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I. Administrative reform in Uzbekistan as a provision of balanced and sustainable development of country, region and person.

The Republic of Uzbekistan has been a sovereign state since September 1991. It is situated in the middle of Central Asia and occupies most of the area between the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya rivers, a total of 448,900 square kilometres. The population of Uzbekistan, estimated at about 26 million people, is the largest of the Central Asian republics, compromising more than 40 percent of their total population. The ethnic composition of Uzbekistan consists of Uzbeks (77%), the remainder includes several minorities: Russians (6%), Tajiks (5.1%), Kazakhs (4.2%), Crimea Tartars (2%), Karakalpaks (2%), Koreans (1%), Kyrgyzs (1%), others (1.7%).

More than 60% of its population lives in rural communities. During the Soviet era (1924 -1991), production of cotton and grain led to overuse of agrochemicals and the depletion of water supplies, which have left the land polluted and the Aral Sea and certain rivers half dry. Independent since 1991, the country seeks to gradually lessen its dependence on agriculture while developing its mineral and petroleum reserves. Uzbekistan is now the world's second-largest cotton exporter to Russia, China, Iran, Bangladesh, Republic of Korea, Vietnam, a large producer of gold and oil, and a regionally significant producer of chemicals and machinery. Following independence in December 1991, the government sought to prop up its Soviet-style command economy with subsidies and strictly controls on production and prices. Uzbekistan chose emphasizing import substitute industrialization (in 1990 the volume of the internal conversion of cotton formed 3%, in 2004 - 28%, and it is forecasted that this factor will increase up to 51% by 2008) and has tightened export and currency controls within its already largely closed economy in response to the results of the Asian financial crisis.

In the Republic of Uzbekistan the regional policy focused in consisting Republic of Karakalpakstan, 12 oblasts*, or regions and the capital city - Tashkent, 120 cities, 113 towns, 159 rural administrative districts, 11844 rural settlements and 7501 local self-governing bodies - “Makhallya”.

Existing for present-day state governance in regions is not fully corresponds to needs of the development of the country. Old-fashioned methods of governance are still left in activity and established structure, functions and practice of regional government bodies all more face contradictions with process of deepening of the administrative reform and further liberalization of economics.

As foreign and Uzbek experts have pointed - one of the instruments of improvement of governing is its decentralization, which intends the transfer to responsibility from the centre of local self-governing bodies and the authorities, but in the same way organization of the civil society.¹ The World experience witnesses that if decentralization is been conducted in countries without of the account of specific conditions of the country, then it can have the most negative consequences: bring macroeconomics to destabilization, uneven access towards service and reinforcement of poverty. For smoothing differences between economics and social development region it is possible to obtain only under efficient use of territorial factors and competitive advantages.

In Uzbekistan decentralization appears as one of the directions commenced by administrative reform, within the framework of which revising and reduction of functions of state governing bodies and reinforcement authority regional and local governing bodies of power is realized. The republican organs quite often limit the independence of regional governing bodies that practically transform the regional governing bodies in “transmission” section between republican body and bodies of economic activity in local areas by focusing on the most government and economic functions. Echoing the significant relationship of the existing situation in regions of Uzbekistan and necessity of harmonization of the society, Vicktor Abaturov argues:

* An oblast is an administrative region in Uzbekistan, similar to a state, province, or county in other countries.
“Established structure, functions and practice of regional government bodies come to contradiction with process of decentralizations of state government, deepening of the administrative reforms and further liberalization of economics.”

Since 2003 in Uzbekistan there is conducted the complex of the administrative transformations, directed on:
- most further reduction of state influence on economics, liquidation of elements of command-administrative system, radical modification of the structure and system of government;
- Liquidation of the system of distribution and transition to market mechanisms of the realization of material resources;
- organizing of new mechanism interactions of the society and state, provision to transparencies of state government activity.

The primary tasks of reforming of state government in regions within the framework of the public administrative reforms are:
- increasing of the level of living standards of the population;
- ensuring of efficient function and rise of the economic region;
- organizing of conditions and premises for sustainable development of regions;
- realization of structural, investment and scientific-technical politics.

Importance of reforming of regional government activities depends on following factors:

Firstly, regional government bodies act as the conductor of state economic politics, under development of government of the country.
Secondly, regional government bodies are institutes of development and realization of regional politics, directed on increasing of the level of living standards of the population, ensuring of sustainable development of the region in social, economic, political and ecological measurements.
Thirdly, exactly regional government bodies act as the mediator between the government, enterprise and civil society. The improvement of function of regional government bodies must be directed on increasing of partnership "state-business-civil society". Igor Pugach thinks that equaling of economical levels of regions mostly is defined by created conditions for developing of entrepreneurship.

II. Regional aspects of economic development in Uzbekistan in point of view of reducing of income inequality problem in various regions of Uzbekistan

The Economic space of Uzbekistan – is a collection of regions, differing from each other with the level of economic development, branch specialization, natural-climatic conditions, but closely bounds between itself moreover not only with trade, but with modern specialized production, as well. In each of them share of the product, produced for other regions and received from them is high. Nowadays the problem of study of separate regions’ contribution to the economy of the whole country costs stands sharply, since; the economy of the whole country often depends on the trade turnover of one region.

The regional aspects of economic development have a significant importance for Uzbekistan because of the climatic, geographic and economic differences among the regions. Regional factors may significantly influence the essence and results of the socio-economic transformations in the country.

In recent years some positive results have been achieved in the development of the regions by expanding the rights and powers of the local authorities, strengthening local economies, and stationing and modernizing facilities for the exploitation of their mineral and raw material resources, as well as their natural and economic potential.

Although the territorial socio-economic disproportions are caused by a number of objective factors (differences in geographic and economic potential), the present situation and the dynamics of the inter-regional differentiation need to be alleviated.

The main reasons for the differentiation of the socio-economic development in the regions are:
- the high level of concentration of industrial production and production infrastructure in the Tashkent and Ferghana economic regions;
- the insufficient level of adaptation of the mostly agrarian regions to the market environment (the Republic of Karakalpakstan, Khoresm, Surkhandarya, Syrdarya, Jizzakh regions);
- the territorial disproportion of the distribution of local and foreign investment;
- the irrational use of the natural and economic potential of the regions;
disproportions in the budget provisions of the regions and the low income level of the local budgets in some regions;

- the inadequate economic regulation of the regions taking into account their particularities;

- Adjusting the level of the socio-economic development in the regions by removing the current obstacles and disproportions is seen as an important factor for the sustainable and balanced development of the country's economy.

It requests definition of tendencies development of regions and deep analysis of their economy and for analyzes development of economic territories of the Republic of Uzbekistan we use several indices. As index defining development of economy of regions are used gross regional product, industrial products, consumer goods, regional division of investment, agricultural products and rendering pay services. In accordance with aggregation of results of these indices defined level of development on economic regions of Uzbekistan. The use of indices of Gross Regional Product per capita is considered as aggregated and be methodologically correct among the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Indices of Gross Regional Product per capita in Republic of Uzbekistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Karakalpakstan</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andijan Region</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukhara Region</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jizzakh Region</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashkadarya Region</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navoi Region</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namangan Region</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarkand Region</td>
<td>0.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surkhandarya Region</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirdarya Region</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashkent Region</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferghana Region</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khorezm Region</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashkent city</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Uzbekistan</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between regions (times)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between regions except Tashkent</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the data from the state Statistics Committee of Republic of Uzbekistan

Analysis of Table 1 shows that after the independence in 1991 the asymmetrical changes can be observed, which means the better development of developing regions and lagging behind in development of comparatively worse developed regions. It can be also seen, that after 1998 the difference between the regions has increased.

In new conditions main aim of regional politics in country became the effective use of regional factor and premises for ensuring of the sustainable development of economics of the country and increasing of the living standards, reduction of the negative influence of the disadvantage conditions on social-economic development of separate regions. According to Bahodir Ganiev and Tursun Akhmedov the main tasks of regional politics of Uzbekistan are the following:

- Prevention of excessive difference in social and economic development level between the regions;
- Differentiated regulation of social-economic development of regions in accordance with their resource-economic potential and objective possibilities of the functioning in market economy;
- Rational combination of national and regional interests with state support of the lagging behind and unfavourable regions;
- Ensuring of minimum social warranty regardless of place of the residence of the population;
- Assistance on deepening of institutional and structured reforms, priority development of private sectors in regions;
- Prevention of the environmental pollution and undertaking of active ecological politics in regions;
- Development of regional and interregional infrastructure (transportation, communication and others);
- deepening of the processes of decentralization, increasing of the role and responsibility of regional government bodies and self-governance in decision of social tasks;
- increasing of the role of regional budgets and non-budget funds in realization of social programs in regions”.

The Regional policy with connection to amount of solving problems and financial possibilities is realized basically on three levels:

1. Republican (central). On this level the regional policy is realized by republican government bodies (the Cabinet of Ministers, Ministry and departments), where facility of the republican budget or other centralized financial sources is used.

2. Regional (Republic of Karakalpakstan, 12 regions and Tashkent city). The governing bodies (the Cabinet of Ministers of Republics of Karakalpakstan, Regional hokimiyats and Tashkent city) on the base of republican and regional budget, non-budget and other fund realize the territorial politics, directed on mobilization of resource and ensuring of necessary conditions to lives at a rate of districts and cities, located in their territory.

3. Local (provinces, districts, cities, kishlaks, auls, citizen’s self-govern bodies-makhallya). On this level social-economic processes in concrete populated areas on the base of regions and cities’ budget are controlled, as well as other addressed sources of the financing.

On republican level number of the state purpose-oriented programs with territorial affiliations, uniting practically all spheres of social-economic development is developed and realization has began: small and medium business; the localization of production and promotion of export; attraction of foreign investments; social defence of the most vulnerable layers of the population; reforms on education and public health; improvement of social infrastructure of districts; ensuring the rural population with drinking water and natural gases and others. Within the framework of rendering of state support laggings behind regions territorial programs on social-economic development of Namangan and Khorezm regions were marketed, preferences and privileges for small business in Republic of Karakalpakstan and Khorezm regions were given.

However, in spite of reforms held in Uzbekistan for years of independence by state authorities, the high level of its centralizations was saved. Ideology and concepts of the above mentioned types of programs are developed at a rate of national government, but regional governing bodies emerge mainly in dug of the pickers of the information and performers. Aggregate of the different national programs on territorial level can’t be named comprehensive program of development of regions, strategic documents of the similar sort on systematic base in country practically are not developed in any levels of authorities. This in turn brings to not efficient use of potential of regions in consequence of which the interregional differences increases. As B. Ganiev and T. Akhmedov observing,

“Significant and declining interregional difference in social-economic development entails negative consequences and at elaboration of regional strategy the decision of problems of increasing of living standards of the population of the regions and its competitiveness must be main”.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Regional Product</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>4,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial products</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>23,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer goods</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>8,2</td>
<td>7,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of investments</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>6,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural product</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailed trade turnover</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendering pay services</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the date from statistics committee of Republic of Uzbekistan

Undertaken in republic measures on provision of macro economical stability, institutional and structured transformations as a whole in country have prevented sharp and unadjusted rise of difference of regional development. However at a rate of regions this process had uneven temper in point of view of separate sectors of economics. So, on production per capita break-up of Gross Regional Product between
the most developed (Tashkent city) and the lagging behind (Republic of Karakalpakstan) regions for 1991-2003 had increased from 2.1 to 4.2 times, on industrial products – from 5.4 to 23.3 times.7

Established range of variations between regions has objective and subjective reasons. Objectives are conditioned by different supply of regions with natural-economic resources; with the level of concentrations of production potential; with different saturation of infrastructural objects; with the structure of economics and system of settling of population; with the adaptation level towards the market mechanism of the government. The subjective reasons of the established level of interregional difference is possible to refer to uneven distribution of investment in regions, prevalence of administrative methods of regulation of social-economic processes, insufficiency of material - technical and financial resources of regions.

In spite of different level of interregional difference (refer to table 3), the relationship between economic development and well-being of the population is straight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The level of economic development¹</th>
<th>Range of regions</th>
<th>The level of social development²</th>
<th>Range of regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>Navoi region</td>
<td>Tashkent city</td>
<td>High level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tashkent city</td>
<td>Bukhara region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bukhara region</td>
<td>Navoi region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tashkent region</td>
<td>Tashkent region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium level</td>
<td>Fergana region</td>
<td>Fergana region</td>
<td>Medium level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andijan region</td>
<td>Andijan region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirdarya region</td>
<td>Sirdarya region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jizzakh region</td>
<td>Khorezm region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surkhandarya region</td>
<td>Namangan region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kashkadarya region</td>
<td>Samarkand region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>Samarkand region</td>
<td>Kashkadarya region</td>
<td>Low level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khorezm region</td>
<td>Republic of Karakalpakstan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Namangan region</td>
<td>Jizzakh region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Karakalpakstan</td>
<td>Surkhandarya region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ level of the economic development is defined on factor of Gross Regional Product per capita.
² levels of the income of the social development are defined on factor per capita: income, supplies with object of social infrastructure, volumes of the trade turnover and pay services.

Source: the date from statistics committee of Republic of Uzbekistan

Differences in level of social-economic development promote following factors:
- insufficient consideration of the regional particularities (the geographical position, natural-climatic conditions, demographic features, mineral-raw materials and economic potential, ecological load and others) at development and realization of the state target programs, complex of the measures on decision of social problems;
- high level of centralizations of regulation of social-economic processes, financing of investment programs and projects in social sphere, basically to the account of the republican budget;
- weak initiatives of regional government bodies in maintenance of social stability in regions because of insufficiency of their material and technical basis, and limit of financial possibilities;
- disproportions and being undefined in division of function, tasks and responsibilities between central and regional administrations, between ministries and departments in governing the social-economic process in regions of the country.

Significant and declining interregional difference in social-economic development entails such negative consequences, as high unemployment rate in lagging behind regions, growing of migration in more successful regions, reinforcement of tension on the labour market, reduction of real income and increase of
poverty, reduction of investment activity. In final result all this leads to reinforcement of social tension in society and mistrust towards the governing bodies. With provision of this, overweening differences in living standards of the population of different regions, though have an objective reasons, require the softening by means of centralized state politics.

Unfortunately, there is no common state program on economic development of logging behind regions is yet created, and at development and realization of the purpose-oriented state programs regional specifics are not deeply taken into account.

**III. Social organizations and local self-government bodies in solving the problem**

The community (*makhallya*) represents the primary administrative and territorial unit, and thereby the Primary Uzbek self-government unit. *Makhallya* is a traditional association of the families living in the neighborhood and based on the principle of common residence in a certain locality with an established border. *Makhallya* is established by citizens of a community at the place of their residence, with the main goal of protecting their interests and rights, and jointly meeting their needs. It should be emphasized that the *makhallya* is the closest entity to the primary administrative territorial self-government body in Uzbekistan. For a centuries-old history the institute of *makhallya* has proved the stability and at the same times the ability to self-development. Modern *makhallya* is a self-government institution of citizens, one of key elements of civil society. Steady there were principles of mutual aid, solidarity, social tolerance are still survived. In new conditions, *makhallya* has apprehended and success realizes new functions - it became the main conductor of the administrative programs of address social support of families against poverty. Since 1994 the unique mechanism on supporting of incomes and standard of living of citizens which has no analogues has been developed and successfully realized: the allocated public funds are distributed among needy families by the decision of the council of citizens or their elective representatives. Heads of self-government institutions - leaders of the *makhallya* (*aksakals* of *makhallya*) - provide payment of grants to families with children and material aid to needy families according to the decision of all members of *makhallya* and the current legislation. Publicity and democratism, and acceptance of decisions on purpose of payment of grants concerns to advantage of the given mechanism of distribution and material aid, strengthening of a social justice rule maintenance of the maximal addressing by granting the state support to families, absence of bureaucratic barriers, individualism and voluntarism at purpose and payment of grants.

The body is independent and is not a direct part of the local government system. Throughout Uzbekistan, 7,501 self-government bodies have been established and are now operating. Now, the *makhallya* self-government bodies have a solid viable structure, consisting of the citizens’ assembly. This meeting of citizens’ representatives directly elects chairmen; executive secretaries; counsellors, and chairmen of the auditing and administrative committees. The assembly approves the membership of the assembly’s council.

On average, each *makhallya* has around 1,500 – 2,000 residents. The number of activists involved in self-government activities is over 25, (i.e. heads of self-government bodies established in each *makhallya*). Only two of them are paid salaries out of the local (district or city) budget. The other members of the assembly council – the primary self-government body – are volunteers.

For instance, by October 6, 2005 "Employment" fund has given 1,614,035 USD for social vulnerable layer of population for developing family business in Ferghana region. On decision of special commissions of "Employment" and "Makhallya" funds, to which 8,051 families applied, where the resolution about giving micro credits for 2987 families was accepted. For social-vulnerable layer of the population amount goal-directed selected facilities for development of the home labour, handicrafts and developments of stock-breeding the amount of money per family was equal to 500 - 700 US Dollars. By the end of October of 2005 1,535,614 US dollars were used on micro credits from above mentioned amount of money. This enabled to provide jobs for 5705 people (2542 of them are women). Such measures were accepted in Andijan and Namangan regions, together with Ferghana region, where there is a density of population, and accordingly the number of unemployed people - is the most high in the republic.

Consequently, the main objective of the self-government bodies is to engage their citizens in the self-government process. This is done via creating preconditions for the realization of the interests and needs of individual citizens and the entire community, ensuring the economic independence and stable funding for functions gradually delegated from both the national and local governments.
Conclusions:

1. Main aim of regional politics in Uzbekistan is the effective use of regional factor and premises for ensuring of the sustainable development of economics of the country and increasing of the living standards, reduction of the negative influence of the disadvantage conditions on social-economic development of various regions.

2. There are differentiations and disproportion of the socio-economic development in the regions of Uzbekistan. Established range of variations between regions has objective and subjective reasons. Objectives are conditioned by different supply of regions with natural-economic resources; with the level of concentrations of production potential; with different saturation of infrastructural objects; with the structure of economics and system of settling of population; with the adaptation level towards the market mechanism of the government. The subjective reasons of the established level of interregional difference is possible to refer to uneven distribution of investment in regions, prevalence of administrative methods of regulation of social-economic processes, insufficiency of material - technical and financial resources of regions. In spite of different level of interregional difference, the relationship between economic development and well-being of the population is straight.

3. Significant and declining interregional difference in social-economic development entails such negative consequences, as high unemployment rate in lagging behind regions, growing of migration in more successful regions, reinforcement of tension on the labour market, reduction of real income and increase of poverty, reduction of investment activity. In final result all this leads to reinforcement of social tension in society and mistrust towards the governing bodies. With provision of this, overweening differences in living standards of the population of different regions, though have an objective reasons, require the softening by means of centralized state politics.

4. State governance in regions is not fully corresponds to needs of the development of the country. Old-fashioned methods of governance are still left in activity and established structure, functions and practice of regional government bodies all more face contradictions with process of deepening of the administrative reform and further liberalization of economics. One of the instruments of improvement of governing is its decentralization, which intends the transfer to responsibility from the centre of local self-governing bodies and the authorities, but in the same way organization of the civil society. During the decentralization of every country it is necessary undertaking of corresponding state measures directed on minimization of possible risks. This is important for smoothening of differences in economic and social development of regions, what is possible to be obtained only under the efficient use of regional factors and competitive advantages of each region on the base of thought-out strategies.

5. For development of the regional politics, improvement of decentralization process and deepening of administrative reforms in Uzbekistan package of target social programs is planned for this year, which is devoted to securing social stability and growth in the living standards of the population. The package consists of such programs as: reforming housing-communal entities, addressing social support towards vulnerable groups of the population, training specialists, developing school education, providing drinking water and natural gas to rural inhabitants, developing children’s sports, increasing employment among the population and others.

6. There is no common state program on economic development of logging behind regions is yet created in Uzbekistan, and at development and realization of the addressed state programs regional specifics are not deeply taken into account.

All mentioned above items show how the state government, regions and self-governing bodies in Uzbekistan effort in promotion of economic and social development in country.
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Glossary of Uzbek Terms:

Aksakal – elected leaders of the makhallya
Aul – The equivalent of kishlak, or rural settlement, in Karakalpak
Hokimiayt – The executive branch of local governments.
Kishlak – A rural settlement, which may include many neighbouring localities and is represented by an assembly of its citizens.
Makhallya – A community of people residing in a localized area; these may range from 150 to 1,500 families

Notice:

12 oblasts/regions are:
Andijan Region, Bukhara Region, Jizzakh Region, Kashkadarya Region, Navoi Region, Namangan Region, Samarkand Region, Surkhandarya Region, Sirdarya Region, Tashkent Region, Ferghana Region, Khorezm Region; in some investigations of researchers from Uzbekistan the regions are united in six macroeconomic territories: Ferghana (Andijan, Ferghana, Namangan), Tashkent (Tashkent city and Tashkent Region), Mirzachul (Jizzakh, Sirdarya), Central (Samarkand, Navoi, Bukhara) Southern (Kashkadarya and Surkhandarya Regions) and Amudarya (Khorezm and Karakalpak Republic) – D. Madirimov – Developing of Economic Regions in Republic: Market, Money and Credit, # 3, 2005, p. 29. We decided that it is considered to be logically right to divide regions on the bases of administrative-territorial principle. Therefore, statistics in Uzbekistan are based on these principles.

Bahodir Ganiev, national coordinator on strategies of the regional development of the Project PROON "Creation of sustainable income" and Tursun Akhmedov, the first deputy director of the Centre of efficient economic politics at Ministry of the economics of Republic of Uzbekistan.

Sources:

1 Economical review (January, 2005, Special Edition) – Decentralization and sustainable development of the country and the person, p. 3; I. Pugach - Economical differences between territories and searches of decentralization direction, p. 21-25.
6 ibid p. 27
8 Bahodir Ganiev and Tursun Akhmedov – Actuality of regional politics in Republic of Uzbekistan, p. 28;
9 Alisher R. Yunusov – report presented in Kuala – Lumpur "Alleviating of poverty in strategy of national development of Uzbekistan" - The Role of Public Administration In Alleviating Poverty and Improving Governance, p. 5-6
10 The data analyzed by Sh. Yunusov on the base of official information of Ferghana region Administration of Labour Business and Social Defence of the Population, October, 2005