ANALYSIS OF STATE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS (ON THE EXAMPLE OF SURKHANDARYA REGION)

Abstract: In this article the state programs of national and territorial development in the Republic of Uzbekistan are considered. In particular, the significance and results of state programs in the development of industrial sectors of Surkhandarya region were studied in depth. The factors influencing the effectiveness of state programs were also studied, elective factors were selected on the basis of their selection and quantitatively analyzed on the basis of econometric models of influence. In addition, theoretical recommendations for further improving the efficiency of state programs were proposed.
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Introduction

In recent years, large-scale programs for further development of the region’s economy, including industries, creation of decent conditions for the population, employment have been implemented in all regions of the country through the support of socio-economic development, active entrepreneurship and innovative ideas. In particular, the consistent implementation of the action strategy for the five priority areas of development of the Republic of Uzbekistan in 2017-2021 allows the country to ensure high rates of GDP growth and industrial production among the few countries in the world. In particular, in 2018, GDP growth was 5.1%, and industrial production-14.4%.

Until now, many state programs in the socio-economic and individual spheres have been adopted and widely implemented in our country. For example: in 2011, the State program “Year of small business and private entrepreneurship” to create opportunities for the development of small business and private entrepreneurship in industries and the organization of modern high-tech industries, to stimulate the introduction of innovative technologies in the production of small businesses and private entrepreneurship; Program “development of industrial potential of Surkhandarya region for 2015-2017” for 2014; in accordance with the decree of the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan On measures to develop production of export-oriented and import-substituting competitive modern products, stimulate production of domestic products that meet internal and external market on the basis of local raw materials and mineral resources, widespread establishment and further strengthening of industrial cooperation between domestic industries and cross-industry enterprises, including between small businesses and large enterprises of the Republic, 2015-2019, among them are the programs “localization of production of components and materials and measures to ensure structural reforms, modernization and diversification of production for 2015-2019”; state programs “Year of support for active entrepreneurship, innovative ideas and technologies”, “every family is an entrepreneur” and “youth-our future” for 2018; state programs “Year of active investment and social development” for 2019 and others.
Impact Factor:

| Country/Region | Impact Factor |
|----------------|--------------|
| ISRA (India)   | 4.971        |
| ISI (Dubai, UAE) | 0.829      |
| GIF (Australia) | 0.564        |
| JIF            | 1.500        |
| SIS (USA)      | 0.912        |
| PHHII (Russia) | 0.126        |
| ESJ (KZ)       | 8.716        |
| IBI (India)    | 4.260        |
| SIF (Morocco)  | 5.667        |
| ICV (Poland)   | 6.630        |
| PIF (India)    | 1.940        |
| OAJI (USA)     | 0.350        |

Of course, along with state programs that play an important role in the development of regional production, support competitiveness and ensure sustainable functioning of industry [1], one of the main goals in their development is the development of territorial industries. The development of industry in this direction is important, this industry is a leading sphere in the effective solution of such problems as the formation and replenishment of the consumer market, ensuring the necessary balance in the market, increasing the competitiveness of the national economy, localization of production, employment and increasing incomes.

It should be noted that as a result of the implementation of the above-mentioned state programs, the country’s export potential increased, the volume of which in 2018 amounted to $ 14,253.9 million. Founder: editorial office of the newspaper “Xabar”. While this figure increased by 13.5% compared to 2017, the largest number of exporting partner countries were led by China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Turkey and Afghanistan (pic.1).

![Picture 1. Dynamics of exports of the Republic of Uzbekistan with major partner countries](image)

1-pic. data show that the dynamics of export volumes to China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Turkey and Afghanistan saw various declines and growth during 2014-2017, and in 2018 there was a high growth dynamics.

Similarly, in Surkhandarya region, according to the results of state programs, the volume of industrial production of the region in 2018 increased almost 5.2 times compared to 2017.

Within the framework of the state program "increasing the production potential of Surkhandarya region for 2015-2017", 21 million projects worth $ 1,900 were implemented in the region, more than 1,900 new jobs were created. The three new plants produce 34 types of ice cream, 20 types of porcelain and 23 million units of pharmaceutical products per year. Also, during the period of the program, industrial enterprises of the region produced products in the amount of 117.8 million dollars. Exports of products and services in the amount of 15 million. export activity of more than 15 new enterprises, such as” Surkhandarya Agrofirm “,” Boisun Omonkonkhon juice “, LLC” Expo Time”has been established.

In order to implement the targets set out in the strategy for the development of the country in the years 2017-2021 the direction of “further development and liberalization of the economy”, and in accordance with the decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan from April 5, 2017 “On measures for implementation of the resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers, in accordance with the decree of the government of the Republic of Uzbekistan № 182"On approval of indicators of the projects to agricultural development and service projects”, in order to increase the level of economic and social development of the region and employment and quality of life in the region is working to increase the efficiency created by small industrial areas, their specialization, work location of businesses engaged in the full cycle of production, taking into account resource potential of the territory,, as a result of system monitoring of implementation of investment projects and fulfillment of obligations assigned to participants, as well as work to expand the participation of commercial banks in the implementation of new investment projects in small industrial zones, during 2017 in the field of industry, agriculture and services received 1,820 billion dollars.

1 Data from the State Statistics Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan.
Impact Factor:

| Source       | Impact Factor |
|--------------|---------------|
| ISRA (India) | 4.971         |
| ISI (Dubai, UAE) | 0.829     |
| GIF (Australia) | 0.564    |
| JIF          | 1.500         |
| SIS (USA)    | 0.912         |
| PHHII (Russia) | 0.126       |
| ESJI (KZ)    | 8.716         |
| IBI (India)  | 4.260         |
| SJIF (Morocco) | 5.667      |
| OAJI (USA)   | 0.350         |

million soms and 98.4 million US dollars 188 projects worth about us dollars have been Implemented². During 2018, according to state programs in all regions of Surkhandarya region, a total of $ 2571.25 billion was spent in the industrial direction. 248 units of Sum, in the direction of services and service-413.9 billion sums. the amount of 463 units, in the direction of agriculture 457.13 billion dollars. implemented 231 projects in the amount of. In addition, 24,009 new jobs were created on the basis of the employment programme (tab.1).

Table 1. Implemented projects under state programs in the context of regions of Surkhandarya region in 2018

| №   | Name of district       | Industry amount (pieces) | Industry amount (bln. sum) | Sphere of services amount (pieces) | Sphere of services amount (bln. sum) | Agriculture amount (pieces) | Agriculture amount (bln. sum) |
|-----|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1   | Termez city            | 33                        | 215.40                    | 34                               | 103.90                               | 5                           | 28.10                       | 3 480                      |
| 2   | Angor                  | 13                        | 5.80                      | 7                                | 11.56                                | 9                           | 66.20                       | 854                       |
| 3   | Boysun                 | 13                        | 10.45                     | 15                               | 11.07                                | 26                          | 10.64                       | 920                       |
| 4   | Denov                  | 27                        | 210.06                    | 24                               | 42.41                                | 21                          | 25.33                       | 2 676                     |
| 5   | Jarkurgan              | 14                        | 106.28                    | 27                               | 22.48                                | 8                           | 81.35                       | 1 640                     |
| 6   | Kizirik                | 29                        | 8.77                      | 75                               | 53.39                                | 24                          | 96.51                       | 1 710                     |
| 7   | Kumkurgan              | 8                         | 3.27                      | 21                               | 23.18                                | 5                           | 3.84                        | 1 292                     |
| 8   | Muzrabat               | 12                        | 4.45                      | 63                               | 22.46                                | 15                          | 15.38                       | 1 439                     |
| 9   | Oltinsoy               | 15                        | 19.74                     | 48                               | 16.09                                | 32                          | 4.58                        | 818                       |
| 10  | Sariasia               | 14                        | 190.70                    | 12                               | 5.36                                 | 17                          | 40.46                       | 2 901                     |
| 11  | Termez                 | 16                        | 18.34                     | 14                               | 17.09                                | 8                           | 24.80                       | 1 016                     |
| 12  | Uzun                   | 29                        | 11.39                     | 81                               | 21.72                                | 37                          | 19.34                       | 1 016                     |
| 13  | Sherabad               | 15                        | 1 758.77                  | 24                               | 39.42                                | 9                           | 28.31                       | 2 671                     |
| 14  | Shurchi                | 10                        | 7.85                      | 18                               | 23.77                                | 15                          | 12.30                       | 1 666                     |
|      | Total                  | 248                       | 2571.25                   | 463                              | 413.90                               | 231                         | 457.13                      | 24099                     |

The results of these projects can be explained by the fact that by 2018 the industrial production of the region has a high growth trend (pic.2).

Picture 2. Dynamics of industrial production of Surkhandarya region, district (city) for 2018

² Electronic source, [http://www.uzlidep.uz/news-of-party/555](http://www.uzlidep.uz/news-of-party/555)
³ Compiled by the author based on the data provided by the Surkhandarya Region Department of Statistics.
⁴ Data of the Statistics Department Surkhandarya region.
This year under the program “development of textile and garment-knitting industry in Surkhandarya region” the total cost is 121 million us dollars. The export potential of textile products amounted to $48.0 million. Editorial office address: 30 Navoi street, Tashkent, 100129. As a result, 3,170 new jobs will be created. In addition, in order to bring the level of processing of cotton fiber to 94.0 percent by 2020, a cotton textile cluster is organized with 63.5 percent of the land plots of the region.

In addition, there are 14,463 business entities in the region. Of these, 2 thousand 132 were created in the six months of this year. Of these, 32 large, 2 thousand 225 small industrial enterprises, in recent years, mastered the production of sandwich panels, cement, iodized salt, sewing and knitting products, hosiery.

In 2019, the volume of production in the region amounted to 80.6 million dollars. Exports of industrial products to the United States amounted to $127.9 million, imports - $127.9 million. Although imports fell by 40 percent compared to the same period last year, this does not mean that the region is making full and effective use of its potential.

According to analytical data, 267 industrial enterprises of the region do not work at the level of design capacity. Production stopped 44 times. 82 percent of consumer goods are imported from abroad.

Poor condition in the mining industry, only 30 partially developed of the 84 registered in the oasis minerals. Of course, such cases affect the effectiveness of existing government programs.

Therefore, it is important to consider state programs as a tool of strategic planning, which can qualitatively influence the key factors of socio-economic development of regions [2].

Any economic process requires study, analysis and evaluation in order to develop strategies for further development and improve its effectiveness. Because the choice and adoption of the most optimal strategy is a clear result. When developing programs for the development of territorial industries, it is also impossible to rely on certain factors. For example, B. according to Quint, the use of new technologies often leads to temporary success [3].

Indeed, the issue of assessing the effectiveness of government programs and services remains very relevant at the present time.

Economist Gordeev believes that the definition and knowledge of the level of use of production capacity allows you to take the necessary measures in the implementation of high-quality industrial program [4].

When assessing the implementation of any state program, it is advisable to take into account three main criteria [5]:

1. General provisions Audit-determination of compliance of certain management practices with established official requirements;
2. Other Monitoring-tracking of the processes of achieving the program goal and performing the corresponding tasks;
3. Other Evaluation-analytical evaluation of the program.

In our opinion, in order to determine the most objective, transparent and qualitative methodology of state programs, its evaluation would be appropriate if it were done on the basis of the following model (pic.3).

Mechanisms for evaluating government programs

Qualitative indicators of program evaluation

Evaluation of the implementation of key activities under the program

Quantitative indicators of program evaluation

Evaluation of program financial support

Determining the effectiveness of the program

Evaluation of program management quality

Risks, consequences, internal-external and organization of quality control of other factors

Picture 3. The model of evaluation of government programs\textsuperscript{5}.

\textsuperscript{5} Statement of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan at the meeting on August 2, 2019 “Analysis of the ongoing work on further development of small business and private entrepreneurship”. http://uza.uz/oz/society/tahtirkorlik-rivozhda-barcha-masul-29-08-2019?qphrase_id=2280803

\textsuperscript{6} Developed by the author.
This model combines the General principles and indicators of evaluation of government programs. The model also describes the overall effectiveness of the implementation of the state program, which is important in the development of industries, as well as the analysis of the dynamics of changes in targets and the calculation of the degree of achievement of the program goal. Quantitative indicators and quality criteria are also used in the evaluation process.

Based on the above, during the implementation of state programs, we will consider the econometric analysis of the development of industrial sectors of Surkhandarya region and quantifying factors affecting it, for this we use the regression equation of the following factors:

$$Y = a_0 + a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + \cdots + a_nX_n$$

We present the following indicators that directly and indirectly affect the effectiveness of government programs, as well as factors that affect the quality and quantity, by statistical observation (table 2).

### Table 2. Dynamics of key indicators of industrial sectors of Surkhandarya region

| Years | Industrial products, (billion. sum) | Financial resources, (billion. sum) | New industrial enterprises, (pieces) | New technologies, (billion. sum) | Labor productivity, (million sums for 1 person engaged in industry) |
|-------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2010  | 614,3                            | 623,1                            | 75                                 | 0,4                             | 12,6                                                          |
| 2011  | 756,4                            | 702,6                            | 84                                 | 1,2                             | 15,4                                                          |
| 2012  | 899,4                            | 912,7                            | 101                                | 0,9                             | 18,6                                                          |
| 2013  | 1136,2                           | 1198,9                           | 92                                 | 0,7                             | 21,9                                                          |
| 2014  | 1421,6                           | 1482,8                           | 98                                 | 1,1                             | 25,8                                                          |
| 2015  | 1874,3                           | 1749,3                           | 107                                | 0,8                             | 29,6                                                          |
| 2016  | 1552,3                           | 1951,2                           | 116                                | 1,2                             | 24,3                                                          |
| 2017  | 2189,8                           | 3432,7                           | 367                                | 1,9                             | 33,1                                                          |
| 2018  | 3222,5                           | 7458,2                           | 415                                | 6,5                             | 48,8                                                          |

Based on the data of table 2, we can say that the volume of industrial production of the region for 2010-2018 amounted to an average of 24.5 %, and the volume of financial resources allocated under state programs and investments-an average of 40.1%, reflecting the dynamics of growth. However, the study of newly established industrial enterprises and technologies introduced into them during this period saw growth and decline to varying degrees. Labor productivity at industrial enterprises of the region in 2018 compared to 2010 increased by almost 3.9 times.

When studying these factors, it turned out that some of them are insignificant. Thus, the basis of the process factor selection method has been studied by the selected factors:

- $Y$ – the volume of industrial production during the implementation of the programs;
- $X_1$ – the amount of financial resources included in the industry under the programmes;
- $X_2$ – technologies implemented in industrial enterprises by programs;
- $X_3$ – productivity in industry.

As a result of calculations the values of unknown coefficients $a_0$, $a_1$, $a_2$ and $a_3$ of the regression equation were determined and the following equation was made.

The economic characteristics of the model can be explained as follows, namely: the value of $Y$ increases by 0.002389, 0.059351 and 71.93812, respectively, when the factors $X_1$, $X_2$ and $X_3$ increase by 1 unit. It follows that the influence of factor $X_1$ is significantly higher than factors $X_2$ and $X_3$.

Thus, it was found that the highest intensity factor that increases the effectiveness of government programs is labor productivity in these industries. However, it is desirable to take into account the other factors mentioned above.

As a result of the study we propose the following to further improve the quality and effectiveness of government programs:

1. General provisions Further increase of responsibility of subordinate bodies for implementation and control of state programs;
2. Other Develop and ensure timely implementation of the schedule of financing projects under the program with accurate real time;
3. Other Improving the quality and quantification of programmes;

---

* Data of the Statistics Department Surkhandarya region.
Impact Factor:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{ISRA (India)} & = 4.971 & \text{SIS (USA)} & = 0.912 & \text{ICV (Poland)} & = 6.630 \\
    \text{ISI (Dubai, UAE)} & = 0.829 & \text{PHHII (Russia)} & = 0.126 & \text{PIF (India)} & = 1.940 \\
    \text{GIF (Australia)} & = 0.564 & \text{ESJI (KZ)} & = 8.716 & \text{IBI (India)} & = 4.260 \\
    \text{JIF} & = 1.500 & \text{SJIF (Morocco)} & = 5.667 & \text{OAJI (USA)} & = 0.350
\end{align*}
\]

4. Others Comparison of practical results of programs with the external market and development of analytical conclusions;

5. Others Based on the capabilities and existing conditions of each territory, improving its optimality on the basis of an individual approach to the development of programs, etc.

Thus, the implementation of state programs on diversification and modernization and further development of territorial production will create opportunities not only for the development of territorial industries, but also for the sustainable development of the country’s economy. At the same time, its effectiveness can be improved by analyzing and evaluating indicators that affect the state of government programs.

The diversified econometric analysis of the state programs of development of industries of kurkhandarya region showed that to achieve high efficiency in the sphere of industrial production it is necessary, first of all, to increase labor productivity in the industry. This, in turn, it is advisable to establish the full use of existing industrial enterprises and to attract highly qualified staff to implement high quality and sustainable governance arrangements, through improved marketing and management.
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