

**Lykke Andersen\***

## **Development Cooperation Experiences from Uzbekistan\*\***

### **New Trends in Development Cooperation and Focus on Development Effectiveness**

**S**ince the late 1980s there has been considerable focus on and debate about the purpose of technical cooperation its performance and long-term impact. (This article refers to technical cooperation based on the OECD/DAC definition. OECD/DAC defines technical cooperation

---

*\*Lykke Andersen, Deputy Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme, Uzbekistan. (lykke.andersen@undp.org)*

*\*\*This article focuses on the role of aid in supporting the achievements of the MDGs in Uzbekistan and discusses its effectiveness. The views presented in the article are solely the views of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of UNDP.*

as: (a) grants to nationals of aid recipient countries receiving education or training at home or abroad, and (b) payments to consultants, advisers and similar personnel as well as teachers and administrators serving in aid recipient countries, (including the cost of associated equipment).) Several studies have been undertaken since the beginning of the new millennium on the effectiveness of technical cooperation and development cooperation. UNDP has been very active in this area and has undertaken much work on the contribution of technical cooperation to capacity development.

In general, technical cooperation has led to very mixed results. There have been numerous micro-successes for millions of people around the developing world in improving infrastructure, health care, education, housing, as well as improving means of productive livelihoods in agriculture and industry. Evaluations show that the proportion of “effective” projects is usually over 60%.<sup>1</sup>

However, at the macro level the failure of aid has been the inability to render itself redundant. There is a widespread belief that traditional technical cooperation does not function effectively and has failed to achieve its intended purpose of enhancing development and reducing poverty. Technical cooperation is being criticised for being inefficient, supply-rather than demand-driven, undermining local capacity, distorting local labour markets, lacking sustainability, having a negative impact on self-esteem in the aid-receiving countries, and often being of low quality.

Recipient countries are often being criticised for having inadequate systems of accountability and public participation, misguided policies and priorities, lack of transparency and corruption, demotivated officials and inefficient bureaucracies. Furthermore, recipient countries often suffer from weak leadership and lack of strategic vision. However, despite the criticism that technical cooperation has been ineffective, there is also an increased recognition that, for a variety of reasons, international public transfers from developed countries to developing countries to help boost the development process continue to be justified. Official Development Assistance (ODA) continues to play an essential role as a complement to other sources of financing for development, especially in those countries with the least capacity to attract private direct investment. For many countries in Africa, least developed countries, small island states and land-locked countries, ODA is still the largest external financing and is critical to the achievements of the *Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs).

Furthermore, the 1990s showed increased recognition that the global development challenges can only be addressed in partnership, and world leaders made important commitments to jointly address those challenges. This process culminated in the *Millennium Summit* in September 2000, where more than 150 heads of state and government endorsed the *Millennium Declaration* in an effort to ensure that globalisation would bring opportunities and benefits to all countries in the world. The *Millennium Declaration* gave a new impetus to halving poverty by 2015 and to the development goals which had emerged from the global conferences of the 1990s.

*The Millennium Development Goals* (See Table 1) have brought a much clearer focus to the global development challenges, together with the target date of 2015. The MDGs represent the internationalisation of global norms and standards, and their realisation is a task to which all countries, including aid recipients and donors, must contribute.

**Table 1. Millennium Development Goals**

<b>Millennium Development Goals</b>
Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education
Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women
Goal 4: Reduce child mortality
Goal 5: Improve maternal health
Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability
Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development

The primary responsibility for achieving the first seven MDGs lies with the developing countries. However, evidence so far indicates that most developing countries will not be able to meet the MDGs without additional resources and related policy actions by development partners. It is estimated that resources of USD 50 billion a year are required to meet the MDGs.<sup>2</sup>

At the *International Conference on Financing for Development* in Monterrey in March 2002, many donors renewed their determination to advance ODA contributions towards the 0.7% of GNP target. However,

most countries have not yet followed through on this commitment, and in 2003 only 5 out of 22 donor countries had met the international target, and only 5 countries had announced specific plans to do so in the coming years.

As such, ODA levels today remain insufficient, and the gap between the progress and the commitments made in Monterrey to help meet the MDGs is large. However, the prospects for attaining the MDGs depend not only on more financing for development, including aid, but also on more effective aid.

Technical cooperation and its effectiveness is very complex, as it requires involvement/cooperation by a broad range of partners, holistic approaches, and participation. However, in general in order to ensure effectiveness of technical cooperation three main principles should be taken into consideration<sup>3</sup>:

1. Country ownership of its own development interventions as well as interventions by international donors.
2. The reduction of fragmentation of development interventions, including government leadership on coordination of technical cooperation, and harmonising procedures of international donors such as reporting, accounting and monitoring.
3. Encouragement of more trust and collective action among all development stakeholders. International donors should give the government more space to assert its ownership and leadership, and governments should enable donors to meet their accountabilities by treating them as legitimate stakeholders and dialogue partners.

## **Uzbekistan and its Development Context**

Uzbekistan is situated at the crossroads of the ancient Silk Road between China, the Middle East and Europe. Bordering Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Afghanistan, and with the largest population (25 million) among the Central Asian countries, Uzbekistan plays a pivotal geopolitical and economic role in Central Asia the region. Uzbekistan is a double land locked country and as such depends on cooperation with its neighbours in order to achieve sustainable economic growth.

Since independence in 1991, the Government of Uzbekistan has followed a path of gradual economic transition, and has been successful in controlling the budget deficit, managing inflation and producing econo-

mic growth. Although government strategies have in principle met some of the challenges posed by the transition, they have done so mainly at the expense of the sustainability of economic development, agriculture and the small and medium-size enterprise (SME) sectors. Today, almost 14 years after independence Uzbekistan is facing challenges, which are similar to many other transition countries, with declines in the human capital stock, increase in unemployment and high rates of underemployment, decreased access to health and education services and decrease in the quality of such services, continued degradation of the environment and a weak system of governance. These factors constitute a threat to the relatively high level of human development achieved during the Soviet period, and to the achievement of some of the MDGs in Uzbekistan.

Despite continuous economic growth (average annual GDP growth of 3.2%<sup>4</sup>) during the period 1993 – 2003, this growth has not translated into improved living standards and basic social services for the poor. Uzbekistan's GNI per capita was USD 420 in 2003. According to the *World Bank Living Standards Assessment*<sup>5</sup>, 27.5% of the population lives below the poverty line (based on a daily calorie intake of 2,100), and approximately one third of all poor households can be classified as extremely poor. With a human development index (HDI) of 0.729 in 2001, Uzbekistan ranks 107 out of 177 countries, according to *UNDP's Human Development Report 2004*.

During Uzbekistan's transition process, the state has continued to play a leading role in initiating reforms across all sectors of the economy. At the same time the Government has expressed commitment to (i) promote private sector development by strengthening the legal and institutional framework, and (ii) allowing greater involvement of civil society organisations in the implementation of the national strategy for improvement of living standards.

Furthermore, the Government has recently reiterated its commitment to reduce poverty and improve the living standards of the population. In mid-2004 the Government completed its *Living Standards Strategy* (LSS). The strategy was prepared with the support by the *Asian Development Bank* (ADB). It outlines the main strategic policies the Government intends to implement to improve living standards in Uzbekistan over the period until 2010. As the next step in the process the Government has committed itself to the preparation of a *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper* (PRSP) using the LSS as a basis. The completion of a PRSP and its presen-

tation to the joint Boards of the *International Monetary Fund* (IMF) and the *World Bank* is a condition for access to concessional funding from these two institutions.

The MDGs have provided an overall framework for the preparation of the LSS, and the main objectives of the strategy are in line with the global MDGs. National ownership is fundamental to reaching the MDGs. Therefore, Uzbekistan has started a process of nationalising the MDGs to its own context. Supported by the UN, a set of Uzbek MDGs, targets and indicators have been prepared. It is envisaged that the national MDGs, targets and indicators will provide the monitoring and evaluation framework of the LSS. The challenge which Uzbekistan now faces is to implement the LSS through allocation and mobilisation of needed resources, and to provide for national and transparent monitoring of progress towards achieving the national MDGs. The latter will require improved capacities to collect, analyse and disseminate data in support of policy and decision-making.

### **Development Cooperation in Uzbekistan**

Following the terror attacks on the USA and the war in Afghanistan in 2001, Central Asia received renewed attention by the international community and many donors increased their assistance to the Central Asian countries, including Uzbekistan. External assistance, including concessional loans, grants and humanitarian assistance provided to Uzbekistan has been steadily increasing since 2000, and external assistance increased to almost USD 600 million 2003 up from USD 379 million in 2002, due to a significant increase in the loan portfolio of the *Asian Development Bank* (ADB)<sup>6</sup>. Net inflows of Official Development Assistance came at USD 189 million in 2002.<sup>7</sup>

ODA began to flow into Uzbekistan in 1992 after independence, however, it never reached same significance as in neighbouring countries such as Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. In 2001 ODA was equal to 1.4% of Uzbekistan's GNI<sup>8</sup>, compared to 13% in Kyrgyzstan and 16.6% in Tajikistan.

Uzbekistan's cooperation with multilateral partners is more significant in monetary terms than bilateral development cooperation, and multilateral assistance (including loans and grants) made up 68% of total external assistance received in 2003. Assistance provided by non-governmental organisations is limited and decreased in 2003 to 0.4% of total external assistance, down from 4.2% in 2002<sup>9</sup>.

ADB is the largest multilateral donor in Uzbekistan, providing 49% of the multilateral assistance. Among bilateral donors, USA remained the largest bilateral donor in 2003. Other significant bilateral donors include Switzerland, Japan, and Germany<sup>10</sup>.

While Uzbekistan received renewed attention by the international community in the aftermath of 9/11, the perceived slow economic and democratic reform process has made many donors give priority to neighbouring Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan in their technical cooperation programmes. In 2003 the *European Bank for Reconstruction and Development* (EBRD) limited its assistance to support to private investment and entrepreneurship, and in 2004 the US Government decided not to certify Uzbekistan on progress towards democratisation and human rights improvements, resulting in decreased assistance for 2004 in the amount of USD 18 million. Furthermore, the recent decision by the Uzbek Government to not re-register the *Open Society Institute*, and the increased restrictions on the operations of the non-governmental sector have contributed to limiting the assistance provided in particular by the international non-governmental sector.

Most technical assistance to Uzbekistan focuses on institution and capacity development in support of the economic and democratic reform process. In particular, assistance is being provided in the fields of social development, good governance and private sector/entrepreneurial development. The largest recipients of ODA in 2001 – 2002 were the economic infrastructure and services sector followed by the education and social sectors.<sup>11</sup>

Considering the relatively limited ODA resource flows into Uzbekistan in relation to the size of the country, ODA is not a significant source of financing for development. Government and private investments remain significant sources of development finance. In order to achieve the MDGs, Uzbekistan will have to attract resources from private domestic and foreign investments and Government resources will have to be managed effectively and efficiently.

Moreover, the relatively limited ODA resources available for Uzbekistan pose an additional challenge on the international donor community, as technical cooperation has to be managed and delivered effectively in order to ensure that it contributes to Uzbekistan's progress towards achieving the MDGs.

However, this situation also creates an environment which may be more conducive for development effectiveness. Unlike many other developing

countries, donors do not compete for good projects in Uzbekistan. The coordination, including information and knowledge-sharing among the donor community in the country is relatively successful. Donors seek to ensure complementarities among their programmes, recognising and building on each others' comparative advantages. As an example, the donor community has been working closely together in supporting the Government in promotion and protection of human rights, including coordination of advocacy efforts, and cooperating in delivering joint capacity development and awareness-raising activities.

However, while overall coordination among donors is effective, the cooperation among donors at the programme level is limited. Furthermore, like in other developing countries, the Uzbek Government is being burdened with a multiplicity of consultation processes, programmes/projects and accounting systems, which takes away important time for policy work. There are no attempts made to apply i.e. *Sector-Wide Approaches* and pooling of resources, and in general the limited ODA is relatively fragmented covering a wide range of sectors and sub-sectors. The UN has prepared its first *United Nations Development Framework for Uzbekistan* (UNDAF), which makes an attempt to take a comprehensive and coordinated approach to increase the effectiveness of UN's assistance to Uzbekistan. The UNDAF focuses on five development outcomes in poverty reduction, health, education, environment and good governance.

In this respect, the Government's *Living Standards Strategy*, and at a later stage the *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*, is a promising step, as it provides a platform for aligning Government policies and donor support within the overall objective of improving the living standards for the people of Uzbekistan. In most countries, the PRSP serves as the basis for coordinating donor support from bilateral donors as well as from other multilateral institutions (ADB and the UN family) behind the goal of poverty reduction. As such the LSS and the PRPS process provide an excellent framework for enhancing the coordination and the effectiveness of the external assistance received by Uzbekistan, and for ensuring the national ownership of the development interventions.

At the beginning of the transition process, Uzbekistan had only little experience and institutional capacity to manage technical cooperation, and the international community had limited conceptual understanding of the scale and nature of the transition process in Central Asia. This posed a challenge that international donors were poorly equipped to meet.



In retrospect and based on the last 10 years of transition experience, it may be argued that the international community may have had unrealistic expectations about the speed with which the economic transition and recovery of growth and living standards could be achieved.

Many of the development challenges facing Uzbekistan are insoluble through short-term technical cooperation interventions. Most of the development challenges are systemic and rooted in traditions and social institutions, which it took developed countries decades and even centuries to address. However, often the international donor community operates with very short-time frames and ambitious objectives of contributing to dramatic improvement of the development situation in Uzbekistan. Such short time-frames limit the ability to contribute effectively to the longer-term process of institutional change. Therefore, in order to enhance the effectiveness, technical cooperation has to be put in a more balanced perspective, realistic objectives have to be set, and step-by-step approaches applied.

### **UNDP's Support to Development in Uzbekistan and Lessons Learned**

UNDP has provided support to Uzbekistan since its independence, and the organisation opened its office in Tashkent in 1993. UNDP's assistance has continuously focused on supporting Uzbekistan's transition process to a democratic, market economy, and to strengthen and foster the participation of civil society in development processes at national and local levels. During the last eleven years, UNDP has established an effective and trusted partnership with the Government, non-governmental organisations, private sector and academia working together to address the challenges of the transition process. UNDP also works closely with multilateral and bilateral donor organisations to support Uzbekistan's reform process.

UNDP has recently finalised its next country programme for Uzbekistan covering the period 2005 - 2009. The country programme is aligned with the *United Nations Development Assistance Framework* and the MDGs. During the new programme cycle, UNDP will support Uzbekistan's progress towards achievement of the MDGs through capacity development in the areas of economic development and poverty reduction, democratic governance, and environmental governance.

In the field of *poverty reduction*, UNDP has in particular been active in the promotion and development of the micro-finance and the small- and

micro-enterprise sector in Uzbekistan. The programme supported establishment of the first NGOs specialised in micro-finance, and it operates in two poor regions (Karakalpakstan and Kashkadarya). It also supported the development of a network of 23 business incubators in all provinces of the country. UNDP has now opened a policy dialogue with the Government to develop an enabling regulatory and policy framework for microfinance activities and to support integrated regional development programmes in the poorest regions of the country aimed at employment generation and poverty reduction.

In the area of *democratic governance*, UNDP has in particular focused on promotion of the access to information through the development of the *Information and Communication Technologies* (ICT) sector. Building on five years of experience with the promotion of internet access, UNDP provided support to development of a policy and regulatory framework for the promotion of ICT, as well as support to building capacities for use and management of ICT for the development of the country. UNDP also facilitated the preparation and adoption of four ICT laws paving the way for the implementation of e-governance to public administration.

In addition, UNDP is working to promote human rights, and provides support to develop national capacities to integrate human rights with the national legal framework, raising awareness on human rights principles and enhancing peoples' access to justice. In particular, UNDP supported the elaboration and implementation of a national action plan to combat torture following the visit of the *Special Rapporteur on Torture* to Uzbekistan, and has supported the establishment of a non-governmental NGO providing legal advice to vulnerable groups.

UNDP also provides support to build capacities for policy reform and has provided assistance to the establishment of the first think tank in the country, the *Centre for Economic Research*. The Centre provides policy advice to the Government in key economic areas, as well as in governance and public administration reform. Furthermore, UNDP provides continuous support to improve the coordination of external assistance, through chairing donor coordination meetings and building the capacities of the government to coordinate external assistance.

In *environment*, UNDP is working to enhance Uzbekistan's capacity to negotiate and implement international environmental conventions and agreements. In particular, UNDP provides support to the preparation of

a national waste management strategy, developing capacities for improved monitoring of the environmental situation, and assisting local communities and Government in preserving biodiversity and promoting sustainable land management. UNDP also advocates for the use of renewable energy sources as an alternative source of energy. UNDP supports the development of capacity for solar panel production in the country, and has piloted projects in remote areas of Karakalpakstan to demonstrate the benefits of small solar panel infrastructure on improving the quality of life of the community concerned.

UNDP's experience during the previous programme period (2000 – 2004), indicates that national government ownership is crucial to ensure the impact of assistance. This is in particular important in Uzbekistan where the decision-making process is centralised and all technical cooperation activities must be approved by the Government. It is therefore essential to involve local stakeholders, including government and civil society, into the project cycle from the very beginning when identifying needs and conceptualising the programme/project. In cases where programmes have been conceptualised by the development practitioners/professionals based on perceived needs with limited consultation and involvement of local partners, national partners were reluctant to approve and participate in such activities.

However, at the same time experience also indicates that within the framework of technical cooperation new initiatives and approaches can successfully be piloted. Small scale demonstration projects can be powerful tools to demonstrate alternative approaches and influence policies. This has been the case with UNDP's support to development of the micro-finance sector, which is now being recognised by the Government as one approach for poverty reduction in rural areas, as well as UNDP's support to establishment of the first internet café in the country in the late 90s, which resulted in rapid replication throughout the country. Another example is the support provided to the establishment of a trust point for needle exchange in Tashkent in order to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS, – a concept which is now being replicated by Government throughout the country.

The above experience indicates that UNDP's strength lies in introducing new approaches and facilitating sharing of knowledge. In this respect, UNDP can make a contribution to the reform process in Uzbekistan

by developing national capacities to manage change and by facilitating sharing of and learning from the experience of other transition countries in Central/Eastern Europe and the CIS, as well as Asia.

While the experience of the Central/Eastern European countries may not be fully replicable in Uzbekistan due to differences in geographical location, institutional structure and traditions, the recent experience of managing reforms as well as the understanding among the former east-block countries of the Soviet past and the transition process may make that experience more interesting and useful for Uzbekistan, than i.e. the experience of Western European countries and the US.

Within the framework of East-East cooperation, UNDP has facilitated knowledge-sharing with Slovakia on waste management, with Estonia on e-governance, with Hungary on ICT based community centres (telecottages), with Slovenia on human rights, and with the Czech Republic in developing local sustainable development strategies.

## **Conclusion**

According to the UNDP study on *Reforming Technical Cooperation for Capacity Development*<sup>12</sup>, many practices which are not supportive of capacity development persist. Many donors still prefer to have their assistance carried out through individual projects, often reflecting their own priorities. Projects still tend to have short timeframes, limiting their ability to contribute effectively to longer-term processes of institutional change. Furthermore, lack of coordination among donors and the resulting multiplicity of projects and accounting systems place unmanageable burdens on already weak government ministries.

However, there have also been significant changes in the direction of partnerships and consultations in terms of setting priorities. Today, there is more focus on technical cooperation efforts in line with national priorities, and on processes of dialogue that extend participation to groups outside the government.

The above practices also exist in Uzbekistan, where technical cooperation programmes in many cases tend to have short timeframes and too ambitious objectives. In some cases there is divergence between donor priorities and government priorities contributing to confusion and disappointment, and hampering lasting impact on capacity.

The global commitment towards the MDGs offers a promising framework for renewed and measurable focus on the effectiveness of technical cooperation. In this respect, the Uzbek Government's first *Living Standards Strategy*, and future *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper* process have the potential for contributing to enhancing the effectiveness of technical cooperation by providing a framework for coordination and for a more coherent approach to Uzbekistan's development.

Even though technical cooperation in monetary terms may not be significant, its contribution to the reform and change process in Uzbekistan should not be under-estimated. Technical cooperation can provide new knowledge and new approaches to address development challenges. Furthermore, the development dialogue with multilateral and bilateral partners may also contribute important input to changing attitudes and developing capacities. In this respect, in order for technical cooperation to be effective, it is important to engage in a continuous dialogue with the Government of Uzbekistan, seek to understand the profound nature of the country's development path, respect and promote national ownership, promote participation, and set realistic, long-term targets.

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> "Developing Capacity through Technical Cooperation", UNDP: 2002.

<sup>2</sup> "Development Effectiveness Report", UNDP: 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Morgan, Peter, "Technical Assistance: Correcting the Precedents", UNDP Policy Development Journal, Volume 2, December 2002.

<sup>4</sup> World Bank.

<sup>5</sup> "Living Standards Assessment", World Bank: May 2003.

<sup>6</sup> Department of External Economic Relations and Foreign Investments of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Agency of Foreign Economic Relations and UNDP's Development Cooperation Report 2003.

<sup>7</sup> "Development Cooperation Report", OECD/DAC: 2002.

<sup>8</sup> "Development Cooperation Report", OECD/DAC: 2003.

<sup>9</sup> Department of External Economic Relations and Foreign Investments of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Agency of Foreign Economic Relations and UNDP's, Development Cooperation Report 2003.

<sup>10</sup> Department of External Economic Relations and Foreign Investments of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Agency of Foreign Economic Relations and UNDP's Development Cooperation Report 2003.

<sup>11</sup> OECD/World Bank.

<sup>12</sup> "Developing Capacity through Technical Cooperation", UNDP: 2002.

**Resumé:****Lykke Andersen:** *Rozvojová spolupráca: skúsenosti z Uzbekistanu*

Podľa štúdie UNDP *Reforma technickej spolupráce na rozvoj kapacít* (Reforming Technical Cooperation for Capacity Development) z roku 2002 sa v rámci rozvojovej spolupráce zachovalo množstvo praktík, ktoré nepodporujú ďalší rozvoj kapacít. Donori stále preferujú realizáciu svojich projektov na individuálnej báze a tieto projekty často odrážajú ich vlastné priority. Sú realizované v krátkodobom rámci, čo limituje ich efektívnosť a zároveň to neprispieva k dlhodobým procesom potrebných inštitucionálnych zmien. Nedostatočná koordinácia medzi samotnými donormi a z toho vyplývajúca multiplicita projektov a účtovných systémov vedie k vytváraniu nevládnuteľných prekážok pre už aj tak slabé ministerstvá jednotlivých vlád. Na druhej strane sa však podarilo dosiahnuť výrazný pokrok v oblasti spolupráce, partnerstva a konzultácií pri určovaní priorít. V súčasnosti je kladený väčší dôraz na technickú spoluprácu, ktorá je v súlade s národnými prioritami, ako aj na dialóg, ktorý už nezahŕňa iba vládne inštitúcie. (Príspevok sa zaoberá technickou spolupracou na základe definície OECD/DAC. Technická spolupráca je touto organizáciou definovaná nasledujúco: poskytuje občanom prijímateľskej krajiny vzdelanie a školenie v domovskej krajine i v zahraničí a financuje konzultantov, poradcov, školiteľov a administratívnych pracovníkov, ktorí pôsobia v prijímateľskej krajine.)

S podobnou praxou sa stretávame aj v Uzbekistane. Väčšina programov technickej spolupráce má krátkodobý rámec a vysoké ambície. V niektorých prípadoch vedú rozdiely v prioritách jednotlivých donorov a jednotlivých vlád k zmätkom a sklamaniam a ohrozujú dlhodobý dopad na budovanie kapacít.

Globálny záväzok plniť *Miléniové rozvojové ciele* poskytuje sľubný rámec pre obnovenú a merateľnú koncentráciu na efektívnosť technickej spolupráce. *Stratégia na zlepšenie životných podmienok* (Living Standards Strategy) vypracovaná uzbeckou vládou a budúca *Stratégia na zníženie chudoby* (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper) v tejto súvislosti predstavujú potenciál pre zvýšenie efektívnosti technickej spolupráce, poskytujúc tak priestor pre koordináciu a koherentnejší prístup k rozvoju Uzbekistanu.

Aj keď z finančného hľadiska nemusí byť technická spolupráca v Uzbekistane významná, jej vplyv a príspevok k reformám a procesu

zmien v Uzbekistane by nemal byť podceňovaný. Technická spolupráca poskytuje nové vedomosti a nové postupy pre vymedzenie rozvojových výziev. Navyše, rozvojový dialóg s multilaterálnymi a bilaterálnymi partnermi môže prispieť aj k zmene postojov a rozvoju kapacít. V tejto súvislosti je pre efektívnosť technickej spolupráce dôležité pokračovať v dialógu s uzbeckou vládou, pochopiť, akým smerom sa chce Uzbekistan uberať, a stanoviť si realistické dlhodobé ciele.