![REP - Research Center on Public Entities - A company of Fondazione Etica]

ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY INDEX

**Regions
data collection 2022**

Abruzzo

Population
1,293,941

GDP per capita
€ 25,185.15

SYNTHETIC INDEX OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

P+ - Weak

Rating

42

out of 100

Chronological trend

↑

Benchmark score

Benchmark
Emilia-Romagna   **70**/100

Average score of the Public Administrations   **52**/100

Worst score
Molise   **32**/100

Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class

ND - Unavailable
F - Fallible
P - Poor
P+ - Weak
PP - Satisfactory
PP+ - Good
PPP - Very Good
PPP+ - Excellent

Administrative capacity: summary of the 6 macro-indicators

● **Score of the Public Administration**
● **Benchmark Public Administration for each macro-area**
● **Average score of Public Administrations assessed**

Financial situation

Environment

Governance

50

0

Public tenders and relations with suppliers

Personnel management

Public services and relations with citizens

(1) Financial situation

P+ - Weak

Rating

43

out of 100

Chronological trend

↓

Benchmark score

Benchmark
Emilia-Romagna

79/100

Average score of the Public Administrations

51/100

Worst score
Sicilia

15/100

Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class

| ND - Unavailable | F - Fallible | P - Poor | **P+ - Weak** | PP - Satisfactory | PP+ - Good | PPP - Very Good | PPP+ - Excellent |

Strengths

- Financial pressure per capita
- New liabilities generated in the current period on the accumulated current liabilities
- Capital account expenditure financed by loans and bonds

Weaknesses

- Financial autonomy
- Collection capacity
- Spending capacity
- Debt per capita
- EU funds management - effected payments

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR FINANCIAL SITUATION

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
Financial autonomy	%	84.17	High score for high values	1		Low
Financial pressure per capita	€ p.c.	2,303.59	High score for low values	8		High
Collection capacity	%	77.67	High score for high values	1		Low
Spending capacity	%	78.98	High score for high values	1		Low
Spending rigidity	%	3.95	High score for low values	5		Medium
Debt per capita	€ p.c.	1,491.14	High score for low values	1		Low
Coverage of current expenditure and loan repayments through current revenues	%	103.93	High score for high values	4		Medium

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
New liabilities generated in the current period on the accumulated current liabilities	%	55.22	High score for low values	8		High
Capital account expenditure financed by loans and bonds	%	0.0	High score for low values	8		High
Deficit/surplus on health expenditure per capita	€ p.c.	-10.33	High score for high values	5		Medium
EU funds management - effected payments	%	28.0	High score for high values	1		Low

![REP - Research Center on Public Entities | A company of Fondazione Etica]

② Governance

PP - Satisfactory

Rating | Chronological trend

50
out of 100

↑

Benchmark score

Benchmark
Emilia-Romagna   **78**/100

Average score of the Public Administrations   **55**/100

Worst score
Molise   **24**/100

Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class

ND - Unavailable
F - Fallible
P - Poor
P+ - Weak
PP - Satisfactory
PP+ - Good
PPP - Very Good
PPP+ - Excellent

Strengths

- E- Government
- Public works incompleted
- Public Real Estate properties - report

Weaknesses

- Degree of digitization
- Target achievement
- Public Real Estate properties - management

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR GOVERNANCE

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
E- Government	value	23.4	High score for high values	12		▮▮▮ High
Degree of digitization	value	0.18	High score for high values	1		▮ Low
Target achievement	value	101.0	High score for high values	1		▮ Low
Smart Working	value	10.0	High score for high values	5	Trend not available	▮▮ Medium
Public works incompleted	numero	0.0	High score for low values	8		▮▮▮ High
Public Real Estate properties - report	value	111.0	High score for high values	10	Trend not available	▮▮▮ High
Public Real Estate properties - management	€ p.c.	-1.98	High score for high values	1		▮ Low
Subsidiary companies	ABS	66.67	High score for high values	6		▮▮ Medium
Anti-corruption measures undertaken	value	15.6	High score for high values	6		▮▮ Medium

![REP - Research Center on Public Entities   A company of Fondazione Etica](logo)

③ Personnel management

P - Poor

Rating

34

out of 100

Chronological trend

↓

Benchmark score

Benchmark
Emilia-Romagna

74/100

Average score of the Public Administrations

48/100

Worst score
Molise

28/100

Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class

ND - Unavailable
F - Fallible
P - Poor
P+ - Weak
PP - Satisfactory
PP+ - Good
PPP - Very Good
PPP+ - Excellent

⚡ **Strengths**

🚫 **Weaknesses**

- Average age
- Average of training days

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
Per capita personnel expenditure	€ p.c.	51.88	High score for low values	5		Medium
Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants	val./1.000 residents	1.12	High score for low values	5	Trend not available	Medium
Personnel with fixed-term contract on total personnel	%	1.11	High score for low values	5		Medium
Average age	years	54.98	High score for low values	1		Low
Personnel with a degree on total personnel	%	47.93	High score for high values	4		Medium
Average days of absence (sick leave)	average days	17.72	High score for low values	4		Medium
Total managers on total personnel	%	3.99	High score for low values	5	Trend not available	Medium

| Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
Women managers on total managers	%	38.6	High score for high values	4	Trend not available	▊▊ Medium
Provided bonus out of allocated ones to managers	%	n.d.	High score for low values	0	Trend not available	N.A.
Average of training days	average days	0.03	High score for high values	1	Trend not available	▊ Low
Degree of differentiation of bonus paid to managers	variance	n.d.	High score for high values	0	Trend not available	N.A.

(4) **Public services and relations with citizens**

P+ - Weak

Rating

49

out of 100

Chronological trend

↑

Benchmark score

Benchmark
Toscana   **90**/100

Average score of the Public Administrations   **51**/100

Worst score
Calabria
Molise
Campania   **23**/100

Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class

Classes (left to right):
ND - Unavailable, F - Fallible, P - Poor, **P+ - Weak**, PP - Satisfactory, PP+ - Good, PPP - Very Good, PPP+ - Excellent

Strengths

- Integrated home care services
- Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants
- FOIA register: accepted requests

Weaknesses

- Efficiency indicator - timing supervision (general)
- Hospital emigration
- Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants
- Territorial pharmaceutical expenditure per capita

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR PUBLIC SERVICES AND RELATIONS WITH CITIZENS

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
Efficiency indicator - reporting (general)	value	11.0	High score for high values	5	Trend not available	▮▮ Medium
Efficiency indicator - timing supervision (general)	value	0.0	High score for high values	1	Trend not available	▮ Low
Landline high-speed internet access covering	%	16.4	High score for high values	5		▮▮ Medium
Hospital emigration	%	14.5	High score for low values	1		▮ Low
Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	v/ 10k inhabitants	42.0	High score for high values	1		▮ Low
Integrated home care services	%	4.3	High score for high values	10		▮▮▮ High
Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	v/ 10k inhabitants	1.04	High score for low values	10		▮▮▮ High

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
Territorial pharmaceutical expenditure per capita	€ p.c.	15.0	High score for low values	1		Low
Citizens involvement	value	7.8	High score for high values	5		Medium
FOIA register: accepted requests	%	94.59	High score for high values	10		High

⑤ Public tenders and relations with suppliers

F - Fallible

Rating

18

out of 100

Chronological trend

↑

Benchmark score

Benchmark
Liguria
Umbria   **86**/100

Average score of the Public Administrations   **53**/100

Worst score
Abruzzo   **18**/100

# Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class

ND - Unavailable
F - Fallible
P - Poor
P+ - Weak
PP - Satisfactory
PP+ - Good
PPP - Very Good
F - Fallible*
PPP+ - Excellent

⚡ Strengths

- Recurring contractors in direct procurements

⊘ Weaknesses

- Direct procurements on global public tenders - number
- Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount
- Timeliness of payments indicator

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR PUBLIC TENDERS AND RELATIONS WITH SUPPLIERS

| Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
Recurring contractors in direct procurements	%	13.67	High score for low values	14		🟩🟩🟩 High
Direct procurements on global public tenders - number	%	83.05	High score for low values	1	Trend not available	🟥 Low
Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount	%	36.69	High score for low values	1		🟥 Low
Timeliness of payments indicator	days	62.0	High score for low values	2		🟥 Low
Per capita debt amount vs suppliers	€ p.c.	n.d.	High score for low values	0	Trend not available	N.A.
Number of corporate creditors per 10k citizens	v/ 10k inhabitants	n.d.	High score for low values	0	Trend not available	N.A.
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during the fiscal year	%	n.d.	High score for high values	0	Trend not available	N.A.

⑥ Environment

PP - Satisfactory

Rating	Chronological trend
51	⬇
out of 100	

Benchmark score

Benchmark
P.A. Bolzano   **77**/100

Average score of the Public Administrations   **53**/100

Worst score
Toscana
Liguria   **29**/100

Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class

ND - Unavailable
F - Fallible
P - Poor
P+ - Weak
PP - Satisfactory
PP+ - Good
PPP - Very Good
PP - Satisfactory*
PPP+ - Excellent

Strengths

- Contaminated sites

Weaknesses

- Population exposed to landslide risk

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR ENVIRONMENT

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
Air quality - PM 2.5	%	81.8	High score for low values	6		▮▮ Medium
Land consumption	%	5.02	High score for low values	6		▮▮ Medium
Contaminated sites	thousandths	0.6	High score for low values	12		▮▮▮ High
Urban waste disposal into dump	%	29.2	High score for low values	7		▮▮ Medium
Soil waterproofing due to artificial covering	%	5.0	High score for low values	6		▮▮ Medium
Population exposed to landslide risk	%	5.6	High score for low values	1		▮ Low
Population exposed to flood risk	%	7.2	High score for low values	6		▮▮ Medium

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score		Trend	Evaluation of the indicator
Electricity consumption covered by renewable sources	%	42.4	High score for high values	7			Medium