

## ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY INDEX

Regions 2023

# Emilia-Romagna



## SYNTHETIC INDEX OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

PP+ - Good

Rating


**68**

out of 100


Chronological trend

Not available

### Benchmark score




## Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



## 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



## 1 Financial situation

PP+ - Good

Rating

79

out of 100

Chronological trend

Not available

### Benchmark score

Benchmark  
Emilia-Romagna **79/100**




Average score of the Public Administrations **49/100**



Worst score  
Sicilia  
Molise **6/100**



## Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



### Strengths



### Weaknesses

- Financial autonomy
- Spending capacity
- Spending rigidity
- Per capita debt from financing
- Off-budget debts recognized and financed
- Capital account expenditure financed by loans and bonds
- EU funds management - effected payments

## INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR FINANCIAL SITUATION

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Financial autonomy	%	90.6313	High score for high values	8	High
Financial pressure per capita	€ p.c.	2,644.1141	High score for low values	4	Medium
Collection capacity	%	79.7659	High score for high values	5	Medium
Spending capacity	%	86.0671	High score for high values	10	High
Spending rigidity	%	1.8638	High score for low values	8	High
Per capita debt from financing	€ p.c.	264.3724	High score for low values	8	High
Off-budget debts recognized and financed	%	0.0	High score for low values	8	High

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Coverage of current expenditure and loan repayments through current revenues	%	103.686	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
New liabilities generated in the current period on the current accumulated liabilities	%	67.418	High score for low values	4	■ ■ Medium
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.	-22.565	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
EU funds management - effected payments	%	103.0	High score for high values	8	■ ■ ■ High

## 2 Governance

PP+ - Good

Rating

65

out of 100

Chronological trend

Not available

### Benchmark score

Benchmark  
Emilia-Romagna 65/100




Average score of the Public Administrations 43/100



Worst score  
Molise 21/100



## Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



### Strengths















### Weaknesses

- Performance
- Working from home (WFH)
- Subsidiary companies
- Service outsourcing
- Efficiency indicator - reporting
- Efficiency indicator - timing supervision
- Compliance with public works supervision

- E- Government
- Degree of digitalization
- Public real estate properties - report
- Public Real Estate properties - management

## INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR GOVERNANCE

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
E- Government	abs	110.0	High score for high values	1	 Low
Degree of digitalization	abs	0.315	High score for high values	1	 Low
Performance	abs	111.0	High score for high values	8	 High
Working from home (WFH)	abs	111.0	High score for high values	8	 High
Public real estate properties - report	abs	100.0	High score for high values	1	 Low
Public Real Estate properties - management	€ p.c.	- 2.3333	High score for high values	1	 Low
Subsidiary companies	abs	130.0	High score for high values	8	 High
Anti-corruption measures undertaken	abs	8.8	High score for high values	5	 Medium
Service outsourcing	%	1.88	High score for low values	10	 High
Efficiency indicator - reporting	abs	11.0	High score for high values	6	 High
Efficiency indicator - timing supervision	abs	11.0	High score for high values	6	 High
Average completion time for public works	mean	1.0866	High score for low values	2	 Medium

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Compliance with public works supervision	%	61.0	High score for high values	8	High

### 3 Personnel management

PPP - Very Good

Rating


87

out of 100


Chronological trend

Not available

#### Benchmark score



## Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



### Strengths



### Weaknesses

- Per capita personnel expenditure
- Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants
- Average age
- Personnel with a degree on total personnel
- Average days of absence (except holidays and training)
- Average of training days
- Total managers on total personnel
- Women managers on total managers

## INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Per capita personnel expenditure	€ p.c.	38.8366	High score for low values	10	■■■ High
Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants	value per 1k inhab.	0.8236	High score for low values	10	■■■ High
Personnel with fixed-term contract on total personnel	%	2.3096	High score for low values	5	■■ Medium
Average age	years	51.4755	High score for low values	10	■■■ High
Personnel with a degree on total personnel	%	66.9775	High score for high values	8	■■■ High
Average days of absence (except holidays and training)	days per person	11.7521	High score for low values	8	■■■ High
Average of training days	days	1.918	High score for high values	10	■■■ High
Total managers on total personnel	%	2.825	High score for low values	10	■■■ High
Women managers on total managers	%	45.6311	High score for high values	8	■■■ High
Provided bonus out of allocated ones to managers	%	100.0	High score for low values	4	■■ Medium
Degree of differentiation of bonus paid to managers	variance	85.2217	High score for high values	4	■■ Medium

## 4 Public services and relations with citizens

PP+ - Good

Rating

67

out of 100

Chronological trend

Not available

### Benchmark score

Benchmark

Toscana

74/100



Average score of the Public Administrations

51/100




Worst score

Puglia

28/100



## Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



### Strengths








### Weaknesses

- Hospital migration
- Integrated Home Care services
- Per capita territorial pharmaceutical expenditure
- Essential levels of care - prevention area
- Essential levels of care - territorial area
- Essential levels of care - hospital area

- Per capita current expenditure on transport and right to mobility
- Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants

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

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Landline high-speed internet access covering	%	36.1	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Per capita current expenditure on transport and right to mobility	€ p.c.	127.3344	High score for high values	1	 Low
Per capita expenditure on economic development and competitiveness	€ p.c.	13.6875	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Per capita expenditure on labour policies and vocational education	€ p.c.	48.1909	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Hospital migration	%	5.1	High score for low values	8	 High
Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	value per 10k inhab.	94.1	High score for high values	3	 Medium
Integrated Home Care services	%	3.6	High score for high values	8	 High
Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	value per 10k inhab.	3.4393	High score for low values	1	 Low
Per capita territorial pharmaceutical expenditure	€ p.c.	9.2	High score for low values	6	 High

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Essential levels of care - prevention area	abs	90.731	High score for high values	8	High
Essential levels of care - territorial area	abs	95.9607	High score for high values	8	High
Essential levels of care - hospital area	abs	94.5	High score for high values	8	High
Services guaranteed in time (priority class B)	abs	93.2306	High score for high values	4	Medium

## 5 Public tenders and relations with suppliers

PP+ - Good

Rating

65

out of 100

Chronological trend

Not available

### Benchmark score

Benchmark

Liguria

100/100



Average score of the Public Administrations

60/100




Worst score

Basilicata

18/100



## Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



### Strengths










### Weaknesses

- Timeliness of payments indicator
- Number of corporate creditor per 10k inhabitants

- Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount

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

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Direct procurements on global public tenders - number	%	82.4723	High score for low values	4	 Medium
Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount	%	66.3738	High score for low values	1	 Low
Timeliness of payments indicator	days	-14.15	High score for low values	20	 High
Per capita total amount of debts with suppliers	€ p.c.	2.0296	High score for low values	8	 Medium
Number of corporate creditor per 10k inhabitants	value per 10k inhab.	0.2327	High score for low values	16	 High
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during the fiscal year	%	75.5	High score for high values	8	 Medium
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during previous years	%	59.5	High score for high values	8	 Medium

## 6 Environment

P - Poor

Rating

37

out of 100

Chronological trend

Not available

### Benchmark score

Benchmark  
Valle d'Aosta 69/100




Average score of the Public Administrations 51/100



Worst score  
Liguria 32/100



## Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



### Strengths








- Contaminated sites
- Urban waste disposal at landfill





### Weaknesses

- Air quality - PM 2.5
- Land consumption
- Soil waterproofing due to artificial covering
- Electricity consumption covered by renewable sources
- Population exposed to flood risk

## INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR ENVIRONMENT

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Air quality - PM 2.5	%	87.2	High score for low values	1	 Low
Land consumption	%	8.9	High score for low values	1	 Low
Contaminated sites	‰ inhabitants	1.7	High score for low values	10	 High
Urban waste disposal at landfill	%	7.5	High score for low values	10	 High
Soil waterproofing due to artificial covering	%	9.0	High score for low values	1	 Low
Electricity consumption covered by renewable sources	%	20.5	High score for high values	1	 Low
Population exposed to landslide risk	%	2.0	High score for low values	6	 Medium

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Population exposed to flood risk	%	62.5	High score for low values	1	 Low
Per capita expenditure on sustainable development and environmental protection	€ p.c.	15.5653	High score for high values	6	 Medium