



SPRING 2012 REFORM BAROMETER - LATVIA

| | | | | Level | | | Rank | | Gap | | Areas of Action |
|----------|----|--|-------|--------|--------|------|------|--------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | 2010 | 2011 | Change | 2010 | 2011 | change | EU top 5 | Gap ¹ | <u></u> |
| | 1 | GDP per capita (Purchasing Power Parity- PPP) | 12605 | 13463 | 6,8% | 30 | 30 | 0 | NL AT IE SE DK | -58% | |
| | 2 | GDP per capita (€at 2000 prices) | 5529 | 5819 | 5,2% | 30 | 30 | 0 | DK IE SE NL AT | -83% | |
| Pillar I | 3 | Labour productivity per hour worked (PPP) | 15,6 | 16,2 | 3,8% | 29 | 29 | 0 | NL BE FR IE DE | -64% | |
| | 4 | Labour productivity per person employed (PPP) | 30268 | 31409 | 3,8% | 30 | 30 | 0 | IE BE AT FR NL | -55% | |
| | 5 | Private investment (excluding non residential, %GDP) | 3,7 | 3,7 | 0,0 | 22 | 25 | -3 | SK AT BE IT CZ | -4,7 | |
| | 6 | Industrial activity (% total value added) | 15,7 | 15,8 | 0,1 | 25 | 26 | -1 | SK CZ IE RO HU | -14,7 | |
| | 7 | R&D expenditure (% GDP) * | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,1 | 25 | 28 | -3 | FI SE DK DE AT | -2,6 | |
| | 8 | Operating surplus (% total value added) | 51,7 | 52,7 | 1,0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | BG GR RO LT IE | -2,5 | |
| | 9 | Current Account (% GDP) | 3,0 | -0,4 | -3,4 | 12 | 17 | -5 | SE DK NL LU DE | -6,1 | |
| | 10 | Export market share (gain from 2000) | 22,9 | 23,8 | 0,9 | 8 | 11 | -3 | LT RO HU BG CZ | -39,3 | |
| ar = | 11 | Net export contribution to GDP | -0,3 | -2,6 | -2,3 | 24 | 32 | -8 | PT IE GR SK HU | -5,7 | |
| Pillar | 12 | Relative yearly gain in global trade share (% total trade) | 0,00 | 0,11 | 0,1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | EE LT LV BG CZ | 0,00 | |
| | 13 | Relative unit labour cost (gain from 2000) | 51,3 | 53,0 | 1,7 | 30 | 30 | 0 | DE SE AT PL GR | 60,0 | |
| | 14 | High-tech exports (% total exports) ** | 4,6 | 5,3 | 0,7 | 27 | 27 | 0 | MT LU HU IE CY | -24,7 | |
| | 15 | Employment rate (% working age population) | 59,3 | 60,8 | 1,5 | 31 | 31 | 0 | AT NL LU DE CY | -9,6 | |
| | 16 | Employment rate 15-24 (% population 15-24) | 26,4 | 26,5 | 0,1 | 19 | 20 | -1 | NL DK AT DE UK | -26,8 | |
| ≡ | 17 | Employment rate 55-64 (% population 55-64) | 48,2 | 50,3 | 2,1 | 17 | 15 | 2 | SE DE DK UK FI | -10,4 | |
| Pillar | 18 | Annual hours worked (per capita) | 1934 | 1934 | 0,0% | 6 | 6 | 0 | PL PT CZ GR HU | -2% | |
| 區 | 19 | Labour participation (% working age population) | 74,7 | 74,6 | -0,1 | 16 | 16 | 0 | SE DK NL PT DE | -5,2 | |
| | 20 | Working age population (as % total population) | 68,9 | 68,8 | -0,1 | 10 | 10 | 0 | SK PL CY LT RO | 1,0 | |
| | 21 | Unemployment rate (% labour force) | 19,3 | 17,7 | -1,6 | 31 | 31 | 0 | AT NL LU DK MT | 12,3 | |
| | 22 | Gross debt - general government (% GDP) | 44,7 | 44,8 | 0,1 | 12 | 11 | 1 | EE BG LU RO SE | 22,2 | |
| | | Net debt - general government (% GDP)* | -12,5 | -18,5 | -5,9 | 12 | 12 | 0 | EE DK BG RO SE | -23,9 | |
| ≥ | 24 | Government budget balance (% GDP) | -8,3 | -4,2 | 4,1 | 25 | 16 | 9 | HU SE EE LU FI | -2,7 | |
| Pillar | 25 | Primary balance (% GDP) | -6,8 | -2,3 | 4,5 | 28 | 18 | 10 | HU SE DE EE IT | -4,7 | |
| 4 | 26 | Tax burden (% GDP) | 27,5 | 28,1 | 0,0 | 3 | 4 | -1 | BG LT LV RO SK | 0,2 | |
| | | Highest marginal tax rate, individual rate (%) | 26,0 | 25,0 | -0,04 | 7 | 8 | -1 | BG CZ LT RO SK | 15 | |
| | 28 | Public investment (% total public expenditure) | 10,3 | 13,6 | 0,3 | 8 | 4 | 4 | RO PL BG LV LT | -1,4 | |
| | 29 | | 83,8 | 101,9 | 18,1 | 22 | 25 | -3 | LU NL CY BE DE | 177,6 | |
| | | | 10,1 | 11,0 | 0,9 | 27 | 27 | 0 | BE IT MT NL CY | -159,9 | |
| > | | Net financial liabilities, non financial corporations (% GDP)* | -94,9 | -108,7 | -13,8 | 10 | 10 | 0 | SK DE NL GR DK | 48,3 | |
| Pillar | | Regulatory tier 1 capital to risk weighted assets * | 10,8 | 10,9 | 0,1 | 22 | 25 | -3 | EE BE MT LU RO | -4,0 | |
| 4 | | Non performing loans to total gross loans | 16,4 | 15,4 | -1,0 | 28 | 26 | 2 | FI LU SE AT BE | 3,5 | |
| | | Loans to private sector (% GDP) * | 102,9 | 97,2 | -5,6 | 13 | 11 | 2 | RO SK PL CZ LT | 45,5 | |
| | 35 | Bank liabilities (%GDP) * | 148,5 | 151,5 | 3,0 | 8 | 10 | -2 | RO SK PL LT BG | 71 | |

Five best
Lowest third

- 1. Percentage points, when not indicated otherwise
- * 2009/ 2010 data ** 2008/ 2009 data

A methodological note can be found in the report or here.



PRIORITIES FOR REFORM IN 2012

| I. Policy Are | | II. Concrete Recommendations | III. Are the proposed recommendations already in the agenda of your Government? | | |
|---------------|--|--|---|----|--|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| Priority 1 | 19 | Stability and predictability of taxing system | x | | |
| Priority 2 | 16 | Further structural reforms of public administration | х | | |
| Priority 3 | Combating shadow economy and preference system to tax payers | | х | | |
| Priority 4 | Priority 4 18 Creation of effective investment policy | | х | | |
| Priority 5 | 13 | Effective and sustainable social security system and demography policy | | х | |

Policy areas

- **1.** Business Environment Regulatory barriers to entrepreneurship
- 2. Business Dynamics Start-up conditions
- 3. R&D and Innovation
- **4.** ICT
- **5.** Competition policy framework
- **6.** Sector specific regulation (telecom, energy)
- **7.** Market integration Openness to trade and investment
- 8. Active labour market policies
- 9. Job protection
- **10.** Labour supply measures for specific groups (older workers, women...)
- **11.** Wage bargaining and wage-setting policies
- 12. Labour market mismatch and labour mobility
- **13.** Making work-pay: interplay of tax and benefit system
- 14. Pension and health care reforms
- **15.** Quality of fiscal institutions and budgetary framework
- **16.** Consolidation of public expenditures
- 17. Public sector efficiency
- 18. Public investment
- **19.** Tax reforms
- 20. Access to bond markets
- 21. Access to equity markets
- 22. Venture capital and SME financing instruments
- 23. Bank lending conditions
- **24.** Long term investment instruments



REFORM PROGRESS IN 2011

| | I. Policy Area | II. Concrete Recommendations | III. Are the proposed recommendations already in the agenda of your Government? | | How do you assess reform progress over the past year? (1 for excellent progress; 5 for no progress) * | | Are these priorities properly identified in the National Reform Programme submitted by your governmnet in 2011? | |
|------------|----------------|--|---|----|---|------|---|----------|
| | | | Yes | No | Comments | Rank | Yes | No |
| Priority 1 | 16. | Further structural reforms of public administration | х | | Our concrete recommendations were not taken into account | 4 | | V |
| Priority 2 | 19. | Stability and predictability of taxing system | х | | Taxes were raised | 5 | To some extent | |
| Priority 3 | 5. | Combating shadow economy | х | | There are improvements but many recommendations have not been taken into account | 3 | Not enough | |
| Priority 4 | 18. | Creation of effective investment policy | | х | | 5 | | V |
| Priority 5 | 13. | Effective and sustainable social security system and demography policy | | х | | 5 | Not e | nough |

^{*} Please see list of areas on page 2 "reform priorities for 2012"

^{*} Rank of reform progress: 1. Excellent/ no further progress nedeed; 2. Satisfactory; 3. Mixed; 4. Unsatisfactory; 5. No progress



REFORM PROGRESS IN OVERALL POLICY AREAS 2011

| | Excellent | Satisfactory | Mixed | Unsatisfactory | No progress |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
| Productivity and investment | | | | х | |
| International competitiveness | | | х | | |
| Labour market | | | х | | |
| Public finances | | | х | | |
| Financial stability | | x | | | |



EUROPEAN SEMESTER

1. Do you believe the European Semester will bring a real change to policy coordination in Europe?

| Υe | es, absolutely | To a large extent | To some extent | Not enough | Not at all |
|----|----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| | | | Х | | |

2. Basing your analysis on the National Reform Programme submitted by your government, would you consider that it reveals a greater commitment from your country to this process?

| | Yes, absolutely | To a large extent | To some extent | Not enough | Not at all |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| 7 | NO EVALUATION | POSSIBLE | • | | |

3. Do you believe the National Reform Programme submitted by your government properly reflects the key challenges in your county?

| Yes, absolutely | To a large extent | To some extent | Not enough | Not at all |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| | | Х | | |

4. The Commission's country specific recommendations for your country are:

THERE WERE NONE

Recommendation was to follow Memorandum of Understanding (concerning financial assistance). Thus the Commission in form and fact did not carry out analysis.

5. Are the country-specific recommendations being properly implemented?

| Yes, absolu | utely | To a large extent | To some extent | Not enough | Not at all |
|-------------|-------|-------------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| NO EVALU | ATION | POSSIBLE | | | |

6. Are commitments concerning the euro plus pact properly addressed by your government in the NRP?

| Yes, absolutely | To a large extent | To some extent | Not enough | Not at all |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| | | Х | | |

7. Do you believe the Commission recommendations in this area to be appropriate?

| | Yes, absolutely | To a large extent | To some extent | Not enough | Not at all |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| THERE WERE NONE | | | | | |