

## ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY INDEX

Regions 2023

# Molise



## SYNTHETIC INDEX OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

**P - Poor**

Rating


**28**

out of 100

Chronological trend



### Benchmark score





Research Center on Public Entities A company of [Fondazione Etica](#)

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

### **Administrative capacity: summary of the 6 macro-indicators**

# 1 Financial situation

F - Fallible

Rating

6

out of 100

Chronological trend



## 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

---

- Off-budget debts recognized and financed
- Deficit/surplus on health expenditure per capita

## INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR FINANCIAL SITUATION

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Financial autonomy	%	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Financial pressure per capita	€ p.c.	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
Collection capacity	%	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Spending capacity	%	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Spending rigidity	%	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
Per capita debt from financing	€ p.c.	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
Off-budget debts recognized and financed	%	2.87	High score for low values	1	 Low

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Coverage of current expenditure and loan repayments through current revenues	%	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
New liabilities generated in the current period on the current accumulated liabilities	%	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
Capital account expenditure financed by loans and bonds	%	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
Deficit/surplus on health expenditure per capita	€ p.c.	- 150.1071	High score for high values	1	 Low
EU funds management - effected payments	%	67.0	High score for high values	4	 Medium

## 2 Governance

P - Poor

Rating

21

out of 100

Chronological trend



### 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

---

- Service outsourcing
- Average completion time for public works





## Weaknesses

---

- Public Real Estate properties - management
- Anti-corruption measures undertaken
- Compliance with public works supervision

## INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR GOVERNANCE

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
E- Government	absolute value	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Degree of digitalization	absolute value	0.45	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Performance	absolute value	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Working from home (WFH)	absolute value	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Public Real Estate properties - report	absolute value	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Public Real Estate properties - management	€ p.c.	- 1.5863	High score for high values	1	 Low
Subsidiary companies	absolute value	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Anti-corruption measures undertaken	absolute value	2.0	High score for high values	1	 Low
Service outsourcing	%	0.22	High score for low values	10	 High
Efficiency indicator - reporting	absolute value	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Efficiency indicator - timing supervision	absolute value	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Average completion time for public works	mean value	0.9459	High score for low values	4	 High

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Compliance with public works supervision	%	21.0	High score for high values	1	<div></div> Low

### 3 Personnel management

P - Poor

Rating

27

out of 100

Chronological trend



#### Benchmark score



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



## Strengths

---

- Average days of absence (except holidays and training)



## Weaknesses

---

- Average age
- Personnel with a degree on total personnel
- Average of training days
- Total managers on total personnel
- Provided bonus out of allocated ones to 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.	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants	val./1.000 ab.	1.6388	High score for low values	5	■ ■ Medium
Personnel with fixed-term contract on total personnel	%	3.2587	High score for low values	5	■ ■ Medium
Average age	years	56.0579	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Personnel with a degree on total personnel	%	40.6316	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Average days of absence (except holidays and training)	days per person	9.4463	High score for low values	8	■ ■ ■ High
Average of training days	days	0.072	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Total managers on total personnel	%	6.1053	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Women managers on total managers	%	41.3793	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Provided bonus out of allocated ones to managers	%	100.0	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Degree of differentiation of bonus paid to managers	variance	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.

## 4 Public services and relations with citizens

P - Poor

Rating

36

out of 100

Chronological trend



### 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





- Services guaranteed in time (priority class B)

- Hospital migration
- Essential levels of care - hospital area

## 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	%	40.4	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Per capita expenditure on transport and right to mobility	€ p.c.	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Per capita expenditure on economic development and competitiveness	€ p.c.	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Per capita expenditure on labour policies and vocational education	€ p.c.	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Hospital migration	%	29.2	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	65.0	High score for high values	3	■ ■ Medium
Integrated Home Care services	%	2.9	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	2.5672	High score for low values	4	■ ■ Medium
Per capita territorial pharmaceutical expenditure	€ p.c.	11.0	High score for low values	3	■ ■ Medium



Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Essential levels of care - prevention area	absolute value	82.9917	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Essential levels of care - territorial area	absolute value	65.4006	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Essential levels of care - hospital area	absolute value	48.5496	High score for high values	1	 Low
Services guaranteed in time (priority class B)	absolute value	100.0	High score for high values	8	 High

## 5 Public tenders and relations with suppliers

**P - Poor**

Rating

**28**

out of 100

Chronological trend



### 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

---

- Direct procurements on global public tenders - number
- Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount





## Weaknesses

---

- Timeliness of payments indicator
- Settlement of commercial debts incurred during the fiscal year

## 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	%	64.8	High score for low values	8	 High
Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount	%	0.8188	High score for low values	8	 High
Timeliness of payments indicator	days	69.47	High score for low values	2	 Low
Per capita total amount of debts with suppliers	€ p.c.	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
Number of corporate creditor per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during the fiscal year	%	58.01	High score for high values	2	 Low
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during previous years	%	60.27	High score for high values	8	 Medium

## 6 Environment

PP+ - Good

Rating


68

out of 100

Chronological trend



### Benchmark score



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



## Strengths

---

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



## Weaknesses

---

- Urban waste disposal at landfill
- Population exposed to landslide 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	%	50.0	High score for low values	12	High
Land consumption	%	3.92	High score for low values	12	High
Contaminated sites	‰ inhabitants	0.3	High score for low values	10	High
Urban waste disposal at landfill	%	90.4	High score for low values	1	Low
Soil waterproofing due to artificial covering	%	3.9	High score for low values	10	High
Electricity consumption covered by renewable sources	%	85.1	High score for high values	12	High
Population exposed to landslide risk	%	6.1	High score for low values	1	Low
Population exposed to flood risk	%	2.3	High score for low values	10	High
Per capita expenditure on sustainable development and environmental protection	€ p.c.	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.