

Annual Planning and Quarterly Progress Reporting

Project title: Local Governance Support Project: participation and partnership (LGSP)

Award ID: 00059422

Project ID: 00074296

Implementing partner: Cabinet of Ministers of Republic of Uzbekistan

Period covered in this report: March 1 – December 31, 2010

Date of last QPR: September 30, 2010

Date of the last Project Board meeting: 10 December 10, 2010

Project Performance

1. Please list the annual targets for the reporting year as set out in the project document and/or AWP:

- 1.1 The process of awareness-raising and an engaged dialog with key stakeholders – government, civil society, private sector and the general public is launched
- 2.1. A program on expert review of framework governance laws is initiated
- 3.1. Local governments identify the types of information that can be made widely available (based on citizen's opinion poll)
- 3.2. The concept of press services is diffused among local governments
- 4.1. Capacity Assessment of civil servants to provide public service delivery
- 4.2. Training needs of civil servants on national, regional and local levels are assessed (the assessment is gender sensitive)
- 5.1. Quality dialogue of governments with the civil society and the private sector in policy formulation and decision making is launched. Capacity development of NGOs
- 6.1. Existing partnerships analyzed, new progressive approaches applicable in the Uzbek context are identified

Please specify below what has been the progress towards the above indicated targets during the reporting period:

- 1.1 The Statute on Interagency Working Group (IWG) was prepared and submitted to Cabinet of Ministers for consideration.

E-database of government initiatives and one analytical paper on improvement of institutional and legal bases and delegation of government functions were prepared.

Three mainstream themes – UNDP international experience in local governance development, engagement of NGOs in regional strategic planning process, and effective ways to deliver governmental services – have been compiled in 3 analytical papers. Findings and materials will be distributed among local authorities in pilot regions.

Summary report on sets of measures to improve the quality of technical and administrative aspects of activities of local authorities (Khokimiyats) and civil society institutions (Mahallas) has been prepared.

Based on these findings analytical report is being prepared for the Cabinet of Ministers' review.
- 2.1. Analysis on legislative data in the field of budget preparation on central and local levels (income part) which included field work in two pilot regions and analytical report on local budget planning (income part) with coherent proposals and recommendations to improve current legislation in local regional budget planning was completed.

- 3.1 Summary report of national legislation on access to information was prepared; survey on access to information in two pilot regions was completed. Based on these findings analytical report on access to information was prepared for the CoM review.
- 3.2 Concept on Public Relations was prepared for distribution among local authority institutions. The Programme to implement the Concept on Public Relations with establishment of offices of press-services in local government institutions (Khokimiyats) in two pilot regions is being developed.
- 4.1. Inventory of public service was initiated and 5 most popular public services were identified for further functional analysis and capacity assessment of public servants to deliver these services. International Consultant from Bratislava Regional Center was invited to accomplish scoping mission on further capacity assessment of civil servants for effective delivery of 5 selected public services. Based on recommendations of International Consultant Capacity Development Expert will be invited in 2011 to complete capacity assessment and partial functional analysis in two pilot regions.
- 4.2. Training needs assessment of civil servants on national, regional and local levels was re-scheduled for 2011 (the assessment is gender-sensitive).
- 5.1. E-database on current legislation on NGOs in Uzbekistan, survey in two pilot regions on NGO development and engagement, summary report on current trends on NGOs in Uzbekistan, and a set of coherent proposals to improve the legislation on NGOs in Uzbekistan were prepared. Accordingly, analytical report on NGOs engagement with local authorities is being prepared for the Cabinet of Ministers' review.

Analytical research paper on current legislation on private enterprises, methodology and questionnaires for survey on Private Enterprises, and set of coherent proposals and recommendations to engage private enterprises with local authorities were developed. Based on these findings, analytical report on engagement of private sector into regional decision making is being prepared for consideration of the Cabinet of Ministers.

Training modules on NGOs capacity development in two pilot regions in 2011 were developed.

- 6.1. Summary report on current national legislation on PPP and comparative analysis of PPP in other countries were developed and two pilot initiatives – ecotourism in Djizzak and communal services (water management) in Namangan - were identified. Based on these findings analytical report on PPP initiatives is being developed for consideration by the Cabinet of Ministers.

2. Implementation / Quality Log (to be completed by Project Managers)

PLANNING FOR THE YEAR		REPORTING IS TO BE ENTERED ON QUARTERLY BASIS Update on Quality Log / Activity Quality Assessment (report on this Quarter only)				
Actual progress made/ User perspective		Activity Result 1: High level policy dialogue and reform of public administration for ensuring an effective, strategic and practical approach to pro-poor service delivery promoted. Start date of the Activity: May 6, 2010 End Date of the Activity: December 31, 2013				
Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)	Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)	Due Date	Responsible person in the project	Timeliness (were the achievements reached within the planned timeframe)	Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)	Quality rating (from 1 to 9) and % of completion
1. Number of government officials, representatives of CSOs, private sector and general public engaged in discussion on public administration reforms.	1. Interagency Working Group on Governance Reform is established with regular (quarterly) consultative meetings, Feedback from participants, Recommendations from roundtables,	December 2010	Project Manager	Quarter 2	Quarter 2	Quarter 2
		December 2011		On Track	On Track	On Track
		December 2012		Quarter 3	Quarter 3	Quarter 3
		December 2013		On Track	On Track	On Track
2. At least 3 analytical papers and recommendations on Governance provided for the Government's consideration.	2. Policy briefs, survey results, feedback lists, minutes of Project Board meeting Road Map for Governance Reform.	December 2011		Quarter 4	Quarter 4	Quarter 4
		December 2013		On Track	On Track	On Track
				Quarter 2	Quarter 2	Quarter 2
				On Track	On Track	On Track
				The activity was delayed due to the late approval of the questionnaires from the CoM.		
				Creation of Inter-departmental Working Group was discussed at the meeting with NPC.		
				Project workshops were conducted in two pilot regions. More than 40 government officials were present at average in each pilot region.		
				The Statute of Inter-governmental Working Group was developed and submitted to Cabinet of Ministers.		
				One Legal adviser on review of legislation and development of E-database on govt initiatives was recruited,		
				One Local Consultant on International Experience on regional strategic planning and government services was hired.		
				E-database on government initiatives on public administration reforms was developed;		

<p>3. Number of civil servants trained on equality issues (gender, disabilities, age, etc); at least 2 recommendation papers on women empowerment developed and submitted for Governments' review.</p>	<p>3 Feedback from participants; Minutes of the Project Board meetings</p>	<p>September 2013</p>	<p>Quarter 4 Two analytical research papers on decentralization of public functions from central government to local state authorities and interaction between central and regional state authorities with set coherent proposals and recommendations to amend the current legislation were prepared. Three analytical papers on UNDP international experience in local governance development, engagement of NGOs in regional strategic planning process, and effective ways to deliver governmental services have been prepared for distribution among local authorities in the pilot regions. Summary report on sets of measures to improve the quality of technical and administrative aspects of activities of local authorities (Khokimiya) and civil society institutions (Mahallas) has been prepared.</p>	<p>Quarter 4 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 4 On Track</p>
<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p>
<p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p>
<p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>
<p>PLANNING FOR THE YEAR</p>					
<p>REPORTING IS TO BE ENTERED ON QUARTERLY BASIS</p>					
<p><i>Update on Quality Log / Activity Quality Assessment (report on this Quarter only)</i></p>					
<p>Activity Result 2: Institutional and legal framework for streamlining the work and relationships between and within executive and legislative authorities at the local and national level reviewed.</p>					
<p>Start date of the Activity: May 6, 2010</p>	<p>End Date of the Activity: December 31, 2013</p>				<p>Quality rating (from 1 to 9) and % of completion</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>

1. At least 2 recommendation papers on amendments of current legislation on Public Administration submitted for the Government's review	1. Feedback from the Round table's participants Minutes of Project Board meeting	December 2013	Project Manager	<p>Quarter 2 TOR for Legal Adviser on functional analyses on regional level was prepared; TOR for Financial Adviser on budget planning was prepared.</p> <p>Quarter 3 Analysis on regional budget planning was initiated to submit set of recommendations on improvement of current legislation on regional budget planning (income part).</p> <p>Quarter 4 Based on surveys in pilot regions analytical research paper on local budgeting system (income part) was developed.</p>	<p>Quarter 2 The activity was delayed due to postponing the functional analysis process until October 2010</p> <p>Quarter 3 Postponed until October 2010</p> <p>Quarter 4 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 2 On Track</p> <p>Quarter 3 Postponed until October 2010</p> <p>Quarter 4 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 On Track</p>	
2. At least 2 proposals to improve performance of public functions based on structural and functional analysis submitted for the Government's review	2. Survey results Minutes of Project Board meeting	December 2011		<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	
PLANNING FOR THE YEAR				REPORTING IS TO BE ENTERED ON QUARTERLY BASIS				
Activity Result 3: Access to information on activities of government bodies facilitated at all levels				<i>Update on Quality Log / Activity Quality Assessment (report on this Quarter only)</i>				
Start date of the Activity: May 6, 2010 Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)	Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)	Due Date	Responsible person in the project	Actual progress made/ User perspective				Quality rating (from 1 to 9) and % of completion
End Date of the Activity: December 31, 2013				Timeliness (were the achievements reached within the planned timeframe)				Resources Usage (were the achievements reached within the planned budget)

1. The concept of press-services developed and submitted for Government's review	1) Minutes of Project Board meetings Feedback from roundtables' participants	March 2011	Project Manager	<p>Quarter 2 Two experts (legal specialist and specialist on Public Relations) were recruited; First draft of methodology to conduct survey and questionnaires on free access of information were prepared and submitted for review; Initiated recruitment process of 4 local pollsters for each region to conduct survey.</p> <p>Quarter 3 Questionnaires on access to information were developed and approved by Cabinet of Ministers; Survey on access to information started in two pilot regions; the first results are being processed.</p> <p>Quarter 4 A summary report on national legislation on access to information in Uzbekistan was prepared; Based on the survey results provided an analytical research paper on access to information was prepared. Based on these findings the analytical report for consideration of CoM was prepared. The Concept of Public Relations was prepared and submitted for consideration of CoM.</p>	Quarter 2 On Track	Quarter 2 On Track	Quarter 2 On Track
2. At least 25 government officials from two pilot regions trained on PK and effective communication (at least 20% of opposite gender)	2) Feedback from participants , lists of participants	December 2011		<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p>	Quarter 2 Currently N/A	Quarter 2 Currently N/A	Quarter 2 Currently N/A

		Quarter 4 Currently N/A	Quarter 4 Currently N/A	Quarter 4 Currently N/A	Quarter 4 Currently N/A	Quarter 4 Currently N/A
3. Number of e-governance elements introduced and enhanced for better operability and responsiveness	3) Needs assessment; Technical assessment report # of website visits; Minutes of the Project Board meetings	Quarter 2 Currently N/A	Quarter 2 Currently N/A	Quarter 2 Currently N/A	Quarter 2 Currently N/A	Quarter 2 Currently N/A
	July 2012	Quarter 3 Currently N/A	Quarter 3 Currently N/A	Quarter 3 Currently N/A	Quarter 3 Currently N/A	Quarter 3 Currently N/A
		Quarter 4 Currently N/A	Quarter 4 Currently N/A	Quarter 4 Currently N/A	Quarter 4 Currently N/A	Quarter 4 Currently N/A
PLANNING FOR THE YEAR						
REPORTING IS TO BE ENTERED ON QUARTERLY BASIS						
<i>Update on Quality Log / Activity Quality Assessment (report on this Quarter only)</i>						
Activity Result 4: Capacities of local governments to deliver public services enhanced through professional trainings, introducing modern and innovative approaches to rural/urban management						
Start date of the Activity: May 6, 2010		End Date of the Activity: December 31, 2013				
Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)	Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)	Actual progress made/ User perspective	Timeliness (were the achievements reached within the planned timeframe)	Resources Usage (were the achievements reached within the planned budget)	Quality rating (from 1 to 9) and % of completion	
1). Number of training modules on public services developed and introduced	1). Training modules; Minutes of Project Board meetings	Quarter 2 Two experts on public services for drafting list of government services and define 5 government functions per each region for further analyses recruited; One expert on review of international experience and UNDP endeavors worldwide was recruited; Recruitment process to contract sociological centre or local sociologists to conduct assessment on defining potential of government officials was initiated.	Quarter 2 On Track	Quarter 2 On Track	Quarter 2 Currently N/A	Quarter 2 Currently N/A
	December 2013	Project Manager	Quarter 3 The process was delayed due to cancellation of two contracts of two experts.	Quarter 3	Quarter 3	Quarter 3

<p>Quarter 4</p> <p>Inventory of local public services in two pilot regions was prepared for further functional analysis and capacity assessment.</p> <p>5 most popular government services 3 in Dizzak and 2 in Namanagan – were identified after inventory of public service in two pilot regions for further functional analysis and capacity development.</p> <p>International Consultant from Bratislava Regional Center was invited for scoping mission for in-depth interviews and focus group discussions to identify the schedule for capacity assessment based on these 5 functions.</p>	<p>Quarter 4</p> <p>On track</p>	<p>Quarter 4</p> <p>On track</p>	<p>Quarter 4</p> <p>On track</p>	<p>Quarter 4</p> <p>On track</p>
<p>Quarter 2</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>
<p>Quarter 3</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 3</p> <p>Currently N/A</p>
<p>Quarter 4</p>	<p>Quarter 4</p>	<p>Quarter 4</p>	<p>Quarter 4</p>	<p>Quarter 4</p>
<p align="center">REPORTING IS TO BE ENTERED ON QUARTERLY BASIS</p>				
<p align="center"><i>Update on Quality Log / Activity Quality Assessment (report on this Quarter only)</i></p>				
<p>Activity Result 5: Civil Society Partnership: mechanism of participation of citizens through local self-governance bodies and civil society institutions in the process of local development issues and strategic planning is institutionalized</p>				
<p align="center">PLANNING FOR THE YEAR</p>				
<p>2) Number of middle and low-ranking government officials from khokimiyats and regional state agencies in two piloted regions trained on provision of public services (30 % are women)</p>	<p>2) Surveys of participants, Minutes of Project Board meetings; BTORs; Experts' reports</p>	<p>December 2011 December 2013</p>	<p>Responsible person in the project</p>	<p>Quality rating (from 1 to 9) and % of completion</p>
<p>Start date of the Activity: May 6, 2010</p> <p>Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)</p>	<p>Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)</p>	<p>Due Date</p>	<p>Actual progress made/ User perspective</p>	<p>Resources Usage (were achievements reached within the planned budget)</p>
<p>End Date of the Activity: December 31, 2013</p>				

<p>1) At least one research and two analytical papers on civil society and private sector engagement in strategic planning process prepared and submitted for Government's review;</p>	<p>1) Minutes of Project Board meetings; Recommendations from round tables</p>	<p>December 2011</p>	<p>Project Manager</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Two experts on defining potential of NGOs in the region and training needs assessment were recruited; One expert from CCI on defining potential of private enterprises was hired to do reports and surveys in two pilot regions; Recruitment process of the specialists on assessment of private enterprises and define administrative borders on their development was initiated; Six pollsters for survey on private enterprises recruited to do surveys in two pilot regions. Quarter 3 Questionnaires to assess local NGOs and private enterprises were developed; Surveys of local NGOs and private enterprises were launched; E-database on current legislation on NGOs in Uzbekistan and summary report on current trends of NGOs in Uzbekistan prepared. Quarter 4 One summary report with set of coherent proposals and recommendations on improvement of national legislation on NGOs was prepared; Based on surveys in two pilot regions on NGOs one summary report with set of coherent proposals and recommendations on improvement of NGOs and enhancement of engagement of NGOs in local decision making was prepared; Based on these findings and research one analytical report on NGOs' active engagement in local decision making is being prepared for CoM consideration; Based on the survey results on private enterprises in two pilot regions one summary report with set of coherent proposals and recommendations on improvement of private enterprises and enhancement of engagement of private enterprises in local decision making was prepared; Based on these findings and research one analytical report on improvement of private enterprises and enhancement of engagement of private enterprises in local decision making was prepared for CoM consideration</p>	<p>Quarter 2 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 2 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p>
					<p>Quarter 3 On track</p>	<p>Quarter 3 On track</p>	<p>Quarter 3 On track</p>
					<p>Quarter 4 On track</p>	<p>Quarter 4 On track</p>	<p>Quarter 4 On track</p>

2). Number of Government officials, CSO and private sector representatives engaged in decision making process	2). Assessment reports and survey results; Minutes of Project Board meetings; BTOR	December 2011 December 2012	<p>Quarter 2 Partnership with National Association of NGOs on further development of NGOs in the field was established;</p> <p>Process to establish partnership with Chamber of Commerce and Trade, Business Women Association and Farmers Association was initiated</p> <p>Quarter 3 N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Training modules on NGOs capacity development in two pilot regions in 2011 were developed.</p> <p>Engagement (regular meetings, group discussions, focus-groups) of government officials, CSO, and private sector was postponed until 2011.</p>	<p>Quarter 2 On Track</p> <p>Quarter 3 On Track</p> <p>Quarter 4 On track</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 On Track</p> <p>Quarter 4 On track</p>
---	--	--------------------------------	---	--	---

PLANNING FOR THE YEAR				REPORTING IS TO BE ENTERED ON QUARTERLY BASIS			
				Update on Quality Log / Activity Quality Assessment (report on this Quarter only)			
Activity Result 6: Public Private Partnership: Modern and innovative approaches to public service provision and recreational facilities management in the pilot regions showcased							
Start date of the Activity: May 5, 2010							
End Date of the Activity: December 31, 2013							
Quality criteria (i.e. how/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?)	Quality method (what method will be used for this criteria?)	Due Date	Responsible person in the project	Actual progress made/ User perspective	Timeliness (were the achievements reached within the planned timeframe)	Resources Usage (were the achievements reached within the planned budget)	Quality rating (from 1 to 9) and % of completion
1) At least 3 analytical documents on public-private partnerships developed and submitted for Government's review	1) Report of national and international experts; Minutes of Project Board meetings; BTORs.	December 2011	Project Manager	<p>Quarter 2 One local expert on current analyses of situation of PPP in the regions and comparative analyses of international PPP experience was recruited.</p>	<p>Quarter 2 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 2 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 2 On Track</p>

<p>2). At least two public-private partnership projects developed and presented to the Government for further implementation</p>				<p>Quarter 3 One summary report on current legislation on PPP was prepared; One analytical research paper on international experience in PPP was prepared;</p> <p>Quarter 4 One analytical report on PPP and development of two pilot initiatives on PPP in Uzbekistan is being prepared for consideration of Cabinet of Ministers</p>	<p>Quarter 3 On Track</p> <p>Quarter 4 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 3 On Track</p> <p>Quarter 4 On Track</p>	<p>Quarter 3 On Track</p> <p>Quarter 4 On Track</p>
	<p>2). Concept notes; Feedback from roundtable participants; Minutes of the Project Board meetings</p>	<p>December 2013</p>		<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>	<p>Quarter 2 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 3 Currently N/A</p> <p>Quarter 4 Currently N/A</p>

3. Issues

a) Please specify the issues that were raised during the reporting period to the attention of the Project Board. Describe the steps taken to solve those (Management response in ATLAS).

#	Description	Countermeasures / Mngt response taken
1.	Work in the regions (Namangan and Djizzak) due to absence of office premises and means of communication	- Assistance from NPC for obtaining office premises was requested; project staff was temporarily located at the HR project premises
2.	Questionnaires for planned surveys under activity 1, 3, 4, and 5 were approved late due to busy schedule of National Project Coordinator so outcomes from these surveys came later than it was scheduled in Project Document.	- Surveys were completed a bit behind schedule but local consultants were requested to fasten their outputs so all materials (reports, analyses, and research papers) were completed as it was scheduled in 2010.
3.	Under Activity 4 it was planned to complete inventory of public services in two pilot regions for further capacity assessment of government employees in delivering public service. Local consultants hired to prepare qualified and substantial reports capacity assessment of civil servants provided low quality reports and materials and their contracts were cancelled.	- Newly recruited consultant prepared the background materials although later than it was scheduled in Project Document. Due to late reports under these circumstances capacity assessment in public service delivery was postponed for January-February 2011.
4.	Due to technical problems \$30,000 received from HQ (German funds) were allocated under wrong donor code and thus became unavailable.	- Additional \$30,000 of TRAC funds were included in 2013 budget in lieu of unavailable donor's funds.

4. Project risks

a) Please provide update on any changes with regard to the above indicated risks (e.g. risk occurred; no change and etc.). Specify the responses taken for each of those.

#	Description	Countermeasures / Mngt response taken	Status
1.	Due to delay in start of implementation of the project, some activities will be done later than scheduled in the workplan.	Assistance from NPC requested to obtain office premises;	Risk occurred
2.	Approval of conducting assessments and surveys as well as making comments by NPC would take more time due to NPC's busy schedule, which may result in delays of further activities	Funds for delayed activities are allocated within 2011 AWP; additional workload is distributed among project team members so that delayed activities could be successfully implemented in 2011.	Risk occurred
3.	Low level of commitment from partners due to insufficient understanding of the envisaged reforms at regional and local levels	Constant contact with government partners is influencing raising awareness of state officials and representatives of local governments in pilot regions regarding the project implementation process, current status, obstacles and achievements are being conducted.	No change
4.	Weak capacity of the civil society and the private sector may prevent a meaningful dialog from taking place	Capacity of NGOs and private sector in pilot regions were analyzed. Training and seminars for NGOs and private sector representatives are scheduled for 2011 to enhance their capacities and support engagement into regional decision making	No change
5.	Resource mobilization does not produce sufficient funds to support the government priorities	Additional grant money were raised for supporting the institutionalization of Information centers at local governments in pilot regions; Constant work on raising additional funds for the project is conducted. At the same time co-financing of project activities is widely promoted among partners.	Risk decreased

b) Please identify risks (if any) you anticipate for the next Quarters:

--

5. Financial management


Current AWP budget:

USD 263,900


Current expenditure (broken down by donor) **USD 249,954**
Current delivery rate: **89.3%**
Expected delivery by end of the year: **USD 263,900 (in USD)**

6. Required steps for the next Quarter (if any?)

Please specify below any adjustments (revisions) required under the approved AWP/project document in terms of project activities or budget adjustments, if applicable (e.g. due to low delivery)

Prepared by:  Dilshod Isroilov, Project Manager

Cleared by:  Aziza Umarova, Head of Good Governance Unit

Cleared by:  Bakhrom Kuchkarov, National Project Coordinator

Checklist to be completed by the Programme focal point:

Before completing this checklist, programme focal point has to visit the Executive Snapshot/Programme & Project Management > Overview of Awards > Select Award ID > Click on "View the Progress Report for this Award."

- Yes No Quality Log/Progress report is updated in ATLAS
- Yes No Risk logs is updated in ATLAS by Project Manager and management response is updated by Programme Officer / programme focal point
- Yes No Issues logs is updated in ATLAS
- Yes No Lessons learned are reflected appropriately (offline in the programme files)
- Yes No N/A Budget revision is approved (if applicable)

If for some boxes, "No" was checked, please provide justification:

Signed by:

 Natalya Pygay, Programme Associate, GGU