

<b>1. CAS Data</b>	
<b>Country:</b> UZBEKISTAN	
<b>CPS Year:</b> FY08 & CAS PR Year FY10	<b>CPS Period:</b> FY08 – FY11
<b>CPSCR Review Period:</b> FY08- FY11	<b>Date of this review:</b> November 29, 2011

<b>2. Executive Summary</b>
<p>i. This review examines the implementation of the FY08-11 Uzbekistan Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) and FY10 CAS Progress Report (CASPR), which defined the joint strategy of IBRD/IDA and the IFC. It also evaluates the CAS Completion Report (CASCR).</p> <p>ii. The WBG strategy set out to support the implementation of Uzbekistan’s Welfare Improvement Strategy (WIS), while deepening the WBG engagement following a more cautious Interim Strategy Note (FY06-07), which focused on technical assistance and kept lending to a minimum. The main objective of the strategy was to help maintain high GDP growth and improve living standards by creating a more diversified modern economy, enhancing access to and the quality of public services, and reducing inter-regional disparities. The strategy was organized around four pillars. Under pillar 1, the WBG sought to support the continuation of the sound macroeconomic environment, provide it with institutional support for WIS implementation and promote good governance, and foster private sector development through a better business environment and investment climate. Under pillar 2, the objectives were to promote rural development, and improve water resource management, irrigation and drainage. Under pillar 3, the WBG sought to support municipal services and financing in Bukhara and Samarkand, the improvement of health services, bettering basic education and learning, and strengthening the targeting of safety nets. And under pillar 4, the objectives included improving environmental and disaster risk management, promoting energy efficiency and the development of renewable energy, and improving Uzbekistan role on global public goods. The strategy was built around a dual track approach, where in addition to the core program, the WBG would focus its analytical work on key areas to increase consensus with the government.</p> <p>iii. The outcome of WBG support to Uzbekistan under the strategy was <i>moderately unsatisfactory</i>. On the positive side, macroeconomic policies remain sound on the fiscal side, and some progress was made in the financial sector. Some progress has been made on increasing access to financial services, albeit at a modest scale, and work is under way on water resource management. Also, there was progress in improving access to safe water and on the coverage of ARV treatment of HIV-positive pregnant women. However, progress in the remaining areas of macroeconomic policy, in the governance and implementation of the WIS, and in the business and investment climate was very limited, if any. Moreover, nothing happened regarding the share of central rayon hospitals using care-based financing, and there was no progress in improving education quality. The results on agricultural productivity are not known, nor is there information on the outcomes relating to water resource management, irrigation and drainage. Also, there is no information on progress on other health indicators, or on sewerage. Nor on environmental and disaster risk management, energy efficiency and the development of renewable energy, or the provision of global public goods.</p>

<b>CPSCR Reviewed by:</b>	<b>Peer Reviewed by:</b>	<b>CASCR Review Coordinator</b>
<b>Chad Leechor, Senior Evaluation Officer, IEGCC</b>	<b>Jorge Garcia-Garcia Consultant, IEGCC</b>	<b>Jaime Jaramillo-Vallejo Lead Economist, IEGCC</b>
<b>Shoghik Hovhannisyan, Consultant, IEGCC</b>	<b>Stephen Francis Pirozzi Senior Evaluation Officer, CEXEG</b>	

iv. IEG agrees with some of the lessons drawn in the CASCR. Chief among them is that the differences between the country's and the WBG's approach to economic policies can best be worked out through a substantive and creative dialogue anchored in the need to promote growth and address poverty, unless the WBG wants to limit its areas of influence to those where there is a firm government ownership. In addition, IEG stresses the need to focus the strategies on a more realistic set of objectives, as well as on the design of a results framework that can actually be monitored and used to guide the implementation of the strategy. Over-ambitious objectives distract attention from the areas where the WBG can be more effective, while outcome indicators that cannot be monitored help little in letting the team know how much progress is being made and what corrections may be called for.

### 3. WBG Strategy Summary

#### **Overview of CAS Relevance:**

##### Country Context:

1. Located in Central Asia, Uzbekistan is a landlocked country, with a population of 27 million and a per capita gross national income of US\$1,100 (2009). It is rich in natural resources, including gold, copper, natural gas, oil and uranium. The economy has been strong, with real GDP growth averaging above 8 percent a year since 2008, but higher than expected inflation. Buoyed by strong commodity prices, government revenue has risen rapidly, allowing the budget to remain in surplus in recent years despite some increases in expenditures. The national poverty level (defined on the basis of food consumption) declined from 25 percent in 2005 to 20 percent in 2010. Uzbekistan is prone to natural disasters, mostly earthquakes and drought. The Aral Sea is contaminated and is now barely 10 percent of its original area and volume. In addition, over-use of chemical fertilizers since the Soviet times poses a serious public health hazard.

2. Unlike most countries in the region, Uzbekistan has retained a state-led development strategy, focusing on import substitution and self-sufficiency in food, while pursuing a gradual approach to reform. This inward-looking stance limits the impact of external shocks, such as the global financial crisis of 2008-09, but reduces the scope for adopting a strategy for accelerating the rate of growth of economic sectors with higher labor productivity. Within that stance, the government is implementing a comprehensive medium-term development framework—the Welfare Improvement Strategy (WIS), which aims to maintain high growth and prudent macroeconomic management; to allocate a rising share of the budget to social sectors; and to upgrade the efficiency of government spending.

##### Objectives of WBG Assistance:

3. The WBG strategy set out to support the implementation of Uzbekistan's Welfare Improvement Strategy (WIS), while deepening the WBG engagement following a more cautious Interim Strategy Note (FY06-07), which focused on technical assistance and kept lending to a minimum. The main objective of the strategy was to help maintain high GDP growth and improve living standards by creating a more diversified modern economy, enhancing access to and the quality of public services, and reducing inter-regional disparities. The strategy was organized around four pillars. Under pillar 1, the WBG sought to support the continuation of the sound macroeconomic environment, provide it with institutional support for WIS implementation and promote good governance, and foster private sector development through a better business environment and investment climate. Under pillar 2, the objectives were to promote rural development, and improve water resource management, irrigation and drainage. Under pillar 3, the WBG sought to support municipal services and financing in Bukhara and Samarkand, the improvement of health services, bettering basic education and learning, and strengthening the targeting of safety nets. And under pillar 4, the objectives included improving environmental and disaster risk management, promoting energy efficiency and the development of renewable energy, and improving Uzbekistan role

on global public goods. The strategy was built around a dual track approach, where in addition to the core program, the WBG would focus its analytical work on key areas to increase consensus with the government.

Relevance of WBG Strategy:

4. The objectives were aligned with those of the country, as defined in the government's WIS. Although it avoided contentious areas, the strategy was targeted at areas that represent a challenge for the government. In doing so, the strategy provided an opportunity to the WBG to add value, but tested the government's resolve and seemed optimistic relative to past experience in Uzbekistan.
5. The relevance of design of the strategy was modest. The results framework included targets that were over-ambitious, or where the WBG could hardly contribute to the desired outcome. It also showed some of the shortcomings in the WIS, including the lack of specificity and consistency in some areas.
6. IFC's strategy of selective and narrowly targeted interventions was relevant. The results framework, however, was not adequate to capture the results envisaged and IFC's impact on the economy. In addition, the design of some of the interventions, including the PPP on medical diagnostic centers, was not supported by a timely and adequate needs assessment.
7. A key risk identified in the CAS was its weak ownership by the government. To mitigate this risk, the CAS envisaged a two-prong strategy involving (a) limited engagement in areas where government commitment was absent or unclear; and (b) full engagement -- including more lending -- in areas where common agreement prevailed. In the event, the WBG program focused its financial support in the areas where there were shared views with the government.

***Overview of CAS Implementation:***

Lending and Investments:

8. IBRD/IDA actual commitments totaled \$533 million, almost 10 times the amount committed in the preceding CAS period (\$55million). The value of the portfolio more than doubled during the CAS period, rising from \$266 million in FY08 to \$633 million by the end of FY11. Of the 13 projects envisaged in the CAS and CASPR, 8 were approved within the period, while 3 were dropped and 2 delayed. No development policy operations were approved during the period.
9. The quality of the portfolio as measured by IEG outcome ratings is satisfactory based on the two projects that were closed in FY08, at the beginning of the CAS period. The share of commitments at risk, however, increased from 6.7 percent in 2008 to 10.3 percent in 2011, while the number of projects at risk when from one to two.
10. During the CAS period IFC had 9 ongoing investment projects in its portfolio and approved three investment projects (total of \$6.9 million) of which one was canceled due to the inability to register the loan agreement. To foster private sector development, business environment, and investment climate, IFC interventions targeted the following areas: increasing access to finance for MSMEs, strengthening financial sector, and investing in agribusiness and general manufacturing in the form of more direct investment to small enterprises.

Advisory and Analytical Activities:

11. The IBRD/IDA program of analytical and advisory activities (AAA) was intended to prepare the ground work for reform and be guided by the dual track approach, and, for the most part, provide just-in-time technical assistance. Of the 16 economic and sector works envisaged, 11 were dropped and only 6

were delivered during the period, including an unplanned policy note in FY2011. Of 11 tasks scheduled for technical assistance (TA), 6 were delivered and 5 were dropped. However, 11 additional and unplanned TAs were requested and delivered. IBRD/IDA has used economic and sector work from other development partners as the basis for its projects, as was the case with two of the three large energy-sector operations added in the CASPR FY10 for which the Asian Development Bank (ADB) contributed the analytical pieces.

12. The IFC advisory services program proposed in the CAS was largely implemented as planned, although some activities were not realized. During the CAS period, IFC approved four advisory services projects for a total cost of 1.9 million. The interventions focused on increasing access to finance for MSMEs, improving business environment, strengthening financial sector, supporting the development of an efficient credit bureau system, and encouraging private sector participation in infrastructure.

Safeguards and Fiduciary Issues:

13. A safeguards case was brought to the Inspection Panel regarding the construction of “Rogun” hydroelectric power station, which included a dam that was considered to have an impact on the Amudarya River (Aral Sea basin). The dam’s location, however, was in the neighboring Tajikistan. Executive Directors considered the Panel’s assessment and approved the conclusion that no further actions or investigations were need. IEG is not aware of any INT investigations regarding the Uzbekistan program.

***Overview of Achievement by Objective:***

**Pillar 1: Enable Environment for Shared Growth**

14. Under this pillar, the WBG sought to support the continuation of the sound macroeconomic environment, provide it with institutional support for WIS implementation and promote good governance, and foster private sector development through a better business environment and investment climate.

15. **Continue sound macroeconomic management.** Macroeconomic management in Uzbekistan remains strong in many respects. Nevertheless, most of the information on current trends is based on foreign estimates, because statistical information on Uzbekistan is quite limited and not readily available on time. Bolstered by a solid performance in the Russian economy and broadly favorable export prices, Uzbekistan’s real GDP growth has been strong in recent years and is estimated to have remained over 8 percent in 2010. Meanwhile, average measured inflation, at around 10 percent per year recently, remains high. While some of the inflation can be attributed to higher world commodity prices, there is a wide perception that credit policy does not sterilize foreign flows as much, and that this estimate understates true inflation, which is being constrained through controlled prices at home on energy and basic foodstuffs. Meanwhile, the overall fiscal balance is estimated by foreign observers to remain at about balance, while the external current account surplus is estimated to continue over 15 percent of GDP. Monetary policy appears to be easier than needed to contain prices.

16. WBG assistance was provided through technical assistance for the Ministry of Economy and affiliated agencies, and regular macroeconomic policy dialogue. Progress was made in linking the M&E system of WIS to budget preparation and planning. There was no indication, however, that international practices were adopted, or that data was provided timely and regularly.

17. **Provide institutional support for WIS implementation and promote good governance.** Most of the results envisaged in the CAS for this objective were not achieved. On poverty analysis, the WBG provided analytical support but no information is available on outcomes or results. The WIS M&E system has been developed but not implemented as envisaged. The review of public financial management remains to be conducted. Similarly, agreed disclosure of budgetary reports has not been

carried out. The WBG assistance covered the following clusters of activity: (a) poverty analysis; (b) monitoring and evaluation; (c) public financial management; (d) budget transparency; and (e) governance.

18. **Foster private sector development and investment climate.** There is little information on the extent of true progress on private sector development in Uzbekistan. At the micro level, IFC had mixed achievements IFC sought to (a) increase access to finance for MSMEs; (b) improve the business environment; (c) strengthen the financial sector; (d) support the development of an efficient credit bureau system; (e) invest in agribusiness and manufacturing through support for small enterprises; and (f) encourage private participation in infrastructure. There were four new and three ongoing advisory services during the CAS period. In addition, IFC had nine ongoing investment projects in its portfolio and approved three new investments, one of which was canceled.

19. IFC helped Uzbekistan take the initial steps in the development of the leasing and housing finance sectors, with lease financing increasing from US\$ 265 million in 2007 to US\$ 770 million in 2009, and mortgages increasing from 0.3 percent of GDP in 2007 to about 0.6 percent in 2010. IFC's support was through an advisory service and by financing a client that provides medium-term financial leases for SME's equipment and machinery. The extent to which IFC's advisory services to simplify tax administration got traction on the ground was limited. The IFC's only direct investment in small enterprises was canceled due to the inability to register the loan agreement. In addition, potentially meaningful progress in the development of an efficient credit bureau system only took place in October 2011 with the adoption of new regulations. Meanwhile information sharing increased by only one percent during the CAS period.

20. IEG rates the outcome of WBG support in this pillar as *moderately unsatisfactory*. Macroeconomic policies remain sound on the fiscal side, and some progress was made in the financial sector. Progress in the remaining areas of macroeconomic policy, in the governance and implementation of the WIS, and in the business and investment climate was very limited, if any.

## **Pillar 2: Increased income and economic opportunities in rural areas**

21. The objectives under this pillar included promoting rural development, and improving water resource management, irrigation and drainage.

22. **Rural development.** There is no information on outcomes at the scale of this objective, which included within its outcome indicators to increase productivity of farming in about 2 million hectares, and increase farm access to financial services in seven regions. The extent to which productivity increased is unknown because data is not available at this time. The microcredit lines were offered to 185 beneficiaries, significantly below the target of 500 beneficiaries. The incentive system was improved through higher administered prices and a new option for farmers to sell cotton above output quota. Nonetheless, farm productivity is reported to remain constrained by the state control of seeds, fertilizers, farming techniques, credit and the state requirement that the farms sell most of their output to the state. IBRD/IDA provided support through two Rural Enterprise Support Projects (RESP I and II).

23. **Water resource management, irrigation and drainage.** As in the case of the previous sub-objective, there is no information on outcomes at the country level. The internal evaluation of WBG projects, without IEG validation, show that these are only in the initial stages of implementation and, hence, limited results can be expected at this stage. The WBG is supporting this objective through the Drainage, Irrigation and Wetlands Improvement Project and the Fergana Valley Water Resources Management Project. The outputs delivered under these projects include new membership criteria for water user association and a water sector investment planning study.

24. The outcome of the WBG support in this pillar was *moderately unsatisfactory*. Some progress has been made on increasing access to financial services, albeit at a modest scale, and work is under way on water resource management. The results on agricultural productivity are not known, nor is there information on the outcomes relating to water resource management, irrigation and drainage.

**Pillar 3: Human development and social protection through better service delivery**

25. Under this pillar, the WBG sought to support municipal services and financing in Bukhara and Samarkand, the improvement of health services, bettering basic education and learning, and strengthening the targeting of safety nets.

26. **Municipal services sector development and financing in Bukhara and Samarkand.** The WBG instruments were focused on the provision of water and on sewerage. While there is information on the former, there is none on the latter. Access to a reliable water supply increased from 48 percent in Samarkand and 87 in Bukhara to almost 100 percent in both places. Similarly the quality of water, as measured by the percentage of the samples failing the quality test, dropped below 5 percent, which was the WBG's target. On the other hand, collection rates for residential customers, which were expected to increase significantly to improve the financial viability of the service, only improved to the targeted level in Bukhara. IBRD/IDA supported this objective through Bukhara and Samarkand Water Supply Project, the Bukhara and Samarkand Sewerage Project, and a large number of AAAs, including the Municipal Services Sector Study & Water Supply and Sanitation Strategy Note.

27. **Improved health indices.** Overall, health services may be improving in Uzbekistan, as evidenced by the decline in the infant mortality rate from 45.4 per thousand live births in 2008 to 43.8 in 2010, the mortality rate for children under five years from 53.6 per thousand live births in 2008 to 51.5 percent in 2010, and by the increase of the share of HRV positive pregnant women using anti-retro-viral (ARV) treatment from 70.0 percent in 2007 to 100.0 percent in 2011. There is, however, limited information on the outcome indicators of the results framework of the strategy. There is no information available on the use of primary health care services, or updated information beyond 2009 on the share of health care expenditures that is spent on primary health and out-patient care. . . Neither is there data on the indicators on flu prevention and control, or two of the three indicators for the HIV interventions. Available information indicates that nothing happened regarding one of the health indicators, namely the share of central rayon hospitals using care-based financing. IBRD/IDA provided support through AAA and the Third Health System Improvement Project, which was much larger than its predecessor (Second Health Project). IFC prepared a pilot PPP for medical diagnostic centers to encourage, private participation in health, but traction on the ground was limited and implementation was behind schedule.

28. **Improved basic education and learning.** The results that were to be monitored under the results framework of the strategy show no progress—percentage of schools with the core set of educational materials available, the percentage of retained teachers in project schools, and the percentage of schools with active boards. IEG understands that there are schools in the process of developing requests for educational materials and that some of the schools that have boards are working on school improvement proposals. These processes are expected to take time. The instruments used by IBRD/IDA were the Basic Education Project Phase I, which started before the CAS period, and Basic Education Phase II, which was approved in 2009.

29. On balance, this pillar is rated *moderately satisfactory*, but marginally so. There was progress in improving access to safe water and on the coverage of ARV treatment of HIV-positive pregnant women. Nothing happened regarding the share of central rayon hospitals using care-based financing. No progress was made in education quality. There is no information on progress on other health indicators, or on sewerage.

**Pillar 4: Environmental and disaster risk management and global public goods provision**

30. The strategy's objectives under this pillar included improving environmental and disaster risk management, promoting energy efficiency and the development of renewable energy, and improving Uzbekistan role on global public goods.

31. **Environmental and disaster risk management.** There is no information on the improvement of environmental and disaster risk management in Uzbekistan. While IBRD/IDA provided the government with recommendations for improving climate resilience of the energy sector, action has yet to be taken in this front. Moreover, the goal of establishing optimal adaptation strategies for risk management did not materialize.

32. **Energy efficiency and development of renewable energy.** No progress at the outcome level is reported on energy efficiency and the development of pilot projects of renewable energy. A project of \$25 million to finance energy saving technology was added in 2010, but the latest internal rating, not validated by IEG, gives it a moderately unsatisfactory. There was also AAA in this area.

33. **Provision of global public goods.** There is no information on the reduction of greenhouse emissions regarding volume and intensity, which were the outcome indicators of the strategy. However, the national oil and gas company, *Uzbekneftegaz*, endorsed the *Global Gas Flaring Reduction Partnership* (GFRP) and its Voluntary Standard for Global Gas Flaring Reduction, committing itself to cut gas flaring. Progress in fulfilling this commitment is not documented at this point.

34. IEG rates the outcome of the WBG program in this pillar as *unsatisfactory*. There is no information on progress on any of the objectives, namely, environmental and disaster risk management, energy efficiency and the development of renewable energy, or the provision of global public goods.

Pillars	IEG Rating
1. Environment for Shared Growth	Moderately Unsatisfactory
2. Economic Opportunities in Rural Areas	Moderately Unsatisfactory
3. Human Development through Service Delivery	Moderately Satisfactory
4. Environment and Global Public Goods	Unsatisfactory

**4. Overall IEG Assessment**

<b>Outcome:</b>	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory</i>
<b>IBRD Performance:</b>	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory</i>
<b>IFC Performance:</b>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>

**Overall Outcome**

35. The outcome of WBG support to Uzbekistan under the strategy was *moderately unsatisfactory*. On the positive side, macroeconomic policies remain sound on the fiscal side, and some progress was made in the financial sector. Some progress has been made on increasing access to financial services, albeit at a modest scale, and work is under way on water resource management. Also, there was progress in improving access to safe water and on the coverage of ARV treatment of HIV-positive pregnant women. However, progress in the remaining areas of macroeconomic policy, in the governance and implementation of the WIS, and in the business and investment climate was very limited, if any. Moreover, nothing happened regarding the share of central rayon hospitals using care-based financing, and there was no progress in improving education quality. The results on agricultural

productivity are not known, nor is there information on the outcomes relating to water resource management, irrigation and drainage. Also, there is no information on progress on other health indicators, or on sewerage. Nor on environmental and disaster risk management, energy efficiency and the development of renewable energy, or the provision of global public goods.

#### **IBRD/IDA Performance**

36. While IBRD/IDA's strategy was broadly aligned with the government's WIS, its objectives were over-ambitious and its associated results framework virtually impossible to monitor. In addition, the degree of government ownership that was needed for the WBG strategy to be effective did not seem to materialize. While recognizing the effort to design a two-pronged approach to the risk of weak government ownership when adapting the AAA program, IEG notes that little monitoring was undertaken even within projects that were said to be demand-driven. A closer link between financial support and AAA may have helped bridge program monitoring. The management of the portfolio was weak as well, with the commitments at risk increasing during the strategy period. Donor coordination was not a major activity during the CAS period as donors were few in numbers and official development assistance was limited in scale. IBRD/IDA performance is rated *moderately unsatisfactory*, while recognizing the difficult and challenging conditions on the ground.

#### **IFC Performance:**

37. IFC's areas of focus were mostly appropriate. Its investments and advisory services contributed to improvements in access to finance, business environment and private businesses, especially in rural areas. Shortcomings were observed, however, in the results framework and lack of a timely and adequate needs assessment in a project. IFC's performance is rated *moderately satisfactory*, but marginally so.

### **5. Assessment of CPS Completion Report**

38. The CASCR provided good information on the implementation of the strategy, but was short on its outcomes. It also had frank discussions where the achievements fell short and there was information about the outcomes. In the context of weak governance, more concrete evidence and analysis is needed on the impact of interventions, including achievements of results and unintended consequences. In addition, more discussion of the challenges in monitoring performance indicators would be welcome.

### **6. Findings and Lessons**

39. IEG agrees with some of the lessons drawn in the CASCR. Chief among them is that the differences between the country's and the WBG's approach to economic policies can best be worked out through a substantive and creative dialogue anchored in the need to promote growth and address poverty, unless the WBG wants to limit its areas of influence to those where there is a firm government ownership. In addition, IEG stresses the need to focus the strategies on a more realistic set of objectives, as well as on the design of a results framework that can actually be monitored and used to guide the implementation of the strategy. Over-ambitious objectives distract attention from the areas where the WBG can be more effective, while outcome indicators that cannot be monitored help little in letting the team know how much progress is being made and what corrections may be called for.



<b>Annex Table 1:</b>	<b>Uzbekistan - Planned and Actual Lending, FY08-11</b>
<b>Annex Table 2:</b>	<b>Planned and Actual Analytical and Advisory Work, FY08-11</b>
<b>Annex Table 3a:</b>	<b>Project Ratings for Uzbekistan, FY08 -11</b>
<b>Annex Table 3b:</b>	<b>IEG Project Ratings for Uzbekistan and Comparators, FY08-11</b>
<b>Annex Table 4:</b>	<b>Portfolio Status for Uzbekistan and Comparators, FY08-11</b>
<b>Annex Table 5:</b>	<b>IBRD / IDA Net Disbursements and Charges Summary Report for Uzbekistan</b>
<b>Annex Table 6:</b>	<b>Total Net Disbursements of Official Development Assistance and Official Aid, 2004 - 2009</b>
<b>Annex Table 7:</b>	<b>Economic and Social Indicators for Uzbekistan and Comparators, 2006 - 2009</b>
<b>Annex Table 8:</b>	<b>Uzbekistan - Millennium Development Goals</b>
<b>Annex Table 9:</b>	<b>List of IFC's investment in Uzbekistan that were approved during FY08-11</b>
<b>Annex Table 10:</b>	<b>List of IFC's Advisory Services in Uzbekistan, FY08-11</b>
<b>Annex Table 11:</b>	<b>Uzbekistan-Country Risk Rating</b>
<b>Annex Table 12:</b>	<b>Uzbekistan - Summary of Achievements of the CAS Objectives</b>



Annex Table 1: Uzbekistan - Planned and Actual Lending, FY08-11

Project ID	Product Line	Projects Approved During CAS Period	Proposed FY	Approval FY	Proposed Amount	Approved Amount
<b>Programmed projects</b>						
P109126	IDA	Rural Enterprise Support Project Phase II	2008	2008	68.0	68.0
P110538	IDA	Ferghana Valley	2009	2010	65.0	65.0
P107845	IDA	Basic Education II	2009	2009	25.0	28.0
P111760	IDA	Small town / rural water supply in SyrDarya	2010	2011	108.0	88.0
P112719	IDA	Bukhara & Samarkand Sewerage	2010	2010	40.0	55.0
P118737	IDA	Energy Efficiency Facility for Industrial	2010	2010	25.0	25.0
		Alat-Karakul Water Supply	2011	<i>Forwarded to FY12</i>	12.0	
P119939	IBRD	Talimarjan gas-fired thermal	2011	2011	170.0	110.0
	IBRD	Automatic metering of electricity (IBRD)	2011	<i>Forwarded to FY12</i>	80.0	
		Municipal Infrastructure	2011	<i>Dropped</i>		
		Irrigation and Drainage II	2011	<i>Dropped</i>		
P113349	IDA	Health III	2011	2011	93.0	93.0
		Sewerage in Fergana and Republic of	2011	<i>Dropped</i>	40.0	
<b>Total Programmed projects CAS FY08-11</b>					<b>726.0</b>	<b>532.0</b>
<b>On Going Projects During CAS Period</b>				<b>Approval FY</b>	<b>Closing FY</b>	<b>Approved Amount</b>
P009127	IBRD/IDA	Drainage, Irrigation & Wetlands Improvement Project - Phase 1		Active	Active	60.0
P051370	IDA	Health 2 Project		Active	Active	40.0
P094042	IDA	Basic Education, Phase I		2007	2011	15.0
P049621	IBRD/IDA	Bukhara & Samarkand Water Supply Project		2010	2010	40.0
P046043	IBRD	Rural Enterprise Support Project		2008	2008	36.1
P009121	IBRD	Water Supply, Sanitation and Health Project		2008	2008	75.0
<b>Grants and Special Financing projects</b>						
P092243	Recipient Executed Activities	Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition - Nat'l Flour Fortification Program		Active	Active	2.3
	Institutional Development Fund	Health & Education ME& Capacity Building IDF Grant		2010	2010	
P104304	Recipient Executed Activities	Uzbekistan - Avian Influenza Control & Human Pandemic Preparedness Project		2010	2010	3.0
P093918	Institutional Development Fund	Strengthening Capacity of Public Sector Audit Institutions		2009	2009	
<b>Total On-Going projects CAS FY08-11</b>						<b>271.4</b>
<b>Total projects CAS FY08-11 including Grants and Special Financing projects</b>						<b>803.4</b>

Source: Uzbekistan 2008 CAS, 2010 CASPR, WB Business Warehouse Table 2a.1, 2a.4, 2a.7 as of 6/24/2011, Operations Portal and Client Connection.

Annex Table 2: Planned and Actual Analytical and Advisory Work, FY08-11

Project ID	Products	Proposed FY	Delivered to Client FY	Output Type
<b>Economic and Sector Work</b>				
<b>Planned (CAS FY08-11)</b>				
P102774	Governance Assessment (Health Sector)	2008	2008	Report
P102268	Health and Nutrition Review	2008	<i>Dropped</i>	
P093777	Water Sector Investment Planning Study	2009	2009	Policy Note
	Adv. On Dev. Of Treasury Syst TA	2009	<i>Dropped</i>	
P107951	Accounting & Auditing ROSC	2009	2009	Report
	Welfare Improvement Strategy (WIS)	2009	<i>Dropped</i>	
	Governance Assessment in Municipal Sector	2009	<i>Dropped</i>	
	Growth and Poverty Dialogue	2009	<i>Dropped</i>	
	Growth and Innovation	2010	<i>Dropped</i>	
	CPIA Policy Dialogue	2010	<i>Dropped</i>	
P108361	Private Sector Development (PSD) Policy Dialogue	2010	2011	Report
	Insurance Sector Development	2011	<i>Dropped</i>	
	Public Expenditure Review	2011	<i>Dropped</i>	
	Policy Note on Basic and Pre-school Education	2011	<i>Dropped</i>	
	Policy Notes on Fruit and Vegetables Sector	2011	<i>Dropped</i>	
P120981	Country Integrated Fiduciary Assessment (CIFA)	2011	2011	Report
<b>Non-planned</b>				
P107792	Hospital Policy Note		2008	Policy Note
<b>Technical Assistance</b>				
<b>Planned (CAS FY08-11)</b>				
P110431	PSD/FSD Dialogue	2009	2008	"How-To" Guidance
P103598	Advice on Development of Treasury system	2010	2010	Client Document Review
P107310	Assessing Vulnerability	2010	2010	"How-To" Guidance
P118021	FSD Policy Dialogue	2010	2010	Client Document Review
	Uzbekistan Municipal Governance TA	2010	<i>Dropped</i>	
P107965	Municipal Sector Development & Governance	2010	2010	"How-To" Guidance
	Innovation and Growth TA	2011	<i>Dropped</i>	
P117694	Assessing Vulnerability TA	2011	2010	Model/Survey
P119391	Uzbekistan Municipal Governance TA	2011	2010	"How-To" Guidance
	Audit Firms Review Follow-up TA	2011	<i>Dropped</i>	
	UAP-ES Assessment TA	2011	<i>Dropped</i>	
<b>Non-planned</b>				
P109055	Uzbekistan PRSP - Technical Assistance		2008	"How-To" Guidance
P108893	Poverty		2008	"How-To" Guidance
P108145	Tashkent CDM FORUM (CF ASSIST)		2008	Knowledge-Sharing Forum
P112486	Financial Sector Development (FSD) Policy Dialogue		2009	Client Document Review
P112850	Debt and Tax Reforms		2009	"How-To" Guidance
P114939	Water Supply and Sanitation Strategy		2009	"How-To" Guidance
P118022	UZ Private Sector Dialogue		2010	Client Document Review
P118530	FIU Workshop in Tashkent, Uzbekistan		2010	Knowledge-Sharing Forum
P119230	Uzbek PSM SUPPORT		2011	"How-To" Guidance
P122644	UZ FSD Policy Dialogue		2011	"How-To" Guidance
P113829	Dialogue on Poverty/Social Safety Nets		2011	"How-To" Guidance

Source: The Uzbekistan 2008 CAS, 2010 CASPR and WB Business Warehouse Table ESW/TA 8.1.4 as of 6/24/2011, and Imagebank.

Annex Table 3a: Project Ratings for Uzbekistan, FY08-11

Closed Projects Evaluated by IEG					
Exit FY	Project Name	Total Evaluated (US\$M)	IEG Outcome	IEG Risk to Development Outcome	Project ID
2008	Rural WS & SAN	58.6	Moderately Satisfactory	Significant	P009121
2008	Rur Ent Support	35.0	Satisfactory	Significant	P046043

Source: Operations, Client Connection and WB Business Warehouse Table 4a.5 and 4a.6 as of 6/1/2011.

\* With IEG new methodology for evaluating projects, institutional development impact and sustainability are no longer rated separately.

Annex Table 3b: IEG Project Ratings for Uzbekistan and Comparators, FY08-11-

	Total Evaluated (\$M)	Total Evaluated (No)	Outcome % Sat (\$)	Outcome % Sat (No)	RDO % Moderate or Lower (\$)	RDO % Moderate or Lower (No) *
Uzbekistan	93.6	2.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Kyrgyz Republic	138.9	8.0	56.7	62.5	0.0	0.0
Tajikistan	32.1	3.0	32.9	66.7	0.0	0.0
Kazakhstan	220.9	2.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ECA	5,571.0	113.0	88.6	80.2	75.2	62.2
World	29,166.2	535.0	84.7	75.3	69.0	57.7

Source: WB Business Warehouse Table 4a.5 and 4a.6 as of 4/13/2011.

\* With IEG new methodology for evaluating projects, institutional development impact and sustainability are no longer rated separately.

Annex Table 4: Portfolio Status for Uzbekistan and Comparators, FY08-11

Fiscal year	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Uzbekistan</b>				
# Project	5.0	6.0	8.0	10.0
# Project At Risk	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
% At Risk	20.0	16.7	25.0	20.0
Net Comm. Amt (million US dollars)	222.8	250.8	356.5	632.5
Comm. at Risk (million US dollars)	15.0	40.0	55.0	65.0
% Commit at Risk	6.7	15.9	15.4	10.3
<b>Kyrgyz Republic</b>				
# Project	17.0	19.0	19.0	19.0
# Project At Risk	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
% At Risk	5.9	5.3	0.0	15.8
Net Comm. Amt (million US dollars)	196.2	205.6	237.6	327.6
Comm. At Risk (million US dollars)	7.8	6.9	0.0	83.0
% Commit at Risk	4.0	3.4	0.0	25.3
<b>Tajikistan</b>				
# Project	14.0	15.0	16.0	15.0
# Project At Risk	3.0	4.0	3.0	1.0
% At Risk	21.4	26.7	18.8	6.7
Net Comm. Amt (million US dollars)	161.3	173.8	226.2	212.3
Comm. At Risk (million US dollars)	37.0	53.5	54.3	5.0
% Commit at Risk	22.9	30.8	24.0	2.4
<b>Kazakhstan</b>				
# Project	11.0	11.0	14.0	15.0
# Project At Risk	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
% At Risk	18.2	27.3	14.3	13.3
Net Comm. Amt (million US dollars)	607.8	2592.8	3657.8	2700.9
Comm. At Risk (million US dollars)	59.0	78.4	48.4	37.4
% Commit at Risk	9.7	3.0	1.3	1.4
<b>ECA</b>				
# Project	283.0	273.0	264.0	260.0
# Project At Risk	34.0	48.0	46.0	39.0
% At Risk	12.0	17.6	17.4	15.0
Net Comm. Amt (million US dollars)	17758.1	21206.5	24191.5	24175.4
Comm. At Risk (million US dollars)	2216.8	3422.8	4311.7	2384.0
% Commit at Risk		-16.1	17.8	9.9
<b>World</b>				
# Project	1384.0	1408.0	1449.0	1504.0
# Project At Risk	250.0	310.0	328.0	309.0
% At Risk	18.1	22.0	22.6	20.5
Net Comm. Amt (million US dollars)	104145.2	128471.6	155683.9	167076.2
Comm. At Risk (million US dollars)	18179.3	19539.0	27683.8	21909.8
% Commit at Risk	17.5	15.2	17.8	13.1

Source: WB Business Warehouse Table 3a.4 as of 4/13/2011.

**Annex Table 5: IBRD/IDA Net Disbursements and Charges Summary Report for Uzbekistan (in US\$ million)**

FY	Disbursed. Amount.	Repay Amount	Net Amount	Charges	Fees	Net Transfer
2008	34.2	26.8	7.4	19.3	.4	-12.3
2009	26.5	31.1	-4.6	16.2	.5	-21.2
2010	35.5	33.1	2.4	12.0	.6	-10.3
2011	37.8	31.4	6.4	9.7	.8	-4.1
<b>Total (2008-2011)</b>	<b>134.0</b>	<b>122.4</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>57.2</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>-47.9</b>

Source: WB Loan Kiosk, Net Disbursement and Charges Report as of 4/13/2011.

Annex Table 6: Total Net Disbursements of Official Development Assistance and Official Aid, 2004- 2009 (in US\$ million)

Bilaterals	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004-2009
Austria	0.27	0.3	0.4	0.36	3.52	0.35	0.87
Belgium	4.97	..	0.02	..	..	..	2.50
Canada	0.76	0.86	0.03	0.45	0.01	0.01	0.35
Finland	0.15	0.24	0.53	0.49	0.4	0.09	0.32
France	3.11	3.12	2.68	2.81	2.95	2.87	2.92
Germany	20.33	16.96	15.78	16.51	29.46	32.07	21.85
Greece	0.47	0.4	0.18	0.29	0.44	0.39	0.36
Italy	0.01	..	..	..	0.12	0.03	0.05
Japan	99.75	54.44	18.61	56.32	48.63	20.41	49.69
Korea	2.32	2.63	4.29	3.21	3.99	5.9	3.72
Luxembourg	..	0.18	..	..	..	..	0.18
Netherlands	0.66	0.49	0.04	0.07	0.04	..	0.26
New Zealand	0.13	0.16	0.03	..	..	..	0.11
Norway	0.96	0.53	0.46	0.01	0.17	0.3	0.41
Spain	1.28	0.08	0.08	..	0.36	0.66	0.49
Sweden	0.37	0.96	1.35	0.81	0.05	0.56	0.68
Switzerland	9.9	6.6	3	5.05	4.14	2.12	5.14
United Kingdom	1.45	0.55	0.13	0.05	1	1.84	0.84
United States	61.24	34.97	49.15	19.1	17.96	9.85	32.05
<i>DAC Countries, Total</i>	<i>208.13</i>	<i>123.47</i>	<i>96.76</i>	<i>105.53</i>	<i>113.24</i>	<i>77.45</i>	<i>120.76</i>
Czech Republic	0.31	0.39	0.31	0.45	0.26	0.33	0.34
Israel	6.02	3.48	2.13	1.76	2.35	2.39	3.02
Poland	0.12	5.96	4.52	4.6	-0.09	-0.56	2.43
Slovak Republic	0.23	..	0.03	0.1	0.25	0.05	0.13
Slovenia	..	..	..	..	0.01	0.01	0.01
Thailand	..	..	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.03
Turkey	5.48	4.27	3.79	7.25	7.25	8.84	6.15
Arab Countries	-0.05	-0.42	-0.31	0.22	3.89	11.63	2.49
<b>Other Partner Countries, Total</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.11</b>
<b>Non-DAC Countries, Total</b>	<b>12.14</b>	<b>13.68</b>	<b>10.62</b>	<b>14.58</b>	<b>14.18</b>	<b>22.84</b>	<b>14.67</b>
<b>Multilaterals</b>							
Arab Agencies	5	0.09	0.08	1.6	7.54	5.13	3.24
AsDF (Asian Dev. Fund)	2.61	..	0.15	0.17	4.16	19.44	5.31
EBRD	2.92	2.54	0.04	0.26	0.18	..	1.19
GEF	0.2	1.21	..	3	5.03	1.7	2.23
GAVI	..	..	..	0.23	3.66	5.87	3.25
Global Fund	0.41	3.92	5.65	8.44	6.34	12.24	6.17
IAEA	..	..	0.66	0.49	0.23	0.14	0.38
IDA	4.5	7.1	13.39	15.87	12.92	27.71	13.58
UNAIDS	..	0.14	0.18	0.38	0.26	0.27	0.25
UNDP	2.32	3.05	3.86	3.98	4.35	6.57	4.02
UNFPA	0.68	0.87	0.96	0.87	1.16	0.96	0.92
UNHCR	1.07	0.81	0.32	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.40
UNICEF	1.93	2.27	2.51	2.77	2.97	3.46	2.65
UNTA	0.81	1.37	1.42	1.16	0.37	0.37	0.92
EU Institutions	3.1	9.18	12.61	10.36	10.6	6.1	8.66
<b>Multilateral Agencies, Total</b>	<b>25.55</b>	<b>32.55</b>	<b>41.83</b>	<b>49.65</b>	<b>59.83</b>	<b>90.01</b>	<b>49.90</b>
<b>All Partners, Total</b>	<b>245.82</b>	<b>169.7</b>	<b>149.21</b>	<b>169.76</b>	<b>187.25</b>	<b>190.3</b>	<b>185.34</b>

Source: OECD DAC Online database, Table 2a. Destination of Official Development Assistance and Official Aid - Disbursements, as of 3/30/2011.





Series Name	Uzbekistan				Uzbekistan	Kyrgyz Republic	Tajikistan	Kazakhstan	ECA	World
	2006	2007	2008	2009	Average 2006-2009					
School enrollment, preprimary (% gross)	26.9	27.3	27.2	26.2	26.9	15.9	9.1 <sup>1</sup>	41.2	72.7 <sup>1</sup>	42.2 <sup>1</sup>
School enrollment, primary (% gross)	96.6	94.4	92.8	91.8	93.9	94.9	100.7 <sup>1</sup>	106.6		105.9 <sup>1</sup>
School enrollment, secondary (% gross)	100.6	102.4	101.4	103.5	102.0	85.4	83.7 <sup>1</sup>	94.7		66.3 <sup>1</sup>

Source: WB World Development Indicators (6/20/2011) for all indicators excluding those noted.

1. The average does not include 2009.
2. The data are for year 2008, since the data for other years are missing.
3. The data are for year 2006, since the data for other years are missing.
4. The data for 2008 and 2009 are the estimates of the Economist Intelligence Unit.
5. The data are from the Economist Intelligence Unit.

Annex Table 8: Uzbekistan - Millennium Development Goals

	1990	1995	2000	2009
<b>Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</b>				
Employment to population ratio, 15+, total (%)	54	52	54	58
Employment to population ratio, ages 15-24, total (%)	36	32	34	39
Income share held by lowest 20%	10.9	..	7.8	..
Malnutrition prevalence, weight for age (% of children under 5)	..	153	7.1	..
Poverty gap at \$1.25 a day (PPP) (%)	0	..	12	..
Poverty headcount ratio at \$1.25 a day (PPP) (% of population)	0	..	42	..
Prevalence of undernourishment (% of population)	5	5	19	11
Vulnerable employment, total (% of total employment)	..	..	..	..
<b>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education</b>				
Literacy rate, youth female (% of females ages 15-24)	..	..	99	100
Literacy rate, youth male (% of males ages 15-24)	..	..	99	100
Persistence to last grade of primary, total (% of cohort)	..	..	98	98
Primary completion rate, total (% of relevant age group)	..	98	96	92
Total enrollment, primary (% net)	..	..	..	90
<b>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women</b>				
Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments (%)	..	6	7	18
Ratio of female to male primary enrollment (%)	99	97	99	98
Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment (%)	..	..	97	99
Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment (%)	..	..	83	70
Share of women employed in the nonagricultural sector (% of total nonagricultural employment)	37	36	37.1	39.4
<b>Goal 4: Reduce child mortality</b>				
Immunization, measles (% of children ages 12-23 months)	84	91	99	95
Mortality rate, infant (per 1,000 live births)	61	57	53	32
Mortality rate, under-5 (per 1,000)	74	68	62	36
<b>Goal 5: Improve maternal health</b>				
Adolescent fertility rate (births per 1,000 women ages 15-19)	..	..	28	13
Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total)	..	98	96	..
Contraceptive prevalence (% of women ages 15-49)	..	56	67	..
Maternal mortality ratio (modeled estimate, per 100,000 live births)	53	32	29	30
Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%)	..	95	97	..
Unmet need for contraception (% of married women ages 15-49)	..	14	..	..
<b>Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases</b>				
Children with fever receiving antimalarial drugs (% of children under age 5 with fever)	..	..	..	..
Condom use, population ages 15-24, female (% of females ages 15-24)	..	..	3	..
Condom use, population ages 15-24, male (% of males ages 15-24)	..	..	18	..
Incidence of tuberculosis (per 100,000 people)	128	128	128	128
Prevalence of HIV, female (% ages 15-24)	..	..	..	0.1
Prevalence of HIV, male (% ages 15-24)	..	..	..	0
Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Tuberculosis case detection rate (% of all forms)	36	34	50	50
<b>Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability</b>				
CO2 emissions (kg per PPP \$ of GDP)	4.1	3.7	3.3	1.8
CO2 emissions (metric tons per capita)	5.3	4.4	4.8	4.3
Forest area (% of land area)	7	..	8	8
Improved sanitation facilities (% of population with access)	84	85	91	100
Improved water source (% of population with access)	90	90	89	87
Marine protected areas (% of total surface area)	..	..	..	..
<b>Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development</b>				
Debt service (PPG and IMF only, % of exports, excluding workers' remittances)	..	..	..	..
Internet users (per 100 people)	0	0	0.5	16.9
Mobile cellular subscriptions (per 100 people)	0	0	0	59
Net ODA received per capita (current US\$)	3	4	8	7
Telephone lines (per 100 people)	7	7	7	7
Other	..	..	..	..
Fertility rate, total (births per woman)	4.1	3.6	2.6	2.7
GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US\$)	600	580	630	1100
GNI, Atlas method (current US\$) (billions)	12.9	13.3	15.4	30.6
Gross capital formation (% of GDP)	32.2	27.2	16.3	26.1
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)	67	66	67	68
Literacy rate, adult total (% of people ages 15 and above)	..	..	97	99
Population, total (millions)	20.5	22.8	24.7	27.8
Trade (% of GDP)	76.6	56	46.1	72.8

Source: World Development Indicators database as of 4/13/2011.

Annex Table 9: List of IFC's investment in Uzbekistan that were approved during FY08-11

Project ID	Approval FY	Project Status	Project Size US\$ thousand	Greenfield or Existing	Primary Sector	Loan (net) US\$	Equity (net) US\$	Total net commitment US\$
27671	2009	Active	1,250,000	Greenfield	Wholesale and Retail Trade	1,250,000	0	1,250,000
27615	2010	Active	5,200,000	Existing	Finance & Insurance	2,000,000	3,200,000	5,200,000
30893	2011	Active	447,032	Existing	Finance & Insurance	0	440,715	440,715
<b>Grand Total</b>								<b>6,890,715</b>

Annex Table 10: List of IFC's Advisory Services in Uzbekistan, FY08-11.

Project ID	Project Name	Project Status	Primary Business Line	Total Funding, US\$	Start FY	End FY
27816	Uzbek Health PPP	Active	Public-Private Partnerships Transaction Advisory	412,000	2010	2012
559085	Uzbekistan: Building Capacity for Better Regulation	Closed	Investment Climate	655,000	2009	2011
569389	Uzbekistan FM Infrastructure	Active	Access To Finance	576,150	2010	2013
570307	Hamkorbank SME Banking	Active	Access To Finance	217,268	2010	2012
<b>Grand Total</b>				<b>1,860,418</b>		

Source: IFC Advisory database, April 2011.

Annex Table 11. Uzbekistan-Country Risk Rating

Country	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Uzbekistan	23.1	21.6	23.7	23.0	25.2	26.2	26.8	29.6
Kyrgyz Republic	17.1	18.3	21.2	22.5	21.5	25.0	24.1	25
Tajikistan	13.7	14.2	15.7	16.9	14.4	15.4	16.4	21.1
Kazakhstan	39.8	45.6	52.3	55.5	60.9	59.7	50.9	54

Source: IICCR score September 2010.

Note: 30 or less: High risk, 45 or above: low risk.

Annex Table 12: Uzbekistan - Summary of Achievements of the CAS Objectives

<b>CAS 08-11: Pillar 1 Enable Environment for Shared Growth</b>		<b>Actual Results (as of current month year)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	1. <b>Continue Sound Macroeconomic Management</b>		
	2. <b>Provide Institutional Support for WIS Implementation and Promote Good Governance</b>		
	3. <b>Foster Private Sector Development, Business Environment, and Investment Climate</b>		
<b>Major Outcome Measures</b>	1. <b>Continue Sound Macroeconomic Management</b>		
	NA		
	2. <b>Provide Institutional Support for WIS Implementation and Promote Good Governance</b>		
	Ensure the Government adopts techniques consistent with international practice for Household Budget Surveys and Labor Force Surveys	No information is available.	Negligible Progress. Source: CASCR.  Preparation of Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) is underway since early 2010 (with UNICEF support), but execution is underway only since 2011. Progress towards enhancing quality of poverty analysis (for Welfare Improvement Strategy (WIS) II) is limited to WBG analytical support.
	Equip the Government with M&E system for implementation of the WIS	WIS monitoring framework developed in Ministry of Economy (MoE), but not yet integrated into other ministries. M&E unit established, but not yet formally included in MoE. Database of over 170 M&E indicators created in MoE and in Ministries of Education and Health.	Modest Progress. Source: CASCR.
	Increase transparency in public resource utilization, measured by publication of summary budget execution reports	There was no publication of summary budget execution reports.	Modest Progress. Source: CASCR.  There was more regular budget reporting (monthly and quarterly) and greater comprehensiveness

CAS 08-11: Pillar 1 Enable Environment for Shared Growth		Actual Results (as of current month year)	Comments
			(e.g. all extra-budgetary funds, except Fund for Reconstruction & Development incorporated in treasury system). Treasury system adopted GFSM 2001-based budget classification in 2011.
<b>3. Foster Private Sector Development, Business Environment, and Investment Climate</b>			
Strengthen insurance regulation and supervision to promote and secure sound, stable insurance market	No information is available.	Negligible Progress. Source: CASCR.	
Increase private participation in infrastructure projects	No increase.	Modest Progress. Source: CASCR. Pilot PPP for medical diagnostic centers is under preparation with Presidential decision pending since February, 2011. MOUs are signed for pilot water supply & solid waste management PPPs.	
Develop leasing and housing finance sectors in line with international best practices.	Value of lease financing increased from \$265 million in 2007 to over \$770 million in 2009.  In mortgage market there was an increase in the depth of the mortgage market from a baseline of 0.28% of GDP in 2007 to 0.60% of GDP in 2010, in the number of banks offering mortgage loans from a baseline of 1 to 19, and in the mortgage portfolio as a percent of total loan portfolio across the banking sector from a baseline of 0.9% to 2.0%.	Substantial Progress. Source: CASCR  547630 CA Mortgage-UZB Internal Review (IR). June, 2010.  Law on Realtors' Activities is adopted and appraisal criteria for housing finance is drafted, publicly discussed, and approved by Appraisers' Associations. Mortgage lending training program, mortgage borrowers' guide, and mortgage best practices are developed.	
Improve system for credit information sharing as measured by Doing Business indicator and by increased number of credit reports issued	Credit information sharing increased by 1%.	Modest Progress. Source: CASCR.  Adoption of law On Sharing Credit Information is expected to facilitate increased coverage.	
Simplify tax administration	No outcome yet.	Modest Progress. Source: CASCR  IFC Advisory Service Supervision	

<b>CAS 08-11: Pillar 1 Enable Environment for Shared Growth</b>		<b>Actual Results (as of current month year)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
			Report. With the purpose of improving tax legislation and easing taxpayer's access to tax information (currently the largest tax compliance cost item) the IFC Advisory Service reviewed the Tax Code and published the official commentaries to Tax.
<b><u>Ongoing pre CAS/CPS 07-10 Support</u></b>	N/A		
<b><u>New Lending Support</u></b>	N/A		
<b><u>New Non-Lending Support (Grants and Special Financing Projects)</u></b>	N/A		
<b><u>Planned AAA</u></b>	P117694 Assessing Vulnerability TA		
	P107310 Assessing Vulnerability		
	P118021 FSD Policy Dialogue		
	P107951 Accounting & Auditing ROSC		
<b><u>Additional AAA</u></b>	P113829 Dialogue on Pov/Social Safety Nets		
	P119230 Uzbek PSM SUPPORT		
	P122644 UZ FSD Policy Dialogue		
	P118022 UZ Private Sector Dialogue		

<b>CPS 08-11: Pillar 2 Increase Income and Economic Opportunities in Rural Areas</b>		<b>Actual Results (as of current month year)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	<b>1. Promote Rural Development</b>		
	<b>2. Improve Water Resource Management, Irrigation and Drainage</b>		
<b>Major Outcome Measures</b>	<b>1. <u>Promote Rural Development</u></b>		
	Increase productivity of farming in area totaling 2 million ha, as measured by higher yields of cotton, wheat, potatoes, fruits, vegetables, silage corn	There is no information available, since according to ISR the project implementation is two-years old and results on yields will be collected after 2011 harvesting season.	Unknown Progress. Source: P109126 Rural Enterprise Support Project Phase II. IR. February, 2011.
	Enhance farm access to financial services in 7 regions, as measured by 500 new microcredit lines	RESP II participating banks finance agricultural machinery, greenhouses, equipment and materials for development of orchards, vineyards, animal husbandry, poultry and fisheries. RESP II participating banks disbursed. \$15.7 million to 185 beneficiaries to date.	Modest Progress. Source: CASCR P109126 Rural Enterprise Support Project Phase II. IR. February, 2011.
	<b>2. <u>Improve Water Resource Management, Irrigation and Drainage</u></b>		
	Enhance capacity and financial viability of Water Users' Associations (WUAs), as measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase maintenance conducted by WUAs: Baseline: 30% and Target: 45%,</li> <li>- Increase fee collection: Baseline: 15%, Target: 30%</li> </ul>		Modest Progress. Source: CASCR  International consultant is selected to design and supervise civil works. RRA and SDC consultants are completing financial and economic analysis of WUAs, with fee collection one of the main issues under review. Financial & institutional support is provided to restructure 84 administratively managed WUAs into 62 canal-level management/hydrographic units.  P109126 Rural Enterprise Support Project Phase II. IR. February, 2011.



<b>CPS 08-11: Pillar 2 Increase Income and Economic Opportunities in Rural Areas</b>		<b>Actual Results (as of current month year)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b><u>Ongoing pre CAS/CPS 08-10 Support</u></b>	P009127 Drainage, Irrigation & Wetlands Improvement Project - Phase 1	Approved FY 2003. Active.	Latest internal rating: Satisfactory, IR. 11/24/2011.
	P046043 Rural Enterprise Support Project	Approved FY 2002. Closed 2008.	IEG outcome rating: Satisfactory.
<b><u>New Lending Support</u></b>	P109126 Rural Enterprise Support Project Phase II	Approved FY 2008. Active.	Latest internal rating: Moderately Satisfactory, IR. 02/07/2011.
<b><u>New non- lending Support (Grants and Special Financing Projects)</u></b>	NA		
<b><u>Planned AAA</u></b>	NA		
<b><u>Additional AAA</u></b>	NA		

<b>CPS 08-11: Pillar 3 Improve Service Delivery</b>		<b>Actual Results (as of current month year)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	<b>1. Support Municipal Services Sector Development and Financing</b>		
	<b>2. Improve Health Indices</b>		
	<b>3. Improve Basic Education and Learning</b>		
<b>Major Outcome Measures</b>	<b>1. Support Municipal Services Sector Development and Financing</b>		
	<p>Improve access to safe water and sanitation in Bukhara and Samarkand project areas, as measured by:</p> <p>(a) Reliable water supply: -Baseline (2007): Bukhara - 87%; -Samarkand - 48%</p> <p>(b) Enhanced water quality: -Baseline (2007): % of samples failing quality tests in -Bukhara - 8%; -Samarkand - 40%, -Target (2011): less than 5%</p> <p>(c) Strengthened financial viability, as measured by improved collections of water tariff: -Baseline (2007): Bukhara--67%; Samarkan--44%, -Target(2011): Bukhara--87%; -Samarkand--80%</p>	<p>(a) Access to reliable water supply increased to 99.9% in project areas.</p> <p>(b) Water quality improved in project areas: Bukhara: 5% and Samarkand: 0.0% in June, 2010.</p> <p>(c) Collection rates for residential customers were for Bukhara: 107% and for Samarkand: 68%.</p>	<p>Substantial Progress. Source: P049621 Bukhara-Samarkand Water Supply Project. IR. December, 2010.</p>
	<b>2. Improve Health Indices</b>		
	<p>Enhance access to quality health care, as measured by:</p> <p>(a) Increased use of primary health care services - % of pregnant women receiving antenatal care in first 12 weeks: -Baseline (2007)— 85% -Target (2011)—95%,</p> <p>(b) % of CRHs using case-based financing: -Baseline (2007) : 0% -Target (2011): 100% in at least one oblast</p>	<p>No information is available.</p> <p>No progress.</p>	<p>Negligible Progress. Source: CASCR.</p> <p>Percent of public health</p>

<b>CPS 08-11: Pillar 3 Improve Service Delivery</b>		<b>Actual Results (as of current month year)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
(c)	% of public health expenditures on primary health and out-patient care: -Baseline (2007)—43% -Target (2011)—50%	No information is available.	expenditures on primary health care increased to 47% in 2009. No information is available on outpatient care or on 2010 for the targeted indicator.
	Improve HIV/AIDS prevention & control, as measured by:  (a) % of HIV-positive women receiving ARV treatment voluntarily: -Baseline (2007)—70%, -Target (2011)—100%  (b) % of HIV-positive children born to HIV-positive mothers: -Baseline (2007)—60%, -Target (2010)—85%  (c) % of HIV-positive pregnant women receiving ARV prophylaxis: -Baseline (2007)—90%, -Target (2010) —100%.	(a) 100% coverage of HIV+ pregnant women with ARV treatment.  (b) No information is available.  (c) No information is available.	Negligible Progress. Source: CASCR.
	Improve seasonal flu prevention & control, as measured by:  • % of at-risk population vaccinated: - - Baseline(2007)— 50% - - Target (2010)—100%  • # of AI diagnostic tests annually on animal and human samples	No information is available.	Unknown Progress. Source: P104304 Uzbekistan – Avian Influenza Control and Human Pandemic Preparedness and Response Project. “Report on Project Evaluation and Beneficiary Survey.” 2009.  Influenza vaccines are procured. Chain of specialists is being vaccinated. No progress on diagnostic tests.
	<b>3. <u>Improve Basic Education and Learning</u></b>		
	Ensure schools adopt quality enhancing techniques, materials and participatory practices as measured by:  (a) % of schools with core set of educational materials available: -Baseline (2007): 10%, -Target (2011): 80%.  (b) % of retrained teachers in project	(a) No progress.    (b) No progress.	Negligible Progress. Source: P107845 Second Basic Education. IR. November, 2010. P094042 Basic Education Phase 1. IR. February 2011  (a) Schools in the process of developing requests for materials. It will take 18 to 20 months until schools get the materials.  (b) Training was postponed to a

<b>CPS 08-11: Pillar 3 Improve Service Delivery</b>		<b>Actual Results (as of current month year)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	schools -Baseline(2007): 5% -Target (2011): 70% (c) % of project schools with active boards -Baseline (2007): 75% -Target: (2011): 85%	(c)No progress.	new project. (c) The output available is percent of schools boards at project schools that have implemented a school improvement proposal. Proposal writing in 163 schools is progressing well.
<b><u>Ongoing pre CAS/CPS 07-10 Support</u></b>	P049621 Bukhara & Samarkand Water Supply Project	Approved FY 2002. Closed FY 2010.	IR rating: Moderately Satisfactory. 12/17/2010.
	P051370 Health 2 Project	Approved FY 2005. Active.	Latest internal rating: Moderately Satisfactory, IR. 01/10/2011.
	P094042 BASIC EDUCATION, Phase I	Approved FY 2007. Closed FY 2011.	Latest internal rating: Satisfactory, IR. 2010/11/27.
<b><u>New Lending Support</u></b>	P112719 Bukhara & Samarkand Sewerage	Approved FY 2010. Closed FY 2015.	Latest internal rating: Moderately Satisfactory, IR. 11/01/2010.
	P113349 Health III	Approved FY 2011. Active.	
	P107845 Basic Education II	Approved FY 2009. Active.	Latest internal rating: Moderately Satisfactory, IR. 12/17/2010.
<b><u>New non-lending Support (Grants and Special Financing Projects)</u></b>	P101583 Health & Education ME& Capacity Building IDF Grant		
	P104304 Uzbekistan - Avian Influenza Control & Human Pandemic Preparedness Project		
	P092243 Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition - Nat'l Flour Fortification Program		
<b><u>Planned AAA</u></b>	NA		
<b><u>Additional AAA</u></b>	NA		

<b>CPS 09-11: Pillar 4</b> Provide Environmental Management, Disaster Risk Management and Global Goods		<b>Actual Results</b> (as of current month year)	<b>Comments</b>
<b><u>Objectives</u></b>	1. Provide Environmental Management		
	2. Provide Disaster Risk Management, Weather Forecasting, and Adaptation to Climate Change		
	3. Achieve Energy Efficiency and Develop Pilot Renewable Energy Investments		
	4. Provide Global Public Goods		
<b><u>Major Outcome Measures</u></b>	1. <b><u>Provide Environmental Management</u></b>		
	NA		
	2. <b><u>Provide Disaster Risk Management, Weather Forecasting, and Adaptation to Climate Change</u></b>		
	Establish optimal adaptation strategies for managing risks to energy sector of changing climatic hazards		Negligible Progress. Source: CASCR  Three workshops for over 100 energy sector professionals held on Climate Vulnerability, Risk and Adaptation Assessments. Recommendations for improving climate resilience of energy sector are developed and proposed to government.
	Analysis and prioritization of obsolete pesticide contaminated sites initiated	No information is available.	Negligible Progress.
	3. <b><u>Achieve Energy Efficiency and Develop Pilot Renewable Energy Investments</u></b>		

<b>CPS 09-11: Pillar 4</b> <b>Provide Environmental Management, Disaster Risk Management and Global Goods</b>		<b>Actual Results</b> <b>(as of current month year)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	Enhance awareness of energy savings & sources of renewable energy in selected remote areas, as measured by # of equipped public service buildings in remote areas	There is no progress on this outcome.	Negligible Progress.  The projects targeting them are in the early stage of implementation.
	<b>4. Provide Global Public Goods</b>		
	Reduced greenhouse gas emissions, as measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Baseline (2004): 121 m. tons CO2</li> </ul> </li> <li>Intensity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Baseline (2004): 2,686 tons CO2 per mln. 2000 ppp US\$ GDP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	No information is available.	Negligible Progress. Source: CASCR.  Nine Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects are registered at UNFCCC Secretariat between 2009 and 2011. Uzbekneftegaz endorsed Global Gas Flaring Reduction Partnership and its Voluntary Standard for Global Gas Flaring Reduction, and became Partner of GGFR. Associated Gas Recovery Plan (AGRP) is prepared and presented in September, 2010.
<b>Ongoing pre CAS/CPS 07-10 Support</b>	NA		
<b>New Lending Support</b>	P119939 Talimarjan gas-fired thermal	Approved FY 2011. Active.	
	P118737 Energy Efficiency Facility for Industrial Enterprises	Approved FY 2010. Active.	Latest internal rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory, IR. 03/30/2011.
<b>New non-lending Support (Grants and Special Financing Projects)</b>	NA		
<b>Planned AAA</b>	P119391 Uzbekistan Municipal Governance TA		
<b>Additional AAA</b>	NA		