

Caccavaio, Marianna; Carmassi, Jacopo; Di Giorgio, Giorgio; Spallone, Marco

Working Paper

SMEs and the challenge to go public: evidence from a recent survey

CASMEF Working Paper Series, No. WP 2012/02

Provided in Cooperation with:

Arcelli Centre for Monetary and Financial Studies, Department of Economics and Finance, LUISS Guido Carli

Suggested Citation: Caccavaio, Marianna; Carmassi, Jacopo; Di Giorgio, Giorgio; Spallone, Marco (2012) : SMEs and the challenge to go public: evidence from a recent survey, CASMEF Working Paper Series, No. WP 2012/02, LUISS Guido Carli, Department of Economics and Business, Arcelli Centre for Monetary and Financial Studies, Rome

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/319945>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

CASMEF Working Paper Series

SMEs AND THE CHALLENGE TO GO PUBLIC: EVIDENCE FROM A RECENT SURVEY

Marianna Caccavaio Jacopo Carmassi Giorgio Di Giorgio Marco Spallone

Working Paper No. 2
January 2012

Arcelli Centre for Monetary and Financial Studies
Department of Economics and Business
LUISS Guido Carli
Viale Romania 32, 00197, Rome -- Italy
<http://casmef.luiss.edu>

© Marianna Caccavaio, Jacopo Carmassi, Giorgio Di Giorgio and Marco Spallone. The aim of the series is to diffuse the research conducted by CASMEF Fellows. The series accepts external contributions whose topics are related to the research fields of the Center. The views expressed in the articles are those of the authors and cannot be attributed to CASMEF.

SMEs And The Challenge To Go Public

Evidence from a Recent Survey

by

Marianna Caccavaio, Jacopo Carmassi, Giorgio Di Giorgio, Marco Spallone^{*}

January 2012

Abstract:

Italian SMEs go public much less than SMEs located in other European countries, even though their relevance for the national economy is relatively higher in terms of employment and value added. Why do Italian SMEs so scarcely rely on equity as an external source of finance, despite the option of getting listed on SME-dedicated stock market segments? In this paper we address this question by analyzing the responses to a questionnaire that we submitted to a sample of listed firms and institutional investors. We also suggest policy interventions to provide Italian SMEs with the appropriate incentives for listing.

Keywords: SMEs, IPO, equity financing, financial constraints

JEL codes: G1, G3

^{*}Caccavaio: Department of Business and Management and CASMEF-LUISS Guido Carli, email: mcaccavaio@luiss.it; Carmassi: CASMEF-LUISS Guido Carli, email: jcarmassi@luiss.it; Di Giorgio: Department of Economics and Finance and CASMEF-LUISS Guido Carli, email: gdg@luiss.it; Spallone: Università Gabriele D'Annunzio di Pescara and CASMEF-LUISS Guido Carli, email: mspallone@luiss.it. Correspondence to Marco Spallone, CASMEF (Arcelli Centre for Monetary and Financial Studies), LUISS Guido Carli, Viale Romania 32-00197-Rome-Italy, <http://casmeff.luiss.edu>. This paper has been written for the 25th Anniversary of Assosim and a preliminary version was presented and discussed at the Borsa Italiana on November 14th, 2011. The views expressed in the article are those of the authors and cannot be attributed either to CASMEF or Assosim.

1. Introduction

Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) are key contributors to employment and growth. For example, considering a sample of 99 countries in the time interval 2006-2010, Ayyagari et al. (2011) found that SMEs employed on average the 66% of total workers; even considering a restricted sample of industrialized countries (EU-27), the contribution of SMEs to total employment was again 66%.

Given the economic relevance of SMEs, their difficulties in accessing funds are a crucial issue for both policy makers and researchers worldwide. However, the relative share of external and internal sources of funds and the role of bank credit versus equity financing vary across countries, as shown by Beck et al. (2008). So, both scholars and policy makers have focused on the role played by institutional, financial and legal environments in explaining SME difficulties across countries.

Interestingly, Italian SMEs go public much less than SMEs located in other European countries, even though their relevance for the national economy is relatively higher in terms of number of firms, employment and value added. The objective of this paper is to explore why Italian SMEs rarely rely on equity as an external source of finance, i.e. they rarely go public, despite the option of getting listed on SME-dedicated stock market segments. We also aim at suggesting policy interventions to provide SMEs with appropriate incentives for listing.

The decision of going public is still an open issue in corporate finance; moreover, since this decision depends on a large set of potential determinants, there is no theoretical model capable of capturing the role played by all of them. That is why we decided to investigate the “paradox” of Italian SMEs (that is, the paradox of SMEs playing a key role in the national economy and simultaneously being rarely listed on regulated markets) through a questionnaire: in particular, we submitted it to a sample of listed firms and institutional investors to understand both the decision of firms of going (or not going) public and the decision of investors of allocating (or not allocating) their funds into SMEs.

This paper is organized as follows: the second section contains a brief analysis of the economic relevance of European SMEs; the third section describes the differences among dedicated institutional frameworks for listing across Europe; the fourth and the fifth sections focus on Italian listed SMEs and institutional investors respectively; the sixth section describes the structure of the questionnaire, the surveyed sample, and the main results; the seventh and the eighth sections summarize recent policy interventions and suggest new ones to facilitate the access of Italian SMEs to regulated markets; finally we offer our conclusions.

2. The economic context

SMEs represent a dominant share of the industrial structure of European countries, in terms of number of firms (over 99%) and employees (over 65%); their contribution to value added is also very significant, close to 60% of the overall value added. Within SMEs, the breakdown into micro, small and medium enterprises allows to identify some important features: micro firms (i.e. those with fewer than 10 employees) play a central role, amounting to 92% of the total number of enterprises, producing about 22% of total value added, and accounting for about 30% of total labor force (Table 1).

Table 1: Enterprise size class analysis of key indicators, EU-27, 2008

| | Number of enterprises | Persons employed | Value added |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | (mln) | | (EUR 1 000 mln) |
| All enterprises | 21,0 | 135,8 | 6.176 |
| All SMEs | 20,9 | 90,6 | 3.617 |
| Micro | 19,3 | 39,3 | 1.348 |
| Small | 1,4 | 27,9 | 1.147 |
| Medium | 0,2 | 23,4 | 1.122 |
| Large | 0,04 | 45,2 | 2.559 |
| | | | |
| | Number of enterprises | Persons employed | Value added |
| | share in total (%) | | |
| All enterprises | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 |
| All SMEs | 99,8 | 66,7 | 58,6 |
| Micro | 92,0 | 29,0 | 21,8 |
| Small | 6,7 | 20,5 | 18,6 |
| Medium | 1,1 | 17,2 | 18,2 |
| Large | 0,2 | 33,3 | 41,4 |

Size classes based on number of employees: micro = 1-9; small = 10-49; medium = 50-249; large = 250 or more. Financial firms are excluded. *Source:* Eurostat.

Across country analysis over EU member states shows that both similarities and differences exist:

- Similarities: SMEs are about 99% of the total number of firms, with a largely prevailing share of micro enterprises, a small share of small firms and an even smaller one of medium firms (Table 2).

- Differences:
 - The percentage of micro-enterprises significantly varies across countries, with countries like Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and France having more micro firms than the 92% EU-27 average, and other countries, including Germany and United Kingdom, having less micro firms than the 92% EU-27 average;
 - As for the number of workers employed by SMEs (Table 3), some countries are well above the 67% EU average (Greece, Italy, Portugal, and Spain), while other countries are below such average (France, Germany, and United Kingdom);
 - As for the value added (i.e., the gross operative income), the contribution of micro firms is relatively higher in those countries with a larger share of employees at SMEs (Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain) with respect to others (France, Germany and United Kingdom), as shown in Table 4.

Table 2: Number of enterprises by size, 2008

| | Total number of enterprises (thousands) | Micro | Small | Medium | All SMEs | Large |
|----------------|--|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | | (%) | | | | |
| Greece | 811 | 96,6 | 3,0 | 0,4 | 99,9 | 0,1 |
| Italy | 3.947 | 94,3 | 5,1 | 0,5 | 99,9 | 0,1 |
| Portugal | 778 | 94,0 | 5,1 | 0,7 | 99,9 | 0,1 |
| Spain | 2.653 | 93,1 | 6,0 | 0,8 | 99,9 | 0,1 |
| Sweden | 586 | 94,7 | 4,4 | 0,8 | 99,8 | 0,2 |
| France | 2.633 | 93,1 | 5,9 | 0,9 | 99,8 | 0,2 |
| Belgium | 426 | 92,5 | 6,3 | 0,9 | 99,8 | 0,2 |
| EU-27 | 20.994 | 92,0 | 6,7 | 1,1 | 99,8 | 0,2 |
| Netherlands | 583 | 90,4 | 8,0 | 1,4 | 99,7 | 0,3 |
| Ireland | 158 | 87,8 | 9,9 | 1,9 | 99,7 | 0,3 |
| Finland | 202 | 91,7 | 6,9 | 1,1 | 99,7 | 0,3 |
| Austria | 294 | 87,2 | 10,8 | 1,7 | 99,6 | 0,4 |
| United Kingdom | 1.731 | 89,3 | 8,8 | 1,5 | 99,6 | 0,4 |
| Denmark | 211 | 85,0 | 12,2 | 2,4 | 99,6 | 0,4 |
| Germany | 1.880 | 83,0 | 14,1 | 2,4 | 99,5 | 0,5 |

Size classes based on number of employees: micro = 1-9; small = 10-49; medium = 50-249; large = 250 or more.

Financial firms are excluded. *Source:* Eurostat, European Commission.

Table 3: Number of employees (%) by size of enterprises, 2008

| | Micro | Small | Medium | All SMEs | Large |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Greece | 57% | 17% | 11% | 86% | 14% |
| Italy | 46% | 22% | 12% | 81% | 19% |
| Portugal | 39% | 23% | 17% | 79% | 21% |
| Spain | 39% | 23% | 15% | 76% | 24% |
| Ireland | 23% | 26% | 24% | 73% | 27% |
| Austria | 25% | 23% | 19% | 67% | 33% |
| Belgium | 29% | 21% | 16% | 67% | 33% |
| EU-27 | 29% | 21% | 17% | 67% | 33% |
| Denmark | 17% | 25% | 24% | 66% | 34% |
| Netherlands | 25% | 21% | 19% | 66% | 34% |
| Sweden | 26% | 21% | 18% | 65% | 35% |
| Finland | 25% | 20% | 17% | 61% | 39% |
| Germany | 19% | 22% | 20% | 61% | 39% |
| France | 24% | 20% | 16% | 61% | 39% |
| United Kingdom | 20% | 16% | 16% | 51% | 49% |

Size classes based on number of employees: micro = 1-9; small = 10-49; medium = 50-249; large = 250 or more.

Financial firms are excluded. *Source*: Eurostat, European Commission.

Table 4: Value added* by size of enterprises, 2008

| | Micro | Small | Medium | ALL SMEs | Large |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Greece | 36% | 21% | 16% | 72% | 28% |
| Italy | 32% | 23% | 16% | 71% | 29% |
| Portugal | 23% | 23% | 22% | 68% | 32% |
| Spain | 28% | 22% | 17% | 67% | 33% |
| Netherlands | 28% | 19% | 19% | 66% | 34% |
| Denmark | 19% | 21% | 21% | 62% | 38% |
| Austria | 19% | 20% | 21% | 60% | 40% |
| Belgium | 20% | 21% | 19% | 60% | 40% |
| Sweden | 22% | 19% | 18% | 59% | 41% |
| EU-27 | 22% | 19% | 18% | 59% | 41% |
| Ireland | 16% | 20% | 22% | 58% | 42% |
| France | 22% | 19% | 15% | 56% | 44% |
| Germany | 16% | 18% | 20% | 54% | 46% |
| Finland | 19% | 17% | 17% | 53% | 47% |
| United Kingdom | 19% | 15% | 16% | 50% | 50% |

*Gross operative income. Size classes based on number of employees: micro = 1-9; small = 10-49; medium = 50-249; large = 250 or more. Financial firms are excluded. *Source*: Eurostat, European Commission.

Given their key role, policy makers at national and European level have undertaken initiatives to create a convenient business environment for SMEs: in the EU, the 2008 Small Business Act (SBA)¹ introduced a set of 10 principles to serve as guidelines for national and

¹ *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, "Think Small First", A "Small Business Act" for Europe*, Brussels, 25.6.2008, COM(2008) 394 final. The SBA was reviewed in February 2011, *Communication from the Commission to*

European rules,² aimed both at creating a consistent business environment for SMEs throughout Europe and at promoting growth, competitiveness and job creation. One of the fundamental problems that SMEs have to face is funding: the constraints on bank credit, more binding after the 2007-2009 financial crisis, and the further potential restrictions, which might be produced by the new Basel III framework, urge both firms and policy makers to rethink the role of bank debt and to search for alternative sources of funds.

A survey on SMEs³ published in December 2011 by the European Commission found that access to finance is the second top concern of European SMEs: in fact, while almost two-thirds (63%) of the European SMEs who applied for a bank loan during the last six months of 2011 received the whole amount they asked for (vs. 77% for large firms)⁴, 11% of them were not funded at all, and 17% of them received less than the amount they applied for; moreover, 4% of SMEs declined the loan offer from the bank because the financial conditions were considered unacceptable. So, almost one-third of European SMEs applying for bank loans did not receive funding.

In the same time interval, while 75% of European SMEs made use of debt financing (Figure 1), only 7% of them accessed equity financing (Figure 2)⁵; it is worth noticing that equity financing is particularly low in countries where SMEs play a relatively more important role, such as in Italy (3%), Spain (3%), and Portugal (2%).

the European Parliament, the Council, Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Review of the "Small Business Act" for Europe, Brussels, 23.2.2011, COM(2011) 78 final.

² In particular:


- 1) Create an environment in which entrepreneurs and family businesses can thrive and entrepreneurship is rewarded;
- 2) ensure that honest entrepreneurs who have faced bankruptcy quickly get a second chance;
- 3) design rules according to the "Think Small First" principle;
- 4) make public administrations responsive to SMEs' needs;
- 5) adapt public policy tools to SME needs: facilitate SMEs' participation in public procurement and better use State Aid possibilities for SMEs
- 6) facilitate SMEs' access to finance and develop a legal and business environment supportive to timely payments in commercial transactions;
- 7) help SMEs to benefit more from the opportunities offered by the Single Market;
- 8) promote the upgrading of skills in SMEs and all forms of innovation;
- 9) enable SMEs to turn environmental challenges into opportunities; 10) encourage and support SMEs to benefit from the growth of markets.

³ SMEs are defined in the report as firm with 1-249 employees. 15,150 interviews were conducted across 38 countries, of which 13,859 interviews across the EU 27 countries, between 22nd August 2011 and 7th October 2011. Sampled firms belong to the following sectors: mining and quarrying, manufacturing electricity, gas and water supply, construction, wholesale and retail trade, hotels and restaurants, transport, storage and communication, real estate, renting and business activities, education, health and social work, other community, social and personal service. Enterprises of the following sectors are not included: agriculture, fishing, public administration, financial services, activities of households, extra-territorial organizations and bodies, holding companies.

⁴ Based on a survey of 91 banks in 45 countries, Beck, Demirgüç-Kunt and Martínez Pería (2008) found a negative bias for SMEs versus large firms in the relationship with banks: the latter are less exposed and charge higher interest rates and fees to SMEs relative to large firms and have higher non-performing loans related to lending to SMEs.


⁵ The survey reports that the share of large firms (250 or more employees) using equity financing is 11%, while the figure rises to 14% for SMEs owned by venture firms; equity financing is reported to be less likely for enterprises with a single owner.

Figure 1: Share of SMEs using debt financing*



*Data referred to last six months before publication of the survey. *Source:* European Commission, *SMEs' Access to Finance, Survey 2011 (December)*.

Figure 2: Share of SMEs using equity financing*



*Data referred to last six months before publication of the survey. *Source:* European Commission, *SMEs' Access to Finance, Survey 2011 (December)*.

Overall, despite cross country differences, European SMEs are generally characterized by a significant share of short-term debt and a high reliance on bank debt; moreover, in some countries (as Italy, for example), a low level of capitalization and a shortage of both private equity and venture capital funds are relevant issues. Policy makers have tried to increase capitalization of SMEs and to facilitate their access to external funds through a number of initiatives, such as the launch of SME-dedicated stock markets, that are the focus of the next section.

3. Institutional settings for SMEs listing

Increased competition in the new global arena and the need to reduce the dependence from the banking system call for a different capital structure of SMEs and for the design of proper incentives for SMEs to turn to capital markets. Going public could bring significant benefits to SMEs, such as:


- Easier access to capital;
- Potential diversification of funding sources;
- Better medium-long term growth perspectives.

However, both high admission fees and strict listing requirements discourage SMEs from going public. Moreover, cultural factors may induce further resistances: in fact, when firms are family-run, going public may imply substantial ownership and governance changes.

In order to tackle these issues, SME-dedicated markets have been established in many countries, with lighter requirements and lower costs for both being and remaining listed. In the last two decades stock market segments dedicated to SMEs have been launched in many European countries: these segments are typically set up as Multilateral Trading Facilities (MTF), self-regulated markets introduced by the MiFID Directive (2004/39/EC), which allow listing with lower admission and annual fees⁶ and easier requirements in terms of compliance and reporting. In 1995 the London stock exchange was the first market maker to establish the Alternative Investment Market (AIM): since then, it has attracted over 3200 companies (17% of them located outside the United Kingdom), raising £76.7 bn. Over 1100 companies are currently (they were more than 1600 in 2006 and 2007, as shown in Figure 3) listed.

⁶ For a study on listing fees in main exchanges around the world, including MTFs in EU countries, see Geranio and Lazzari (2011).

Figure 3: Number of companies listed on AIM UK, 1995-2011



Source: AIM Market Statistics, November 2011.

In the new millennium, the successful UK experiment was followed by other EU countries: in May 2005 Euronext launched Alternext and in October 2005 Deutsche Börse created the Entry Standard segment; in the same year Nasdaq OMX launched First North (initially in Denmark and later in Sweden, Iceland, and Finland). In Italy, two different segments dedicated to SMEs were established: MAC, Mercato Alternativo del Capitale, in 2007 (restricted to institutional investors) and AIM Italia (open to retail investors) in 2008. Other SME-dedicated markets have been created, among others, in Austria (Mid Market in 2007) and in Japan (AIM Tokyo in 2009).

The success of these SME-dedicated regulated markets varies across countries in terms of listed companies, with the AIM UK and the AIM Italia being respectively the most and the least successful. However, it should be underlined that the performance of the AIM Italia has been badly affected by the difficult global economic situation and the poor performance of the Italian economy.

There seems to be no positive correlation between the role played by SMEs and their propensity to be listed on stock exchanges: the Italian case is highly representative of this missing link (Vegas 2011). If we consider either the number of firms listed on SME-dedicated segments or their market capitalization, Italian markets appear to be scarcely attractive for SMEs, as it is evident from international comparisons: the dedicated stock markets of France, Germany, and especially United Kingdom appear to be much more attractive for SMEs, although in these countries SMEs are relatively less important than in Italy. As shown in Figure 4, 1189 companies were listed on the


AIM UK, with a total market capitalization of €74 bn; Alternext, First North, and Entry Standard are less developed, but still successful, with 189, 132, and 132 listed companies and a market capitalization of €5.5 bn, €14.1 bn, and €2.6 bn respectively; only 13 and 10 companies were listed on the AIM Italia and the MAC, with a market capitalization of €0,313 bn and €0,269 bn respectively ⁷. Many reasons can be taken into account to explain these figures: in particular, both higher admission fees and higher annual listing fees are likely to play an important role. For example, minimum fees for the AIM Italia are set at a significantly higher level with respect to those of the AIM London, Entry Standard and Alternext (see Geranio and Lazzari, 2011). However, it should be stressed that these differences may also be due to the relatively younger age of Italian SME-dedicated stock markets with respect to their foreign counterparts (this is particularly true for United Kingdom): a more robust comparison will be possible in the next few years.

Obviously, the development of SME-dedicated segments mirrors that of the main Italian stock exchanges: from 2000 to 2010 the number of listed domestic companies decreased from 297 to 286, and the ratio of market capitalization on national GDP went from 69% to 35% (in France, Germany, and United Kingdom this ratio is 90%, 50% and 157%, respectively). New admissions to listing were also much fewer in Italy (160) than in France (633), Germany (234), and United Kingdom (1910) (see Vegas, 2011).

Given this outlook, an analysis of share indexes of the main international SME-dedicated exchanges and the FTSE Italia Micro Cap index shows that the Italian markets performed worse than other markets and are also less liquid: in 2010, returns expressed in Euros were -5% for the FTSE Italia Micro Cap, -33% for the AIM Italia and -10% for the MAC (in the same period FTSE MIB lost 12%). Markets in other countries performed much better: Alternext only lost 3%, while AIM UK gained 47%, First North 16%, and Entry Standard 4%.

⁷ The previous Italian stock market segment dedicated to SMEs, Expandi, was not more successful, since only 39 firms were listed on it at year-end 2008 (four years after its launch). Expandi was later merged with the MTA.

Figure 4: Number of listed companies (left scale) and market capitalization of SMEs-dedicated stock markets (**right scale, mln €**)*



*Number of listed companies as of December 15 2011. Market capitalization as of November 30 2011. First North market capitalization as of 31 October 2011. The year reported under the name of each market is its launch date.
Source: exchanges websites.

In the next section we focus on some selected features of Italian listed SMEs.

4. Focus on Italian listed SMEs

A sample of SMEs listed on the Italian stock markets has been identified in order to understand their key features. This sample has been selected either on the basis of the stock market segments on which they are listed or on the basis of size indicators: therefore, companies listed on SME-dedicated markets have been included, i.e. the AIM Italia and the MAC, as well as SMEs that are listed on the Mercato Telematico Azionario (MTA). Firms listed on the latter market have been selected according to the definition of SMEs employed by the European Commission in its 2003/361/EC Recommendation (May 2003). The EU criteria define as SMEs those firms with less than 250 employees and with a total balance sheet not larger than €43 mln or annual revenues not

higher than €50 mln;⁸ lower thresholds are set for small and micro enterprises (Table 5); banks and financial firms, real estate companies and investment holding companies are excluded.

Table 5: European criteria for the identification of SMEs

| | Number of employees | Annual balance sheet total | Annual turnover |
|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | AND | OR |
| Medium | <250 | <= €43 mln | <=€50 mln |
| Small | <50 | <=€10 mln | <=€10 mln |
| Micro | <10 | <=€2 mln | <=€2 mln |

Based on this methodology, the resulting sample is composed by 11 companies listed on the AIM Italia⁹, 11 companies listed on the MAC¹⁰, and 21 companies listed on the MTA.¹¹ The average size of companies listed on the AIM Italia and the MAC is high relative to EU thresholds for SME definition, signaling that not all firms listed on SME-dedicated exchanges are actually SMEs, at least in terms of strict EU definitions.

With regard to SMEs listed on the MTA, both at individual and aggregate level the turnover ceiling requirement is met more frequently than the total asset ceiling. The following tables (6, 7, and 8) display the SMEs listed on the MTA, the AIM Italia and the MAC, also reporting the number of employees, the total assets, the turnover and the business sector in which they operate.

⁸ Criteria on firms independence included in the European methodology have not been used.

⁹ A 12th company, Made in Italy 1, is a SPAC (Special Purpose Acquisition Company) listed in June 2011 for which data have not been found. After our sample elaborations were completed, two more companies were listed on AIM Italia: Ternigreen (“green” industry) on November 10, 2011, and Ambromobiliare (financial advisory services) on December 23, 2011.

¹⁰ Editoriale Olimpia was suspended from negotiations in May 2011, but was still included in the official listing in October 2011 when elaborations were completed and is included in our sample (it was later removed from the listing).

¹¹ Using market capitalization thresholds would significantly expand the sample; however, on the one hand listed SMEs tend to have a lower market capitalization than large firms, but on the other hand not all listed companies with a low market capitalization are actually SMEs; also, negative stock market performances (as in 2011) would tend to artificially enlarge the sample to include firms which are not small or medium. Besides, the economic meaning of SMEs and Small and Medium Caps is different and, given that the fundamental question addressed in this paper is why Italian SMEs rarely go public, we decided to select the sample based on employees and size based on balance sheet and income statement rather than on market data.

Table 6: Sample of SMEs listed on MTA

| | | Number of employees, 2010 | Total assets 2010, mln € | Turnover 2010, mln € | Sector |
|----|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 1 | INDUSTRIA E INNOVAZIONE S.P.A. | 12 | 135,2 | 6,0 | Energy |
| 2 | BORGOSIESA S.P.A. | 13 | 131,7 | 3,7 | Textile, real estate |
| 3 | K.R. ENERGY S.P.A. | 19 | 94,2 | 22,6 | Energy |
| 4 | MONDO TV SPA | 26 | 46,5 | 12,4 | Media, animation |
| 5 | CHL SPA | 30 | 27,8 | 21,2 | Online commerce |
| 6 | MONDO HOME ENTERTAINMENT SPA | 33 | 44,8 | 29,3 | Home videos |
| 7 | UNI LAND S.P.A. | 45 | 604,9 | 22,0 | Real estate, renewable energy |
| 8 | RETELIT S.P.A. | 53 | 197,6 | 33,4 | Telecommunications |
| 9 | OLIDATA SPA | 69 | 35,2 | 31,1 | Computer |
| 10 | MOLECULAR MEDICINE S.P.A. | 84 | 73,9 | 2,7 | Biotechnology, research |
| 11 | KINEXIA S.P.A. | 85 | 228,1 | 41,9 | Cosmetics, energy |
| 12 | BONIFICHE FERRARESI | 86 | 157,1 | 11,0 | Agriculture |
| 13 | VALSOIA S.P.A. | 89 | 39,9 | 57,0 | Food |
| 14 | ALERION CLEAN POWER S.P.A. | 100 | 633,0 | 47,0 | Energy |
| 15 | B&C SPEAKERS S.P.A. | 100 | 17,9 | 23,6 | Audio equipment |
| 16 | FULLSIX S.P.A. | 121 | 18,3 | 12,0 | E-business, online marketing |
| 17 | ROSS SPA | 125 | 15,4 | 17,2 | Metallic shelvings |
| 18 | ENERVIT S.P.A. | 142 | 31,6 | 41,1 | Sport nutrition and wellbeing |
| 19 | POLIGRAFICA SAN FAUSTINO SPA | 190 | 34,6 | 44,0 | Graphics and communications services |
| 20 | BEST UNION COMPANY SPA | 200 | 29,0 | 26,1 | E-ticketing, hospitality and security for large-scale events |
| 21 | MONTI ASCENSORI SPA | 218 | 66,6 | 43,5 | Lifts |
| | Average | 88 | 126,8 | 26,1 | |

2009 data for Uni Land. *Source:* annual reports, Osiris.

Table 7: Companies listed on AIM ITALIA

| | | Number of employees, 2010 | Total assets 2010, mln € | Turnover 2010, mln € | Sector |
|----|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 1 | UNIONE ALBERGHI ITALIANI S.P.A. | 1 | 12,3 | 0,6 | Hotels |
| 2 | FIRST CAPITAL | 1 | 25,2 | 0,6 | Investments in small e mid caps, private equity |
| 3 | METHORIOS CAPITAL SPA | 10 | 14,5 | 6,2 | Corporate finance, assistance to SMEs |
| 4 | VRWAY COMMUNICATION | 13 | 22,2 | 6,0 | Media publishing |
| 5 | FINTEL ENERGIA GROUP S.P.A. | 34 | 56,9 | 54,8 | Energy |
| 6 | NEUROSOFT | 51 | 6,6 | 2,9 | Software |
| 7 | PMS S.P.A. | 71 | 7,5 | 6,4 | Consulting, corporate and financial communication |
| 8 | VITA SOCIETA' EDITORIALE S.P.A. | 130 | 6,2 | 3,1 | Publishing |
| 9 | IKF S.P.A. | 149 | 76,5 | 54,3 | Investments in SMEs |
| 10 | POLIGRAFICI PRINTING S.P.A. | 233 | 93,7 | 68,6 | Publishing |
| 11 | TBS GROUP S.P.A. | 1948 | 225,4 | 190,7 | Clinical engineering, e-health |
| | Average | 240 | 49,7 | 35,8 | |


Source: annual reports, Osiris.

Table 8: Companies listed on MAC

| | | Number of employees, 2010 | Total assets 2010, mln € | Turnover 2010, mln € | Sector |
|----|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 1 | VALORE ITALIA HOLDING DI PARTECIPAZIONI | 0 | 4,8 | 2,8 | Investment holding company |
| 2 | IMVEST | 10 | 27,3 | 0,05 | Real estate |
| 3 | GRUPPO EFFEGI | 14 | 5,5 | 3,6 | Holding - consumer credit, insurance, IT |
| 4 | AREA IMPIANTI | 20 | 35,4 | 22,0 | Energy |
| 5 | SEI ENERGIA | 25 | 81,7 | 21,7 | Energy |
| 6 | TESSITURA PONTELAMBRO | 39 | 9,0 | 5,6 | Textile |
| 7 | SOFT STRATEGY | 59 | 2,8 | 3,3 | Consulting |
| 8 | EDITORIALE OLIMPIA | 59 | 17,3 | 5,0 | Publishing |
| 9 | CENTRO SERVIZI METALLI | 68 | 42,1 | 46,4 | Steel cutting |
| 10 | RAFFAELE CARUSO | 605 | 33,1 | 20,7 | Clothing |
| 11 | ROSETTI MARINO | 747 | 339,9 | 477,4 | Services for gas and oil industry |
| | Average | 150 | 54,4 | 55,3 | |

Source: annual reports, Osiris. Data as of 30 June 2010 for Editoriale Olimpia and Raffaele Caruso.

Figure 5: Profitability, capitalization and liquidity of SMEs listed in Italian exchanges, 2010




Source: annual reports, Osiris.

As shown in Figure 5, the profitability of SMEs included in the sample was negative in 2010, reflecting the overall negative financial and economic environment. The average data on each segment (AIM Italia, MAC, MTA) should be interpreted carefully, also taking into account the high variance that characterize the selected sample: in fact, there are companies that performed extremely well with a ROE above 10% or even 20%, and companies with significantly negative ROE. A similar analysis applies to returns on assets.


Regarding liquidity, listed SMEs are on average sound, as highlighted by the current ratio (i.e., current assets/current liabilities), which is close to or well above 100%. The solvency ratio is below 40% in all groups and indicates that Italian SMEs (i.e., most Italian firms) suffer from undercapitalization. The international comparison with companies listed in foreign SME-dedicated markets makes this weakness particularly evident (Figure 6). However, this weakness characterizes the entire universe of Italian SMEs vis-à-vis SMEs in other countries. Moreover, as highlighted in Figure 7, the European Commission survey on SMEs cited in Section 2 found that the ratio of debt over total assets for Italian SMEs has been increasing in 2011, while the trend has been decreasing for the large majority of SMEs located in other EU-27 countries. This feature reinforces the need to carefully evaluate the impact of the new Basel III framework on bank credit to Italian SMEs; in order to limit the risk of a credit crunch for SMEs caused by new capital rules, specific proposals have been submitted, all aimed at keeping the minimum capital requirement on banks exposures to SMEs at 8%, unchanged relatively to Basel II.

Figure 6: Liabilities structures of listed and not listed SMEs*, 2010



* Listed SMEs include the SMEs in the sample; listed and non listed medium firms include all the medium firms in Italy; listed firms include all listed firms in Italy; Aim UK, Alternext, Entry Standard, First North include all the companies listed in the respective markets. *Source:* DataStream. Listed and non listed medium firms data are from Mediobanca.

Figure 7: SMEs debt-to-assets ratio



Source: European Commission, *SMEs' Access to Finance, Survey 2011 (December)*.

5. Institutional investors, private equity and venture capital in Italy

Institutional investors are the main vehicle by which households access financial markets. According to international standards, the portfolios of Italian households are characterized by a very small share of securities issued by institutional investors. Indeed, the percentage of investments in mutual funds, pension funds, and insurance securities is equal to 24%, compared with 47% in France, 46% in Germany, and 57% in UK (Banca d'Italia, 2010). Moreover, in Italy the weight of institutional investors in the stock market is much smaller than in other countries: in fact, the market capitalization held by institutional investors is equal to 28% in Italy, while it is 65% in USA and in Europe (EU-27), and 81% in UK (Mussari, 2011).

Given this situation, it is also important to highlight the lack of small cap funds. Indeed, in Italy only 9 funds are dedicated to investments in SMEs, versus 61 in France, and 57 in UK (Montanino, 2011). Furthermore, as we will show later, institutional investors generally consider as small cap those companies with a capitalization less than € 1 billion. This definition includes almost all companies listed in the Italian stock exchanges, revealing a weak propensity to invest in small and micro firms.

The weak role of institutional investors in the Italian stock market is perceived as a limit for all SMEs evaluating the option of going public: in fact, it is an obstacle to the placement of securities in the primary market and causes a reduction in trading activities in the secondary market, with negative effects on the liquidity of SME listed securities.

Another key issue is the lack of both venture capital (VC) and private equity (PE) markets. On the fundraising side, the Italian VC/PE market is dominated by generalist closed end funds (managed by asset management firms – Italian SGRs), followed by pan-European funds; banks play a limited role and the contribution of pension funds is very low, especially if compared with other European countries, where they are top players (EVCA, 2011, and Di Giorgio and Di Odoardo, 2008). After a quite significant growth from 1998 to 2008, the market suffered a retrenchment after the 2007-2008 financial crisis: in fact, in 2009 PE/VC investments halved from € 5,458 bn of the previous year to € 2,615 bn, falling again to € 2,461 bn in 2010. However, the early stage investments have known some growth since 2007, after a few years of very low figures from 2002 to 2006, reaching the amount of € 115 bn, € 98 bn, and € 89 bn in 2008, 2009, and 2010 respectively. Expansion investments have experienced a decreasing trend in recent years, as did buyout investments, which continue to account for the major share (around two-third) of total investments. Moreover, the percentage of investments in high tech firms was generally very low in the last decade (with a partial exception in 2000 and 2001), even though it recently jumped from 4% in 2007 and 2008 to 21% in 2009 and 37% in 2010; in 2010 the number of firms receiving VC/PE

funds was higher in the biotech (24%), medical (20%), media, entertainment (16%), and computer sectors (16%) (AIFI, 2011, and Di Giorgio and Di Odoardo 2008).

The limited availability of private equity and venture capital funds in Italy is often regarded as a relevant barrier to the growth of SMEs, which face significant financing obstacles especially in the start-up and the expansion phases: despite few good news, the traditionally low share of investments in early stages and in high-tech sectors is likely to have put a brake to growth, notably for more innovative firms¹². The cited European Commission survey on SMEs access to finance showed that only 4% of sampled Italian SMEs are confident about obtaining financing from equity investors or venture capital firms, vis-à-vis the 16% EU-27 average; the results of our questionnaire seem to confirm an excess of demand relative to the supply of private equity/venture capital funds. A more efficient private equity and venture capital market could be beneficial and effective in helping SME growth and innovation¹³, thus allowing SMEs to be less dependent on bank financing¹⁴.

Another possible interpretation is that the demand for venture capital/private equity funds is scarce because SMEs are reluctant to grow and to go public; some support to this intuition emerged from our questionnaire. However, little demand for VC/PE funds could also be caused by other factors, such as the relatively high costs (in terms of both money and time) of PE/VC funds or the concerns about the loss of control due to the involvement of PE/VC funds into firms.

6. The Questionnaire

In order to investigate the reasons of the relatively scarce presence of listed SMEs in Italy despite their prominent role in the economy, we chose to contact a sample of firms and institutional investors in order to receive direct information about:

- The decision of SMEs of going (or not going) public;

¹² For an overview of the VC/PE market in Italy until 2006 see Di Giorgio and Di Odoardo (2008).

¹³ However, it must be recalled that the literature has found mixed evidence on the causal link between a developed venture capital/private equity market on one side and innovation activity and growth on the other side: for example, according to Hellman and Puri (2000) and Kortum and Lerner (2000), in the United States venture capital plays a key role in promoting innovation and growth; but Ueda and Hirukawa (2008a) found that venture capital has at best a weak positive impact on innovation, while Gompers and Lerner (2001) indicated that the causal chain is the opposite, i.e. most innovative firms are those who go in search of venture capital funds, and similar results were obtained by Ueda and Hirukawa (2008b; “innovation first” hypothesis). With regard to Europe, Di Giorgio and Di Odoardo (2007) found a positive effect of venture capital investments on GDP growth in the period 1993-2004, while Bottazzi and Da Rin (2002) do not find higher growth and employment creation for listed firms funded by venture capital; similar conclusions are reached by Hamao, Packer and Ritter (1998) for Japan, who found that venture capital-backed IPOs in Japan do not perform better in the long run than other IPOs.

¹⁴ Berger and Udell (2011) show that there is an inverse association between the number of banking relationships and funding by venture capitalists, based on a dataset of venture capital funds obtained by SMEs and bank-firm relationships in Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom; besides, firms backed by venture capital before seeking bank funding are less likely to use bank financing.

- The choice of investors to allocate (or not) their funds on SMEs;
- The choice of firms over the preferred regulated market;
- The most relevant costs and benefits of being listed;
- The policy recommendations.

We submitted a questionnaire¹⁵ to our sample of both listed firms and institutional investors.

The questionnaire submitted to firms is divided into 6 Parts:

1. Obstacles and advantages of listing
2. Where to go public?
3. Before going public
4. After going public
5. Governance
6. Interventions to encourage the listing of SMEs

The questionnaire submitted to institutional investors include parts 1, 2, 6 and a part dedicating to investment in SMEs in Italy. Interviews were conducted either by telephone or face to face with senior managers. In few cases, the questionnaires were sent in excel format by email.

In this section, we present the results obtained from the questionnaires completed by the 5th of December 2011: in particular, 10 questionnaires from listed firms and 10 questionnaires from institutional investors. Due to the small number of completed questionnaires received so far, we decided not to perform any quantitative analysis; however, the results obtained so far seem to be sufficiently consistent to provide us with a reliable picture of the current situation. In the following subsections, we illustrate and discuss the results obtained from the questionnaire.

Part 1: Obstacles and advantages of listing

The first session of the questionnaire aims at analyzing the costs and benefits of listing. The decision of going public is complex and the relevant costs and benefits cannot be captured by a single theoretical model: Pagano et al. (1998) provided an overview of the main findings concerning the decision of going public¹⁶ and performed an empirical research on a sample of Italian firms, concluding that the probability of going public increases with both size and industry market-to-book ratio; they also found that the main reason for listing is the need of rebalancing


¹⁵ The questionnaire is in Italian and is available upon request.

¹⁶ Main theories on the costs of going public focus, among other factors, on the following: adverse selection and fixed costs (both lowering the probability of small firms going public), loss of confidentiality (lowering the likelihood of high-tech companies going public; Campbell 1979, Yosha 1995). Main theories on the benefits of going public are focused on: overcoming borrowing constraints, greater bargaining power with banks, liquidity and portfolio diversification, monitoring, enlargement of the set of potential investors, stock market monitoring, investor recognition, change of control, windows of opportunity.

financial sheets after large investments, rather than the need to fund new investments. Chemmanur and Fulghieri (1999) developed a theoretical model to understand at what stage of life a company should go public; Chemmanur et al. (2010) investigated the relationship between the decision of going public and market performance both before and after listing; Boot et al. (2006) focused on incentives, costs and benefits of being public versus those of staying private; Lerner (1994) studied the timing of IPOs of a sample of privately held venture-backed biotechnology firms, finding that these companies decide to go public when share prices are high, while they prefer to stay private when prices are low.

Many issues identified by theoretical contributions have been investigated through this section of the questionnaire, with a special focus on the Italian context. The interviewees had to rank costs and benefits on a 1 (non- relevant) to 5 (very relevant) scale. Figure 8 shows the results for both companies and institutional investors with respect to costs.

Figure 8: The costs of going public



Admission fees and other monetary costs are perceived as a relevant barrier to entry; however, the time consumed to fulfill listing requirements seems to be regarded as more burdensome. It is important to notice that monetary costs are more important for firms than for

institutional investors: this is probably due to a sample bias, given that interviews were conducted at companies that have already chosen to go public. Despite these considerations, listing fees (especially admission fees) are still regarded as relevant: it may be useful to recall that, according to Borsa Italiana, issuers listed on the MTA have to bear an average cost of € 800/900.000 (i.e., from 2% to 5% of the total amount of funds raised through the IPO), while issuers listed on the AIM Italia have to bear an average cost of € 200/300.000 (i.e., between 5% and 6% of the total amount of funds raised through the IPO, as shown by Mussari, 2011). It is worth pointing out that the fees to be paid on the AIM Italia are higher than those on other European SME-dedicated markets, as recalled in Section 3. Moreover, listed Italian firms incur non-monetary costs, such as the mandatory publication on newspapers of risk bulletins, that foreign listed firms do not incur.

Both the potential slowdown of decision-making procedures and the loss of privacy (for example, institutional investors stress the firms' reluctance to disclose their business plans) that may result from listing seem to matter for both firms and investors; the distinction between family and corporate wealth is regarded as a very important consequence of going public by institutional investors, but not by firms. Risks related to insider trading, exposure to market cycles, increased management responsibility and loss of control are perceived as very relevant by investors. Surprisingly, the potential loss of control does not seem to be a major concern for firms: however, this result might change with a larger sample, or could be interpreted as a firms' attempt to deny their desire to maintain the traditional structure of ownership and governance.

With regard to regulatory costs, stability emerges as the basic need from the responses of both firms and investors. Obviously, the dominant role of the banking system is viewed as a relevant obstacle to listing more by investors than by firms, while the limited role of institutional investors is regarded as an important structural weakness by both firms and investors themselves. The scarce liquidity of SME securities is considered as a major issue by both firms and market operators.

Among cultural obstacles, firms and investors agree on the importance of the lack of financial culture on the companies' side, the poor knowledge of the SME market and the reluctance of retail investors.

Figure 9: The benefits of going public





Figure 9 shows the responses of both firms and investors about the benefits of going public. Not surprisingly, the major advantage of listing is the access to an extra source of funds; firms also consider listing as an useful tool to increase their bargaining power with banks and obtain better lending conditions. As highlighted by Rajan (1992), gaining access to the stock market, thus disseminating information to a large population of investors, ensures both a lower cost of credit and a larger potential supply of external finance.

Strategic benefits from going public include corporate image and international visibility: in fact, investors, both foreign and domestic, can interpret being listed on a major regulated market as a quality signal. It is worth noticing that mandatory reporting procedures are perceived by listed companies as operational advantages: in fact, even if these procedures are expensive and burdensome (and imply the disclosure of corporate information to fiscal authorities and competitors), companies claim that they induce more efficient management processes.

The benefits of listing for shareholders (monetization, recapitalization, succession) and managers (remuneration, visibility, networking) are deemed relevant more by investors than by companies.

Figure 10: The scarce SMEs listing in Italian stock exchanges: who is responsible?



We have asked our respondents to provide their view about the current situation of Italian SME-dedicated markets: in particular, we asked them to identify responsibilities. Again, they had to rank responsibilities on a 1 (low responsibility) to 5 (high responsibility) scale. The results are presented in Figure 10 above.

Our intuition is that the low number of listed Italian SMEs is a rational response to the current economic and regulatory framework. However, while this intuition seem to be confirmed by the responses of institutional investors (who point out the responsibilities of the regulatory framework, together with those of Consob and Borsa Italiana), it is not supported by those of firms. Investors also claim that companies themselves are responsible, mainly because of their poor financial culture. In fact, most Italian SMEs are family-owned businesses, traditionally reluctant to give up total control: actually, the lack of dedicated institutional investors could itself be a consequence of this reluctance.

Part 2: Where to go public?

The choice of the regulated market on which being listed is a relatively new issue for companies: in fact, the possibility of choosing among different markets is a feature of the post-MiFID world (i.e., with the notable exception of the AIM London, European SME-dedicated markets have been set up after 2004).

This part of the questionnaire aims at investigating which market characteristics are more attractive to both companies and investors. The main outcome is that the choice of being listed on

the AIM Italia is driven by the fact that SMEs are not able to meet the requirements to access the MTA (i.e., either the capitalization requirement¹⁷ or the free floating requirement¹⁸). The MAC is never the preferred option. A possible explanation of this outcome is that companies are willing to signal their quality by complying with the highest level of disclosure and with the stricter and costlier set of rules (i.e., a sort of regulatory “race to the top”): in fact, quality signals may positively affect share prices, liquidity, and cost of funds. In this sense, the MAC seems to suffer from a negative bias that could be overcome through a merger with AIM Italia, as planned by Borsa Italiana and supported by the large majority of our sample.

Another interesting outcome is that investors are interested in small caps with a strong growth potential, but do not distinguish between companies listed on the MTA and those listed on the AIM Italia. Again, they tend to be reluctant to invest in companies listed on the MAC, thus confirming the existence of a negative bias.

Part 3: Before going public

Part 3 deals with listing procedures and requirements. In particular, it focuses on the determinants that are more likely to ensure the successful completion of the listing procedure.

The responses from our sample reveal that companies operating at international level are more likely to be successful. The quality of management is another determinant of success.

It is a widespread opinion in our sample that a major role in listing procedures is played by the financial advisors, the tax advisors, the independent auditors, the legal consultants, the sponsors, and finally the communication consultant.

Part 4: After going public

This set of questions focuses on the post-listing phase. Here, the main result is that the funds collected on the market have been employed to finance productive investments and innovation. Companies are fairly satisfied regarding the post-listing support offered by Borsa Italiana.

Finally, among the tools employed by listed companies to inform their current and potential investors, a strong preference goes to websites.

¹⁷ It is 40 millions Euros for the MTA.

¹⁸ It is 25% for MTA and 35% for the STAR segment.


Part 5: Governance

Part 5 deals with corporate governance. It turns out that the post-listing board of directors is generally more efficient than the pre-listing one: our sample claims that this is due to the clear separation of governmental and business roles, to the higher quality of human resources, and to the presence of independent directors and specialized committees within the board.

Part 6: Interventions to encourage the listing of SMEs

This section investigates which policy interventions could be undertaken in order to support the listing of SMEs in Italy. As usual, companies and investors were asked to rank a broad selection of measures on a 1 (non-effective) to 5 (very effective) scale. Results for both companies and institutional investors are shown in Figure 11. The main result is that policies capable of ensuring stability in the regulatory environment and of favoring the capitalization of SMEs were the preferred ones.

Figure 11: Interventions to encourage the listing of SMEs



Tax incentives for listed SME and for small cap investment funds are supposed to be very effective by both firms and investors; in particular, the introduction of tax cuts for those investing in companies listed on the AIM Italia and/or the MAC is considered as a valuable option. The issue of fiscal incentives is intensely debated also with regard to the AIM UK (for example, a favorable tax

regime on capital gains has been proposed by Grant Thornton, 2010): their rationale is to address the negative bias suffered by SMEs versus large firms (i.e., the so called “equity gap”), due to asymmetric information, transaction costs, illiquidity of assets, and scarce trading of assets, further reinforced by the relatively higher costs of due diligence procedures. Fiscal incentives could fill the “equity gap” by supporting SMEs both in the primary and the secondary market, hence improving liquidity, reducing the cost of capital, and favoring fund raising.

Favorable capital gain or income tax treatments, together with dividend relief (for retail investors and/or venture capital funds), can offset the high risk that investors have to bear when they invest in SMEs. Moreover, favorable fiscal treatments could increase the amount of investments of private equity funds, small cap funds, and pension funds.

On the whole, a streamlining of regulatory and bureaucratic costs is highly desirable for both firms and investors; with regard to disclosure requirements, the 2% equity stake threshold for the compulsory communication to the market is also perceived as burdensome. Finally, a merger between the AIM Italia and the MAC is generally supported, even though firms do not see it as a key intervention.

The large majority of our sample believes that the new Basel III framework will increase the costs of funds for SMEs. In this scenario, it becomes even more relevant to adopt policy measures capable of favoring the listing of SMEs.

Part 7: Investments in SMEs

This part of the questionnaire was submitted to institutional investors only. It deals with the choice of investing in stocks with a relatively small market capitalization. The institutional investors who completed the questionnaire are not constrained to invest a share of their portfolio in SME securities; moreover, they do not manage SME dedicated funds.

The answers received show that investors are only interested in returns; actually, they also value the possibility of having an easy access to the top management. Investors are not interested in corporate governance; furthermore, they do not perceive fiscal incentives and visibility as relevant benefits.

Investors think that the main reasons that prevent investments in Italian SMEs are the following:

- SME’s access to regulated markets is often seen as the culmination of a process of growth and not as a starting point; indeed Pagano et al. (1998) show that in Italy IPOs tend to involve companies that were very profitable in the previous years;

- The market capitalization of the high-growth sectors is very low in Italy; as shown in Table 9, there are only 20 Hi-Tech companies listed on the MTA and they account for the 0.3% of total market capitalization; companies operating in high-value-added sectors, such as basic materials, and media and telecommunications, account just for the 0.1%, 1.4%, and 4.7% of total market capitalization respectively (and they are often publicly owned);
- The market capitalization of all listed Italian companies is very low if compared with international standards; in fact, the average capitalization is € 1.250 millions and the median is only € 81 million; moreover, 77% (85%) of the companies have a market capitalization lower than € 500 million (€ 1 billion), meaning that almost all the companies in the Italian stock exchanges can be considered as small cap companies.

Table 9: Capitalization of Italian Companies (November 30, 2011)

| Borsa Italia: Capitalization of Italian Companies (November 30, 2011) | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|---------|
| Sectors | Number of companies | Capitalization millions of € | % total |
| Automobiles & Parts | 10 | 9,889.8 | 3.0% |
| Banks | 19 | 55,608.4 | 16.7% |
| Basic Materials | 2 | 178.6 | 0.1% |
| Chemicals | 3 | 430.5 | 0.1% |
| Construction & materials | 15 | 5,234.1 | 1.6% |
| Financial Services | 22 | 7,641.6 | 2.3% |
| Food | 10 | 6,012.9 | 1.8% |
| Health Care | 7 | 3,797.2 | 1.1% |
| Industrial Goods & Services | 46 | 28,999.1 | 8.7% |
| Insurance | 8 | 23,660.5 | 7.1% |
| Media | 15 | 4,806.4 | 1.4% |
| Oil & Gas | 7 | 79,064.3 | 23.8% |
| Personal & Household Goods | 29 | 17,872.5 | 5.4% |
| Public Services | 18 | 65,366.0 | 19.6% |
| Real estate | 10 | 1,182.3 | 0.4% |
| Retail | 5 | 1,059.6 | 0.3% |
| Technology | 20 | 1,159.6 | 0.3% |
| Telecommunications | 4 | 15,713.3 | 4.7% |
| Travel & Leisure | 9 | 4,431.1 | 1.3% |
| Total MTA | 259 | 332,107.8 | 99.8% |
| AIM | 13 | 313.4 | 0.094% |
| MAC | 10 | 269.0 | 0.081% |
| Total MTA - AIM - MAC | 282 | 332,690.2 | 100% |

7. Recent initiatives to support Italian SMEs

A number of significant initiatives have been adopted in Italy to support SME growth, internationalization, capitalization, and access to loans. In June 2011, ABI and Borsa Italiana reached an agreement on an “IPO Bank Facility”, designed to grant credit to newly listed firms, especially SMEs. Banks participating the program will provide firms with medium-long term funds

to be allocated on growth-enhancing investments (i.e., physical or financial investments, not substituting a previous debt); the amount of funding will be determined applying a 1 to 2 multiplier to the total resources raised through the IPO. Companies obtaining loans will have to maintain a balanced post-IPO financial structure and banks will allow a fast track procedure for the loans, having also the possibility to use the information provided by firms to Borsa Italiana (for admission to listing). The estimated extra amount of loans made available to firms by the banking industry in the first three years is €1 bn (ABI and Borsa Italiana, 2011).

Three more projects have been launched in October 2011:

1. Elite, a three-year training program created through the cooperation of Borsa Italiana and the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance with the aim of promoting the organizational development, transparency and efficient management of SMEs; Elite is not a market but rather a program designed to enhance SMEs growth regardless of listing. Access to the network of players around the stock market, proximity to listed companies, increased ability to attract capital and strengthened reputation are all benefits offered by Elite. Eligibility criteria include a growth project, a minimum turnover of € 10 million (and growing; or lower, but only with high growth rates); operative result must be higher than 5% and last income statement must report a profit. The training program includes the budget and business plan elaboration, half-year financial reporting, definition of an adequate governance model and auditing of financial accounts; the program ends with a final check up and the release of a quality certificate;
2. The European Investment Fund-Italian Investment Fund (EIF-FII)¹⁹ program, aimed at making parallel co-investments to promote the capitalization and growth of SMEs in the segment of funds for growth, with an initial total amount of €200 mln (50% by EIF and 50% by FII), renewable after the first 4 years period. The FII will be entrusted with the task of finding possible options for the co-investments: the ultimate objective is to increase the financial resources available for growth to Italian SMEs; the governance of investment funds that will receive the resources is also expected to be strengthened and be thus able to attract further investments;

¹⁹ The European Investment Fund is part of the European Investment Bank (EIB) Group and is specialist provider of small and medium-sized enterprises risk finance across Europe. The Italian Investment Fund (Fondo Italiano d'Investimento) is a fund established in March 2010 by the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance, several sponsor banks and category associations, with the objective of supporting SMEs growth through investments in their capital.

3. Sace²⁰ will support SMEs through a strategy of acquisition and management of qualified investments (not exceeding 4%) in export-oriented companies listed or about to being listed, with no minimum capitalization threshold; an asset manager specialized in Small Cap will invest with a 3 to 5 years time horizon, and at least 60% of the portfolio will be dedicated to listed companies.

Moreover, the introduction of a favorable weighting for bank exposures toward SMEs under the Basel III framework and the new EU Capital Requirements Directive (the so-called CRD IV) has been advocated by ABI, Confindustria, Rete Imprese Italia and Alleanza delle Cooperative Italiane, and proposed to the European Commission: such proposal envisages that a particular coefficient (SME Supporting Factor) should be applied when calculating RWA related to exposures toward SMEs, in order to leave the Basel II 8% capital requirement unchanged. This proposal might be helpful in order to avoid a credit crunch for SMEs, which could be a serious and undesirable collateral effect of the higher capital requirements mandated by Basel III. The European Banking Authority (EBA) has been assigned the task of preparing by September 2012 a study on the risks posed by SMEs and, based on the results of the study, the EU Commission might subsequently amend its CRD IV proposal.

8. Policy Implications

The interventions to support SMEs described in the previous section seem to go in the right direction; however, further policy interventions are necessary. In fact, the institutional framework has favored undercapitalization and has made bank loans the only effective source of funds.

The newly established SME-dedicated markets, AIM Italia and MAC, have not been successful so far, despite convenient listing procedures. The lack of liquidity of the securities traded on the SME-dedicated markets together with the low profitability of listed firms have made these markets not attractive for investors, thus further discouraging SMEs from being listed on these markets. Therefore, policy interventions should aim at raising the listing requirements in order to signal the good quality of listed firms to potential investors; moreover, merging AIM Italia and MAC could be useful to enlarge the size of the market and increase liquidity.

Favorable conditions in terms of costs and procedures could be envisaged for companies operating in high value added sectors, in order to facilitate and encourage their listing, for example:

²⁰ SACE (Servizi Assicurativi del Commercio Estero) is an Italian insurance and financial group founded in 1977 and active in export credit, credit insurance, investment protection, financial guarantees, sureties and factoring; it is fully owned by the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance and works with SMEs and large corporations in over 180 countries, supporting export and internationalization.

1. Tailored admission requirements and adequate listing fees, together with fiscal incentives for investors, should be introduced, so as to promote the access to regulated markets of high-tech companies;
2. Dedicated incentives should be designed to favor venture capital and private equity investing in start-up companies;
3. Enhanced reimbursement flexibility for investments in SMEs operating in selected industries should be considered in order to solve liquidity issues of closed-ends funds.

Obviously, the structural undercapitalization of Italian listed SMEs with respect to SMEs listed in foreign markets raises a confidence issue on the side of investors: so, it is desirable to change the financial structure of SMEs, possibly decreasing the cost of debt and increasing the willingness of investing into small/young/innovative and thus potentially riskier companies.

Moreover, from the standpoint of SMEs, both fiscal incentives and the reduction of bureaucratic and regulatory costs seem to be crucial to favor the decision of entering regulated markets, as it is clear from the responses to our questionnaire: in fact, these are the only possible solutions to overcome all those cultural factors (especially binding in family-run enterprises) that make bank loans the preferred source of funds. On the first issue, incentives should be in place to encourage firms to achieve more diversification in their sources of funding (in this perspective, a strengthening of the PE/VC market would be crucial), along with a stronger capitalization. Actually, the recent ABI-Borsa Italiana “IPO Bank Facility” appears to be an effective move in this direction.

9. Concluding remarks

It is well known that the size of Italian firms is small if compared with the size of firms operating in other industrialized countries. This study confirms the intuition that the Italian economic system does not provide firms with the right incentives to grow: more precisely, this study suggests that Italian entrepreneurs keep their firms small in order to rationally respond to a set of distortive incentives provided by legislation (for example, about labor market and unions), regulation (for example, about accounting standards and tax procedures), and industrial policies.²¹

It is worth noticing that the results derived from the questionnaire submitted to a sample of listed firms and institutional investors are preliminary as only a small fraction of the sample completed and returned the questionnaire. However, some of the findings seem to be robust:

²¹ See Di Giorgio and Parascandolo (2010).

1. Both the firms and the institutional investors recognize the importance of being listed on regulated markets to favor investments and to improve international visibility; however, both recognize that listing is costly;
2. Institutional investors think that the major obstacles to the access of SMEs to regulated markets are:
 - i. The fear of entrepreneurs of losing total control over firms;
 - ii. The willingness of entrepreneurs of retaining informal managerial practices;
 - iii. The lack of financial literacy;
 - iv. Both the firms and the institutional investors think that there is no need of having many SME-dedicated markets;
3. Both the firms and the institutional investors claim that the Italian economic system lacks stability in terms of regulation, thus making long term strategies difficult to be implemented.

These results implicitly suggest a set of solutions to favor the access of Italian SMEs to regulated markets.

Some technical interventions may be designed to promote the start-up of SME-dedicated investment funds and to make SME-dedicated markets more liquid. However, what seems to be the most difficult issue to address is the lack of Italian SMEs operating in industrial sectors which are attractive for investors (for example, hi-tech and energy sectors): in fact, a complete and appropriate set of industrial policies should be implemented in order to develop capital intensive sectors.

As for future research, this study could be extended across two dimensions: first, the size of the sample should be enlarged in order to increase robustness of the results and to support the main findings through more sophisticated quantitative analysis; second, the questionnaire could be rolled out for a longer time span in order to identify the existence of medium-long term factors having an impact on the perceived costs and benefits from listing.

References

- ABI and Borsa Italiana, 2011. *Imprese: accordo ABI-Borsa italiana, 1 miliardo per sostenere le Ipo*, Milano, 23 giugno.
- ABI, Confindustria, Rete Imprese Italia and Alleanza delle Cooperative Italiane, 2011. *Macroeconomic growth and capital treatment of loans to SMEs: introduction of the 'SMEs Supporting Factor' to the capital requirements calculation*, June.
- AIFI, 2011. *The Italian Private Equity and Venture Capital market in 2010*, Survey AIFI – PricewaterhouseCoopers.
- Ayyagari M., Demirguc-Kunt A. and V. Maksimovic, 2011. *Small vs. Young Firms across the World Contribution to Employment, Job Creation, and Growth*. World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper 5631.
- Banca d'Italia, 2011. *Relazione Annuale 2010*, Roma.
- Banca Europea per gli Investimenti, Borsa Italiana, Fondo Italiano d'Investimento, Ministero dell'Economia e delle Finanze, Sace, 2011. *Nuovi strumenti integrati per la capitalizzazione delle PMI italiane*, Milano, 24 October.
- Beck T., Demirguc-Kunt A., and V. Maksimovic, 2008. *Financing patterns around the world: Are small firms different?*, "Journal of Financial Economics", 89(3), 467-487.
- Beck T., Demirguc-Kunt A. and M.S. Martínez Pería, 2008. *Bank Financing for SMEs around the World - Drivers, Obstacles, Business Models, and Lending Practices*, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4785, November.
- Berger, A.N. and K. Schaeck, 2011. *Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises, Bank Relationship Strength, and the Use of Venture Capital*, "Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking", Vol. 43, No. 2-3, 461-490.

Boot, A.W.A., Gopalan, R. and A.V. Thakor, 2006. *The Entrepreneur's Choice between Private and Public Ownership*, "The Journal of Finance", Vol. 61, No. 2, April.

Bottazzi L. and M. Da Rin, 2002. *Venture capital in Europe and the financing of innovative companies*, "Economic Policy", Vol. 17, No. 34, 229-270, April.

Campbell, T., 1979. *Optimal investment financing decisions and the value of confidentiality*, "Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis", 14, 913-924.

Chemmanur, T. and P. Fulghieri, 1999. *A Theory of the Going-Public Decision*, "The Review of Financial Studies", Vol. 12, No. 2, 249-279.

Chemmanur, T., He, S. and D. Nandy, 2010. *The Going-Public Decision and the Product Market*, "The Review of Financial Studies", Vol. 23, n. 5.

Di Giorgio, G. and M. Di Odoardo, 2007. *Venture Capital e Crescita in Europa*, in "Banche Italiane: La Metamorfosi?", Fondazione Rosselli, Edibank, Milano.

Di Giorgio, G. and M. Di Odoardo, 2008. *Venture Capital e Private Equity in Italia*, Government of the Italian Republic, Ministry of Economy and Finance, Department of the Treasury Working Paper No. 3, March.

Di Giorgio G. and P. Parascandolo, 2010. *In Search for growth and productivity: analysis and policy suggestions for the Italian economy*, Rivista Bancaria – Minerva Bancaria, 5-6, 31-58.

European Commission, 2011. *SME's access to Finance. Survey 2011*.

EVCA, European Private Equity and Venture Capital Association, 2011. *Pan-European Private Equity and Venture Capital Activity – Yearbook 2011*.

Geranio M. and V. Lazzari (2011). *Going Public and Listing Fees Around the World*, in Lazzari, V. (ed.), "Trends in the European Securities Industry", Emittenti Titoli, Egea, Milano, 1-49.

Gompers, P. and J. Lerner, 2001. *The Venture Capital Revolution*, “Journal of Economic Perspectives”, American Economic Association, vol. 15(2), 145-168.

Grant Thornton, 2010. *Economic impact of AIM and the role of fiscal incentives*, study commissioned by the London Stock Exchange, September.

Hamao Y., Packer, F. e J.R. Ritter. 1998. *Institutional Affiliation and the Role of Venture Capital: Evidence from Initial Public Offerings in Japan*, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Staff Report n.52, November.

Hellman T. and M. Puri, 2000. *The interaction between product market and financial strategy: the role of venture capital*, “Review of Financial Studies”, Vol. 13, n.4.

Lerner, J. 1994. *Venture Capitalists and the Decision to Go Public*, “Journal of Financial Economics”, 35, 293–316.

Montanino, 2011. *Pubblico e privato per il sostegno alle piccole e medie imprese*, in *Nuovi strumenti integrati per la capitalizzazione delle PMI italiane*, Banca Europea per gli Investimenti, Borsa Italiana, Fondo Italiano d’Investimento, Ministero dell’Economia e delle Finanze, Sace, Milano, 24 ottobre.

Mussari G., 2011. The limited weight of the Italian equity market: towards an action plan. *Bancaria* n. 2/2011

Pagano M., Panetta F. and Zingales L., 1998. *Why do companies go public? An empirical analysis*, “Journal of Finance”, 1, 27-64.

Rajan, Raghuram G., 1992, *Insiders and outsiders: The choice between informed and arm’s length debt*, “Journal of Finance”, 47, 1367–1400.

Ueda M. and M. Hirukawa, 2008a. *Venture Capital and Industrial “Innovation”*, CEPR Discussion Paper 7089.

Ueda M. and M. Hirukawa, 2008a. *Venture Capital and Innovation: Which is First?*, CEPR Discussion Paper 7090.

Vegas, G. 2011. Indagine conoscitiva sul mercato degli strumenti finanziari. Audizione del Presidente della Consob presso la VI Commissione (Finanze) della Camera dei Deputati, March 23, 2011.

Yosha, O. (1995). *Information disclosure costs and the choice of financing source*, “Journal of Financial Intermediation”, 4, 3–20.