

ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY INDEX

Regions 2023

Puglia



SYNTHETIC INDEX OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

P+ - Weak

Rating

48

out of 100

Chronological trend



Benchmark score

Benchmark
Emilia-Romagna **68/100**



Average score of the Public Administrations **50/100**



Worst score
Basilicata
Molise **28/100**





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

PP - Satisfactory

Rating

59

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








- Financial pressure per capita
- Spending rigidity
- Per capita debt from financing
- Capital account expenditure financed by loans and bonds
- EU funds management - effected payments



Weaknesses

- Financial autonomy
- Collection capacity
- Spending capacity

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR FINANCIAL SITUATION

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Financial autonomy	%	64.3001	High score for high values	1	 Low
Financial pressure per capita	€ p.c.	1,857.4385	High score for low values	8	 High
Collection capacity	%	72.797	High score for high values	1	 Low
Spending capacity	%	74.0105	High score for high values	1	 Low
Spending rigidity	%	1.8255	High score for low values	8	 High
Per capita debt from financing	€ p.c.	312.9039	High score for low values	8	 High
Off-budget debts recognized and financed	%	0.07	High score for low values	4	 Medium

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Coverage of current expenditure and loan repayments through current revenues	%	103.3577	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
New liabilities generated in the current period on the current accumulated liabilities	%	68.1248	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.	-38.1515	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
EU funds management - effected payments	%	98.0	High score for high values	8	■ ■ ■ High

2 Governance

P+ - Weak

Rating


47

out of 100

Chronological trend



Benchmark score



Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



Strengths











- Working from home (WFH)
- Public real estate properties - report
- Anti-corruption measures undertaken



Weaknesses

- E- Government
- Degree of digitalization
- Subsidiary companies
- Average completion time for public works

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR GOVERNANCE

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
E- Government	absolute value	110.0	High score for high values	1	 Low
Degree of digitalization	absolute value	0.045	High score for high values	1	 Low
Performance	absolute value	11.0	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Working from home (WFH)	absolute value	111.0	High score for high values	8	 High
Public real estate properties - report	absolute value	111.0	High score for high values	8	 High
Public Real Estate properties - management	€ p.c.	- 0.1853	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Subsidiary companies	absolute value	20.0	High score for high values	1	 Low
Anti-corruption measures undertaken	absolute value	9.9	High score for high values	10	 High
Service outsourcing	%	3.51	High score for low values	5	 Medium
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	1.8065	High score for low values	1	 Medium

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Compliance with public works supervision	%	31.0	High score for high values	4	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> Medium

3 Personnel management

PP - Satisfactory

Rating

59

out of 100

Chronological trend



Benchmark score



Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



Strengths

- Per capita personnel expenditure
- Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants
- Personnel with fixed-term contract on total personnel
- Average of training days
- Women managers on total managers



Weaknesses

- Average days of absence (except holidays and training)
- Total managers on total personnel

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.	37.608	High score for low values	10	High
Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants	val./1.000 ab.	0.6024	High score for low values	10	High
Personnel with fixed-term contract on total personnel	%	0.0	High score for low values	10	High
Average age	years	54.1709	High score for low values	5	Medium
Personnel with a degree on total personnel	%	49.1489	High score for high values	4	Medium
Average days of absence (except holidays and training)	days per person	19.206	High score for low values	1	Low
Average of training days	days	2.4217	High score for high values	10	High
Total managers on total personnel	%	5.1064	High score for low values	1	Low
Women managers on total managers	%	46.6667	High score for high values	8	High
Provided bonus out of allocated ones to managers	%	n.d.	High score for low values	0	N.A.
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

28

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

- Per capita expenditure on transport and right to mobility
- Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants
- Integrated Home Care services
- Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants
- Per capita territorial pharmaceutical expenditure
- Essential levels of care - prevention area
- Essential levels of care - territorial area
- Services guaranteed in time (priority class B)

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	%	34.4	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Per capita expenditure on transport and right to mobility	€ p.c.	131.8672	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Per capita expenditure on economic development and competitiveness	€ p.c.	8.9427	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Per capita expenditure on labour policies and vocational education	€ p.c.	43.6252	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Hospital migration	%	8.4	High score for low values	4	■ ■ Medium
Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	39.9	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Integrated Home Care services	%	1.9	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	3.013	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Per capita territorial pharmaceutical expenditure	€ p.c.	12.0	High score for low values	1	■ Low

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Essential levels of care - prevention area	absolute value	67.854	High score for high values	1	 Low
Essential levels of care - territorial area	absolute value	61.661	High score for high values	1	 Low
Essential levels of care - hospital area	absolute value	79.8322	High score for high values	4	 Medium
Services guaranteed in time (priority class B)	absolute value	70.2433	High score for high values	1	 Low

5 Public tenders and relations with suppliers

PP - Satisfactory

Rating

55

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 - amount
- Timeliness of payments indicator



Weaknesses

- Direct procurements on global public tenders - number
- Settlement of commercial debts incurred during previous years

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	%	88.8052	High score for low values	1	 Low
Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount	%	0.5367	High score for low values	8	 High
Timeliness of payments indicator	days	-7.54	High score for low values	20	 High
Per capita total amount of debts with suppliers	€ p.c.	2.2482	High score for low values	8	 Medium
Number of corporate creditor per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	0.8024	High score for low values	8	 Medium
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during the fiscal year	%	77.19	High score for high values	8	 Medium
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during previous years	%	44.3	High score for high values	2	 Low

6 Environment

P+ - Weak

Rating

47

out of 100

Chronological trend



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

- Population exposed to landslide risk
- Population exposed to flood risk



Weaknesses

- Land consumption
- Contaminated sites
- Per capita expenditure on sustainable development and environmental protection

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR ENVIRONMENT

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Air quality - PM 2.5	%	69.2	High score for low values	6	■ ■ Medium
Land consumption	%	8.2	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Contaminated sites	‰ inhabitants	6.5	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Urban waste disposal at landfill	%	28.1	High score for low values	5	■ ■ Medium
Soil waterproofing due to artificial covering	%	8.2	High score for low values	5	■ ■ Medium
Electricity consumption covered by renewable sources	%	55.3	High score for high values	6	■ ■ Medium
Population exposed to landslide risk	%	1.4	High score for low values	12	■ ■ ■ High

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Population exposed to flood risk	%	3.4	High score for low values	10	High
Per capita expenditure on sustainable development and environmental protection	€ p.c.	8.3804	High score for high values	1	Low