Belize

Commitment to Human Capital - Scorecard

This scorecard presents a snapshot of the country's commitment to the human capital agenda and presents information on how the World Bank Group is supporting the government in the social sectors.

In Belize there are no enough data to calculate the productivity as a future worker of a child born today. The HCI has three components: survival to age 5, health, and education. For more information on human capital outcomes and the HCI, please see the country two-pager on www.worldbank.org/humancapitalproject


KEY OUTCOME AND OUTPUT INDICATORS TO MONITOR

- Women, Business and the Law Index. This index measures gender equality in the law (how the economic decisions women make are affected by the law), with a larger value showing higher gender equality. In Belize, the value is **79** out of 100. This is higher than both the average for its region (79) and the average for its income group (76).
- Net Enrolment Rate in Secondary School. In Belize, 73 percent of girls of secondary-school age are enrolled in secondary school. This is lower than both the average for its region (77) and the average for its income group (77).
- Total Fertility Rate. In Belize, the total fertility rate is 2.5 births per woman. This is higher than both the average for its region (2.1) and the average for its income group (2.2).
- Adolescent Fertility Rate. In Belize, there are 63 births per 1,000 women ages 15-19. This is higher than both the average for its region (57) and the average for its income group (43).
- Contraceptive Prevalence. In Belize, **51** percent of women ages 15-49 uses some form of contraceptive method. This is lower than both the average for its region (64) and the average for its income group (56).
- **Social Protection Coverage.** In Belize, **39 percent** of the poorest quintile is covered by social safety nets. This is lower than both the average for its region (58) and the average for its income group (56).
- **Open Defecation.** In Belize, **1 percent** of the population practices open defecation. This is lower than both the average for its region (3) and the average for its income group (3).


DOMESTIC RESOURCE USE AND MOBILIZATION

- **Health Spending.** Belize spends **12.4 percent** of its government budget on health. This is lower than the average for its region (13.3) but higher than the average for its income group (11.4).
- Education Spending. Belize spends 19.9 percent of its government budget on education. This is higher than both the regional average (16.3) and the average for its income group (14.5).
- **Social Protection Spending.** In Belize, data on social protection spending do not exist. The average for the country's region is 10.7 percent and for its income group is 10.4 percent.

1. Key Indicators on Human Capital




- Percentage that does not Practice Open Defecation
- 60 70 80 90 100
- Large circle=Belize; small circles=other countries. Vertical lines separate terciles of the distribution.
- Pink/light blue='1st tercile; orange/gray=2nd tercile; green/blue=3rd tercile




• Efficiency of Spending. Given the lack of data, it is not possible to predict if the HCI in Belize is higher or lower than what would be predicted for its level of per capita government spending.

3. Spending on Health and Education and HCI



- A selection of 146 countries in the regression are displayed.
- **Domestic Resource Mobilization.** The tax revenue in Belize is **26** percent of GDP. This is higher than both the regional average (17.9) and the average for its income group (17.5).

4. Domestic Resource Mobilization



- A selection of countries are displayed.
- Countries with DRM greater than 25% of GDP are excluded

OTHER RELEVANT INDICATORS

- Human Capital Project. Belize is not part of a network of countries committed to the Human Capital agenda.
- Building Human Capital. In Belize, data on the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment rating for building human resources do not exist. The average for the country's region is 3.9 percent and for its income group is 3.8 percent. This indicator assesses the national policies and public and private sector service delivery that affect access to and quality of health and education services.
- **Identification.** In Belize, **11.5 percent** of the population does not have proof of identity. This is higher than both the regional average (7.6) and the average for its income group (8.9).
- Statistical Data on Human Capital. In Belize, data on stunting rate and Harmonized Learning Outcomes are unavailable after year 2000.

HOW IS THE WORLD BANK SUPPORTING THE EFFORT?

The following table summarizes the World Bank's investments in Human Development for Belize, including measures of volume, performance, and other relevant indicators.

World	Rank	Investments	in	HD

HD Portfolio USD (million)	Indicator	HD	Edu	HNP	SPJ
Diff. from regional average % -2,394 -958 -900 -536 Diff. from income group avg % -1,518 -515 -560 -443 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million)	HD Portfolio				
Diff. from regional average % -2,394 -958 -900 -536 Diff. from income group avg % -1,518 -515 -560 -443 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) % of total Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % HD Performance Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg %	USD (million)	0	0	0	0
Diff. from income group avg % -1,518 -515 -560 -443 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) % of total Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % HD Performance Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. fro	% of total	0	0	0	0
HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) % of total Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % HD Performance Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average %	Diff. from regional average %	-2,394	-958	-900	-536
USD (million) % of total Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % HD Performance Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Soliff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average %		-1,518	-515	-560	-443
% of total Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % HD Performance Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average %					
Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % HD Performance Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average %	, ,				
Diff. from income group avg % HD Performance Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average %	/0 01 total				
HD Performance Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average %	Diff. from regional average %		•		
Average Development Outcome Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Of of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %			•	•	
Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg %	HD Performance				
Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg %					
% Satisfactory DO Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %					
Average Implementation Progress Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %	0 1 0				
Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %					
Diff. from income group avg % % Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %					
% Satisfactory IP Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %					
Disbursement ratio Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %					
Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %	% Satisfactory IP			•	
Diff. from income group avg %					
Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.)					
Average project size (USD mill.) Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %					
Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average %					
Diff. from income group avg %	0 1 ,				
% of portfolio that is co-TTL'd					
Diff. from regional average %					
Diff. from income group avg %					
	Diff. from income group avg %	•	•	•	•

Note: a) Pink indicates that the value is within the first tercile of the distribution for all the countries. Orange indicates that the value is within

the second tercile. **Green** indicates that it is within the third tercile. b) FY20 lending program includes only projects rated A and B. c) DO and IP are on a scale of 1 to 6 where 1 is Highly Unsatisfactory and 6 is Highly Satisfactory. d) Data as of September 5, 2019.

This scorecard is intended to be a conversation starter on where a country is on various aspects of human capital development and the state of the World Bank's support in the social sectors. The choice of indicators is, to a large extent, driven by what is most relevant for the two regions with the lowest HCI scores (Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia). As such, not all the indicators included here are relevant for each country. The scorecard should be complemented with other more context specific indicators.

The sources of data for the different indicators include: the Human Capital Project, the World Development Indicators, and the World Bank's internal system to monitor investments.

For more information, please contact the Human Capital Project team: HCP_Team@worldbank.org