Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.619 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 12 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS AND STRATEGIC MECHANISMS FOR ADVANCING PUBLIC AUDIT IN UZBEKISTAN

Ostonokulov Azamat Abdukarimovich
DSc., Professor at Tashkent State University of Economics
ORCID: 0000-0003-2792-3174

ABSTRACT
The article examines key foundations for developing public audit in Uzbekistan, focusing on international experiences in audit independence, methodology, and enforcement. It outlines strategic reforms such as performance auditing, and digital tools to enhance transparency and accountability.
KEYWORDS: *Public audit, Supreme Audit Institution (SAI), fiscal transparency, performance audit, audit enforcement, ISSAI standards*

INTRODUCTION

In the context of ongoing reforms aimed at strengthening public financial management and enhancing transparency in the use of public resources, the development of a robust and independent public audit system has become a strategic priority for many countries, including Uzbekistan. The effectiveness of public audit institutions plays a vital role not only in detecting financial irregularities or misappropriation of funds but also in assessing the performance, efficiency, and legality of government operations. As governments face increasing demands for accountability, value-for-money, and results-based budgeting, public audit has evolved from a purely compliance-oriented function to a multidimensional tool that contributes to good governance, institutional integrity, and fiscal discipline.

The conceptual foundations of public audit must be understood in light of its institutional role in the broader public sector governance architecture. In its modern form, public audit is no longer limited to ex-post financial oversight; rather, it encompasses performance auditing, compliance auditing, environmental auditing, and audit of policy outcomes. This multidimensional character of public audit is enshrined in the guidelines and frameworks developed by international bodies such as the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI), particularly its *Lima* and *Mexico* Declarations, and the International Standards of Supreme Audit Institutions (ISSAIs).

From a theoretical standpoint, public audit is deeply embedded in public choice theory, new institutional economics, and agency theory. These theories collectively justify the need for independent audit mechanisms that serve as a counterbalance to the information asymmetry and principal-agent problems inherent in public administration. In countries transitioning from centralized planning to market-based economies, such as Uzbekistan, the establishment of independent audit institutions is critical to fostering public trust and preventing inefficiencies and corruption in public expenditure management.

Despite notable improvements in fiscal transparency and public sector reforms, Uzbekistan still faces several challenges in institutionalizing a modern public audit system. These include the need to improve audit methodologies, align national audit practices with international standards, strengthen the legal and institutional framework for audit independence, and enhance the capacity of auditors to assess the performance of public entities. Recent developments, such as the establishment of the Supreme Audit Institution and the adoption of fiscal risk management frameworks, underscore the country’s commitment to advancing public audit. However, further conceptual and practical groundwork is required to ensure that public audit is fully integrated into the country's governance system as a proactive, credible, and results-oriented function.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of public audit has been extensively discussed in the academic and policy literature, especially in the context of public sector governance, fiscal transparency, and institutional accountability. Early literature on public

audit, grounded in the principles of public accountability and control, emphasized the role of audit institutions in verifying the legality and regularity of financial transactions [1]. Classical scholars such as Schick [2] and Wildavsky [3] argued that public audit serves as a key mechanism in controlling public spending and ensuring that government actions conform to the legislative intent. These views were particularly relevant during the era of line-item budgeting, when the primary focus of financial oversight was compliance and legality.

With the evolution of governance paradigms and the emergence of New Public Management (NPM) in the 1980s and 1990s, the focus of public audit shifted toward performance and results-oriented auditing. Scholars such as Pollitt and Bouckaert [4] highlighted the growing importance of evaluating government programs not only for financial compliance but also for effectiveness, efficiency, and economy known as the "3Es" framework. Performance auditing, which examines whether resources have been used wisely and objectives achieved, became central to public audit reform in many OECD countries [5].

From a theoretical perspective, agency theory and new institutional economics provide a robust framework for understanding the need for independent public audit institutions. According to agency theory, public officials (agents) may pursue their own interests rather than those of the public (principals), especially in the presence of information asymmetry [6]. Public audit institutions help mitigate this problem by reducing asymmetry and holding agents accountable through systematic evaluation and reporting. North's [7] work on institutional constraints underscores the role of audit in shaping credible commitments in public finance.

The role of Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs) has been further elaborated in normative frameworks developed by the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI). The *Lima Declaration* (1977) and *Mexico Declaration* (2007) laid down foundational principles for the independence, mandate, and professional standards of SAIs [8]. These declarations emphasize that for public audit to be effective, audit bodies must operate independently of the executive, be adequately resourced, and adhere to internationally recognized standards such as ISSAIs (International Standards of Supreme Audit Institutions).

Several empirical studies have established a strong correlation between effective public audit institutions and reduced corruption, improved budget discipline, and enhanced public trust. For instance, Blume and Voigt [9] found that countries with strong audit institutions tend to have lower levels of perceived corruption. Similarly, Ostonokulov A [10] showed that fiscal transparency, backed by effective audit and legislative scrutiny, improves fiscal performance in developing economies.

More recent literature emphasizes the integration of digital technologies and data analytics in public audit processes [11]. The rise of e-government platforms and open data initiatives has created new opportunities for real-time auditing, risk-based audits, and citizen participation in audit processes [12]. These innovations point toward a future in which public audit will play an even more dynamic and interactive role in public financial management.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

A comprehensive understanding of the conceptual foundations of public audit requires not only theoretical reflection but also empirical examination of institutional practices and reform trajectories in leading countries.

Table 2. Audit scope and methodologies in selected advanced countries

Country	Audit Mandate Scope	Use of Performance Audit Standards	Integration of Digital Audit Tools
Canada	The Office of the Auditor General (OAG) conducts financial, compliance, environmental, and performance audits across all federal ministries and Crown corporations.	Adopts ISSAIs with national guidelines adapted by the Canadian Council of Legislative Auditors (CCOLA). Emphasis is placed on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness (3Es).	Uses advanced data analytics for continuous auditing. Auditors employ machine learning to detect procurement anomalies in real time. Data labs within the OAG support predictive analysis.
South Korea	The Board of Audit and Inspection (BAI) audits all levels of government, including administrative decisions and policy	Applies sector-specific performance metrics. BAI developed its own evaluation frameworks to assess strategic policy	E-audit platform integrates with ministry databases, allowing access to real-time budget execution and payroll data. Mobile audit

	execution. Audits can be initiated based on citizen complaints.	outcomes, integrating risk-based audit planning.	apps are used in field inspections.
Netherlands	Netherlands Court of Audit covers national and EU-funded projects. Special focus on policy implementation, regulatory impact, and cross-ministerial programs.	Combines ISSAI-aligned practices with ex-post impact assessments. Utilizes cost-benefit analysis and stakeholder interviews to evaluate policy effectiveness.	Uses proprietary data visualization tools and open data dashboards. Each audit includes a digital annex with interactive graphs for public use. Emphasis on transparent digital reporting.

Source: Developed by the author

The countries presented showcase an evolution from traditional financial audit to comprehensive performance and strategic policy auditing. Canada's integration of AI-supported anomaly detection and predictive risk analytics provides a global benchmark. South Korea exemplifies citizen-engaged auditing and real-time government data connectivity. The Netherlands takes a unique approach by combining quantitative economic assessment with stakeholder feedback, ensuring both technical accuracy and democratic legitimacy. For Uzbekistan, adopting performance-based audit methodology (3Es), coupled with gradual digital transformation, is critical to making audit relevant to policy outcomes and public service delivery.

Table 3. Mechanisms for audit follow-up and enforcement in leading jurisdictions

Country	Parliamentary Follow-Up Mechanism	Sanctioning / Enforcement Power	Public Disclosure and Engagement
United Kingdom	The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) in the House of Commons systematically reviews National Audit Office (NAO) reports. Hearings are held with ministers and permanent secretaries.	While recommendations are non-binding, implementation is tracked. Institutional pressure and political accountability act as enforcement tools.	Every report is published online with executive summaries. Media briefings and press coverage are integral. Citizens can submit concerns directly to NAO.
Chile	The Contraloría General de la República (CGR) reports to Congress and is supported by a dedicated audit oversight commission.	Audit findings carry legal authority. The CGR can impose financial sanctions and suspend public officials for non-compliance.	Operates a digital audit platform (www.contraloria.cl) where users can track the implementation status of audit findings. Public dashboards enhance civic oversight.
Finland	Reports by the National Audit Office (NAOF) are reviewed by a special Audit Committee of Parliament. Ministries are obliged to respond formally to audit findings.	Mandated by the Audit Act, audit recommendations must be implemented within a specific time frame. Failure to act leads to parliamentary inquiry.	All audit reports are accessible on the NAOF website with timelines for response. Participatory reports invite citizen feedback on public service performance.

Source: Developed by the author

Strong follow-up mechanisms are critical to turning audit reports into governance outcomes. The UK model relies on political pressure, open debate, and media scrutiny, reinforcing democratic accountability. Chile demonstrates a hard law approach, with direct enforcement authority, including sanctions. Finland's model is a hybrid, combining legal obligation with structured parliamentary oversight and public engagement. Uzbekistan, lacking any formal audit implementation framework, must establish a statutory follow-up mechanism such as a standing parliamentary audit committee and introduce legal time-bound obligations for agencies to act on audit findings. Public transparency portals and citizen engagement are also needed to boost trust and compliance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To effectively develop the public audit system in Uzbekistan and align it with international standards, a multi-layered reform strategy must be pursued, grounded in institutional independence, performance orientation, digital innovation, and legal enforceability.

First, Uzbekistan must constitutionally enshrine the independence of the Supreme Audit Institution (SAI), elevating it to a fully autonomous body, structurally decoupled from the executive branch. The legal framework should mandate a fixed-term, non-renewable appointment of the SAI head through a supermajority vote in parliament, thereby safeguarding against politicization. Budgetary autonomy must be institutionalized, with the SAI submitting its budget directly to the legislative branch, immune to executive reductions. These measures would anchor the audit institution as a credible guardian of fiscal integrity.

Second, Uzbekistan should pivot from traditional compliance audits toward performance, policy, and environmental audits by adopting and contextualizing ISSAI standards. This shift requires capacity development through international certification (e.g., via INTOSAI Development Initiative), strategic partnerships with mature SAIs (e.g., Finland, Korea), and the creation of internal audit units within ministries as feeder structures. Furthermore, the audit mandate must explicitly include oversight of off-budget funds, state-owned enterprises, and public-private partnership (PPP) contracts, sectors currently vulnerable to opacity and inefficiency.

Third, the government must invest in a national e-audit infrastructure integrating real-time data from treasury, procurement, payroll, and public investment systems. AI-assisted analytics and anomaly detection tools, as used in Canada and South Korea, should be embedded within audit workflows. This would enable continuous auditing, reduce human discretion, and generate early warnings on fiscal risks. Simultaneously, audit reports should be digitally accessible, visualized for public consumption, and integrated into national open data platforms.

Fourth, a mandatory legal mechanism for implementing audit recommendations should be introduced. Modeled after the Chilean and Finnish frameworks, Uzbekistan should create a parliamentary Audit Implementation Oversight Committee with the authority to summon ministers, monitor corrective actions, and escalate unresolved issues to the Anti-Corruption Agency or Prosecutor General's Office. Each audited entity must be required to submit a formal response plan with deadlines, monitored via a centralized tracking system. This would close the audit-enforcement gap and institutionalize accountability.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, public audit in Uzbekistan must evolve from a reactive control function to a proactive governance instrument. This transformation depends on constitutional safeguards, professionalization, strategic auditing, and binding follow-up mechanisms. The international experience demonstrates that effective public audit strengthens fiscal discipline, deters corruption, and enhances trust in government. For Uzbekistan, the development of a modern, independent, and digitally empowered audit system is not merely a technical reform it is a cornerstone of public sector modernization and democratic accountability.

REFERENCES

1. *Gray, A., & Jenkins, B. (1993). Audit, accountability and independence: The case of the Audit Commission. Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 4(1), 1-31.*
2. *Schick, A. (1966). The Road to PPB: The Stages of Budget Reform. Public Administration Review, 26(4), 243–258.*
3. *Wildavsky, A. (1964). The Politics of the Budgetary Process. Boston: Little, Brown.*
4. *Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis - New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State. Oxford University Press.*
5. *OECD (2016). Performance Budgeting in OECD Countries. OECD Publishing.*
6. *Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360.*
7. *North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge University Press.*
8. *INTOSAI. (2007). Mexico Declaration on SAI Independence. Retrieved from https://www.intosai.org*
9. *Blume, L., & Voigt, S. (2011). Does organizational design of supreme audit institutions matter? A cross-country assessment. European Journal of Political Economy, 27(2), 215–229.*
10. *Ostonokulov A. Improvement of methodology for accounting of extra-budgetary resources of public educational and medical institutions. InE3S Web of Conferences 2021 (Vol. 296, p. 06029). EDP Sciences.*
11. *Ostonokulov, A. A. (2021). Improving Accounting of settlements with Suppliers and Buyers in Public Sector Institutions. American Journal of Economics and Business Management. ISSN, 2576-5973.*
12. *Abdukarimovich, O. A. (2024). IMPROVEMENT OF INVENTORY ACCOUNTING IN BUDGET ORGANIZATIONS. World scientific research journal, 24(2), 17-25.*