

## MY MAIN PUBLICATIONS

### Abstract

#### ***La lotta alla disoccupazione giovanile in Europa: le iniziative recenti dell'UE e il contributo del Fondo Sociale Europeo post 2013***

Collana Working Paper Centro Studi POLITEIA - WP n. 2 luglio 2013

Author: Antonio Bonetti

---

The paper deals with recent initiatives launched by the European Commission for tackling the increasing level of youth unemployment in Europe. The analysis is developed in the framework of the new reform of the European Social Fund (ESF) in the 2014-2020 programming period.

Both aforementioned initiatives and new reforms of the ESF are spoiled by a “supply-side” approach. The author argues that Europe needs expansive policies aimed at enhancing effective demand. That being the case we can expect a reduction in unemployment. On the contrary, both Youth Guarantee and new reforms of the ESF could only bring about a redistribution of current employment.

The paper offers a concise presentation of main innovations in ESF strategy and actions as well.

#### ***Finalità e struttura del bilancio dell'UE***

Collana Working Paper Centro Studi POLITEIA - WP n. 1 gennaio 2010

Authors: Antonio Bonetti

---

The WP describes the system of public finance of the European Union and the main EU financial instruments. The first part presents structure and headings of the Multi-Annual Financial Framework of the EU and resources and principles of the annual budget. The second part presents both the financial instruments managed directly by the European Commission and those funds managed according the share management principle, *in primis* the Structural funds.

#### ***Decentralization of territorial policy in Italy: coherence with the model of Multi-Level Governance and effects on responsibilities of public spending***, in:

“*Il governo delle Regioni e lo sviluppo economico*” (eds. M. Bagarani - 2012)

Authors: Antonio Bonetti, Massimo Bagarani, Simona Zampino

---

The article evaluates the impact of the Italian legislative and administrative decentralization – that began in the ‘90s - on the economic growth of the so-called Objective 1 regions (poorer regions located in Southern Italy).

In the late 1990s a new cycle of regional policies called “*nuova programmazione*” (“new programming”) was introduced. The overall objective of the “*nuova programmazione*” was to tailor internal support policies for disadvantaged areas to EU Cohesion Policy.

In those years some relevant reforms to both the Public Administration and the institutional framework were launched. These aimed at adapting the institutional framework and the administrative procedures to the EU legislative and administrative framework.

Research proposes some critical reflections on the application to the Italian case of the model of EU Multi-Level Governance (typical of the EU Cohesion Policy).

Moreover, it shows that the effects on the economic growth of Southern regions have been disappointing.

#### ***Decentralization of territorial policy in Italy: coherence with the model of Multi-Level Governance and effects on responsibilities of public spending***, in:

“*Il governo delle Regioni e lo sviluppo economico*” (eds. M. Bagarani - 2012)

Authors: Antonio Bonetti, Massimo Bagarani, Simona Zampino

---

The article evaluates the impact of the Italian legislative and administrative decentralization – that began in the ‘90s - on the economic growth of the so-called Objective 1 regions (poorer regions located in Southern Italy).

In the late 1990s a new cycle of regional policies called “*nuova programmazione*” (“new programming”) was introduced. The overall objective of the “*nuova programmazione*” was to tailor internal support policies for disadvantaged areas to EU Cohesion Policy.

In the same period some relevant reforms to both the Public Administration and the institutional framework were launched. These aimed at adapting the institutional framework and the administrative procedures to the EU legislative and administrative framework.

Research proposes some critical reflections on the application to the Italian case of the model of EU Multi-Level Governance (typical of the EU Cohesion Policy).

Moreover, it shows that the effects on the economic growth of Southern regions have been disappointing.

***Evoluzione del sistema di governo delle politiche comunitarie e cambiamenti nella politica regionale nazionale***, in:

“*Il governo delle Regioni e lo sviluppo economico*” (eds. M. Bagarani - 2012)

Authors: Antonio Bonetti, Massimo Bagarani

---

The article analyses governance system of EU territorial policy (cohesion policy). Since the reform of Structural Funds in 1988 “institutional” multi level governance (MLG) has been applied to EU territorial policy (cohesion policy).

In such a decision making system, several levels of jurisdiction participate in decision making and Regions assume a key role in managing development policies.

EU MLG and main principles of EU cohesion policy provided a model that Italy followed in order to reform internal territorial policy and the same Public Administration. Actually, since the mid 1990s a strong process of decentralization has empowered both Regions and Local Authorities.

Three shortcomings have weakened both the administrative reforms and their effects on efficiency of public policies: (i) there is not a well thought-out correspondence between political “prerogatives” and levels of jurisdiction; (ii) there are too many intermediate bodies between levels of jurisdiction; (iii) Italian reforms have partially overlooked the importance of an adequate capacity building assistance for Regions and Local Authorities in order to improve their administrative capacity.

***Multi Level Governance e decentralizzazione: una applicazione al caso italiano***, in:

“*Crescita e sviluppo regionale. Strumenti, sistemi, azioni*” (eds. D. Borri and F. Ferlaino – 2009)

Authors: Antonio Bonetti, Massimo Bagarani, Simona Zampino

---

Since the late 1980s multi level governance (MLG) has been established as the decision making process of EU territorial policy (cohesion policy).

This article highlights how such a governance model, mostly led by Public Institutions, cuts transaction costs. The main reasons are: (i) it is based on principles aimed at streamlining the participation of decision makers, (ii) it aims at making all governing levels and the processes of institutional coordination more effective.

In particular, the article investigates two issues: a) to what extent the reforming of the Italian model of governance is compatible with the main characteristics of Communitarian MLG in the governance of territorial policies; b) to what extent the decentralization in programming policies of development has gone with a transfer of capital expenses from a central (Central Administration) to local jurisdictions (Regions and Local Authorities). Authors set out interesting arguments to support the claim that the decentralisation process recorded in Italy is not fully shareable.

In particular, they underline that the aforementioned process is not fully consistent neither with the principles of institutional EU MLG, nor with those of the theory of fiscal federalism.

Besides, they provide statistical evidence to support the view that the decentralization process would not have seemed accompanied by a symmetrical transfer of political power over public spending from Central Government (Ministries) to Local Authorities.

---

***Politiche regionali e Fondi Strutturali. Programmare nel sistema di governo della UE***  
Rubbettino Ed. - Soveria Mannelli (CZ) dicembre 2005

Authors: Antonio Bonetti, Massimo Bagarani

---

The book analyses the evolution of regional policies in Italy since the middle of the 1990s. As of 1998 a new cycle of regional policies called “*nuova programmazione*” was introduced. The overall objective of the “*nuova programmazione*” was to tailor internal support policies for disadvantaged areas to the EU Cohesion Policy.

In the same period some relevant reforms to both the Public Administration and the institutional framework were launched. These aimed at adapting the institutional framework and the administrative procedures to the EU legislative and administrative framework.

The most relevant reform was the constitutional one, approved in 2001, which enhanced the legislative power of the Italian regions and their competencies. As a result, a new management system of the Italian regional policy was set up. It was fully compliant with the system of Multi-Level Governance (MLG) at the heart of the planning and management system of the EU Cohesion Policy.

Research is focused on the Operational Programs implemented at regional level in the programming period 2000-2006, with particular regard to the “Objective 1” regions (*Mezzogiorno*). It highlights how these regions have managed to vary their development strategies, despite the rigid set of rules that binds the design of Operational Programs.

Also, it highlights how the abovementioned reforms were not able to overcome the initial mismatch between the specific instruments used by the national regional policy and the European one. This has been one of the main reasons why the results, in terms of economic development, have been disappointing.

The book ends with some critical considerations on the new financial and legislative framework at the basis of the EU’s Cohesion policy in the programming period 2007-2013.



***Il mito dei vantaggi comparati delle organizzazioni del terzo settore***, in:

“Le imprese del terzo tipo: economia e etica delle organizzazioni non profit” (eds. M. Schenkel and M. Mellano – 2004)

Authors: Antonio Bonetti, Mauro Mellano

---

This article investigates into rationale and consequences of the increasingly involvement of nonprofit organizations into the delivery of social policies financed by the Public Sector.

From the research authors conclude that this involvement could be considered more a consequence of a crawling privatization of social policies than of a process aimed at making the most of supposed “comparative advantages” of these organizations.

In particular, authors highlight how these supposed “comparative advantages” are largely arguable. Moreover, many scholars overlook the so-called “voluntary failures”, especially the bias of nonprofit organization to be too much “partisan” in the selection both of their members and their beneficiaries.