

ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY INDEX

Regions 2023

Toscana



SYNTHETIC INDEX OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

PP+ - Good

Rating


62

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 - Satisfactory

Rating

56

out of 100

Chronological trend

Not available

Benchmark score

Benchmark
Emilia-Romagna **79/100**




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



Worst score
Molise
Sicilia **6/100**



Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



Strengths

- Spending rigidity
- Off-budget debts recognized and financed
- EU funds management - effected payments



Weaknesses

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

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR FINANCIAL SITUATION

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
Financial autonomy	%	86.6143	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Financial pressure per capita	€ p.c.	2,573.3958	High score for low values	4	■ ■ Medium
Collection capacity	%	81.1812	High score for high values	5	■ ■ Medium
Spending capacity	%	79.9916	High score for high values	5	■ ■ Medium
Spending rigidity	%	2.4737	High score for low values	8	■ ■ ■ High
Per capita debt from financing	€ p.c.	565.4221	High score for low values	4	■ ■ Medium
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	%	103.4052	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
New liabilities generated in the current period on the current accumulated liabilities	%	82.0368	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Capital account expenditure financed by loans and bonds	%	29.3721	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Deficit/surplus on health expenditure per capita	€ p.c.	-20.8635	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
EU funds management - effected payments	%	87.0	High score for high values	8	■ ■ ■ High

2 Governance

P+ - Weak

Rating

48

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

- Performance
- Compliance with public works supervision



Weaknesses

- Degree of digitalization
- Public real estate properties - report
- Service outsourcing

INDICATORS OF THE MACRO-INDICATOR GOVERNANCE

Indicator name	Unit of measure	Value	Scoring criteria	Score	Evaluation of the indicator
E- Government	absolute value	107.0	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Degree of digitalization	absolute value	0.315	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Performance	absolute value	111.0	High score for high values	8	■ ■ ■ High
Working from home (WFH)	absolute value	101.0	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Public real estate properties - report	absolute value	0.0	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Public Real Estate properties - management	€ p.c.	- 0.5461	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Subsidiary companies	absolute value	97.5	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Anti-corruption measures undertaken	absolute value	8.8	High score for high values	5	■ ■ Medium
Service outsourcing	%	6.64	High score for low values	1	■ Low
Efficiency indicator - reporting	absolute value	10.0	High score for high values	3	■ ■ Medium
Efficiency indicator - timing supervision	absolute value	10.0	High score for high values	3	■ ■ Medium
Average completion time for public works	mean value	1.103	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	%	57.0	High score for high values	8	High

3 Personnel management

PP+ - Good

Rating


70

out of 100


Chronological trend

Not available

Benchmark score



Distribution of Public Administrations with respect to the rating class



Strengths



Weaknesses

- Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants
- 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.	44.8891	High score for low values	5	 Medium
Personnel with a permanent contract per 1,000 inhabitants	val./1.000 ab.	0.8945	High score for low values	10	 High
Personnel with fixed-term contract on total personnel	%	1.3859	High score for low values	5	 Medium
Average age	years	52.8374	High score for low values	5	 Medium
Personnel with a degree on total personnel	%	55.3889	High score for high values	8	 High
Average days of absence (except holidays and training)	days per person	9.3748	High score for low values	8	 High
Average of training days	days	3.0051	High score for high values	10	 High
Total managers on total personnel	%	3.1231	High score for low values	10	 High
Women managers on total managers	%	36.2745	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	%	96.7404	High score for low values	4	■ ■ Medium
Degree of differentiation of bonus paid to managers	variance	116.9801	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium

4 Public services and relations with citizens

PP+ - Good

Rating

74

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
- Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants
- 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 expenditure on labour policies and vocational education

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	%	43.1	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Per capita current expenditure on transport and right to mobility	€ p.c.	215.8096	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Per capita expenditure on economic development and competitiveness	€ p.c.	8.8918	High score for high values	4	■ ■ Medium
Per capita expenditure on labour policies and vocational education	€ p.c.	35.3719	High score for high values	1	■ Low
Hospital migration	%	5.9	High score for low values	8	■ ■ ■ High
Beds in residential healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	61.3	High score for high values	3	■ ■ Medium
Integrated Home Care services	%	3.7	High score for high values	8	■ ■ ■ High
Accredited private healthcare facilities per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	1.9955	High score for low values	8	■ ■ ■ High
Per capita territorial pharmaceutical expenditure	€ p.c.	9.8	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	91.371	High score for high values	8	High
Essential levels of care - territorial area	absolute value	95.019	High score for high values	8	High
Essential levels of care - hospital area	absolute value	88.07	High score for high values	8	High
Services guaranteed in time (priority class B)	absolute value	96.5085	High score for high values	4	Medium

5 Public tenders and relations with suppliers

PP+ - Good

Rating

76

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

- Direct procurements on global public tenders - number
- Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount
- Timeliness of payments indicator
- 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	%	61.6985	High score for low values	8	High
Direct procurements on global public tenders - amount	%	1.1783	High score for low values	8	High
Timeliness of payments indicator	days	-27.54	High score for low values	20	High
Per capita total amount of debts with suppliers	€ p.c.	1.6211	High score for low values	8	Medium
Number of corporate creditor per 10k inhabitants	val./10.000 ab.	0.493	High score for low values	8	Medium
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during the fiscal year	%	70.79	High score for high values	8	Medium
Settlement of commercial debts incurred during previous years	%	68.15	High score for high values	16	High

6 Environment

P+ - Weak

Rating

46

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



Weaknesses

● 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	%	73.5	High score for low values	6	■ ■ Medium
Land consumption	%	6.17	High score for low values	6	■ ■ Medium
Contaminated sites	‰ inhabitants	5.1	High score for low values	5	■ ■ Medium
Urban waste disposal at landfill	%	35.2	High score for low values	5	■ ■ Medium
Soil waterproofing due to artificial covering	%	6.2	High score for low values	5	■ ■ Medium
Electricity consumption covered by renewable sources	%	41.3	High score for high values	6	■ ■ Medium
Population exposed to landslide risk	%	4.2	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	%	25.5	High score for low values	1	 Low
Per capita expenditure on sustainable development and environmental protection	€ p.c.	14.5185	High score for high values	6	 Medium