

UZBEKISTAN
COUNTRY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Item	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000 (Estimate)	
ECONOMIC INDICATORS							
A. Income and Growth							
1. GNP per Capita (\$, current prices) ^a	970	1,010	1,020	870	-	-	
2. GDP Growth (%) (in constant prices)	-0.9	1.6	5.2	4.4	4.4	3.0	
a. Agriculture	2.0	-7.3	5.8	4.0	5.9	-	
b. Industry	-5.6	1.7	2.2	2.3	6.1	-	
c. Services	-0.5	5.0	5.9	3.0	4.7	-	
B. Saving and Investment (at current market prices)							
							(percent of GDP)
1. Gross Domestic Savings	20.4	7.9	14.9	9.9	10.5	11.0	
2. Gross Domestic Investment	20.9	15.1	18.9	10.2	11.8	12.0	
C. Money and Inflation							
							(annual percent change)
1. Consumer Prices (end of period)	116.9	64.3	27.6	26.1	26.0	20.0	
2. Broad Money (M2)	158.1	113.7	36.0	28.0	31.5	32.0	
D. Central Government Finances							
							(percent of GDP)
1. Revenue	38.1	39.9	32.0	34.8	32.6	31.1	
2. Expenditure	34.6	34.3	29.7	32.4	31.5	34.1	
3. Overall Surplus/Deficit (-) (including extrabudgetary funds)	-4.1	-7.4	-2.2	-3.4	-2.2	-3.0	
E. Balance of Payments							
1. Merchandise Trade Balance (% of GDP)	2.0	-6.8	-0.5	0.0	0.5	1.2	
2. Current Account Balance (% of GDP)	-0.2	-7.2	-4.0	-0.6	-1.3	-1.0	
3. Export (\$) Growth (annual percent change)	18.2	1.7	4.5	-21.8	-10.0	8.5	
4. Import (\$) Growth (annual percent change)	18.8	31.0	-11.2	-25.2	10.0	8.2	
F. External Payments Indicators							
1. Gross Official Reserves (\$ million; end of period)	1,867	1,901	1,167	1,168	1,283	1,182	IMF
-months of imports	6.2	4.8	3.7	5.2	5.9	5.0	IMF
2. External Debt Service (% of exports of goods and service)	7.0	8.3	9.0	9.0	11.0	26.2	
3. External Debt (% of GDP)	14.7	17.1	18.2	24.8	28.1		IMF
Memorandum Items:							
GDP (current prices, million sums)	302,789	559,073	987,352	1,358,000	1,942,000	2,917,000	
Exchange Rate (sums per US dollar; average of the period)	29.8	40.2	67.7	94.7	124.9	450.0	

- = Not available; GNP = Gross National Product; GDP = Gross Domestic Product.

^a World Bank estimates, using Atlas methodology based on a three-year average of inflation-adjusted exchange rates.

Sources: Uzbekistan authorities and IMF.

UZBEKISTAN
COUNTRY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

	1985	1990	Latest Year	Remarks
POPULATION INDICATORS				
Total Population (1,000)	18,110	20,420	24,100 (1998)	<i>UNDP Human Dev't. Report for UZB 1998</i>
Rural Population (% of total)	59.7	59.4	62.0 (1998)	<i>derived, UNDP 1for UZB 998</i>
Annual Population Growth Rate (% change)	2.7	2.2	1.5 (1998)	<i>UNDP Human Dev't. Report for UZB 1998</i>
Human Development Index	–	0.703	0.697 (1998)	<i>HDR 98 for UZB</i>
Real GDP Per Capita (PPP\$)	–	2,510 (1993)	2,829 (1998)	1992 data; latest data is 1997 AB table
SOCIAL INDICATORS				
Crude birth rate	37.4	33.7	23.0 (1998)	HDR 96; not consistent with AB table
Crude death rate	7.2	6.1	5.8 (1998)	
Maternal Mortality Rate (per 100,000 live births)	48.6	34.1	9.6 (1998)	AB table; not consistent with HDR 96 (see also Children & women in UZB)
Infant Mortality Rate (below 1 year; per 1,000 live births)	45.3	34.6	22.8 (1997)	Children & women in UZB; 94-AB
Contraceptive prevalence rate (%)	–	19.0 (1993)	45.2 (1997)	
Life Expectancy at Birth (years)	–	69.3	70.3 (1998)	HDR 96, not consistent with AB
Male	–	66.1	68.2 (1998)	AB
Female	–	72.4	73.0 (1998)	
Adult Literacy (%)	–	93.0	99.2 (1998)	90-AB table, 94, HDR 96
Secondary school enrollment (% share to total)	–	51.0 (1992)	47.9 (1998)	AB table
Male	–	49.0 (1992)	52.1 (1998)	
Female	–	49.0 (1992)	52.1 (1998)	
Full-time enrollment in tertiary education (% share to total)	–	60.7 (1992)	61.9 (1998)	AB table
Male	–	39.3 (1992)	38.1 (1998)	AB table
Female	–	39.3 (1992)	38.1 (1998)	
Public Education Expenditure as % of GDP	–	11.6 (1992)	7.3 (1998)	HDR 96
Public Health Expenditure as % of GDP	–	5.5 (1992)	3.6 (1998)	
ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS				
Population density (people per sq. km)	–	48.5 (1992)	54 (1998)	
Sulphur and nitrogen emissions (kg of NO ₂ and SO ₂ per capita)	–	25.7 (1992)	20.3 (1998)	
Cultivated land (as percent of land area)	–	9.97 (1992)	10.1 (1998)	HDR 96
Forested and wooded land (as percent of land area)	–	3.0 (1992)	3.0 (1998)	HDR 96
Irrigated land (as percent of arable area)	–	93.0 (1992)	95 (1998)	HDR 96

– = Not Available; GDP = Gross Domestic Product.

Sources: Uzbekistan authorities and Human Development Report, Uzbekistan 1999.

Source: **Programs Division.**

UZBEKISTAN
PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE

Table 1: Implementation, Disbursement Performance and Post Evaluation Results
Public Sector Projects only
(as 31 December 1999)

A. Project Portfolio	Net Loan Amount (\$ million) (%)		Rating (No.) ^a											
			Total		Implementation Progress				Development Objectives					
			(No.)	(%)	HS	S	PS	U	HS	S	PS	U		
Agriculture and Natural Resources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Energy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finance and Industry	50.0	23.8	1	20.0	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Transport and Communications	120.0	57.2	2	40.0	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Social Infrastructure	39.9	19.0	2	40.0	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Multisector/Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	209.9	100.0	5	100.0	1	1	3	0	0	4	1	0	0	0

B. Disbursements	OCR	ADF	Total
(1) Total funds available for withdrawal (\$ mn, active loans only)	163	19.9	182.7
(2) Disbursed amount (\$ mn, cumulative, active loans only)	17.4	0.5	17.9
(3) Percentage disbursed [(2)/(1)] (%)	10.7	2.8	9.8
(4) Disbursements (\$mn, active loans only, Jan-Dec 1999)	16.0	0.1	16.1
(5) Disbursement ratio (%) ^b	8.5	0.5	7.7

C. Net Resource Transfers (\$million)	OCR	ADF	Total
Net Transfer in 1995	-	-	-
Net Transfer in 1996	-	-	-
Net Transfer in 1997	-	-	-
Net Transfer in 1998	1.4	0.5	1.9
Net Transfer in 1999	15.6	0.1	15.7

D. Post-Evaluated Projects	1968-1977		1978 - 1987		1988-1999		1968-1999	
	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)
1. Postevaluation Rating								
Rated Generally Successful (GS)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rated Partly Successful (PS)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rated Unsuccessful (US)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Postevaluation Rating by Sector (1968-1998)								
	GS		PS		US		Total	
	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)
Agriculture and Natural Resources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Energy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finance and Industry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transport and Communications	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Infrastructure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multisector/Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

^a HS: Highly satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; PS: Partially satisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory

^b Ratio of disbursement during the year over the undisbursed net loan balance less cancellations at the beginning of the year. Effective loans during the year have also been added to the beginning balance of undisbursed loans.

Sources: COPP, CTD, and OEO.

UZBEKISTAN
PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE

Table 2 : Status of Project Implementation
Public Sector Projects only
(as of 31 December 1999)

Sector ^a	Project Title	Net Loan Amount		Approval Date (mm/yy)	Effectivity Date (mm/yy)	Closing Date		Physical Progress (% complete)	Cum. Contract Awards (\$ million)	Cumulative Disbursement (\$ million)	Project Performance Rating ^b	
		OCR	ADF			Original	Revised				Implementation	Development
		(\$ million)				(mm/yy)					Progress	Objective
I&F	Rural Enterprises Development Project	50.00	-	Dec-96	Jun-97	Jun-02	-	-	42.82	9.93	S	PS
SOC	Basic Education Textbook Development	20.00	-	Dec-97	Aug-98	Jun 03	-	-	-	-	PS	S
SOC	Basic Education Textbook Development	-	19.86	Dec-97	Aug-98	Jun 03	-	-	0.17	0.55	PS	S
T&C	Railway Rehabilitation	70.00	-	Sep-98	Feb-99	Dec-03	-	15	44.43	7.42	HS	S
T&C	Road Rehabilitation	50.00	-	Dec-98	Apr-99	Jun-03	-	-	-	0.03	PS	S
Total		190.00	19.86						87.43	17.94		

^a Sector:

AGR: Agriculture & Natural Resources

ENE: Energy

SOC: Social Infrastructure

I&F: Industry and Finance

T&C: Transport and Communications

^b HS: Highly satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; PS: Partially satisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory.

Source : COPP.

UZBEKISTAN
OVERALL EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE
(\$ million)

External Source	1995-1998 (Cumulative Commitments)		1999 Approvals	
	Loan/Credit	TA	Loan/Credit	TA
A. Multilateral Assistance				
ADB	210.00	10.73	-	3.65
IBRD	413.00	...	55.00 ^a	...
IFC	96.60 ^a	...	50.00 ^a	...
EBRD	272.92 ^a	...	104.50 ^a	...
UNDP	...	13.00	...	2.60
EU TACIS	...	40.11	...	7.40
Others
Subtotal	992.52	63.84	209.50	13.65
B. Bilateral Assistance				
Germany	76.80	18.56	19.70	0.52
Japan	312.10 ^b	...	135.70 ^c	22.30
Others
Subtotal	388.90	18.56	155.40	22.82
Total (a+b)	1,381.42	82.39	364.90	36.47

... = not available.

^a Approvals.

^b Covers the period 1995-1996.

^c Approved in 1999 based upon negotiations with the Government in 1996 (phase II extension of the existing local airports and telecommunications projects).

Sources: The World Bank Country Assistance Strategy for 1998-2000; EBRD: Strategy for Uzbekistan;
EU TACIS Annual Report; UNDP Development Cooperation Report; Foreign Aid Report (31st December 1999);
and 2000 Development Partner Profiles.

UZBEKISTAN
LENDING PIPELINE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, 2001-2003
 (Amounts in \$ million)

Sector/Project Name	Poverty Classification ^{a*}	Crosscutting Operational Priority ^{b*}	Responsible Division	Year of PPTA	PROJECT COST					
					TOTAL	ADB		Gov't ^c	Co-financing (Others)	
						OCR	ADF			Total
2001 FIRM LOANS										
Agriculture and Natural Resources 1. Rural Savings and Credit Union Development	PI	PSD	AEAR	1999	TBD	30.0	-	30.0	TBD	-
	2. Grain Productivity Improvement <i>Subtotal</i>	ODI	ENV	AEFN	1998	TBD	20.0	-	20.0	TBD
					TBD	50.0	0.0	50.0	TBD	-
Social Infrastructure 1. Basic Education Staff Development	ODI	HD and GAD	AEEH	1999	100.0	40.0	-	40.0	60.0	-
	2. Urban Social Infrastructure Development <i>Subtotal</i>	PI	HD and GG	AEWU	2000	TBD	40.0	-	40.0	TBD
					TBD	80.0	0.0	80.0	TBD	-
Total					TBD	130.0	0.0	130.0	TBD	-
2002 LOAN PIPELINE										
Agriculture and Natural Resources 1. Water Resources Management	PI	ENV	AEFN	2001	TBD	50.0	-	50.0	TBD	-
	2. Support for Agriculture Sector Restructuring <i>Subtotal</i>	ODI	GG and PSD	AEFN	2001	TBD	50.0	-	50.0	TBD
					TBD	100.0	0.0	100.0	TBD	-
Social Infrastructure 1. Education Sector Development <i>Subtotal</i>	PI	HD	AEEH	2001	TBD	60.0	-	60.0	TBD	-
					TBD	60.0	0.0	60.0	TBD	-
Total					TBD	160.0	0.0	160.0	TBD	-
2003 LOAN PIPELINE										
Social Infrastructure 1. Second Senior Secondary Education <i>Subtotal</i>	PI	HD	AEEH	2002	TBD	50.0	-	50.0	TBD	-
					TBD	50.0	0.0	50.0	TBD	-
Transport and Communications 1. Second Road Rehabilitation	ODI	RC	IETC	2002	TBD	60.0	-	60.0	TBD	-
	2. Third Railway Development <i>Subtotal</i>	ODI	RC	IETC	2002	TBD	50.0	-	50.0	TBD
					TBD	110.0	0.0	110.0	TBD	-
Total					TBD	160.0	0.0	160.0	TBD	-

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions.

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development, and RC = Regional Cooperation.

^c Government financing needs to be further defined.

TBD = to be determined.

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

UZBEKISTAN
LENDING PIPELINE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, 2001-2003 ^a

Sector/Project Name	Responsible Division	Type of TA	Amount (\$'000)		
			ADB	Others	Total
2001 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM					
Agriculture and Natural Resources					
1. Pilot Testing of Rural Savings and Credit Union	AEAR	AD	150.0		150.0
2. Supporting Rural Savings & Credit Union*	AEAR	AD	400.0		400.0
3. Furthering Policy Reform in the Food Grain Subsector*	AEFN	AD	500.0		500.0
4. Water Resources Management in Agriculture Sector	AEFN	PP	600.0		600.0
5. Support for Agriculture Sector Restructuring	AEFN	PP	600.0		600.0
	Subtotal		<u>2,250.0</u>		<u>2,250.0</u>
Social Infrastructure					
1. Education Sector Development	AEEH	PP	500.0		500.0
2. Improvement of Education Management *	AEEH	AD	600.0		600.0
3. Supporting Urban Social Infrastructure Development *	AEWU	AD	600.0		600.0
4. Development of Cadastral Survey and Land Management System	AEWU	AD	400.0		400.0
	Subtotal		<u>2,100.0</u>		<u>2,100.0</u>
	Total		4,350.0		4,350.0
2002 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM					
Agriculture and Natural Resources					
1. Institutional Support for Restructuring*	AEFN	AD	600.0		600.0
2. Supporting Water Resources Management Policy and Capacity Building	AEFN	AD	600.0		600.0
	Subtotal		<u>1,200.0</u>		<u>1,200.0</u>
Social Infrastructure					
1. Second Senior Secondary Education	AEEH	PP	800.0		800.0
2. Furthering Policy Reform in the Education Sector *	AEEH	AD	600.0		600.0
	Subtotal		<u>1,400.0</u>		<u>1,400.0</u>
Transport and Communications					
1. Third Railway Development	IETC	PP	700.0		700.0
2. Second Road Rehabilitation	IETC	PP	700.0		700.0
	Subtotal		<u>1,400.0</u>		<u>1,400.0</u>
	Total		4,000.0		4,000.0
2003 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM					
Transport and Communications					
1. Furthering Policy Reform in the Road Sector*	IETC	AD	600.0		600.0
	Total		600.0		600.0

^a Although the proposed TA program has been generally agreed upon by Management, ADB financing may be subject to further reprioritization to fit in with the ADB-wide annual resource envelope.

* Piggy-backed to a loan.

UZBEKISTAN
LENDING PROGRAM, 2001-2003
BY POVERTY CLASSIFICATION, CROSSCUTTING OPERATIONAL PRIORITY AND SECTOR

Classification	2001 (Firm)		2002-2003	
	No.	% ^a	No.	% ^a
I. By Poverty Classification*				
A. Core Poverty Intervention	-	-	-	-
B. Poverty Intervention	2	50.0	3	50.0
C. Other Development Interventions	2	50.0	3	50.0
Total	4	100.0	6	100.0
II. By Crosscutting Operational Priority*				
A. Environment	1	25.0	1	16.7
B. Gender and Development	-	-	-	-
C. Good Governance	-	-	1	16.7
D. Human Development	2	50.0	2	33.3
E. Private Sector Development	1	25.0	-	-
F. Regional Cooperation	-	-	2	33.3
Total	4	100.0	6	100.0
III. By Sector				
A. Agriculture and Natural Resources	2	50.0	2	33.3
B. Energy	-	-	-	-
C. Finance and Industry	-	-	-	-
D. Transport and Communications	-	-	2	33.3
E. Social Infrastructure	2	50.0	2	33.3
F. Others/Multisector	-	-	-	-
Total	4	100.0	6	100.0

^a rounded off.

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

UZBEKISTAN

PROJECT PROFILE					
1. Project Name: Rural Savings and Credit Union Development			2. Sector/Subsector: Agriculture and Rural Development		
3. Poverty Classification: ^{a *} PI			4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^b PSD (TBD)		
5. Rationale & Objectives: <p>Despite agriculture's dominance in the economy, the existing policy, legal and regulatory framework does not provide a particularly favorable environment for the expeditious development of the rural financial market. A system of direct and indirect controls, and implicit and explicit taxes and subsidies on agriculture has led to distortions in relative prices. On the one hand there are producer price controls and on the other free or subsidized provision of inputs and credit. The net effect on producers and agribusiness is a negative impact on income (only a small percentage of producers and agribusinesses benefit from the subsidies) and an inefficient allocation of resources both within the sector and across other sectors.</p> <p>Based on knowledge and experience elsewhere in transition economies it would appear that the domestic savings potential of the population, particularly in rural areas, is not being mobilized. Consequently, the potential of the country to utilize its own domestic resources for investment in and development of the economy has not been maximized. There would therefore appear to be scope in the rural financial market for new non-bank financial institutions that mobilize domestic savings and provide credit services. However, if the rural financial market is to play a positive role in rural development, changes in Government policies to support savings mobilization and the establishment of rural non-bank financial institutions are necessary. In addition to new legislation, existing policies that affect pricing of financial products and services, taxation, and liquidity of mobilized savings will require review.</p>			6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders and beneficiaries will participate in the project design through consultations and socioeconomic surveys. Poverty impact assessments. 		
7. Scope: <p>The Project will aim to supply loans to a market that is currently underserved and must mobilize rural financial savings as their primary source of loan funds. Mobilization of members' savings reduces dependence on Government supplied funds. The introduction of savings and credit unions (SCUs) in rural areas would allow the pooling of capital that otherwise would not be available to further economic growth. SCUs worldwide have played a major role in mobilizing rural financial savings. While several types of institutions can provide such financial products and services, SCUs have demonstrated their adaptability in many countries with differing political, economic and social environments.</p> <p>The objectives of the TA are to support the development of a legal and regulatory framework for the establishment of SCUs and to help Government prepare a project to be financed with Bank support. The TA will be implemented in two phases. Phase 1 will identify policy constraints and assist Government in the establishment of an appropriate legal and regulatory framework for SCUs. Phase 2 will continue and expand activities initiated under Phase 1 and assist the Government in the preparation of a project.</p>					
8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan :				Remarks	
Loan Project Cost (\$m)					
Financing (Source)		FC	LC		Total
ADB					30.0
Co-financing					
Borrower					
Sub-borrowers					
Total		TBD	TBD	TBD	
9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: TBD					
10. Executing Agency: Central Bank of Uzbekistan			11. Project Implementation Period: Start: TBD End:		
12. Environment Category: C			13. Processing Year: 2001		

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

UZBEKISTAN

PROJECT PROFILE				
1. Project Name: Grain Productivity Improvement		2. Sector/Subsector: Agriculture and Natural Resources/ Agricultural Support Services		
3. Poverty Classification: ^{a *} ODI		4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^b ENV (TBD)		
5. Rationale & Objectives: The achievement of food security is a major goal of the Government. At the same time, the optimal degree of self-sufficiency depends upon Uzbekistan's comparative advantage and environmental considerations. The Project's primary objective will be to support the efficient improvement of productivity in irrigated and rainfed cereal production by establishing support mechanisms to facilitate the development and growth of private cereal farms in a market-oriented economy. A secondary objective will be to ensure the environmentally sustainable management of soils and water resources used in cereal production.		6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential Project beneficiaries will be consulted extensively through community surveys, a social assessment, and formal stakeholder workshops. 		
7. Scope: In support of the Government's medium-term strategy for increasingly market-oriented grain sector development, the Project's design will be based on a detailed analysis of constraints to efficient growth and the relative medium-term costs and benefits of alternative strategies for achieving foodgrain security through domestic supply and international trade. This analysis will cover rainfed and irrigated grain production, and competing uses of land for fodder crops, horticulture, and pasture. Depending upon the findings and recommendations of the PPTA, the Project's components may include (i) cost-effective, financially sustainable adaptive research and farm extension services; (ii) training for farmers, farmer associations, and agricultural support service personnel in efficient; environmentally sustainable technologies for cereal production; (iii) systems for competitive input supply; (iv) improvement of the technical efficiency and competitiveness of grain storage, processing, and marketing; and (v) market-oriented policy, legal, and institutional reforms that are essential to facilitate successful Project implementation.				
8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan :				Remarks Government's commitment to the market-oriented reforms necessary to ensure adequate incentives for farmers to participate in the Project and make any required contributions to cost recovery.
Loan Project Cost (\$m)				
Financing (Source)	FC	LC	Total	
ADB			20.0	
Co-financing				
Borrower				
Sub-borrowers				
Total	TBD	TBD	TBD	
9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: Direct Project benefits will include higher and more sustainable agricultural incomes for private farmers in the major cereal-producing regions of the country. Consumers will benefit through an improved domestic food supply at reasonable cost. Environmental benefits will include the reduced degradation of agricultural land through more sustainable on-farm use of water and other inputs in cereal production.				
10. Executing Agency: Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources		11. Project Implementation Period: Start: 2001 End: 2006		
12. Environment Category: B (Provisional)		13. Processing Year: 2001		

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

UZBEKISTAN

PROJECT PROFILE													
1. Project Name: Basic Education Staff Development Project			2. Sector/Subsector: Education										
3. Poverty Classification: ^{a *} ODI			4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^b HD, GAD										
5. Rationale & Objectives: The Project is designed to contribute to the implementation of the National Program in the area of basic education. Its broad objective is to support quality and efficiency of basic education by enhancing staff performance. The project will complement ongoing assistance provided by ADB by expanding the teacher training capacity to support the introduction of textbooks reflecting the new curriculum / standards and teaching methods. It will largely address social equity and poverty reduction concerns by responding in priority to the needs of teaching staff considered as vulnerable (redundant or under-qualified) and those serving in remote and poor areas. The expansion of the teacher outreach through distance education will benefit essentially rural areas and poor schools whose teachers are de facto excluded from further training. A major focus of the Project is to inform staff reductions and cost rationalization plans and at the same time to mitigate their possible negative impact, both from social and educational perspectives.			6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders, including representatives of teachers, parents and local education authorities, participated in the project design through consultation workshops and field surveys. A school improvement fund, managed at the community level is proposed to be established. 										
7. Scope: The Project includes five main components/immediate objectives (i) improving efficiency in the use of teaching and non-teaching staff, (ii) expanding access to in-service training through distance education, (iii) disseminating new teaching methods, (iv) strengthening community involvement with schools, and (v) improving service conditions. Critical activities will include (i) advisory services to assist in designing, implementing and monitoring staff redeployment policies; (ii) provision of equipment and materials for establishing a distance education capacity for teacher retraining; (iii) preparation and implementation of teacher education programs in three critical areas (upgrading program for under-qualified primary school teachers, multiple specialization for redundant secondary school teachers, multigrade teaching for teachers of small rural schools, new teaching methods); (iv) study visits and assignments for selected teaching staff; and (v) establishment of school community funds in poor districts.													
8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan :				Remarks									
Loan Project Cost (\$m)													
Financing (Source)		FC	LC		Total								
ADB		40.0	-		40.0								
Co-financing		-	-		-								
Borrower		-	60.0		60.0								
Sub-borrowers		-	-		-								
Total		40.0	60.0	100.0									
9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: The immediate beneficiaries of the Project are the nearly 500,000 staff of basic education, and more particularly female teachers and those in remote areas. The in-service teacher training institutions and their distance education branches to be established by the Project are the main intermediaries in reaching these beneficiaries. The ultimate beneficiaries of the Project are the 5 million children enrolled in basic education whose schooling will become more relevant and learning environment more stimulating.													
10. Executing Agency: Central Institute for Teacher Training under the Ministry of Public Education			11. Project Implementation Period: <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td>PPTA</td> <td>Loan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Start:</td> <td>1999</td> <td>2001</td> </tr> <tr> <td>End:</td> <td>2000</td> <td>2007</td> </tr> </table>			PPTA	Loan	Start:	1999	2001	End:	2000	2007
	PPTA	Loan											
Start:	1999	2001											
End:	2000	2007											
12. Environment Category: B			13. Processing Year: 2001										

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

UZBEKISTAN

PROJECT PROFILE					
1. Project Name: Urban Social Infrastructure Development			2. Sector/Subsector: Social Infrastructure		
3. Poverty Classification: ^{a *} PI			4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^b HD, GG		
5. Rationale: During the Soviet era the considerable investment in urban infrastructure was based on the standard methodologies and norms adopted at that time. Since independence in 1991, investment has slowed and basic urban social infrastructure services such as water supply, sanitation, drainage, solid waste management, district heating and hot water supply have deteriorated. The operation and maintenance (O&M) of aging assets have become increasingly difficult, performance efficiency has dropped, and the cost of service delivery has risen. As a result the urban population is receiving service of a lower standard that is affecting their living and health conditions. Accordingly there is a pressing need to improve the basic urban infrastructure facilities. There is also a need to build the capacity of the sector agencies concerned to enable them to implement subprojects and to develop their ability to undertake O&M of the constructed systems. Reforms envisaged by the Government include the decentralization of power and responsibility for urban social infrastructure and its assets to the local authorities. The Project will support the Government in enhancing the coverage of basic infrastructure facilities, contributing to improving living and health conditions, in particular for the poor population, and improving the institutional, organizational and managerial capabilities of the sector agencies. In addition to poverty reduction, the Project will contribute to economic development and improvement to the urban environment as well as attract private sector participation.			6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders and beneficiaries will participate in the project design through consultations and socioeconomic surveys. • Poverty impact assessment. • Social needs assessment survey. 		
7. Scope: The Project aims to improve the quality of life of urban residents by enabling the provision, upgrading and rehabilitation of basic urban infrastructure and services. The Project will also improve the urban poor access to affordable basic social infrastructure and services in the Project area by ensuring that the needs of the poor communities are considered in the prioritization of central and local governments' investments. The Project will achieve its objectives by (i) improving the capacity of the central and local governments in the delivery of the infrastructure services; (ii) improving the technical and financial capability of local governments and responsible sector agencies in the planning, implementation, and O&M of urban infrastructure facilities; and (iii) promoting ownership and community management of urban infrastructure services. The Project will consist of two parts: Part A: Physical Infrastructure; and Part B: Institutional Development.					
8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan:				Remarks:	
Loan Project Cost (\$m)					
Financing (Source)		FC	LC		Total
ADB					40.0
Co-financing					
Borrower					
Sub-borrowers					
Total		TBD	TBD	TBD	
9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: TBD					
10. Executing Agency: TBD			11. Project Implementation Period: Start: TBD End:		
12. Environment Category: B			13. Processing Year: 2001		

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Intervention

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.