St. Lucia

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 St. Lucia 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 St. Lucia, the value is 89 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 St. Lucia, 81 percent of girls of secondary-school age are enrolled in secondary school. This is higher than both the average for its region (77) and the average for its income group (77).
- **Total Fertility Rate.** In St. Lucia, the total fertility rate is **1.4** births per woman. This is lower than both the average for its region (2.1) and the average for its income group (2.2).
- Adolescent Fertility Rate. In St. Lucia, there are 41 births per 1,000 women ages 15-19. This is lower than both the average for its region (57) and the average for its income group (43).
- Contraceptive Prevalence. In St. Lucia, 56 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 St. Lucia, data on the percentage
 of the population that is covered by social safety nets do not exist.
 The average for the country's region is 58 percent and for its income
 group is 58 percent.
- **Open Defecation.** In St. Lucia, **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.** St. Lucia spends **8.5 percent** of its government budget on health. This is lower than both the regional average (13.3) and the average for its income group (11.4).
- Education Spending. St. Lucia spends **22.4 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. St. Lucia spends 3.3 percent of its government budget on social protection. This is lower than both the regional average (10.7) and the average for its income group (10.4).

1. Key Indicators on Human Capital













- Large circle=St. Lucia ; 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 St. Lucia is higher or lower than what would be predicted for its level of per capita government spending.



- A selection out of 101 countries in the regression are displayed.
- **Domestic Resource Mobilization.** The tax revenue in St. Lucia is **21** percent of GDP. This is higher than both the regional average (17.9) and the average for its income group (17.5).



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

OTHER RELEVANT INDICATORS

- Human Capital Project. St. Lucia is not part of a network of countries committed to the Human Capital agenda.
- Building Human Capital. The Country Policy and Institutional Assessment rating for building human resources in St. Lucia is 4 (1 is low and 6 is high). This is higher than both the regional average (3.9) and the average for its income group (3.8). 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 St. Lucia, 1.8 percent of the population does not have proof of identity. This is lower than both the regional average (7.6) and the average for its income group (8.9).

Statistical Data on Human Capital. In St. Lucia, 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 St. Lucia, including measures of volume, performance, and other relevant indicators.

| Indicator | World Bank Investments in HD | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|
| USD (million) 20 0 20 0 % of total 32 0 32 0 Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % +8 -10 +23 -5 Diff. from income group avg % +17 -5 +26 -4 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) 20 20 0 0 % of total 29 29 0 0 Diff. from regional average % +11 +18 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % +0.49 . +0.15 . W Satisfactory DO 100 . 100 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . . Diff. from regional average % +0.67 . +0.70 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . Diff. from regional average % +0.63 . +0.25 . Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . | Indicator | HD | Edu | HNP | SPJ |
| % of total 32 0 32 0 Diff. from regional average % +8 -10 +23 -5 Diff. from income group avg % +17 -5 +26 -4 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) 20 20 0 0 % of total 29 29 0 0 Diff. from regional average % +11 +18 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % +0.49 . +0.15 . Piff. from regional average % +0.49 . +0.70 . % Satisfactory DO 100 . 100 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . Diff. from regional average % +0.67 . +0.25 . Diff. from group avag % +0.63 . +0.25 . Diff. from regional average % +0.79 . +0.67 . Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Diff. | HD Portfolio | | | | |
| Diff. from regional average % +8 -10 +23 -5 Diff. from income group avg % +17 -5 +26 -4 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) 20 20 0 0 % of total 29 29 0 0 Diff. from regional average % +11 +18 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % +0.49 - +0.15 - Werage Development Outcome 5 . 5 . 5 Diff. from regional average % +0.49 . +0.15 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.67 . +0.70 . % Satisfactory DO 100 . 100 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . 5 . . Diff. from regional average % +0.63 . +0.25 . . Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Disbursement ratio <td>USD (million)</td> <td>20</td> <td>0</td> <td>20</td> <td>0</td> | USD (million) | 20 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Diff. from income group avg % | % of total | 32 | 0 | 32 | 0 |
| HD FY 20 Lending Program | Diff. from regional average % | +8 | -10 | +23 | -5 |
| USD (million) 20 20 0 0 % of total 29 29 0 0 Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % +11 +18 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % +11 +22 -5 -6 HD Performance *** *** *** -6 Average Development Outcome *** *** *** -5 - *** -6 *** *** *** -6 *** | Diff. from income group avg % | +17 | -5 | +26 | -4 |
| % of total 29 29 0 0 Diff. from regional average % +11 +18 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % +11 +22 -5 -6 HD Performance Average Development Outcome 5 . 5 . | HD FY 20 Lending Program | | | | |
| Diff. from regional average % +11 +18 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % +11 +22 -5 -6 HD Performance Average Development Outcome 5 . 5 . <td>USD (million)</td> <td>20</td> <td>20</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | USD (million) | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Diff. from income group avg % +11 +22 -5 -6 HD Performance Average Development Outcome 5 . 5 . 5 Diff. from regional average % +0.49 . +0.15 . Diff. from income group avg % +0.67 . +0.70 . % Satisfactory DO 100 . 100 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . . Diff. from regional average % +0.63 . +0.25 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.79 . +0.67 . . % Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . | % of total | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 |
| HD Performance | Diff. from regional average % | +11 | +18 | -4 | -3 |
| Average Development Outcome 5 . 5 Diff. from regional average % +0.49 . +0.15 . Diff. from income group avg % +0.67 . +0.70 . % Satisfactory DO 100 . 100 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . Diff. from regional average % +0.63 . +0.25 . Diff. from income group avg % +0.79 . +0.67 . % Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Disbursement ratio 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -7 . -5 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 . -4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 | Diff. from income group avg % | +11 | +22 | -5 | -6 |
| Diff. from regional average % +0.49 . +0.15 . Diff. from income group avg % +0.67 . +0.70 . % Satisfactory DO 100 . 100 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . Diff. from regional average % +0.63 . +0.25 . Diff. from income group avg % +0.79 . +0.67 . % Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Disbursement ratio 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -7 . 55 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 . 4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 15 . | HD Performance | | | | |
| Diff. from income group avg % +0.67 . +0.70 . % Satisfactory DO 100 . 100 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . Diff. from regional average % +0.63 . +0.25 . Diff. from income group avg % +0.79 . +0.67 . % Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Disbursement ratio 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -7 . -5 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 -4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Average Development Outcome | 5 | | 5 | |
| % Satisfactory DO 100 . 100 . Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . Diff. from regional average % +0.63 . +0.25 . Diff. from income group avg % +0.79 . +0.67 . % Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Disbursement ratio 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -7 . -5 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 . -4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Diff. from regional average % | +0.49 | | +0.15 | |
| Average Implementation Progress 5 . 5 . 5 . <t< td=""><td>Diff. from income group avg %</td><td>+0.67</td><td></td><td>+0.70</td><td></td></t<> | Diff. from income group avg % | +0.67 | | +0.70 | |
| Diff. from regional average % +0.63 . +0.25 . Diff. from income group avg % +0.79 . +0.67 . % Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Disbursement ratio 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -7 . -5 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 . -4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | % Satisfactory DO | 100 | | 100 | |
| Diff. from income group avg % +0.79 . +0.67 . % Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Disbursement ratio 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -7 5 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 15 . | Average Implementation Progress | 5 | | 5 | |
| % Satisfactory IP 100 . 100 . Disbursement ratio 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -7 . -5 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 . -4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Diff. from regional average % | +0.63 | | +0.25 | |
| Disbursement ratio 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -7 . -5 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 . -4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Diff. from income group avg % | +0.79 | | +0.67 | |
| Diff. from regional average % -7 5 . Diff. from income group avg % -6 4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | % Satisfactory IP | 100 | | 100 | |
| Diff. from income group avg % -6 . -4 . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Disbursement ratio | 0 | | 0 | |
| Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Diff. from regional average % | -7 | | -5 | |
| Average project size (USD mill.) 20 0 20 0 Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Diff. from income group avg % | -6 | | -4 | |
| Diff. from regional average % -127 -71 -55 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Other indicators | | | | |
| Diff. from income group avg % -118 -71 -59 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -27 . -15 . | Average project size (USD mill.) | 20 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 . 0 . Diff. from regional average % -2715 . | Diff. from regional average % | -127 | -71 | -55 | -99 |
| Diff. from regional average % -2715 . | Diff. from income group avg % | -118 | -71 | -59 | -92 |
| 8 | % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd | 0 | | 0 | |
| Diff. from income group avg % -3113 . | Diff. from regional average % | -27 | | -15 | |
| | Diff. from income group avg % | -31 | | -13 | |

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