

## ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY INDEX

Regions 2023

# Valle d'Aosta



## SYNTHETIC INDEX OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

**PP - Satisfactory**

Rating


**51**

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

PP - Satisfactory

Rating

56

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 autonomy
- Spending capacity
- Coverage of current expenditure and loan repayments through current revenues
- Capital account expenditure financed by loans and bonds
- EU funds management - effected payments










## Weaknesses

---

- Financial pressure per capita
- Spending rigidity
- Per capita debt from financing
- New liabilities generated in the current period on the current accumulated liabilities
- 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	%	94.6429	High score for high values	8	 High
Financial pressure per capita	€ p.c.	11,564.221	High score for low values	1	 Low
Collection capacity	%	78.7671	High score for high values	5	 Medium
Spending capacity	%	90.604	High score for high values	10	 High
Spending rigidity	%	16.7483	High score for low values	1	 Low
Per capita debt from financing	€ p.c.	1,183.0344	High score for low values	1	 Low
Off-budget debts recognized and financed	%	0.03	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	%	129.7283	High score for high values	8	High
New liabilities generated in the current period on the current accumulated liabilities	%	84.642	High score for low values	1	Low
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.	-328.8179	High score for high values	1	Low
EU funds management - effected payments	%	111.0	High score for high values	8	High

## 2 Governance

P+ - Weak

Rating


48

out of 100

Chronological trend



### Benchmark score



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





## Strengths

---

- Public real estate properties - report
- Anti-corruption measures undertaken
- Average completion time for public works



## Weaknesses

---

- Public Real Estate properties - management
- Service outsourcing
- 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	104.0	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Degree of digitalization	absolute value	1.41	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Performance	absolute value	110.0	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Working from home (WFH)	absolute value	101.0	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Public real estate properties - report	absolute value	111.0	High score for high values	8	■ ■ ■ High
Public Real Estate properties - management	€ p.c.	- 22.8817	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Subsidiary companies	absolute value	100.0	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Anti-corruption measures undertaken	absolute value	9.9	High score for high values	10	■ ■ ■ High
Service outsourcing	%	6.54	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Efficiency indicator - reporting	absolute value	n.d.	High score for high values	0	N.A.
Efficiency indicator - timing supervision	absolute value	10.0	High score for high values	3	■ ■ Medium
Average completion time for public works	mean value	0.8484	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	%	3.0	High score for high values	1	<div></div> Low

### 3 Personnel management

P+ - Weak

Rating


41

out of 100

Chronological trend



#### Benchmark score



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



## Strengths

---

- Average age
- Provided bonus out of allocated ones to managers



## Weaknesses

---

- Per capita personnel expenditure
- Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants
- Personnel with fixed-term contract on total personnel
- Personnel with a degree 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.	1,887.7055	High score for low values	1	 Low
Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants	val./1.000 ab.	20.9345	High score for low values	1	 Low
Personnel with fixed-term contract on total personnel	%	7.5736	High score for low values	1	 Low
Average age	years	51.1173	High score for low values	10	 High
Personnel with a degree on total personnel	%	29.2929	High score for high values	1	 Low
Average days of absence (except holidays and training)	days per person	17.2032	High score for low values	4	 Medium
Average of training days	days	0.5269	High score for high values	5	 Medium
Total managers on total personnel	%	4.1958	High score for low values	5	 Medium
Women managers on total managers	%	37.037	High score for high values	1	 Low

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Provided bonus out of allocated ones to managers	%	91.0057	High score for low values	8	■■■ High
Degree of differentiation of bonus paid to managers	variance	154.2896	High score for high values	4	■■ Medium

## 4 Public services and relations with citizens

PP - Satisfactory

Rating

54

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

---

- Per capita expenditure on transport and right to mobility
- Per capita expenditure on economic development and competitiveness
- Per capita expenditure on labour policies and vocational education
- Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants
- Per capita territorial pharmaceutical expenditure
- Services guaranteed in time (priority class B)
















## Weaknesses

---

- Landline high-speed internet access covering
- Hospital migration
- Integrated Home Care services
- Essential levels of care - prevention area
- Essential levels of care - territorial area
- 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	%	29.8	High score for high values	1	 Low
Per capita expenditure on transport and right to mobility	€ p.c.	469.9565	High score for high values	8	 High
Per capita expenditure on economic development and competitiveness	€ p.c.	96.9553	High score for high values	8	 High
Per capita expenditure on labour policies and vocational education	€ p.c.	105.49	High score for high values	8	 High
Hospital migration	%	15.4	High score for low values	1	 Low
Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	109.8	High score for high values	6	 High
Integrated Home Care services	%	0.4	High score for high values	1	 Low
Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	2.2698	High score for low values	4	 Medium
Per capita territorial pharmaceutical expenditure	€ p.c.	8.5	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	absolute value	45.3053	High score for high values	1	 Low
Essential levels of care - territorial area	absolute value	49.311	High score for high values	1	 Low
Essential levels of care - hospital area	absolute value	52.5873	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+ - Weak

Rating

45

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

---

- Timeliness of payments indicator










## Weaknesses

---

- Direct procurements on global public tenders - number
- Per capita total amount of debts with suppliers
- Number of corporate creditor per 10k inhabitants

## 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	%	90.4448	High score for low values	1	 Low
Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount	%	27.662	High score for low values	4	 Medium
Timeliness of payments indicator	days	-3.01	High score for low values	20	 High
Per capita total amount of debts with suppliers	€ p.c.	68.7377	High score for low values	2	 Low
Number of corporate creditor per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	38.144	High score for low values	2	 Low
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during the fiscal year	%	78.05	High score for high values	8	 Medium
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during previous years	%	58.89	High score for high values	8	 Medium

## 6 Environment

PP+ - Good

Rating


69

out of 100

Chronological trend



### Benchmark score



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



## Strengths

---

- Land consumption
- Contaminated sites
- Soil waterproofing due to artificial covering
- Electricity consumption covered by renewable sources
- Per capita expenditure on sustainable development and environmental protection










## 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	%	75.0	High score for low values	6	 Medium
Land consumption	%	2.15	High score for low values	12	 High
Contaminated sites	‰ inhabitants	0.7	High score for low values	10	 High
Urban waste disposal at landfill	%	38.2	High score for low values	1	 Low
Soil waterproofing due to artificial covering	%	2.2	High score for low values	10	 High
Electricity consumption covered by renewable sources	%	255.1	High score for high values	12	 High
Population exposed to landslide risk	%	12.1	High score for low values	1	 Low

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Population exposed to flood risk	%	9.1	High score for low values	5	■ ■ Medium
Per capita expenditure on sustainable development and environmental protection	€ p.c.	320.7891	High score for high values	12	■ ■ ■ High