compared to the 2017 rate of 4.5 percent. Since 2010, U.S. exports of technology added nearly $\$ 65$ billion in new earnings and aggregate growth of 23 percent.

Growth in the tech sector, especially as it relates to international trade, is a function of many factors. Macro technology trends, such as the ongoing push of digital business transformation, combined with economic conditions - are customers in the mood to buy, currency fluctuations, and government trade policies all have a bearing on growth.

Analysis of the export subsectors within the technology category reveal many of these factors. On a percent change basis, the information and data processing services subsector led all technology export categories in growth at 15.2 percent. The IT services category and the software/software-as-a-service category also performed well, recording growth of 5.9 percent and 4.5 percent, respectively. The growth in tech services and the "everything-as-a-service" model have been driving forces in the tech sector over the past decade. The migration to cloud computing, the modernization of legacy applications and workflows, and the mission-critical importance of data - and soon artificial intelligence (AI), translate to demand for expertise in integration, software development, data management, cybersecurity and related competencies categorized as technology services.

On the hardware front, also referred to as manufactured goods, the computing equipment category recorded the highest export growth at 7.4 percent. This was followed by navigational, measuring, and control equipment category ( 6.3 percent), and semiconductors and components (1.6 percent). As important as tech services, applications, and data have been to growth, these categories can only thrive when there is a large installed base of devices (think users with computers, tablets, mobile phones, etc.) and robust infrastructure that reliably delivers faster, higher capacity, and less costly computing and storage. Emerging technologies such as internet of things (IoT), edge computing, smart cities, and robotics require cutting edge processors and the components that form the "brains" of these intelligent solutions.
U.S. TECH PRODUCT + SERVICES EXPORTS


Source: Foreign Trade Division of U.S. Census Bureau | CompTIA

The one export category that notably lagged was telecommunications. Exports of communications equipment hardware fell - 6.0 percent, a loss of $\$ 2.5$ billion in revenue, while telecommunications services dropped -8.1 percent, a loss of nearly $\$ 900$ million in revenue compared to the prior year. For context, the overall U.S. telecom market for equipment, services, and employment has been sluggish the past couple of years. In many markets, traditional wired telecom along with segments of wireless telecom, can be considered mature categories. Moreover, as the transition to 5G gets underway, both telecom providers and customers must contend with the uncertainty that comes with any disruptive shift.

## Number of states that

 recorded positive growth in exports of tech services in 2018Like most countries, the U.S. is both a buyer and seller of technology. U.S. businesses and consumers purchased nearly $\$ 500$ billion in technology goods and services from overseas sellers in 2018. The net of technology exports from the U.S. and technology imports to the U.S. results in a trade deficit of nearly \$161 billion.

In tech services, the U.S. experienced a trade surplus of nearly $\$ 40$ billion in 2018, a figure that grew 10.5 percent over the previous year. This is driven heavily by U.S. software (+\$29.5 billion surplus), followed by information and data processing services (+\$7.2 billion surplus).

In tech goods, the U.S. experienced a trade deficit of slightly over $\$ 200$ billion in 2018, a figure that grew by 4.1 percent year-over-year. The largest deficit occurred in the communications equipment category, where U.S. buyers purchased $\$ 83.7$ billion more in goods from overseas buyers than overseas buyers purchased from U.S. providers. The computing equipment category recorded a deficit of -\$56.8 billion, followed by semiconductors (-\$25.5 billion), and audio and video equipment (-\$22.3 billion).

China accounted for 84 percent of the deficit in tech goods trade with the U.S., down slightly from their 2017 rate of 87 percent. Since 2010, China's share of the tech goods trade deficit has fluctuated between a high of 97 percent and a low of 84 percent. The next two largest trade imbalances for tech goods in 2018 belong to Malaysia ( 10 percent of the total deficit), and Mexico (also 10 percent).

Note: because the U.S. runs a trade surplus with the vast majority of its tech goods trading partners (82 percent surplus vs. 18 percent deficit), as a percentage of the total trade balance, some figures may appear to exceed 100 percent, which is a function of offsetting figures in the surplus column.

The top destinations for U.S. exports in 2018 was nearly identical to the previous year. The top four markets for U.S. tech product exports remained unchanged, while at \#5, Germany moved up one slot, switching places with Japan at \#6. U.S. tech services exports followed a similar pattern, with the top 10 markets consistent with the prior year. The one notable newcomer to the list was Hong Kong appearing at \#10. See tables on following page.
U.S. TECH PRODUCT EXPORTS

|  |  | billions of current dollars |  |  | $\begin{gathered} +\$ 5.1 \text { B } \\ +2.4 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\Gamma$ | 7 |
| Optical media | \$205 | \$209 | \$205 | \$202 | \$208 | \$213 |
|  | 9.7 | 9.8 | 9.6 |  | 9.7 | 9.3 |
| Audio / Visual | 9.7 |  | 9.6 | 9.4 |  |  |
| Telecom equip. | 37.6 | 40.5 | 42.2 | 41.5 | 40.8 | 38.3 |
| Computers / peripherals | 48.3 | 49.1 | 46.7 | 45.1 | 46.3 | 49.7 |
|  <br> Measuring equip. | 51.5 | 50.8 | 48.9 | 47.7 | 48.8 | 51.9 |
| Semiconductors | 53.2 | 54.9 | 53.6 | 54.5 | 58.4 | 59.4 |
|  | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |

Source: Foreign Trade Division of U.S. Census Bureau | CompTIA | rounding may affect totals percent change calculations

## U.S. TECH SERVICES EXPORTS

billions of current dollars



Debate over the meaning of trade deficits has been a topic of discussion since the earliest days of international economic analysis. Given the many complexities of trade, confusion and concern are not uncommon. Because of limitations in how trade statistics are calculated, deficits can be mischaracterized and misinterpreted, which can be especially problematic for technology goods and services.

For example, the iPhone is designed in the U.S. by Apple and then an estimated two hundred suppliers from around the world provide the materials and parts that go into the final product. Lastly, the phone is mostly assembled in China. When shipped back to the U.S. for domestic customers, the entire wholesale value of the device is counted as an import from China. According the research consultancy IHS Market, Chinese assembly facilities capture only 3 to 6 percent of the total manufacturing costs of an iPhone, meaning nearly all of the value flows to Apple and other suppliers.

As noted by Louis Kuijs, head of Asia economics research at Oxford Economics, "if trade deficits were measured to account for the complex nature of global supply chains for products such as smartphones, the U.S.-China trade deficit would be about 36 percent lower." This is but one example. The same principle applies to many tech product categories. See CompTIA's supplemental brief for additional details on U.S.-China tech trade.

Another limitation with trade statistics is the difficulty in accounting for avoidance behaviors. This typically entails sellers in one country shipping their product to an intermediary country that may have more favorable trade terms with the final market destination. For example, tech goods from China sent first to Mexico and then onto the U.S. market. The data indicates Mexico recorded the largest gain of any country exporting tech goods to the U.S. market: + $\$ 5.5$ billion in new sales or an increase of 9.2 percent. In the aggregate the figures generally hold, but evaluating the trade relationship with any single market can quickly get murky because of these scenarios.

## LEADING TRADING PARTNERS FOR TECH SERVICES

Exports from the U.S. Imports into the U.S.

1. Ireland
2. Switzerland
3. United Kingdom
4. Japan
5. Singapore
6. Canada
7. Germany
8. Brazil
9. Netherlands
10. Hong Kong
11. India
12. Ireland
13. Canada
14. United Kingdom
15. Germany
16. China
17. Israel
18. Japan
19. Singapore
20. Netherlands

## LEADING TRADING PARTNERS FOR TECH PRODUCTS

Exports from the U.S. Imports into the U.S.

| 1. Mexico | 1. | China |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Canada | 2. Mexico |  |
| 3. China | 3. Malaysia |  |
| 4. Hong Kong | 4. Taiwan |  |
| 5. Germany | 5. Japan |  |
| 6. Japan | 6. South Korea |  |
| 7. Netherlands | 7. Thailand |  |
| 8. South Korea | 8. Vietnam |  |
| 9. Taiwan | 9. Germany |  |
| 10. Singapore | 10. Canada |  |

[^0]Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis | CompTIA | 2017 data

Strengthening U.S. Dollar adds another concern to the mix

The ICE Dollar Index, which measures the dollar against a basket of six other currencies, has increased more than 5 percent during the past 12 months. The Thdex has risen steadily since early 2018 based on the strength of the U.S. economy and rising U.S. interest rates. A strong dollar provides greater purchasing power, making international travel or imports relatively cheaper for U.S. buyers. The tradeoff, though, U.S. exports become more expensive to many overseas buyers. The combination of new tariffs and a strengthening dollar mean many U.S. companies could face a "double whammy" 1010 of competitive pressures.

## TECHNOLOGY IS ONE OF THE LARGEST CATEGORIES OF U.S. EXPORTS

Exports are a measure of buyer perceptions of quality, value for money, and the degree to which the product or service aligns with business or user objectives. With these basic criteria in mind, the data confirms that technology is one of the most desired offerings among all U.S. exports.

In the manufactured goods category, technology ranks second, trailing the transportation and motor vehicle category. To help put into context, the dollar value of U.S. technology product exports is more than double that of petroleum and coal products.

In the services category tech also ranks second, accounting for 15 percent of total U.S. services exports. As noted previously, this affirms the macro trend toward a services orientation in the delivery of technology, as well as the market leading position of many U.S. technology firms.

Analysis of tech exports at the state-level provides additional insights. As depicted in the accompanying chart, for 11 states, tech ranks as the \#1 goods export across all categories of state export activity. Interestingly, even though Texas is the largest exporter of tech goods among all states, tech ranks 3rd in the state behind the oil \& gas category, and the petroleum \& coal products category.

For six states, tech products exports rank \#2, and for 11 other states, rank \#3. In the aggregate, 28 states claim technology as a top 3 goods export category.

TOP 5 U.S. SECTORS FOR MFG. GOODS EXPORTS

|  | \$ Billions | \% of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Transportation / motor vehicles | \$283 | 17\% |
| 2. Tech products | \$213 | 13\% |
| 3. Chemicals | \$208 | 12\% |
| 4. Machinery | \$143 | 9\% |
| 5. Petroleum \& coal products | \$103 | 6\% |

## TOP 5 U.S. SECTORS FOR SERVICES EXPORTS



Source: Foreign Trade Division of U.S. Census Bureau | U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis | CompTIA | Goods data covers 2018 and services data covers 2017 time period

STATE DISTRIBUTION OF TOP GOODS EXPORTS


## ASSESSING THE EMPLOYMENT IMPACT OF TRADE

U.S. technology exports directly supported an estimated 858,000 American jobs in 2017, the most recent year of available data. During that time period, export-supported jobs grew by 43,000 positions, an increase of 5.2 percent year-over-year. Tech goods account for 68 percent of exports-supported jobs, while tech services account for the remaining 32 percent. Tech services exports boosted employment in the U.S. by 23,000 jobs, a growth rate of 9 percent; in comparison, tech goods exports added 19,667 new jobs for a growth rate of 3.5 percent.

Applying the average wage for these tech industry sectors to the base of employment results in earnings of over $\$ 105$ billion - that is, the amount of money these workers will then spend in their local community and across the economy. These figures are compelling in their own right, but there is more to the story.

Beyond the direct export-supported jobs, there is an additional indirect employment effect associated with trade. Technology development requires many inputs, starting with raw materials, but also various components and software layers. Technology also frequently acts as a platform and enabler, providing users the tool to run applications, pursue business activities, or enjoy entertainment content. The labor behind these inputs or technology 'enhancements' is connected to trade, but not directly. This approach can be taken even further to include workers a step or two removed, such as law firms, shipping companies, marketing firms and so on. For the purposes of this report, only the workers directly supported by technology exports are covered.

## U.S. JOBS DIRECTLY SUPPORTED BY TECH EXPORTS BY MARKET



[^1]

Source: Trade Partnership CDxports database | CompTIA | Data cover 2017 time period

On the imports side of the equation, there is a different, and more nuanced, impact on employment. While trade creates jobs, it also inevitably has the opposite effect and can to lead to employment shifts or displacements. In 2001, the primary technology manufacturing sector (NAICS 334) employed nearly 1.8 million American workers. By 2018, that figure fell to 1.1 million, a loss of 700,000 jobs. Undoubtedly, a portion of these job losses were due to global competition and offshoring. But, there are other factors at play, including automation, process improvements, domestic competition, changing workforce characteristics, and the shift to often highermargin software or tech services categories.

The challenge comes in trying to isolate these effects given that many of the variables are interconnected. Research from government agencies, think tanks, academics, and consultancies can vary widely in their assessment of the workforce impact of trade versus other factors. Some assert the trade impact is relatively small, while others believe unfair trade practices are a major culprit of manufacturing job losses.

STATE RANKINGS

| U.S. tech product exports <br> numeric change growth <br> 2017-2018 | U.S. tech product exports <br> \% change growth <br> 2017-2018 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. California | 1. |

U.S. tech services exports numeric change growth
2016-2017

1. California
2. Washington
3. Texas
4. Massachusetts
5. Virginia
6. Colorado
7. Georgia
8. North Carolina
9. Maryland
10. Indiana
U.S. tech services exports \% change growth 2016-2017
11. South Carolina
12. Maine
13. Alabama
14. Kansas
15. Montana
16. Nevada
17. California
18. Missouri
19. Nebraska
20. Iowa
21. California
22. New Jersey
23. Washington
24. Florida
25. Massachusetts
26. New York
27. Illinois
28. Georgia
29. Indiana
30. Arizona
31. Delaware
32. District of Columbia
33. Wyoming
34. Oklahoma
35. New Hampshire
36. Nevada
37. Montana
38. Kentucky
39. Indiana
40. New Jersey
U.S. TECH PRODUCT EXPORTS DETAIL

| Rank | State | 2017 | 2018 | 2017-2018 <br> Change | 2017-2018 <br> \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Texas | \$46,969,203,414 | \$47,894,768,172 | \$925,564,758 | 2.0\% |
| 2. | California | \$43,670,701,034 | \$45,138,079,588 | \$1,467,378,554 | 3.4\% |
| 3. | Florida | \$12,956,419,775 | \$13,067,284,574 | \$110,864,799 | 0.9\% |
| 4. | Illinois | \$8,584,694,931 | \$8,590,428,005 | \$5,733,074 | 0.1\% |
| 5. | Massachusetts | \$7,455,610,947 | \$7,672,503,247 | \$216,892,300 | 2.9\% |
| 6. | Oregon | \$8,760,011,440 | \$7,538,863,246 | -\$1,221,148,194 | -13.9\% |
| 7. | New York | \$7,105,167,035 | \$7,359,282,098 | \$254,115,063 | 3.6\% |
| 8. | Arizona | \$5,873,411,865 | \$6,336,950,129 | \$463,538,264 | 7.9\% |
| 9. | New Jersey | \$5,041,241,717 | \$5,464,733,402 | \$423,491,685 | 8.4\% |
| 10. | Tennessee | \$5,390,099,760 | \$4,619,352,215 | -\$770,747,545 | -14.3\% |
| 11. | Washington | \$4,243,477,352 | \$4,419,899,305 | \$176,421,953 | 4.2\% |
| 12. | Minnesota | \$3,651,027,990 | \$4,244,772,134 | \$593,744,144 | 16.3\% |
| 13. | Ohio | \$2,796,990,512 | \$3,929,823,182 | \$1,132,832,670 | 40.5\% |
| 14. | Pennsylvania | \$3,603,137,492 | \$3,464,511,851 | -\$138,625,641 | -3.8\% |
| 15. | Georgia | \$2,722,728,806 | \$3,402,462,538 | \$679,733,732 | 25.0\% |
| 16. | Michigan | \$3,300,542,901 | \$3,060,738,277 | -\$239,804,624 | -7.3\% |
| 17. | Wisconsin | \$2,741,881,745 | \$2,830,869,504 | \$88,987,759 | 3.2\% |
| 18. | Virginia | \$2,026,618,439 | \$2,499,593,807 | \$472,975,368 | 23.3\% |
| 19. | North Carolina | \$2,248,655,790 | \$2,237,511,199 | -\$11,144,591 | -0.5\% |
| 20. | Nevada | \$1,910,283,307 | \$2,120,676,153 | \$210,392,846 | 11.0\% |
| 21. | New Mexico | \$1,867,716,338 | \$2,029,773,999 | \$162,057,661 | 8.7\% |
| 22. | Colorado | \$1,920,002,743 | \$1,930,476,263 | \$10,473,520 | 0.5\% |
| 23. | Vermont | \$1,755,586,932 | \$1,905,323,072 | \$149,736,140 | 8.5\% |
| 24. | Kentucky | \$1,800,514,566 | \$1,865,375,217 | \$64,860,651 | 3.6\% |
| 25. | Indiana | \$1,804,975,220 | \$1,782,638,041 | -\$22,337,179 | -1.2\% |
| 26. | Idaho | \$1,653,233,476 | \$1,702,530,557 | \$49,297,081 | 3.0\% |
| 27. | Utah | \$1,847,812,388 | \$1,568,108,842 | -\$279,703,546 | -15.1\% |
| 28. | New Hampshire | \$1,632,356,919 | \$1,399,266,430 | -\$233,090,489 | -14.3\% |
| 29. | South Carolina | \$1,250,305,459 | \$1,389,871,342 | \$139,565,883 | 11.2\% |
| 30. | Mississippi | \$1,113,431,623 | \$1,280,576,656 | \$167,145,033 | 15.0\% |
| 31. | Connecticut | \$1,131,151,700 | \$1,260,018,124 | \$128,866,424 | 11.4\% |
| 32. | Maryland | \$1,089,998,031 | \$1,039,751,962 | -\$50,246,069 | -4.6\% |
| 33. | Oklahoma | \$814,751,324 | \$894,190,633 | \$79,439,309 | 9.8\% |
| 34. | Kansas | \$703,041,033 | \$761,020,132 | \$57,979,099 | 8.2\% |
| 35. | Missouri | \$632,953,314 | \$631,841,206 | -\$1,112,108 | -0.2\% |
| 36. | Iowa | \$647,159,502 | \$606,249,485 | -\$40,910,017 | -6.3\% |
| 37. | Alabama | \$522,996,340 | \$544,089,473 | \$21,093,133 | 4.0\% |
| 38. | Delaware | \$751,814,245 | \$521,676,689 | -\$230,137,556 | -30.6\% |
| 39. | Maine | \$326,409,545 | \$341,802,572 | \$15,393,027 | 4.7\% |
| 40. | Nebraska | \$215,864,275 | \$250,801,052 | \$34,936,777 | 16.2\% |
| 41. | District of Columbia | \$257,361,186 | \$249,573,446 | -\$7,787,740 | -3.0\% |
| 42. | Rhode Island | \$168,140,742 | \$172,635,004 | \$4,494,262 | 2.7\% |
| 43. | Arkansas | \$191,035,929 | \$170,810,993 | -\$20,224,936 | -10.6\% |
| 44. | Louisiana | \$178,641,500 | \$162,568,829 | -\$16,072,671 | -9.0\% |
| 45. | West Virginia | \$123,798,958 | \$122,213,789 | -\$1,585,169 | -1.3\% |
| 46. | South Dakota | \$87,903,053 | \$86,918,030 | -\$985,023 | -1.1\% |
| 47. | North Dakota | \$60,527,300 | \$79,598,883 | \$19,071,583 | 31.5\% |
| 48. | Montana | \$35,082,487 | \$45,260,140 | \$10,177,653 | 29.0\% |
| 49. | Alaska | \$23,704,556 | \$23,236,608 | -\$467,948 | -2.0\% |
| 50. | Hawaii | \$21,187,991 | \$21,119,757 | -\$68,234 | -0.3\% |
| 51. | Wyoming | \$17,429,295 | \$14,059,878 | -\$3,369,417 | -19.3\% |

[^2]| Rank | State | 2016 | 2017 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 2016-2017 } \\ \text { Change } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016-2017 } \\ \text { \% Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | California | \$32,285,435,787 | \$36,442,487,837 | \$4,157,052,050 | 12.9\% |
| 2. | Washington | \$14,208,006,909 | \$14,972,936,022 | \$764,929,113 | 5.4\% |
| 3. | Massachusetts | \$8,200,037,710 | \$8,631,386,582 | \$431,348,872 | 5.3\% |
| 4. | Texas | \$5,673,313,724 | \$6,201,311,146 | \$527,997,422 | 9.3\% |
| 5. | New York | \$5,877,923,599 | \$5,934,598,916 | \$56,675,316 | 1.0\% |
| 6. | North Carolina | \$4,405,573,548 | \$4,576,958,588 | \$171,385,040 | 3.9\% |
| 7. | Georgia | \$3,741,883,051 | \$3,918,351,223 | \$176,468,172 | 4.7\% |
| 8. | New Jersey | \$3,627,127,510 | \$3,752,115,174 | \$124,987,664 | 3.4\% |
| 9. | Colorado | \$3,214,717,904 | \$3,423,229,490 | \$208,511,586 | 6.5\% |
| 10. | Pennsylvania | \$3,295,701,609 | \$3,369,439,243 | \$73,737,634 | 2.2\% |
| 11. | Virginia | \$2,733,851,652 | \$3,022,833,503 | \$288,981,850 | 10.6\% |
| 12. | Maryland | \$2,580,308,680 | \$2,732,459,243 | \$152,150,563 | 5.9\% |
| 13. | Oregon | \$2,353,796,623 | \$2,483,888,025 | \$130,091,403 | 5.5\% |
| 14. | Illinois | \$2,440,065,931 | \$2,418,599,215 | -\$21,466,716 | -0.9\% |
| 15. | Florida | \$2,127,676,735 | \$2,209,910,118 | \$82,233,382 | 3.9\% |
| 16. | Wisconsin | \$1,727,534,474 | \$1,706,840,702 | -\$20,693,772 | -1.2\% |
| 17. | Utah | \$1,605,908,672 | \$1,695,479,820 | \$89,571,148 | 5.6\% |
| 18. | Indiana | \$1,521,484,452 | \$1,672,976,012 | \$151,491,559 | 10.0\% |
| 19. | Connecticut | \$1,491,689,008 | \$1,530,730,109 | \$39,041,101 | 2.6\% |
| 20. | Minnesota | \$1,420,767,193 | \$1,373,605,306 | -\$47,161,888 | -3.3\% |
| 21. | Arizona | \$1,042,978,505 | \$1,154,549,009 | \$111,570,504 | 10.7\% |
| 22. | Michigan | \$1,105,113,285 | \$1,110,586,673 | \$5,473,387 | 0.5\% |
| 23. | Missouri | \$963,074,257 | \$1,084,947,679 | \$121,873,422 | 12.7\% |
| 24. | Ohio | \$961,245,704 | \$911,063,100 | -\$50,182,604 | -5.2\% |
| 25. | District of Columbia | \$802,665,991 | \$884,679,509 | \$82,013,518 | 10.2\% |
| 26. | New Hampshire | \$647,519,480 | \$690,101,589 | \$42,582,109 | 6.6\% |
| 27. | Kansas | \$527,694,208 | \$604,515,899 | \$76,821,690 | 14.6\% |
| 28. | New Mexico | \$402,893,823 | \$417,083,401 | \$14,189,578 | 3.5\% |
| 29. | Alabama | \$284,483,852 | \$326,404,340 | \$41,920,487 | 14.7\% |
| 30. | Iowa | \$225,221,908 | \$249,931,931 | \$24,710,023 | 11.0\% |
| 31. | South Carolina | \$205,683,230 | \$240,231,465 | \$34,548,235 | 16.8\% |
| 32. | Tennessee | \$210,182,630 | \$221,589,845 | \$11,407,215 | 5.4\% |
| 33. | Idaho | \$194,382,485 | \$212,461,430 | \$18,078,946 | 9.3\% |
| 34. | Nebraska | \$178,132,628 | \$200,063,062 | \$21,930,434 | 12.3\% |
| 35. | Rhode Island | \$132,239,461 | \$121,413,504 | -\$10,825,958 | -8.2\% |
| 36. | Arkansas | \$125,443,038 | \$116,350,757 | -\$9,092,281 | -7.2\% |
| 37. | Vermont | \$106,662,059 | \$112,689,249 | \$6,027,190 | 5.7\% |
| 38. | North Dakota | \$126,881,373 | \$105,949,164 | -\$20,932,209 | -16.5\% |
| 39. | Kentucky | \$98,048,881 | \$103,135,547 | \$5,086,666 | 5.2\% |
| 40. | Oklahoma | \$110,220,681 | \$101,752,467 | -\$8,468,214 | -7.7\% |
| 41. | Nevada | \$73,484,063 | \$83,063,350 | \$9,579,287 | 13.0\% |
| 42. | Maine | \$62,093,918 | \$71,287,481 | \$9,193,563 | 14.8\% |
| 43. | Delaware | \$61,049,676 | \$66,599,786 | \$5,550,110 | 9.1\% |
| 44. | Mississippi | \$43,901,384 | \$42,750,469 | -\$1,150,916 | -2.6\% |
| 45. | Alaska | \$43,050,539 | \$37,541,121 | -\$5,509,417 | -12.8\% |
| 46. | Louisiana | \$32,371,188 | \$35,049,615 | \$2,678,427 | 8.3\% |
| 47. | West Virginia | \$31,589,154 | \$30,679,341 | -\$909,813 | -2.9\% |
| 48. | Hawaii | \$29,659,370 | \$28,325,526 | -\$1,333,844 | -4.5\% |
| 49. | South Dakota | \$27,193,302 | \$26,624,756 | -\$568,545 | -2.1\% |
| 50. | Montana | \$22,738,502 | \$25,832,258 | \$3,093,756 | 13.6\% |
| 51. | Wyoming | \$4,296,649 | \$3,610,404 | -\$686,245 | -16.0\% |

[^3]
## U.S. JOBS DIRECTLY SUPPORTED BY TECH EXPORTS

| Rank | State |  | Tech Product Export Jobs 2017 | Tech Services Export Jobs 2017 | Total Tech Export Jobs 2017 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 2016-2017 } \\ \text { Change } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016-2017 } \\ \text { \% Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | California |  | 123,002 | 82,759 | 205,761 | 20,385 | 11.0\% |
| 2. | Texas |  | 145,051 | 15,310 | 160,360 | -1,242 | -0.8\% |
| 3. | Washington |  | 10,889 | 31,456 | 42,346 | 2,929 | 7.4\% |
| 4. | Florida |  | 35,031 | 4,917 | 39,948 | 2,912 | 7.9\% |
| 5. | Massachusetts |  | 19,574 | 19,727 | 39,302 | 2,340 | 6.3\% |
| 6. | Oregon |  | 26,874 | 5,409 | 32,283 | -2,897 | -8.2\% |
| 7. | New York |  | 18,902 | 12,554 | 31,456 | 2,175 | 7.4\% |
| 8. | Illinois |  | 19,712 | 6,230 | 25,942 | 2,115 | 8.9\% |
| 9. | New Jersey |  | 14,669 | 9,342 | 24,010 | 3,091 | 14.8\% |
| 10. | Arizona |  | 16,356 | 2,933 | 19,289 | 1,025 | 5.6\% |
| 11. | North Carolina |  | 6,373 | 10,458 | 16,831 | -62 | -0.4\% |
| 12. | Tennessee |  | 15,773 | 489 | 16,262 | 338 | 2.1\% |
| 13. | Pennsylvania |  | 9,321 | 6,722 | 16,043 | 104 | 0.7\% |
| 14. | Georgia |  | 7,733 | 8,308 | 16,041 | 1,422 | 9.7\% |
| 15. | Virginia |  | 5,882 | 9,172 | 15,054 | 582 | 4.0\% |
| 16. | Colorado |  | 5,147 | 7,929 | 13,076 | 755 | 6.1\% |
| 17. | Minnesota |  | 9,463 | 3,423 | 12,886 | 519 | 4.2\% |
| 18. | Michigan |  | 8,152 | 2,831 | 10,983 | 601 | 5.8\% |
| 19. | Wisconsin |  | 7,139 | 3,593 | 10,731 | -466 | -4.2\% |
| 20. | Ohio |  | 7,398 | 2,252 | 9,650 | 647 | 7.2\% |
| 21. | Maryland |  | 2,747 | 6,708 | 9,454 | -380 | -3.9\% |
| 22. | Indiana |  | 5,189 | 3,766 | 8,955 | 1,162 | 14.9\% |
| 23. | Utah |  | 4,948 | 3,869 | 8,817 | 585 | 7.1\% |
| 24. | New Mexico |  | 6,307 | 919 | 7,225 | -492 | -6.4\% |
| 25. | Connecticut |  | 2,712 | 3,417 | 6,129 | 256 | 4.4\% |
| 26. | New Hampshire |  | 4,385 | 1,606 | 5,991 | 1,016 | 20.4\% |
| 27. | Idaho |  | 5,033 | 478 | 5,511 | -1,254 | -18.5\% |
| 28. | Nevada |  | 5,277 | 205 | 5,481 | 904 | 19.7\% |
| 29. | Vermont |  | 5,120 | 288 | 5,409 | -439 | -7.5\% |
| 30. | Kentucky |  | 4,894 | 231 | 5,124 | 723 | 16.4\% |
| 31. | Missouri |  | 1,700 | 2,902 | 4,602 | 393 | 9.3\% |
| 32. | South Carolina |  | 3,248 | 533 | 3,781 | 209 | 5.9\% |
| 33. | Mississippi |  | 3,057 | 68 | 3,125 | 362 | 13.1\% |
| 34. | Kansas |  | 1,612 | 1,437 | 3,049 | 293 | 10.6\% |
| 35. | District of Columbia |  | 564 | 2,150 | 2,714 | 662 | 32.2\% |
| 36. | Oklahoma |  | 2,460 | 165 | 2,625 | 494 | 23.2\% |
| 37. | Alabama |  | 1,564 | 830 | 2,394 | 38 | 1.6\% |
| 38. | Delaware |  | 1,926 | 183 | 2,108 | 740 | 54.1\% |
| 39. | Iowa |  | 1,476 | 576 | 2,052 | 201 | 10.9\% |
| 40. | Nebraska |  | 562 | 593 | 1,154 | 103 | 9.8\% |
| 41. | Maine |  | 920 | 178 | 1,097 | 24 | 2.2\% |
| 42. | Rhode Island |  | 433 | 374 | 807 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 43. | Arkansas |  | 536 | 215 | 751 | -245 | -24.6\% |
| 44. | Louisiana |  | 416 | 63 | 479 | 13 | 2.7\% |
| 45. | North Dakota |  | 144 | 211 | 355 | -2 | -0.7\% |
| 46. | West Virginia |  | 276 | 65 | 341 | 20 | 6.2\% |
| 47. | South Dakota |  | 269 | 41 | 310 | 17 | 5.7\% |
| 48. | Montana |  | 80 | 65 | 145 | 21 | 16.7\% |
| 49. | Hawaii |  | 49 | 59 | 108 | -34 | -24.2\% |
| 50. | Alaska |  | 58 | 45 | 104 | -1 | -0.7\% |
| 51. | Wyoming |  | 38 | 5 | 43 | 9 | 26.3\% |
|  |  | TOTAL | 580,435 | 278,061 | 858,496 | 42,673 | 5.2\% |

## METHODOLOGY

Sizing the technology industry has become increasingly challenging. This stems from the ongoing blurring of lines between what constitutes tech, as well as how tech is categorized by government statistics agencies. For example, an automobile company exporting its own autonomous vehicle technology or a financial services firm providing fintech data services abroad, some portion of the value of these activities will not be captured by export statistics as currently categorized. Some of the inputs used by automotive companies or financial services companies, such as semiconductors, will be captured in tech manufacturing, but if companies are developing their own software or other technology internally, for example, it will not be captured. Because these scenarios are becoming more prevalent, there is some degree of undercounting of tech products and services exports.

This report relies on a set of categories defined by the NAICS codes used by government agencies. While any categorization system has limitations, relying on established NAICS ensures consistency in tracking data over time and in comparisons across states, regions, and industry sectors.

As it relates to totals, in some cases the sum of the underlying states will not exactly match the reported figure at the national level. This is due to a portion of imports or exports categorized as 'unallocated' and the presence of a small amount of trade attributed to U.S. territories.

As it relates to trade-supported employment figures, the U.S. Office of Trade and Economic Analysis states, "given the data used to estimate jobs supported by state-level exports, care should be taken in the interpretation of the results. The figures presented should best be thought of as representing the number of jobs supported by the exports from a state as opposed to the number of jobs supported by exports within a state."

For additional detail and methodology on state services exports and jobs tied to exports, see The Trade Partnership's CDxports database: http://tradepartnership.com/data/cdxports-and-cdxjobs/

For additional data on manufactured goods exports, see the U.S. International Trade Administration: http://tse.export.gov/tse/tsehome.aspx.

For additional data on services exports, see U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis:
https://www.bea.gov/iTable/index_ita.cfm.
${ }^{1}$ Data from World Bank and IMF

## APPENDIX

## Total tech exports

(product + service), 2018

1. California
2. Texas
3. Washington
4. Massachusetts
5. Florida
6. New York
7. Oregon
8. Illinois
9. New Jersey
10. Arizona

| Tech services exports as a \% | Tech |
| :--- | :---: |
| of state's total tech exports | services \% |


| 1. | Washington | $77.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | District of Columbia | $77.5 \%$ |
| 3. | Maryland | $71.5 \%$ |
| 4. | North Carolina | $67.1 \%$ |
| 5. | Colorado | $64.1 \%$ |
| 6. | North Dakota | $63.6 \%$ |
| 7. | Missouri | $63.2 \%$ |
| 8. | Alaska | $61.3 \%$ |
| 9. | Virginia | $59.9 \%$ |
| 10. | Georgia | $59.0 \%$ |


| Estimated tech exports as a \% of state GDP, 2017 |  | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Vermont | 6.2\% |
| 2. | Oregon | 5.4\% |
| 3. | Washington | 4.4\% |
| 4. | Texas | 3.4\% |
| 5. | Massachusetts | 3.4\% |
| 6. | California | 3.3\% |
| 7. | New Hampshire | 3.2\% |
| 8. | Idaho | 2.9\% |
| 9. | New Mexico | 2.7\% |
| 10. | Arizona | 2.5\% |

## Global tech hubs put spotlight on the ingredients for innovation

The ingredients of innovation have never been more accessible. With little more than a broadband connection and a credit card, a startup can spin up powerful, scalable compute and storage capacity with minimal investment. Add in open source code, stackable
technologies, talent marketplaces, and creative financing and the ingredients are all there for innovation to flourish. The data bears this out as tech hubs have sprouted up across the globe (think Toronto, Nairobi, Budapest, Singapore, Stockholm, Dubai, and Sao Paulo, to name just a few). While Silicon Valley and other U.S. cities remain dominant players, their share of the total "innovation pie" may shrink as a percentage of the total due to accelerating growth in markets around the world. This means the next breakthrough in fintech, smart cities, Al, robotics, quantum computing, or 'to-bedetermined' could occur in any number of global tech hubs. Countries looking to leapfrog ahead increasingly pursue efforts to enhance their appeal, which typically starts with building the most tech-savvy workforce possible. Other efforts may revolve around support for R\&D, public-private partnerships that facilitate the efficient transfer and deployment of technology, or targeted innovation policies. Lastly, factors such as livability, affordability, and openness cannot be overlooked when the competition for talent extends beyond borders.

For complete CompTIA IT Industry Outlook report: https://www.comptia.org/resources/it-industry-trends-analysis

[^4]
## APPENDIX

| TECH EXPORTS FROM U.S. | Type | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 est. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Computer / peripheral equipment | Product | 49,080,733,680 | 46,748,140,492 | 45,132,566,351 | 46,271,543,602 | 49,677,528,139 |
| Communications equipment | Product | 40,458,336,822 | 42,156,979,791 | 41,540,861,800 | 40,766,405,698 | 38,318,513,503 |
| Audio / video equipment | Product | 9,771,035,582 | 9,613,922,984 | 9,397,643,017 | 9,746,555,937 | 9,267,222,018 |
| Semiconductors / components | Product | 54,890,642,780 | 53,647,436,281 | 54,497,349,384 | 58,435,368,109 | 59,363,158,185 |
| Navigational / Measuring / Instruments | Product | 50,829,332,583 | 48,869,406,979 | 47,733,225,761 | 48,836,679,667 | 51,924,230,221 |
| Magnetic / Optical Media | Product | 4,090,878,039 | 3,659,784,001 | 3,632,262,402 | 4,068,184,434 | 4,665,115,397 |
| IT / computer services | Service | 13,991,000,000 | 16,707,000,000 | 19,626,000,000 | 22,941,000,000 | 24,290,000,000 |
| Information / data processing services | Service | 7,160,000,000 | 7,285,000,000 | 7,186,000,000 | 8,399,000,000 | 9,673,000,000 |
| R\&D and testing services | Service | 32,731,000,000 | 34,743,000,000 | 38,159,000,000 | 42,191,000,000 | 42,080,000,000 |
| Telecommunications services | Service | 13,539,000,000 | 12,587,000,000 | 11,736,000,000 | 10,879,000,000 | 9,996,000,000 |
| Software / software-as-a-service | Service | 39,177,000,000 | 36,791,000,000 | 36,708,000,000 | 37,081,000,000 | 38,757,000,000 |
| Tech product subtotal | Subtotal | 209,120,959,486 | 204,695,670,528 | 201,933,908,715 | 208,124,737,447 | 213,215,767,463 |
| Tech services subtotal | Subtotal | 106,598,000,000 | 108,113,000,000 | 113,415,000,000 | 121,491,000,000 | 124,796,000,000 |
| Total | Total | 315,718,959,486 | $312,808,670,528$ | 315,348,908,715 | 329,615,737,447 | 338,011,767,463 |
| TECH IMPORTS INTO U.S. | Type | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 est. |
| Computer / peripheral equipment | Product | 92,509,650,327 | 91,761,230,070 | 86,741,584,959 | 96,988,166,769 | 105,971,921,597 |
| Communications equipment | Product | 107,494,759,454 | 114,257,343,252 | 116,276,096,281 | 125,354,123,196 | 121,791,960,511 |
| Audio / video equipment | Product | 36,164,782,078 | 36,806,046,053 | 34,229,264,339 | 32,065,406,521 | 31,328,118,779 |
| Semiconductors / components | Product | 71,396,990,764 | 72,152,679,185 | 74,259,569,345 | 81,128,232,622 | 86,059,732,451 |
| Navigational / Measuring / Instruments | Product | 53,382,595,888 | 54,195,101,018 | 53,061,560,034 | 54,414,390,502 | 57,604,085,308 |
| Magnetic / Optical Media | Product | 5,654,007,533 | 6,865,400,319 | 8,204,312,791 | 10,613,819,883 | 11,275,090,328 |
| IT / computer services | Service | 27,285,000,000 | 27,940,000,000 | 29,531,000,000 | 31,956,000,000 | 32,239,000,000 |
| Information / data processing services | Service | 2,461,000,000 | 2,483,000,000 | 2,370,000,000 | 2,619,000,000 | 2,472,000,000 |
| R\&D and testing services | Service | 30,869,000,000 | 32,256,000,000 | 34,133,000,000 | 35,344,000,000 | 35,163,000,000 |
| Telecommunications services | Service | 6,757,000,000 | 6,281,000,000 | 5,490,000,000 | 5,478,000,000 | 5,706,000,000 |
| Software / software-as-a-service | Service | 6,714,000,000 | 6,795,000,000 | 7,593,000,000 | 9,957,000,000 | 9,284,000,000 |
| Tech product subtotal | Subtotal | 366,602,786,044 | 376,037,799,897 | 372,772,387,749 | 400,564,139,493 | 414,030,908,974 |
| Tech services subtotal | Subtotal | 74,086,000,000 | 75,755,000,000 | 79,117,000,000 | 85,354,000,000 | 84,864,000,000 |
| Total | Total | 440,688,786,044 | 451,792,799,897 | 451,889,387,749 | 485,918,139,493 | 498,894,908,974 |
| TRADE BALANCE (exports - imports) | Type | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 est. |
| Computer / peripheral equipment | Product | $(43,428,916,647)$ | $(45,013,089,578)$ | $(41,609,018,608)$ | $(50,716,623,167)$ | (56,294,393,458) |
| Communications equipment | Product | $(67,036,422,632)$ | $(72,100,363,461)$ | $(74,735,234,481)$ | $(84,587,717,498)$ | $(83,473,447,008)$ |
| Audio / video equipment | Product | $(26,393,746,496)$ | $(27,192,123,069)$ | $(24,831,621,322)$ | (22,318,850,584) | $(22,060,896,761)$ |
| Semiconductors / components | Product | $(16,506,347,984)$ | $(18,505,242,904)$ | $(19,762,219,961)$ | $(22,692,864,513)$ | $(26,696,574,266)$ |
| Navigational / Measuring / Instruments | Product | $(2,553,263,305)$ | $(5,325,694,039)$ | $(5,328,334,273)$ | $(5,577,710,835)$ | $(5,679,855,087)$ |
| Magnetic / Optical Media | Product | $(1,563,129,494)$ | $(3,205,616,318)$ | $(4,572,050,389)$ | $(6,545,635,449)$ | $(6,609,974,931)$ |
| IT / computer services | Service | $(13,294,000,000)$ | $(11,233,000,000)$ | (9,905,000,000) | (9,015,000,000) | (7,949,000,000) |
| Information / data processing services | Service | 4,699,000,000 | 4,802,000,000 | 4,816,000,000 | 5,780,000,000 | 7,201,000,000 |
| R\&D and testing services | Service | 1,862,000,000 | 2,487,000,000 | 4,026,000,000 | 6,847,000,000 | 6,917,000,000 |
| Telecommunications services | Service | 6,782,000,000 | 6,306,000,000 | 6,246,000,000 | 5,401,000,000 | 4,290,000,000 |
| Software / software-as-a-service | Service | 32,463,000,000 | 29,996,000,000 | 29,115,000,000 | 27,124,000,000 | 29,473,000,000 |
| Tech product subtotal | Subtotal | $(157,481,826,558)$ | $(171,342,129,369)$ | $(170,838,479,034)$ | $(192,439,402,046)$ | (200,815,141,511) |
| Tech services subtotal | Subtotal | 32,512,000,000 | 32,358,000,000 | 34,298,000,000 | 36,137,000,000 | 39,932,000,000 |
| Total | Total | $(124,969,826,558)$ | (138,984,129,369) | $(136,540,479,034)$ | $(156,302,402,046)$ | (160,883,141,511) |

Source: Foreign Trade Division of U.S. Census Bureau | U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis | CompTIA
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