

IMPROVING PARLIAMENTARY OVERSIGHT IN UZBEKISTAN: THE ROLE OF FOREIGN EXPERIENCE**Saidov Shohruhxon Muzaffarovich**

PhD, National University of Uzbekistan

Phone: +998 97 768 3322

Asadova Shohista Otabek kizi

Student, National University of Uzbekistan

E-mail: asadovashoxi@gmail.com

Phone: +998 93 076 1070

Annotation: This article examines the improvement of parliamentary oversight in the Republic of Uzbekistan through the prism of foreign experience. It analyzes institutional, legal, and procedural mechanisms of parliamentary control in advanced democratic systems, including those of the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and South Korea. The study focuses on instruments such as parliamentary inquiries, committee hearings, ombudsman institutions, audit bodies, and digital oversight tools. Based on comparative analysis, the article identifies effective practices that can be adapted to Uzbekistan's legislative framework. The research relies on official reports, academic literature, and international governance indices. The findings highlight the importance of strengthening institutional independence, transparency, and accountability in parliamentary oversight.

Keywords: parliamentary oversight, Uzbekistan, comparative analysis, foreign experience, accountability, legislative control, governance

Introduction

Parliamentary oversight is a fundamental component of democratic governance, ensuring that executive authorities act within the law and remain accountable to the public. In the Republic of Uzbekistan, significant reforms have been implemented in recent years to strengthen the role of parliament, particularly following the adoption of constitutional amendments and legislative reforms aimed at enhancing transparency and accountability. According to official data, the powers of the Oliy Majlis have been expanded to include stronger mechanisms of control over the Cabinet of Ministers and other state bodies [1].

However, despite these developments, challenges remain in ensuring the effectiveness of parliamentary oversight, including limited institutional capacity, insufficient use of oversight tools, and the need for greater public engagement. International experience demonstrates that effective parliamentary control depends on a combination of legal frameworks, political culture, and institutional practices. Therefore, studying foreign models provides valuable insights for improving Uzbekistan's system.

Methodology

The research employs a comparative legal and institutional analysis of parliamentary oversight systems in selected countries. The study is based on qualitative methods, including document analysis of legal acts, parliamentary reports, and international assessments such as those by the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the OECD.

The methodology includes:

- Comparative analysis of oversight mechanisms in different jurisdictions;
- Examination of statistical data and governance indicators;
- Review of academic publications and policy reports;
- Synthesis of best practices applicable to Uzbekistan.

Results

The analysis shows that countries with effective parliamentary oversight share several common features. In the United Kingdom, parliamentary committees play a central role in scrutinizing

government activities. Select committees regularly conduct hearings, request documents, and publish detailed reports, which significantly influence public policy [2].

In Germany, the Bundestag exercises oversight through specialized committees and the Federal Court of Auditors, which provides independent evaluations of government spending [3]. The institutional independence of audit bodies is considered a key factor in ensuring accountability.

France has developed a dual system of oversight involving both parliamentary commissions and the Court of Accounts, which conducts audits and reports directly to parliament [4].

South Korea demonstrates the importance of digitalization in parliamentary oversight. The National Assembly uses advanced information systems to monitor government activities and ensure transparency [5].

These examples indicate that effective oversight requires a combination of legal authority, institutional capacity, and technological support.

Analysis and Discussion

Parliamentary oversight is widely recognized in political science and constitutional law as a multidimensional process that ensures accountability, transparency, and efficiency in governance. Comparative analysis of global practices demonstrates that oversight is not limited to formal legislative procedures but extends to a broader system of institutional interactions, legal guarantees, and societal engagement. In this context, parliamentary oversight mechanisms can be classified into legislative, financial, administrative, and increasingly, digital oversight instruments, each playing a distinct yet interconnected role in controlling executive power.

Legislative oversight remains the most visible and traditional form of parliamentary control. It includes mechanisms such as questioning ministers, interpellations, parliamentary inquiries, and the establishment of investigative commissions. In advanced parliamentary systems, these tools are institutionalized and regularly applied. For example, in the United Kingdom, select committees of the House of Commons conduct systematic scrutiny of government departments, often requiring ministers and civil servants to provide evidence under oath. Studies show that committee reports in the UK significantly influence policy revisions and administrative reforms [2, p. 45]. This demonstrates that legislative oversight is most effective when it is continuous, evidence-based, and supported by strong procedural rules.

In contrast, financial oversight focuses on the control of public expenditures and budget implementation. It is closely linked to the principle of “power of the purse,” which gives parliaments authority over state finances. In Germany, the Bundestag collaborates closely with the Federal Court of Auditors to ensure that public funds are used efficiently and lawfully. The Court operates independently and submits detailed reports to parliament, which are then discussed in committee hearings [3, p. 78]. Empirical evidence indicates that such cooperation enhances fiscal discipline and reduces the risk of corruption. This model highlights the importance of independent audit institutions as a cornerstone of effective parliamentary oversight.

Administrative oversight, on the other hand, involves monitoring the implementation of laws and government policies. It ensures that executive actions align with legislative intent and public interest. In France, administrative oversight is reinforced by the activities of parliamentary commissions and the Court of Accounts, which evaluates the performance of public institutions [4, p. 102]. The French model illustrates how performance auditing can complement legal oversight by focusing on efficiency and outcomes rather than merely compliance.

In recent years, digital oversight has emerged as a new dimension of parliamentary control. Countries such as South Korea have introduced advanced information systems that allow real-time monitoring of government activities. These systems enable parliamentarians to access data on budget execution, policy implementation, and administrative performance [5, p. 56]. Research shows that digital tools significantly enhance the speed, accuracy, and transparency of oversight processes, reducing the information asymmetry between the legislature and the executive.

When analyzing the situation in Uzbekistan, it is evident that the country has made notable progress in strengthening parliamentary oversight. The adoption of the Law “On Parliamentary Oversight” and subsequent reforms have expanded the powers of the Oliy Majlis, allowing it to conduct hearings, request information, and evaluate government performance [6]. These reforms reflect a broader effort to align national governance practices with international standards.

However, despite these advancements, several challenges remain. One of the primary issues is the limited institutional independence of parliamentary committees. Comparative studies indicate that the effectiveness of oversight largely depends on the autonomy of committees from political influence. In systems where committees are dominated by ruling parties, their ability to conduct objective investigations may be constrained. Therefore, ensuring a balanced composition of committees and strengthening their procedural independence is essential for improving oversight in Uzbekistan.

Another critical factor is access to information. Effective oversight requires timely and comprehensive access to government data, documents, and reports. In Germany, legal frameworks guarantee parliament’s right to obtain information from executive bodies, which facilitates thorough scrutiny [3, p. 78]. In Uzbekistan, while legal provisions exist, their practical implementation may face challenges related to bureaucratic resistance or delays. Addressing these issues requires not only legal reforms but also administrative changes that promote a culture of transparency within public institutions.

Public participation is also a key element of effective parliamentary oversight. In democratic systems, citizens play an active role in holding government accountable through mechanisms such as public hearings, petitions, and civil society engagement. In France, for instance, parliamentary sessions and committee hearings are often accessible to the public, and their proceedings are widely disseminated through media channels [4, p. 102]. This openness enhances trust in government and encourages civic involvement. In Uzbekistan, increasing public access to parliamentary activities and promoting citizen engagement could significantly strengthen oversight mechanisms.

The role of digital technologies in enhancing parliamentary oversight cannot be overstated. As demonstrated by South Korea, the integration of electronic governance systems allows for real-time data analysis and more efficient decision-making [5, p. 56]. For Uzbekistan, investing in digital infrastructure and developing e-parliament systems could improve the effectiveness and transparency of oversight processes. This includes the use of online platforms for monitoring government performance, publishing parliamentary reports, and facilitating communication between parliamentarians and citizens.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of parliamentary oversight is closely linked to the professional capacity of parliamentarians and their staff. In many developed countries, members of parliament are supported by expert advisors, research services, and analytical units that provide them with the necessary information and expertise to conduct oversight activities. For example, the UK Parliament has a well-established research service that assists committees in analyzing complex policy issues [2, p. 50]. In Uzbekistan, strengthening the analytical capacity of parliament could enhance the quality of oversight and enable more informed decision-making.

Another important aspect is the relationship between parliament and independent oversight institutions, such as ombudsmen and anti-corruption agencies. International experience shows that cooperation between these bodies can significantly enhance accountability. The Inter-Parliamentary Union emphasizes that parliaments should actively engage with independent institutions to ensure comprehensive oversight [7, p. 25]. In Uzbekistan, further developing such cooperation could improve the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts and strengthen public trust in government.

The role of international organizations, including the OECD, is also significant in shaping best practices for parliamentary oversight. OECD reports highlight the importance of transparency, accountability, and stakeholder engagement in modern governance systems [8, p.

115]. These principles are increasingly reflected in Uzbekistan's reform agenda, indicating a commitment to aligning with global standards.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that the direct transplantation of foreign models may not always be effective. Each country has its own political, cultural, and institutional context, which influences the functioning of parliamentary oversight. Therefore, the adaptation of foreign experience should be based on a careful analysis of local conditions and needs. In the case of Uzbekistan, this means considering factors such as the structure of the political system, the level of institutional development, and the role of civil society.

In addition, the effectiveness of parliamentary oversight is influenced by political will. Even the most advanced legal frameworks and institutional arrangements cannot guarantee accountability if there is a lack of commitment from political actors. In many countries, successful oversight reforms have been driven by strong political leadership and a shared commitment to democratic principles. For Uzbekistan, maintaining momentum in ongoing reforms and fostering a culture of accountability within government institutions will be crucial for achieving sustainable improvements.

The integration of gender and inclusivity considerations into parliamentary oversight is another emerging trend in international practice. Research indicates that diverse parliaments are more effective in addressing a wide range of societal issues and ensuring inclusive governance. While this aspect is still developing in many countries, including Uzbekistan, it represents an important area for future reform.

Moreover, the evaluation of parliamentary oversight effectiveness requires clear indicators and benchmarks. International organizations have developed various tools for assessing oversight performance, including indicators related to transparency, accountability, and citizen participation. Applying such tools in Uzbekistan could provide valuable insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the current system and guide future reforms.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that improving parliamentary oversight in Uzbekistan requires a comprehensive approach based on international best practices. While significant progress has been made, further reforms are needed to enhance institutional capacity, transparency, and accountability.

Foreign experience shows that effective oversight depends on strong legal frameworks, independent institutions, and active public participation. By adapting these elements to its national context, Uzbekistan can strengthen its parliamentary system and promote democratic governance.

References

- [1] Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Parliamentary Oversight," 2016, Article 3, pp. 5–7.
- [2] McLean, I., McMillan, A. "State of the Union: Parliamentary Oversight in the UK," Oxford University Press, 2019, pp. 40–55.
- [3] Bundesrechnungshof Annual Report, Germany, 2020, pp. 70–85.
- [4] Cour des comptes Report, France, 2021, pp. 95–110.
- [5] National Assembly of South Korea Report on Digital Oversight Systems, 2022, pp. 50–60.
- [6] Oliy Majlis Legislative Chamber Report, Uzbekistan, 2021, pp. 12–18.
- [7] Inter-Parliamentary Union, "Parliamentary Oversight Tools," 2018, pp. 20–35.
- [8] OECD, "Government at a Glance," 2021, pp. 110–125.
- [9] Yamamoto, H. "Tools for Parliamentary Oversight," World Bank Institute, 2007, pp. 15–30.
- [10] Pelizzo, R., Stapenhurst, R. "Legislative Oversight and Budgeting," World Bank, 2013, pp. 60–75.

[11] Rockman, B. "Legislative-Executive Relations," Annual Review of Political Science, 2010, pp. 120–135.

[12] Johnson, J. "Comparative Parliamentary Systems," Cambridge University Press, 2018, pp. 200–215.