Guyana

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 Guyana the productivity as a future worker of a child born today is **49 percent** as much as it could be. 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 Guyana, the value is 87 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 Guyana, 86 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 Guyana, 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 Guyana, there are **86 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 Guyana, 34 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 Guyana, 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 Guyana, 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.** Guyana spends **7.7 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.** Guyana spends **10.2 percent** of its government budget on education. This is lower than both the regional average (16.3) and the average for its income group (14.5).
- **Social Protection Spending.** In Guyana, 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




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





- A selection of 146 countries in the regression are displayed.

• Domestic Resource Mobilization. In Guyana, data on domestic resource mobilization do not exist. The average for the country's region is 17.9 percent and for its income group is 17.5 percent.



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

OTHER RELEVANT INDICATORS

- Human Capital Project. Guyana is not part of a network of countries committed to the Human Capital agenda.
- Building Human Capital. The Country Policy and Institutional Assesment rating for building human resources in Guyana 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 Guyana, **3.9 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).

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

• Statistical Data on Human Capital. In Guyana, the latest available

Indicator HD Edu HNP SPJ HD Portfolio 38 32 0 0 % of total 38 38 0 0 Diff. from regional average % +14 +29 -9 -5 Diff. from income group avg % +23 +33 -6 -4 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) 0 0 0 0 Wof total 0 0 0 0 0 0 Wof total 0 </th <th>World Bank Investments in HD</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	World Bank Investments in HD				
USD (million) 23 23 0 0 % of total 38 38 0 0 Diff. from regional average % +14 +29 -9 -5 Diff. from income group avg % +23 +33 -6 -4 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) 0 0 0 0 Wof total 0 0 0 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -18 -11 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % -18 -6 -5 -6 HD Performance 4 4 - -3 -1 -1 -4 -3 -3 -6 -5 -6 -6 -1 -6 -5 -6 -6 -1 -6 -1 -1 -1 -3 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -	Indicator	HD	Edu	HNP	SPJ
% of total 38 38 0 0 Diff. from regional average % +14 +29 -9 -5 Diff. from income group avg % +23 +33 -6 -4 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) 0 0 0 0 Wo f total 0 0 0 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -18 -11 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % -18 -6 -5 -6 HD Performance 4 4 - -3 Average Development Outcome 4 4 - - Diff. from regional average % -0.01 -0.08 - - Diff. from income group avg % +0.17 +0.21 - - Average Implementation Progress 4 4 - - Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 - - N Satisfactory IP 100 100 - - D	HD Portfolio				
Diff. from regional average % +14 +29 -9 -5 Diff. from income group avg % +23 +33 -6 -4 HD FY 20 Lending Program USD (million) 0 0 0 0 Wo f total 0 0 0 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -18 -11 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % -18 -6 -5 -6 HD Performance 4 4 - - Average Development Outcome 4 4 - - Diff. from regional average % -0.01 -0.08 - - Diff. from income group avg % +0.17 +0.21 - - Satisfactory DO 100 100 . - - Average Implementation Progress 4 4 - - - Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 . - N Satisfactory IP 100 100 . . Disbursement ratio 10 10 . .	USD (million)	23	23	0	0
Diff. from income group avg %	% of total	38	38	0	0
USD (million)	Diff. from regional average %	+14	+29	-9	-5
USD (million) 0 0 0 0 % of total 0 0 0 0 Diff. from regional average % Diff. from income group avg % -18 -11 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % -18 -6 -5 -6 HD Performance 4 4 . Average Development Outcome 4 4 . . Diff. from regional average % -0.01 -0.08 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.17 +0.21 . . Satisfactory DO 100 100 . . Average Implementation Progress 4 4 . . Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 . . Satisfactory IP 100 100 . . Disbursement ratio 10 10 . . Diff. from regional average %	Diff. from income group avg %	+23	+33	-6	-4
% of total 0 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -18 -11 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % -18 -6 -5 -6 HD Performance -18 -6 -5 -6 HD Performance -18 -4 -5 -6 Average Development Outcome 4 4 - - Diff. from regional average % -0.01 -0.08 - - Diff. from income group avg % +0.17 +0.21 - - Average Implementation Progress 4 4 - - Average Implementation Progress 4 4 - - Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 - - Satisfactory IP 100 100 - - Disbursement ratio 10 10 - - Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 - - Other indicators -4 -0 <td< td=""><td>HD FY 20 Lending Program</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	HD FY 20 Lending Program				
Diff. from regional average % -18 -11 -4 -3 Diff. from income group avg % -18 -6 -5 -6 HD Performance -18 -6 -5 -6 Average Development Outcome 4 4 . . Diff. from regional average % -0.01 -0.08 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.17 +0.21 . . % Satisfactory DO 100 100 . . Average Implementation Progress 4 4 . . Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 . . Satisfactory IP 100 100 . . Disbursement ratio 10 10 . . Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 . . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0	USD (million)	0	0	0	0
Diff. from income group avg %	% of total	0	0	0	0
Note	Diff. from regional average %	-18	-11	-4	-3
Average Development Outcome 4 4 Diff. from regional average % -0.01 -0.08 Diff. from income group avg % +0.17 +0.21 % Satisfactory DO 100 100 Average Implementation Progress 4 4 Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 % Satisfactory IP 100 100 Disbursement ratio 10 10 Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from income group avg % -1.26 -59	Diff. from income group avg %	-18	-6	-5	-6
Diff. from regional average % -0.01 -0.08 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.17 +0.21 . . % Satisfactory DO 100 100 . . Average Implementation Progress 4 4 . . Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 . . % Satisfactory IP 100 100 . . Disbursement ratio 10 10 . . Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 . . Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 . . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16	HD Performance				
Diff. from income group avg % +0.17 +0.21 % Satisfactory DO 100 100 Average Implementation Progress 4 4 Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 % Satisfactory IP 100 100 Disbursement ratio 10 10 Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 Other indicators 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -27 -16	Average Development Outcome	4	4		
No Satisfactory DO 100 100 Average Implementation Progress 4 4 Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 N Satisfactory IP 100 100 Disbursement ratio 10 10 Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -27 -16	Diff. from regional average %	-0.01	-0.08		
Average Implementation Progress 4 4 . . Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 . . % Satisfactory IP 100 100 . . Disbursement ratio 10 10 . . Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 . . Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 . . Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .	Diff. from income group avg %	+0.17	+0.21		
Diff. from regional average % +0.13 +0.27 . . Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 . . % Satisfactory IP 100 100 . . Disbursement ratio 10 10 . . Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 . . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .	% Satisfactory DO	100	100		
Diff. from income group avg % +0.29 +0.44 . . % Satisfactory IP 100 100 . . Disbursement ratio 10 10 . . Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 . . Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 . . Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .	Average Implementation Progress	4	4		
W Satisfactory IP 100 100 . . Disbursement ratio 10 10 . . Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 . . Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 . . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .	Diff. from regional average %	+0.13	+0.27	•	
Disbursement ratio 10 10 . . . Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 . . Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 . . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .	Diff. from income group avg %	+0.29	+0.44		•
Diff. from regional average % +3 -2 . . Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 . . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .	% Satisfactory IP	100	100		
Diff. from income group avg % +4 -0 . . Other indicators Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .		10	10		•
Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . . .		+3	-2		
Average project size (USD mill.) 12 12 0 0 Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .		+4	-0	•	•
Diff. from regional average % -135 -59 -75 -99 Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .	Other indicators				
Diff. from income group avg % -126 -59 -79 -92 % of portfolio that is co-TTL'd 0 0 . . Diff. from regional average % -27 -16 . .		12	12	0	0
% of portfolio that is co-TTL'd Diff. from regional average % -27 -16	Diff. from regional average %	-135	-59	-75	-99
Diff. from regional average % -27 -16	Diff. from income group avg %	-126	-59	-79	-92
	•	0	0		
Diff. from income group avg % -31 -24	č č	-27	-16		
	Diff. from income group avg %	-31	-24	•	

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 in-

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