CLR Review
Independent Evaluation Group

For Official Use Only

1. CPS Data	
Country: Costa Rica	
CPS Year: FY11	**CPS Period**: FY12 – FY15
CLR Period: FY12 – FY15	**Date of this review:** May 20, 2015

2. Overall IEG Assessment

	CLR Rating	IEG Rating
Development Outcome:	*Moderately Satisfactory*	*Moderately Satisfactory*
WBG Performance:	*Good*	*Fair*

3. Executive Summary

i. Costa Rica is a well-performing, environmentally friendly, upper middle income country that stands out among its Latin American peers for low poverty levels, shared prosperity, and steady development over the past two decades. It started OECD membership discussions on April 9, 2015. The FY12-FY15 CPS had an initially favorable economic environment that deteriorated mid-way through the program period. The country bounced back quickly from the 2008-09 global crisis but momentum slowed in 2013-14, and macro-vulnerabilities, mainly from a weakening fiscal position, started to increase. The country's main structural challenges are a skills shortage that is affecting competitiveness, an inefficient public sector than needs modernizing, and an infrastructure gap that is becoming larger as the country continues to grow. Moreover, fiscal sustainability, and streamlining legislative and accountability procedures for infrastructure project implementation remain priorities.

ii. The WBG program addressed some of these issues. Cluster II on supporting the environment and disaster risk management achieved tangible results. The amount of land under the payment for ecosystems services (PES) program increased significantly, and the government took initial steps to improve disaster risk management. Both achievements though, need to be put in context: the causal link between PES and improved conservation is not well established, and the step of having a hazard component for all public investment projects is a necessary but not sufficient condition to enhance the government's capacity for disaster risk management. Cluster I on improving equity in social sectors achieved some results in education in poor and indigenous areas, but had less than critical mass to have a tangible overall impact on social sectors. The objective of efficiency in social sectors was dropped at the progress report stage. Cluster III on competitiveness showed a reduction in the number of days to open a business, a small step in a country that needs to improve competeviness. Of particular concern, is the failure of the Puerto Limon Integrated Infrastructure Project (FY08).

iii. The design of the WB program was adequate, but unrealistic in light of WBG experience in Costa Rica. The Bank does not appear to have taken appropriate mitigating measures to make the program realistic. As a result, projects suffered from a mix of poor execution capacity and a political economy that continued to block the normal development of Bank projects. With the program at risk in some areas, the Bank tried to improve implementation, but efforts were generally insufficient and late to

CLR Reviewed by:	Peer Reviewed by:	CLR Review Coordinator
Juan José Fernández-Ansola Consultant IEGCC **Surajit Goswami Consultant IEGCC**	**Paul Levy, Consultant, IEGCC** **Igor Artemiev, Consultant, IEGCC**	**Geeta Batra Manager, IEGCC**

address key bottlenecks. IFC participated at the stage of strategy development and contributed significantly to some country development goals through, for example, financing for renewable energy generation projects. But this is not sufficiently recognized in the CLR because IFC was not part of the initial results framework. Moreover, although IFC activities were ongoing at progress report stage, the synergies between IFC and IBRD were not explored, and thus expected results of IFC activities were not reflected in the program even at that stage.

iv. The program's mid-course adjustments recognized the unpleasant reality of slow program implementation. Although the WBG did articulate a reordering of priorities at that stage, the progress report did not explicitly recognize that development objectives needed to be changed rather than just re-ordered. Four out of five objectives in the competitiveness cluster were dropped, but the competitiveness cluster maintained a single objective to reduce the number of days to start a business. Two out of four objectives in the "social sector" cluster were dropped, focusing the cluster narrowly on access to education, but the cluster was still called "improving equity in social sectors." Moreover, a comparison of results matrices in the CLR and progress report shows that most of the outcomes in the CLR matrix were achieved by December 2013, indicative of no substantial measurable program after the progress report, except for some AAA where expected results are not explicit in the results framework. The AAA program was not strategic enough, or built sufficiently around issues directly connected to the program. Many large analytical reports were not followed up with program-related actions.

v. While the CPS discussed lessons from previous strategies, including a need for program realism in light of slow domestic approval process, improved results frameworks, and difficulties in project implementation, these lessons were not reflected in practical solutions. In fact, we note that the issues noted in IEG's CPSCR review of the previous CPS, once again reappeared in this CPS. IEG agrees with the CLR lessons on the importance of taking into account political economy and institutional constraints, a more realistic results framework and efficient monitoring, and the need for a strategic AAA program with more impact. But perhaps the main lesson IEG would like to highlight is to change the approach in the next CPF to avoid past mistakes. This would entail an innovative approach for consensus building for the WBG program, and capacity building with strategic, targeted AAA that would directly benefit WBG program. Having a World Bank office in Costa Rica, a relatively recent development, should help in this regard. IFC's increased relevance in the country provides the opportunity to exploit better the synergies between IBRD, IFC, and MIGA in the next CPF.

4. Development Outcome

Relevance of the WBG Strategy:

1. ***Congruence with Country Context and Country Program***. The CPS was implemented in an initially favorable economic environment that started to deteriorate towards the middle of the program period. Costa Rica bounced back quickly from the 2008-09 global crisis but momentum slowed in 2013-14, and macro-vulnerabilities, mainly from a weakening fiscal position, started to increase. The government attempted to pass a significant tax reform that would address the worsening fiscal situation but failed due to lack of consensus in Congress, particularly about the required structural measures. Yet, the country stands out in Latin America with one of the lowest poverty levels, and with social indicators at the top of the range for the region. Its pioneering efforts to preserve the environment are widely recognized, and Costa Rica's natural beauty and preservation efforts make it a preferred destination for tourists in search of nature-related experiences.

2. In this context, the Government's policy priorities in the 2011-14 national development plan were to: Improve the country's infrastructure (the last important road was built more than 30 years ago), achieve carbon neutrality by 2021, enhance competitiveness (including through building a skilled labor force), and reduce crime and violence, both of which had been increasing in the face of rising levels of drug-

related crime. The Bank program concentrated on three clusters that are closely aligned with key government development objectives: developing competitiveness, improving efficiency and quality of services in the social sectors, and supporting environment and disaster management. IFC was expected to concentrate on renewable energy and energy efficiency projects, manufacturing and agribusiness sectors with an emphasis on supporting companies with plans to increase regional expansion and raise exports, private sector healthcare, financial services, and advisory engagements to support infrastructure and sustainable agribusiness services. The CPS progress report re-ordered the pillars because of persistent project-delivery problems during the period 2011-13, de-emphasizing the competitiveness cluster and shifting attention towards the environment and social sectors, which were the remaining clusters under the program. This reflected a recognition of failure of interventions under the competitiveness cluster mid-way through the program.

3. ***Relevance of Design***. In light of previous difficulties with the approval of operations by Congress, the CPS proposed fewer, larger operations than in previous strategies. This was a reasonable approach to take. The instruments for education namely the Higher Education Improvement Project (FY13), and the Equity and Efficiency of Education Project (FY05), seemed appropriate. But the City of Puerto Limon Integrated Infrastructure Project (FY08) was a failure. The in-country institutional framework (limited implementation capacity of the project implementation unit) and the political economy in Costa Rica proved to be insurmountable bottlenecks. WBG efforts to improve implementation were late and insufficient to address key bottlenecks. Moreover, although IFC activities were ongoing at the progress report stage, the synergies between IFC and IBRD activities were not explored, and thus the expected results of IFC activities were not reflected in the program.

4. The government proactively ensured a division of labor between development partners in Costa Rica based on each institution's comparative advantage and experience. Thus, in environment-related work, there was complementarity between the WBG, the UNDP, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency, European Investment Bank (EIB), European Union and German Development Bank. IFC also cooperated with other development partners effectively, for example in the Reventazon River Hydroelectric Power Project, with EIB, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, institutional investors, and some local banks. The AAA program was partly linked to health, environment, and competitiveness, but overall it was not strategically built around issues connected to the program, and some large analytical reports were not followed up.

5. The 2014 IFC investment in the electricity sector did not address the issue of high electricity rates which now constitutes a serious obstacle for Costa Rica's development. IFC's investment in a private sector initiative in electricity generation came without targets to improve performance in the public electricity company, which dominates the sector and represents a serious barrier to private sector participation.

Overview of Achievement by Objective:

Focus Area I: Improving Equity in Social Sectors[1]

6. ***Improve equitable access to education in poor and indigenous areas.*** The two indicators, which were both revised at the progress report stage, were met. The graduation rate measured as the ratio between 11th and 7th grade enrollment increased to 32 percent in targeted areas against the 27.5 percent target. The gap between the national and targeted areas graduation was reduced substantially, and the graduation ratio stood at 94 percent in 2014 compared to a 67 percent target. The Equity and Efficiency of Education Project (FY05) contribution to this objective was modest according to IEG's ICR review of the project, and it is not easy to reconcile the values of the indicators presented in the CLR with those in the ICR and IEG's ICR review for the project. According to IEG's ICR review, most quality improvements seem to have happened before the project started. The percentage of students passing secondary education *bachillerato* exams in the target areas increased from 14.1 percent in 2006 to 41.6 percent in 2008 before project start (August 2007) and substantially reduced the gap to the national average of 69.8 percent. However, from 2008 until 2013 the rate declined to 40.5 percent in targeted areas and the gap to the national average increased during selected years. The increase in 24 indigenous territories was from 11.4 percent in 2006 to 46.5 percent in 2013, and in rural areas from 53 percent to 60.3 percent, not meeting the target of 70 percent. The pass rate was 49.9 percent in the 14 newly established *liceos rurales* supported by the project (no explicit target under project) and there are no values provided for these subgroups for 2008. *Mostly Achieved*

7. IEG rates the outcome of WBG support under focus area I as Moderately Satisfactory. Equitable access to education improved as did graduation rates in poor and indigenous areas. At the same time IEG's ICR review of the project in support of this objective (Equity and Efficiency of Education (FY05))—in contrast with the finding of the CLR—notes that the gap between graduation rates in targeted areas and the national average appears to have increased during the program period. In addition, unfortunately, the objective on health in the original CPS had to be dropped at progress report stage because of delays in the approval of a health investment project (National Health Insurance System). As a result, the Bank ended up with less than a critical mass in this cluster to achieve a tangible impact on the social sectors.

Focus Area II: Supporting the Environment and Disaster Risk Management

8. ***Increase land incorporated into the PES (Payment for Ecosystem Services) Program***. One indicator was mostly met and the other was met. The number of hectares incorporated into the PES program increased to 292 thousand hectares in 2014 against a revised target of 310 thousand hectares.[2] The number of small and medium landowners (<100 hectares) participating in the PES program increased to 3,300 in 2014 compared to a target of 2,850. The Mainstreaming Market-Based Instruments for Environmental Management Project (FY06), which was partly supported by a Global Environmental Facility grant, contributed to these objectives, but according to the ICR, the revised target of 310 thousand hectares under the PES could not be reached due to limited enrollments in the last two years. The end-of-period value exceeded the original target value (288 thousand hectares) but only reached 95 percent of the revised target (310 thousand hectares). The ICR notes the overachievement of the number of small and medium landowners participating in the PES. The ICR also notes that project design failed to include concrete actions to directly promote and improve biodiversity conservation, and to put in place adequate mechanisms to measure the impact of the PES

[1] The objective of efficiency in social sectors in the original CPS was dropped at CPS progress report stage without much explanation.

[2] The progress report revised the target from 288 thousand to 310 thousand hectares. The CLR incorrectly reports the target as the one in the original CPS (288 thousand).

program on conservation on the ground. The project design—and this CPS objective and its indicators—assume that successful implementation of the program would ensure biodiversity conservation. While there are a number of publications that support this assumption, others disagree with the direct causal link assumption of payment for ecosystem services and improved conservation. Mostly Achieved

9. ***Increase capitalization of the Biodiversity Endowment Fund.*** The fund has been capitalized with contributions from the Global Environmental facility and KfW, and by end-2014 the fund's capitalization amounted to about $19 million, exceeding the 15 million target. Achieved

10. ***Enhance the government's capacity to implement its disaster risk management program for natural disasters***. The indicator on increasing the number of public investment projects that include a hazards assessment from 23 to 75 percent was met with margin during the CPS period. In 2014, 100 percent of all new approved investment projects registered in MIDEPLAN's Investment Projects database incorporates disaster risk management considerations. Achieved

11. IFC contributed to this cluster through the investment of US$100 million in a large hydroelectric project (Reventazon River) expected to reduce carbon emissions. In addition, IFC invested US$6 million in financing energy efficiency projects through local banks.

12. IEG rates the outcome of WBG support under focus area II as Moderately Satisfactory. The objectives were mostly met under this cluster. Significant new land was incorporated in the PES program, the biodiversity fund was capitalized, and all public investment projects now include a hazards assessment component. However, the first objective assumes that more land under the PES would automatically ensure better biodiversity conservation. But this is a controversial issue, and the causal link between payment for ecosystems services and improved conservation is not well established. On the government's disaster risk management, having a hazard assessment component for all projects is a welcome first step, but it seems to be a fairly small step towards the goal of increasing the government's disaster risk management capacity.

Focus Area III: **Supporting Competitiveness**

13. ***Improve the business environment as measured by a reduction in red tape.*** The indicator of reducing the number of days to start a business from 60 in 2011 to 35 in 2015 was met. The average number of days to start a business was 24 in 2015. Achieved

14. Planned IFC financing for corporations with regional integration and export-led strategies, and the IFC support for private sector technical and vocational education institutions did not materialize.

15. IEG rates the outcome of WBG support under focus area III as unsatisfactory. The number of days to start a business has been reduced in line with the target, but this appears to be a very small achievement compared to the cluster's original intent and to the needs of Costa Rica on the competitiveness front. Infrastructure is a key one, as is developing human capital and skills that would allow Costa Rica to move to the next level in competitiveness. On neither of these fronts was progress remarkable, and the failure of the Puerto Limon Integrated Infrastructure Project (FY08) demonstrates the absence of adequate commitment to improving infrastructure. All in all, the WBG program in this cluster lost relevance when most objectives were dropped at progress report stage; in fact, following the progress report it did not look like a cluster anymore.

Overall Assessment and Rating

16. IEG rates the development outcome rating of WBG support as Moderately Satisfactory. Cluster II on supporting the environment and disaster risk management achieved tangible results. The amount of land under the PES program increased significantly, and the government took initial steps to improve disaster risk management. Both achievements though, need to be put in context: the causal link

between payment for ecosystems services (PES) and improved conservation is not well established, and the step of having a hazard component for all public investment projects is a necessary but not sufficient condition to enhance the government's capacity to implement the disaster risk management program. Cluster I on improving equity in social sectors achieved some results in education in poor and indigenous areas but had less than critical mass to achieve a tangible impact on the social sectors. In part, this was the result of dropping the objective on health in the original CPS because of delays in the approval of a health investment project. Cluster III on competitiveness showed minor results—reduction of number of days to open a business—in a country that urgently needs to improve its competeveness. Of particular concern, the failure of the Puerto Limon Integrated Infrastructure Project (FY08) demonstrates the absence of commitment to improve infrastructure.

Objectives	CLR Rating	IEG Rating
Focus Area I: Improving Equity in Social Sectors	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory
Focus Area II: Supporting the Environment and Disaster Risk Management	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory
Focus Area III: Supporting Competitiveness	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

5. WBG Performance

Selectivity

17. The program started out as focused and selective, with interventions balanced across clusters (competitiveness, efficiency and equity in social sectors, environment and disaster risk management),[3] and consistent with a well distributed set of objectives across the clusters. But as the program progressed it became unbalanced because the Puerto Limon Integrated Infrastructure Project (FY08) was dropped from Cluster III on competitiveness, and the National Health Insurance System Project under Cluster I on efficiency and equity in the social sectors was delayed to the next CPS period. Cluster II on the environment remained the most solid area of Bank activity, with interventions matching objectives in a selective and focused way. But overall this program ended up with less than a critical mass of interventions to achieve objectives in all its clusters. Indeed, it became "too selective" in unintended ways, and lost the balanced quality that it had at the beginning of the CPS.

18. The original CPS appeared to be based on adequate country diagnostics and economic sector work, and was congruent with the country development goals. It appears though, that the set of interventions and objectives were not in line with the country's capacity as reflected in the delay or failure of the most important interventions in Clusters I and III, primarily because of institutional weaknesses. The program aimed to have a long-term impact with institutional development and potential for scaling up, particularly in clusters I (social sectors) and II (environment). It also appears sustainable without aid after Bank interventions are closed, although the government will need to conduct an overdue fiscal reform to increase fiscal capacity, and devote it to education and the environment.

19. The CPS did not have an explicit discussion about the rationale for the WBG's choice of areas of interventions, except to say that the government wanted to establish a clear division of labor among donors. It assigned the WBG certain areas (environment, social sectors, and competitiveness), and

[3] The priorities from Costa Rica's recent SCD—admittedly post-CPS, but presumably still relevant for this CPS—are: reducing the skills shortage and improving the efficiency of social spending, moving towards fiscal sustainability, modernizing public sector institutions and the regulatory framework, and addressing the infrastructure gap.

requested that WBG focus investment support in the social sectors, where there had been a sustained level of engagement over time. Other than that, the WBG would propose fewer, larger operations to deal with risks from Congress slow approval process.

Alignment

20. The program was aligned with the twin WBG goals on poverty and shared prosperity. Clusters I and II of the program targeted poor, rural and indigenous communities, and poor small and medium landowners. Cluster I on education is creating opportunities for indigenous people to complete secondary education and attend tertiary education. Cluster III on competitiveness was intended to sustain higher economic growth which is key for reducing poverty.

Lending and Investments

21. At the start of the CPS period, IBRD had 4 ongoing operations totaling $198 million. The ongoing portfolio included investment operations in education, forestry, transport and a Catastrophe Deferred Drawdown Option (CAT DDO). Eight trust funded activities for $14.5 million provided complementary financing.

22. During the CPS period, IBRD made commitments totaling $200 million for an investment operation in the education sector. Two trust funded activities for $3.9 million provided complementary financing. IBRD committed resources were a third of the planned amount ($600 million). As foreseen in the CPS, IBRD delivered a Higher Education Project in FY13 ($200 million). However, an envisaged health project for $400 million did not materialize as the government decided to first engage with the Bank through a RAS[4]. The health project is expected for the next CPF period.

23. On overage, for the period FY12-15, IBRD committed resources were disbursed at a lower rate than for the LCR region and Bank wide. The average disbursement ratio for Costa Rica's investment operations during the CPS period was 9%, as compared to 19.9% and 19% for the LCR region and Bank-wide respectively. According to the CPSPR, the low disbursement ratios are mainly driven by: (i) a non-performing project (City of Puerto Limon Infrastructure Project); (ii) a lengthy and difficult approval process in Congress and; (iii) lack of implementation readiness and weak execution capacity.

24. Notwithstanding the low disbursement ratios, the Costa Rica portfolio was less risky than the LCR Region and Bank wide portfolios. During FY12-15, the Costa Rica portfolio had 10% of the projects at risk, as compared to 22% and 20% for the LCR Region and Bank-wide respectively. On a commitment basis, the Costa Rica portfolio also performed better with 16% of the commitments at risk as compared to 19% for the LCR region and 20% Bank-wide. IEG reviewed the ICR of just one project that closed during the FY12-FY15 period and rated the development outcome of this project as moderately unsatisfactory. With respect to active projects, management assessments report that the majority of projects were making satisfactory progress towards achieving their development objectives except for the City of Puerto Limon Integrated Infrastructure Project (FY08).

25. Six IFC investment projects were in operation at the inception of the review period amounting to US$46.0 million of net commitment. Three of these projects were trade finance guarantees. During the review period, IFC committed US$252.3 million through 12 additional projects. The largest of these was a US$100 million investment in a large hydroelectric project.

26. The CLR made no comments on the IFC portfolio, although two projects supporting non-bank financial intermediaries with local currency loans closed without any disbursements. IEG did not review any of the IFC investments. No MIGA approvals took place during the CPS period.

[4] See CLR, page 8, paragraph 26.

Analytic and Advisory Activities and Services

27. A program of analytic work and advisory activities and services including 3 Economic and Sector Works (ESWs) and 17 Technical Assistance (TA) tasks was delivered during the FY12-FY15 period. The Bank help develop a roadmap to increase the efficiency and quality of health services through Reimbursable Advisory Services. Moreover it provided advice to the government on using rural landscapes productively in an environmentally sustainable manner. All in all, although the program of AAA contains assistance on health, environment, and competitiveness, there are elements of the program that appear fragmented and seem to have responded to specific, punctual requests by the authorities. The impact of the overall program of AAA is hard to assess, and the CLR does not attempt to make an assessment. However, as the CLR recognizes, many large analytical reports were not followed-up with action, and was not strategic enough to support the overall program.

28. No IFC advisory service (AS) were ongoing at the beginning of CPS. During the CPS period, IFC approved four AS projects amounting to over US$625 thousand of total funds. Two of these AS projects were terminated without results, and one closed during the review period with a self-rating of Mostly Unsuccessful. The ongoing AS project on Secured Transaction and Collateral Registries appears to be progressing as planned.

Results Framework

29. The CPS objectives linked well with country development goals addressing important issues in social sectors, environment and competitiveness. The results framework contained the development goals to which the CPS would contribute, a column showing the main issues and obstacles, and then how the CPS would contribute to deal with those. It identified milestones for measuring progress and the main Bank interventions in support of program objectives. The causal chain between interventions and objectives was convincing—except perhaps on the PES and conservation—and the objectives of the program contained appropriate and measurable indicators.

30. Unfortunately, at the progress report stage the failure of a key intervention in the competitiveness cluster, and the delay of another significant intervention in the social sectors significantly weakened the program and made a number of objectives unachievable. As a consequence, the results framework became weak in the clusters on competiveness and social sectors. In addition, a comparison of results matrices in CLR and progress report shows that most of the outcomes in the CLR results matrix were achieved by December 2013, implying no substantial measurable program to achieve after the progress report, except for some AAA where expected results are nor explicit in the results framework. The framework also suffered another significant weakness from not incorporating at CPS inception or progress report stage the expected impact of IFC interventions on the objectives of the program or the clusters.

31. There was no explicit discussion in the CPS of possible scaling up from WBG interventions to country level outcomes, with the possible exception of Bank and IFC working together to develop institutions and personnel capable of negotiating, monitoring and improving the performance of Private Public Partnerships for infrastructure projects. Given the country's fiscal constraints this initiative had the potential of scaling up limited public sector resources for infrastructure development. The WBG delivered AAA on Institutional Strengthening for PPPs, but the CLR is silent on the impact of this piece of advice or any follow up.

Partnerships and Development Partner Coordination

32. According to the CLR the government ensured efficient division of labor between key development partners. In environment-related work the Bank found complementarities with the UNDP, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency, the European Investment Bank (EIB), European Union, and the

German Development Bank. The IFC maintained good cooperation with EIB, IADB, and the Central American Bank for Economic Integration on a large hydro-power project (Reventazon River).

Safeguards and Fiduciary Issues

33. Although the Mainstreaming Market-based Instruments for Environmental Management Project (FY06) triggered four Bank safeguard policies—environmental assessment, natural habitats, indigenous people and forests—the Bank team dealt with them appropriately and there were no safeguard complaints. The Bank team also dealt appropriately with safeguard policies triggered by the Equity and Efficiency of Education Project (FY05). On fiduciary issues, the Bank team identified mistakes in procurement procedures for some projects but did not find evidence to declare mis-procurement.

Ownership and Flexibility

34. This program was very slow in implementation, but it is difficult to disentangle if the reason for the slow implementation was weak implementation capacity and limited experience with WBG operations, or poor ownership. The fact that Congress was very slow in approving projects—and in some cases this was the main obstacle for project effectiveness—suggests that ownership was at least uneven, and there was no shared ownership by the executive and legislative branches in Costa Rica. Moreover, the government did not go ahead with the $400 million National Health-Insurance Project and instead sought a Reimbursable Advisory Service for reform of the Social Security Agency.

35. Project implementation has always been difficult according to the previous IEG CASCR review (July 8, 2011) because of difficulties in consensus building and, in particular, the need to get the Executive to agree with Congress, which approves all foreign borrowing. Such problems have continued under this CPS, and the CPS made mid-course adjustments, reflecting very slow implementation of some projects and outright failure of others.

WBG Internal Cooperation

36. The CLR does not discuss Bank cooperation with IFC and MIGA. IFC and the Bank worked closely in developing the strategy for Costa Rica but it appears that they went their own ways when it came to implementation. IFC had similar problems to the Bank on the ground, and a number of CPS planned activities did not materialize. The institutions did not make an effort to include IFC's interventions explicitly in the results framework or their expected contributions to program objectives. The CLR does not discuss conflicts of interest between the institutions in Costa Rica.

Risk Identification and Mitigation

37. The most important risks identified to CPS implementation were related to sharper-than-anticipated acceleration in food and oil prices, slower than anticipated recovery in the United States, and the timely approval of the tax reform package. The CPS notes that the Bank would mitigate the risk on the tax reform package through continuous macroeconomic policy dialogue, in close coordination with other development partners, and will adjust its program accordingly. The tax reform package was not approved. The Bank adjusted the program at progress report stage but this was related to other issues rather than fiscal space for program implementation. There were no mitigation measures for the other risks.

38. Another risk identified to program implementation was portfolio implementation delays due to the lengthy legislative approval process for external funding. The Bank intended to mitigate this risk by focusing operations on areas of high strategic importance, extensive consultations with stakeholders including Congress, and building consensus on the contents of operations throughout the development face. This risk materialized—as it had under the previous CPS—and the mitigation measures were

insufficient to avoid the failure of the Puerto Limon Infrastructure Project (FY08) or keep more or less on track the National Health Insurance System project, now delayed to the next WBG program period.

Overall Assessment and Rating

39. IEG rates WBG performance as Fair. The design of the program was adequate, but unrealistic in light of WB experience in Costa Rica. The Bank does not appear to have taken appropriate mitigating measures to make the program realistic. As a result, implementation of projects suffered from a mix of poor execution capacity and a political economy that continued to block the normal development of Bank projects. With the program at risk in some areas, the Bank tried to improve implementation, but its efforts were generally insufficient and late to address key bottlenecks. IFC participated at the strategy development stage and contributed significantly to some country development goals through, for example, financing for renewable energy generation projects. But unfortunately this is not sufficiently recognized in the CLR because IFC was not part of the initial or revised results framework. Although IFC activities were ongoing at progress report stage, the synergies between IFC and IBRD were not explored, and thus expected results of IFC activities were not reflected in the program even at that stage.

vi. The program made mid-course adjustments, but rather than pro-active, the changes seemed to be the recognition of an unpleasant reality of slow implementation of some projects, delays in the development of others, and failure in one case. Although the WBG did articulate a reordering of priorities at progress report stage, the report did not recognize explicitly that development objectives needed to be changed rather than just re-shuffled. Four out of five objectives in the competitiveness cluster were dropped, but the competitiveness cluster maintained a single objective to reduce the number of days to start a business. Two out of four objectives in the “social sector” cluster were dropped, focusing the cluster narrowly on access to education, but the cluster was still called “improving equity in social sectors.” Moreover, a comparison of results matrices in the CLR and progress report shows that most of the outcomes in the CLR matrix were achieved by December 2013, indicative of no substantial measurable program after the progress report, except for some AAA where expected results are not explicit in the results framework. The AAA program was not strategic enough, or built sufficiently around issues directly connected to the program. Many large analytical reports were not followed up with program-related actions.

40. The AAA program was not strategic enough, or built sufficiently around issues directly connected to the program. Many large analytical reports were not followed up with program-related actions.

6. Assessment of CLR Completion Report

41. The CLR framework of analysis is consistent with the CPS progress report objectives, although the text and the summary of CPS program self-evaluation have different presentations of the program for some clusters. The CLR discusses the evidence on program indicators, but could have been more substantive in explaining the WBG’s contribution to country outcomes. Some of the findings of the CLR in the education sector are contradicted by relevant ICRs of education projects and IEG’s ICR reviews. Moreover, the CLR could have been more candid in pointing out that this was a program where measured results were mostly achieved by December 2013, and little was done after that. It is also fairly silent on how IFC contributed to the objectives of the program. In fact, given that IFC’s program in Costa Rica is larger than IBRD’s—both in terms of number of operations and value of ongoing operations and new commitments—the analysis toward IBRD operations in the CLR appears unwarranted and at variance with the One Bank Group approach. In light of all the problems of implementation of the CPS and delays with investment projects, the CLR would have benefited from a good account of what went wrong, to be able to learn from this experience. There is no discussion in the CLR of safeguards, fiduciary, or conflicts of interest issues.

6. Lessons

42. IEG agrees with CLR lessons on taking into account political economy and institutional constraints, more realistic results framework and efficient monitoring, and need for a strategic AAA program with more impact. These lessons for the next CPF do not go much beyond the lessons of the previous CPS Completion Review which were not taken on board in practice. Perhaps then the main lesson—and one IEG wants to highlight—is to change the approach in the next CPF to avoid past mistakes. This would entail an innovative approach for consensus building for the WBG program, and capacity building with strategic, targeted AAA that would directly benefit the implementation of the WBG program. Having a WBG office in Costa Rica, which is a relatively recent development, should help in this regard. IFC's increased relevance in the country provides the opportunity to exploit better the synergies between IBRD, IFC, and MIGA in the next CPF.

Annex Table 1: Summary of Achievements of CPS Objectives

	CPS FY12-FY15: Pillar I – Improve Efficiency and Equity in Social Sectors	Actual Results (as of current month/year)	Comments
Major Outcome Measures	1. CPS Outcome: Improve equitable access to education in targeted poor and indigenous areas		
	Indicator: Graduation rate in targeted areas (measured as the ratio between 11th and 7th grade enrollment) **Baseline**: 22% (2008) **Target:** 27.5 % (2014)	As of December 2014, the graduation rate in targeted areas is 32%.	Source: CLR The objective and the indicator were revised at the CPSPR stage as part of the 2011 restructuring of the Equity and Efficiency of Education Project. The original objective was "Increase primary school completion rate in the targeted areas" (baseline: 95.5% in 2009 and target 99% in 2014).
	Indicator: Graduation ratio between targeted areas and the national level (reduction in gap) **Baseline**: 60% (2008) **Target:** 67%(2014)	As of December 2014, the graduation ratio stands at 94%.	Source: CLR The objective and the indicator were revised at the CPSPR stage as part of the 2011 restructuring of the Equity and Efficiency of Education Project. The original objective was "Increase primary school completion rate in the targeted areas" (baseline 95.5% in 2009 and target 99% in 2014).

	CPS FY12-FY15: Pillar II – Supporting the Environment and Disaster Risk Management	Actual Results (as of current month/year)	Comments
Major Outcome Measures	2. CPS Outcome: Increase land incorporated into the PES (Payment for Ecosystem Services) program		
	Indicator: Number of hectares incorporated into the PES program **Baseline**: 230,000 hectares (2007) **Target:** 310,000 hectares (2014)	As of December 2014, achieved an average of 292,000 Ha under contract annually.	Source: CLR and CPSPR The CLR incorrectly uses the original target of 288 thousand hectares. The target was revised to 310 thousand hectares at CPS progress report stage, and not achieved during the CPS as noted in the project's ICR.
	3. CPS Outcome: Increase number of small and medium land owners participating in the PES program.		

	CPS FY12-FY15: Pillar II – Supporting the Environment and Disaster Risk Management	Actual Results (as of current month/year)	Comments
	Indicator: Number of small and medium land owners (< 100 hectares) participating in the PES program. **Baseline**: 1,900 (2007) **Target**: 2,850 (2014)	As of December 2014, PES benefitted an annual average of about 3,300 small and medium land owners.	Source: CLR
	4. CPS Outcome: Increase capitalization of the Biodiversity Endowment Fund		
	Indicator: Endowment funds **Baseline**: US$ 7.5 million **Target**: US$15 million (total)	As of December 2014, the Fund's capitalization is around US$19 million.	Source: CLR The target was revised down at the CPSPR stage (CPS target: US$ 30 million).
	5. CPS Outcome: Enhance the Government's capacity to implement its disaster risk management program for natural disasters as measured		
	Indicator: An increase in the number of projects recorded in the public investment projects (BPIP) that include a hazards assessment component **Baseline**: 22.9% (2011) **Target**: 75% (2015)	As 2014, 100% of all new approved investment projects registered in MIDEPLAN's Investment Projects database incorporates DRM considerations.	Source: CLR The indicator was introduced at the CPS stage but lacked an objective. The objective was introduced at the CPSPR stage.

	CPS FY12-FY15: Pillar III – Supporting Competitiveness	Actual Results (as of current month/year)	Comments
Major Outcome Measures	6. CPS Objective: Improve business environment as measures by a reduction in red tape		
	Indicator: Number of days to start a business **Baseline**: 60 (2011) **Target**: 35 (2015)	Days to start a business: 20 days (DB 2014).	Source: CLR and Doing Business Rankings

Annex Table 2: Planned and Actual Lending, FY11-15

Project ID	Project name	Proposed FY	Approval FY	Closing FY	Proposed Amount	Approved Amount	Outcome Rating
Project Planned Under CPS / CPSPR 2010-13							
P123146	CR Higher Education	2012-13	2013	2018	200	200	LIR: S
	National Health Insurance System project	2012-13			400		
	Total Planned				600	200	
Unplanned Projects during the CPS and CPSPR Period							
	Total Unplanned					0	
On-going Projects during the CPS and CPSPR Period			Approval FY	Closing FY		Approved Amount	
P057857	CR EQUITY AND EFFICIENCY OF EDUCATION		2005	2014		30	IEG: MU
P093384	CR -Mainstreaming Market-Based Instrumnt		2006	2014		30	LIR: S
P085539	CR (CRL) City-Port Integrated Infra.		2008	2014		73	LIR: U
P111926	CR CAT DDO		2009	2018		65	LIR: S
	Total On-going					198	

Source: Costa Rica CPS, CPSPR and WB AO Table 2a.1, 2a.4 and 2a.7 as of 3/31/15
**LIR: Latest internal rating. MU: Moderately Unsatisfactory. MS: Moderately Satisfactory. S: Satisfactory. HS: Highly Satisfactory.*

Annex Table 3: Analytical and Advisory Work for Costa Rica, FY11 - FY15

Proj ID	Economic and Sector Work	Fiscal year	Output Type
P108410	CR Accounting and Auditing ROSC	FY12	Accounting and Auditing Assessment (ROSC)
P128238	CR-Low-Carbon Dev Strategy Policy Note	FY13	Sector or Thematic Study/Note
P133654	CR Health (FBS)	FY15	Sector or Thematic Study/Note
Proj ID	**Technical Assistance**	**Fiscal year**	**Output Type**
P116002	CR Education	FY11	Institutional Development Plan
P119561	CR Competitiveness NLTA	FY11	"How-To" Guidance
P124287	GCMGL Costa Rica Ctry Policy Dialogue	FY11	"How-To" Guidance
P121422	FIRST #9048 Costa Rica Fin Crisis Simul	FY12	TA/IAR
P122245	Costa Rica PEFA	FY12	TA/IAR
P129987	GCMGL Gemloc Costa Rica Country Policy	FY12	TA/IAR

Proj ID	Economic and Sector Work	Fiscal year	Output Type
P131654	Institutional Strengthening for PPPs	FY12	TA/IAR
P130914	Costa Rica #10273 Fin Crisis Simul.	FY13	TA/IAR
P132135	Financial Investigation Training Course	FY13	TA/EPD
P132213	Costa Rica #10275 Devt of Capital Market	FY14	TA/IAR
P146264	Costa Rica TA on DNFBPs	FY14	TA/IAR
P149843	FPD Sector Briefs	FY14	TA/IAR
P146774	CR Analytical Framework for Sytemic Risk	FY15	TA/IAR
P147207	CR Integration into Global Value Chains	FY15	TA/IAR
P149157	CR Recognition of Foreign HE Degrees	FY15	TA/IAR
P149573	Health sector and system reforms PN	FY15	TA/IAR
P149575	Dialogue with incoming authorities	FY15	TA/EPD
P149578	HD Sector/Project Briefs	FY15	TA/IAR
P149579	CR SD Sector / Project Briefs	FY15	TA/IAR
P150814	CR Desamparados Engagement IUWM	FY15	TA/IAR

Source: WB AO ESW/TA 8.1.4 as of 3/27/15

Annex Table 4: Grants and Trust Funds Active in FY11-15 (in US$ million)

Project ID	Project name	TF ID	Approval FY	Closing FY	Approved Amount
P123702	Costa Rica FCPF REDD READINESS	TF 12692	2012	2016	3,600,000
P120608	Strengthening and improving the performance of the public procurement system	TF 99420	2012	2013	300,080
P122206	Costa Rica Pilot on Early Warning Systems for Hydrometeorological Hazards	TF 97089	2011	2013	255,000
P121134	Adaptive Natural Resources Management will Bolster CabÃ©car Communities	TF 97000	2011	2013	205,000
P120320	Integration of Disaster Risk Information in Costa Rica Planning System	TF 97139	2011	2015	450,000
P123702	Costa Rica FCPF REDD READINESS	TF 94486	2009	2011	200,000
P113426	Towards a neighbourhood Imprvmnt and Slum Eradication National Policy - Costa Rica	TF 92530	2009	2014	500,000
P098838	GEF - Mainstreaming Market-Based Instruments for Environmental Management Project	TF 56666	2007	2014	10,000,000
P094155	Carbon Sequestration in Small Farms in the Brunca Region (Coopeagri)	TF 56604	2006	2019	2,315,451
P076421	Costa Rica - Cote Hydroelectric Project	TF 50896	2003	2018	602,420
	Total				18,427,951

Source: Client Connection as of 3/27/15

AnnexTable 5: IEG Project Ratings for Costa Rica, FY11-Present

Exit FY	Proj ID	Project name	Total Evaluated ($M)	IEG Outcome	IEG Risk to DO
2011	P115173	CR Pub Fin & Compet. DPL/ DDO	500.0	SATISFACTORY	NEGLIGIBLE TO LOW
2014	P057857	CR EQUITY AND EFFICIENCY OF EDUCATION	24.3	MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY	MODERATE
		Total	524.3		

Source: AO Key IEG Ratings as of 3/14/15

Annex Table 6: IEG Project Ratings for Costa Rica, FY11-15

Region	Total Evaluated ($M)	Total Evaluated (No)	Outcome % Sat ($)	Outcome % Sat (No)	RDO % Moderate or Lower Sat ($)	RDO % Moderate or Lower Sat (No)
Costa Rica	524.3	2	95.4	50.0	100.0	100.0
LAC	20,232.4	157	92.3	73.0	78.3	61.0
World	74,449.9	904	82.0	69.5	64.5	50.2

Source: WB AO as of 3/14/15
** With IEG new methodology for evaluating projects, institutional development impact and sustainability are no longer rated separately.*

Annex Table 7: Portfolio Status for Costa Rica and Comparators, FY11-15

Fiscal year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Costa Rica						
# Proj	7	7	7	3	3	27
# Proj At Risk	1	1	1			3
% Proj At Risk	14.3	14.3	14.3		-	11.1
Net Comm Amt	208.6	208.6	408.4	265.4	265.4	1,356.3
Comm At Risk	30.0	30.0	72.5			132.5
% Commit at Risk	14.4	14.4	17.8			9.8
LAC						
# Proj	353	346	332	315	303	1,649
# Proj At Risk	61	68	72	70	71	342
% Proj At Risk	17.3	19.7	21.7		23.4	20.7
Net Comm Amt	32,557.8	33,341.8	30,843.3	29,271.0	28,979.5	154,993.5
Comm At Risk	3,195.2	4,503.5	6,097.4	6,355.6	6,405.6	26,557.3
% Commit at Risk	9.8	13.5	19.8	21.7	22.1	17.1
World						
# Proj	2,059	2,029	1,965	2,049	2,053	10,155
# Proj At Risk	382	387	414	412	437	2,032
% Proj At Risk	18.6	19.1	21.1		21.3	20.0

Fiscal year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Net Comm Amt	171,755.3	173,706.1	176,206.6	192,614.1	200,338.1	914,620.2
Comm At Risk	23,850.0	24,465.0	40,805.6	40,933.5	42,664.7	172,718.8
% Commit at Risk	13.9	14.1	23.2	21.3	21.3	18.9

Source: WB AO as of 3/27/15

Annex Table 8: Disbursement Ratio for the Costa Rica, FY11-15

Fiscal Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Overall Result
Costa Rica						
Disbursement Ratio (%)	13.98	11.76	16.06	5.10	5.04	8.72
Inv Disb in FY	18.28	13.22	15.94	14.46	10.02	71.92
Inv Tot Undisb Begin FY	130.74	112.46	99.24	283.30	198.73	824.48
LCR						
Disbursement Ratio (%)	30.88	21.96	23.95	18.76	15.06	22.42
Inv Disb in FY	4,513.46	3,338.43	3,523.98	2,491.08	1,862.18	15,729.12
Inv Tot Undisb Begin FY	14,614.23	15,201.65	14,712.30	13,280.99	12,361.45	70,170.61
World						
Disbursement Ratio (%)	22.38	20.79	20.60	20.79	13.99	19.67
Inv Disb in FY	20,933.51	21,048.75	20,509.01	20,756.34	14,139.00	97,386.62
Inv Tot Undisb Begin FY	93,516.54	101,239.14	99,582.39	99,848.44	101,029.59	495,216.10

** Calculated as IBRD/IDA Disbursements in FY / Opening Undisbursed Amount at FY. Restricted to Lending Instrument Type = Investment.*
Source: WB AO as of 3/14/15

Annex Table 9: List of IFC's investments in Costa Rica that were active during FY12-15 (US$'000)

Project ID	Cmt. FY	Closure FY	Project Status	IFC Sector Primary	IFC Sector Explntry	Project Size	Net Loans[1]	Net Equity	Total Net Commitment
Investments approved pre-FY12, but active during FY12-15									
26553	2008		Active	MAS	City and Bus. Hotels	14,454	3,975	976	4,951
27498*	2009		Active	Finance And Insurance	Trade Finance	10,000	10,000		10,000
27998+	2010		Active	Finance And Insurance	Trade Finance	5,000	5,000		5,000
*26344	2010		Active	Finance And Insurance	Energy Eff. Finance	6,000	6,000		6,000
30325	2011		Active	Finance And Insurance	NBFI MSME Fin	30,000	15,000		15,000
29568	2011		Active	Finance And Insurance	Trade Finance	5,000	5,000		5,000
Subtotal						70,454	44,975	976	45,951
Project ID	Cmt. FY	Closure FY	Project Status	IFC Sector Primary	IFC Sector Explntry	Project Size	Net Loans[1]	Net Equity	Total Net Commitment
Investments approved in FY12-15									

Project ID	Cmt. FY	Closure FY	Project Status	IFC Sector Primary	IFC Sector Explntry	Project Size	Net Loans[1]	Net Equity	Total Net Commitment
29096	2012		Active	MAS	City and Bus. Hotels	14,700	4,053	995	5,048
(29568)	2012		Active	Finance And Insurance	Trade Finance	5,000	5,000		5,000
32050	2012		Active	MAS	City and Bus. Hotels	9,600	2,300		2,300
33947^	2013		Active	Finance And Insurance	Trade Finance	15,000	15,000		15,000
33001	2013	2015	Closed	Finance And Insurance	NBFI - Microfinan.	10,000	10,000		10,000
33028	2013	2015	Closed	Finance And Insurance	NBFI - Coop Fin.	5,000	5,000		5,000
31846	2013		Active	Finance And Insurance	Comm. Banking	20,000	20,000		20,000
(29568)	2014		Active	Finance And Insurance	Trade Finance	10,000	10,000		10,000
31383	2014		Active	Infrastructure	Large HydroElec	1,000,000	100,000		100,000
(27498)	2015		Active	Finance And Insurance	Trade Finance	10,000	10,000		10,000
^32965	2015		Active	Finance And Insurance	Comm. Banking	50,000	50,000		50,000
+35132	2015		Active	Finance And Insurance	SME (30% to Women)	20,000	20,000		20,000
Subtotal						1,169,300	251,353	995	252,348
Grand Total						1,239,754	296,328	1,971	298,299

Source: IFC, April 2015- The list does not cover the regional projects. MAS: Manufacturing, Agriculture, and Services; na: not applicable. *, ^, and + links two or more projects. For these linked projects, the entities are the same. (xxxxx) indicates an increase in the maximum permissible trade finance guarantee under a previously approved project.
1: Includes Trade Finance Guarantees

Annex Table 10: List of IFC's Advisory Services in Costa Rica, FY12-15:

Project ID	Project Name	Start FY	End FY	Project Status	Primary Business Line	Total Funds, US$
Advisory Services operations approved pre-FY12, but active during FY12-15						
						None
Subtotal:						None
Advisory Services operations approved in FY12-15						
595787	Alajuela Sewage WWTP	2013	2014	Terminated	PPP	0
585967	Coopenae	2013	2014	Closed	A2F	348,340
599544	Improsa AS	2014	2015	Terminated	A2F	29
600301	Costa Rica Secured Transaction and Collateral Registries	2014	(2016)	Active	A2F	276,667
Subtotal:						625,036
Grand Total						625,036

A2F: Access to Finance; IC: Investment Climate; PPP: Public-Private Partnerships
Source: IFC, April 2015 Regional Projects are not included.
For Closed/Terminated projects, Total Fund is actual expenditure during implementation. For Active projects, it is Project Size in the Plan.

Annex Table 11: Net Disbursement and Charges for Costa Rica, FY11-14

Period	Disb. Amt.	Repay Amt.	Net Amt.	Charges	Fees	Net Transfer
Jul 2010 - Jun 2011	512,041,309.27	8,395,800.50	503,645,508.77	5,974,455.16	1,375,383.28	496,295,670.33
Jul 2011 - Jun 2012	21,887,076.44	7,127,425.89	14,759,650.55	9,707,011.63	93,828.01	4,958,810.91
Jul 2012 - Jun 2013	15,936,809.27	8,549,184.87	7,387,624.40	10,625,087.15	66,641.83	(3,304,104.58)
Jul 2013 - Jun 2014	13,594,123.81	11,426,908.88	2,167,214.93	9,121,319.63	525,752.33	(7,479,857.03)
Report Total	563,459,318.79	35,499,320.14	527,959,998.65	35,427,873.57	2,061,605.45	490,470,519.63

World Bank Client Connection 3/26/15

Annex Table 12: Total Net Disbursements of Official Development Assistance and Official Aid for Costa Rica

Development Partners	2011	2012	2013
Australia	31.28	24.18	24.13
Austria	0.02	1.51	0.44
Belgium	0.21	0.23	0.12
Canada	..	..	0.01
Czech Republic	2.11	1.87	1.49
Finland	0.01	..	..
France	0.18	0.1	0.04
Germany	3.3	5	5.67
Greece	9.9	11.06	7.15
Ireland	0.01	0.01	..
Italy	..	..	0.03
Japan	-0.15	-0.05	0.2
Korea	-3.12	-8.43	-8.35
Luxembourg	0.23	0.25	0.69
Netherlands	0.12	0.06	0.08
Norway	0.22	0.03	..
Slovenia	2.4	-0.13	6.62
Spain	0.02	..	..
Sweden	4.58	0.82	-1.25
Switzerland	0.37	0.52	0.16
United Kingdom	0.3	0.24	0.17
United States	0.31	1.04	0.17
DAC Countries, Total	52.3	38.31	37.57
EU Institutions	1.89	3.88	7.47
GAVI	..	..	..
GEF	8.5	3.37	4.72
IAEA	0.16	0.16	0.25
IBRD	..	..	..
IDA	-0.08	..	..
IDB Sp.Fund	-4.27	-1.62	-1.2
IFC	..	..	..
UNAIDS	0.07	0.01	0.01
UNDP	0.56	0.46	0.49
UNECE	..	..	..
UNFPA	0.65	0.76	0.68
UNHCR	..	0.12	..

Development Partners	2011	2012	2013
UNICEF	1.17	0.87	0.79
Multilateral, Total	8.65	8.01	13.21
Israel	0.27	0.34	0.31
Romania	0.01	..	..
Russia	..	0.07	..
Thailand	0.07	0.02	0.06
Turkey	0.05	0.07	..
United Arab Emirates	0.02	0.01	0.05
Non-DAC Countries, Total	0.42	0.51	0.42
Development Partners Total	61.37	46.83	51.2

Source: OECD Stat, [DAC2a] as of March 25, 2015

Annex Table 13: Economic and Social Indicators for Costa Rica, 2011 - 2013

Series Name				CRI	LAC	World
	2011	2012	2013	Average 2011-2013		
Growth and Inflation						
GDP growth (annual %)	4.5	5.1	3.5	4.4	3.2	2.4
GDP per capita growth (annual %)	3.0	3.7	2.1	2.9	2.0	1.3
GNI per capita, PPP (current international $)	12,510.0	13,150.0	13,570.0	13,076.7	14,137.8	13,844.9
GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US$) (Millions)	36,723,319,454.0	42,536,714,571.0	46,534,497,273.0	41,931,510,432.7	5,707,720,000,000.0	72,402,366,666,666.7
Inflation, consumer prices (annual %)	4.9	4.5	5.2	4.9	3.9	3.8
Composition of GDP (%)						
Agriculture, value added (% of GDP)	6.4	6.1	5.6	6.0	5.1	3.1
Industry, value added (% of GDP)	25.4	25.3	25.2	25.3	33.2	26.9
Services, etc., value added (% of GDP)	68.2	68.6	69.2	68.7	61.8	70.0
Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP)	20.0	20.4	21.0	20.4	20.3	21.9
Gross domestic savings (% of GDP)	17.0	17.4	17.7	17.3	20.1	22.4
External Accounts						
Exports of goods and services (% of GDP)	37.2	37.2	35.1	36.5	25.3	29.9
Imports of goods and services (% of GDP)	42.1	41.5	38.7	40.8	25.9	29.9
Current account balance (% of GDP)	-5.4	-5.3	-5.1	-5.3		
External debt stocks (% of GNI)	26.4	32.6	35.9	31.6		
Total debt service (% of GNI)	4.1	5.3	6.2	5.2	3.5	
Total reserves in months of imports	3.9	5.1	..	4.5	8.8	13.3
Fiscal Accounts /1						
General government revenue (% of GDP)	13.8	13.7	13.6	13.7		
General government total expenditure (% of GDP)	18.0	18.3	19.2	18.5		
General government net lending/borrowing (% of GDP)	-4.3	-4.6	-5.6	-4.8		
General government gross debt (% of GDP)	30.6	35.1	36.0	33.9		

Series Name	2011	2012	2013	CRI	LAC	World
				Average 2011-2013		
Social Indicators						
Health						
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)	79.5	79.7	..	79.6	74.5	70.7
Immunization, DPT (% of children ages 12-23 months)	85.0	91.0	95.0	90.3	91.9	83.3
Improved sanitation facilities (% of population with access)	93.7	93.9	..	93.8	81.5	63.4
Improved water source (% of population with access)	90.7	90.9	..	90.8	82.1	81.2
Mortality rate, infant (per 1,000 live births)	8.7	8.6	8.4	8.6	15.9	34.6
Education						
School enrollment, preprimary (% gross)	72.7	73.8	..	73.3	73.4	
School enrollment, primary (% gross)	107.1	105.3	..	106.2	109.1	108.3
School enrollment, secondary (% gross)	101.1	103.6	..	102.4	88.3	72.7
Population						
Population, total (Millions)	4,737,680.0	4,805,295.0	4,872,166.0	4,805,047.0	608,546,420.3	7,044,095,860.0
Population growth (annual %)	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.2
Urban population (% of total)	72.9	73.9	75.0	73.9	79.0	52.5

Source: DDP as of 3/12/15
**International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database, April 2013*