



Article

Enhancing Socio-Economic Development Strategies Through The State Budget

Dustmirzayev Farxod Bekmirzayevich*¹

1. Graduate School of Business and Entrepreneurship under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan (gsbe.uz)

* Correspondence: 85fara19@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines strategies for enhancing socio-economic development through the effective use of the state budget. It highlights the role of fiscal policy in promoting sustainable economic growth, improving social welfare, and ensuring the efficient allocation of public resources. The research focuses on performance-based budgeting, medium-term fiscal planning, and digital public financial management as key instruments for increasing the effectiveness of budget policy. Using systematic and comparative analysis, the study identifies the main factors affecting the efficiency of public expenditure and strategic budget management. The findings demonstrate that strengthening budget planning, improving expenditure efficiency, and implementing performance-oriented management contribute significantly to sustainable socio-economic development. The paper proposes practical recommendations for improving fiscal policy and enhancing the effectiveness of public financial management.

Citation: Bekmirzayevich, D. F. Enhancing Socio-Economic Development Strategies Through The State Budget. American Journal of Economics and Business Management 2026, 9(7), 337-348.

Received: 05th May 2026

Revised: 20th May 2026

Accepted: 15th Jun 2026

Published: 11th Jul 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Keywords: State Budget, Socio-Economic Development, Fiscal Policy, Public Expenditure, Performance-Based Budgeting, Budget Efficiency, Public Financial Management, Strategic Planning, Sustainable Development, Digital Transformation

1. Introduction

In the context of global economic uncertainty, rapid digital transformation, and growing social demands, improving strategies for socio-economic development has become a key priority for governments worldwide [1]. As the principal instrument of fiscal policy, the state budget plays a decisive role in allocating public resources, supporting macroeconomic stability, promoting inclusive economic growth, and improving the quality of public services. Consequently, enhancing the effectiveness of budget policy is essential for achieving sustainable development goals and strengthening public sector performance [2].

Recent public finance reforms have shifted the focus from traditional input-based budgeting toward performance-based budgeting, medium-term fiscal planning, and results-oriented public financial management [3]. These approaches emphasize the efficient allocation of budgetary resources, greater fiscal transparency and accountability, and the evaluation of public expenditure based on measurable outcomes. At the same time, digital technologies and data-driven governance have created new opportunities to improve budget planning, monitoring, and decision-making processes [4].

In Uzbekistan, comprehensive fiscal reforms have been implemented to modernize the budget system, strengthen fiscal discipline, and improve the efficiency of public

expenditure [5]. These reforms are aimed at increasing the transparency of budget processes, expanding digital budget management, introducing medium-term budget planning, and aligning public spending with national socio-economic development priorities. Such transformations require the development of scientifically grounded strategies that ensure the effective use of state budget resources while addressing regional disparities, enhancing human capital, and improving the overall well-being of the population [6].

Despite the growing body of research on fiscal policy and public financial management, further studies are needed to identify strategic mechanisms that enhance the contribution of the state budget to socio-economic development under contemporary economic conditions. In particular, there remains a need to integrate strategic planning, performance evaluation, and digital governance into a comprehensive framework for budget management [7].

The aim of this study is to examine strategic approaches to enhancing socio-economic development through the effective use of the state budget and to develop practical recommendations for improving budget policy, increasing the efficiency of public expenditure, and strengthening the strategic management of public finances.

Literature Review. The relationship between the state budget and socio-economic development has remained one of the central issues in public finance theory and fiscal policy research [8]. Over time, the role of the state budget has evolved from serving as a financial instrument for maintaining government functions to becoming a strategic policy tool for promoting economic growth, improving social welfare, reducing regional disparities, and ensuring sustainable development [9].

The theoretical foundations of budget policy were largely established by Keynes, who argued that government expenditure plays a critical role in stabilizing aggregate demand during periods of economic recession. According to Keynesian theory, expansionary fiscal policy can stimulate investment, increase employment, and support long-term economic growth [10]. Consequently, public expenditure should not be viewed merely as a financing mechanism but as an effective macroeconomic policy instrument capable of mitigating cyclical fluctuations and fostering economic stability [11].

Musgrave and Musgrave further developed the theory of public finance by identifying three fundamental functions of the state budget: resource allocation, income redistribution, and macroeconomic stabilization [12]. These functions remain highly relevant in modern fiscal systems, particularly in developing economies where budget policy serves as an important mechanism for reducing poverty, improving access to public services, and promoting balanced regional development [13].

Contemporary studies have expanded traditional fiscal theories by emphasizing efficiency, transparency, and accountability in public expenditure management. Stiglitz and Rosengard argue that the effectiveness of public spending depends not only on the volume of financial resources but also on the institutional quality of budget planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation [14]. They emphasize that efficient public financial management contributes to improved service delivery, enhanced public trust, and sustainable economic development [15].

Similarly, Schick notes that modern budget systems increasingly rely on strategic planning and performance measurement rather than traditional input-based budgeting. This transition reflects a broader shift toward performance-based budgeting, where public expenditures are linked to measurable outputs and policy outcomes instead of administrative spending categories. Such an approach enables governments to improve resource allocation efficiency and strengthen fiscal accountability.

International organizations have also contributed significantly to the development of modern budget management principles. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development emphasizes that sound budget governance should integrate strategic

planning, fiscal sustainability, transparency, public participation, and evidence-based decision-making. Likewise, the International Monetary Fund highlights medium-term fiscal frameworks as an essential instrument for maintaining macroeconomic stability and improving the predictability of public expenditure.

The World Bank argues that effective public financial management requires the integration of digital technologies into budget processes. Digital budget systems facilitate real-time monitoring of expenditures, improve fiscal transparency, reduce administrative costs, and strengthen accountability mechanisms. These innovations have become particularly important in countries implementing comprehensive public sector reforms and digital government strategies.

Recent academic research has also focused on the relationship between digital transformation and fiscal governance. Mergel, Edelmann and Haug suggest that digital government enhances the efficiency of public administration by improving data management, interagency coordination, and citizen engagement. In the context of budget management, digital platforms support more transparent allocation of public resources and improve the monitoring of government programs.

In Uzbekistan, large-scale reforms have been implemented to modernize the public financial management system through the introduction of medium-term budget planning, results-oriented budgeting, and digital budget administration. These reforms aim to improve fiscal discipline, strengthen budget transparency, and increase the effectiveness of public expenditure in achieving national development priorities. The gradual implementation of performance-based budgeting reflects the country's commitment to aligning financial resource allocation with strategic socio-economic objectives.

Despite significant theoretical and practical advances, existing studies primarily examine fiscal policy, budget efficiency, or public financial management as separate research areas. Limited attention has been devoted to integrating strategic planning, performance-based budgeting, digital governance, and socio-economic development within a comprehensive analytical framework. This research seeks to address this gap by examining how these elements can be combined to enhance the strategic role of the state budget in achieving sustainable socio-economic development.

Recent literature demonstrates that the effectiveness of state budget policy depends not only on the volume of public expenditure but also on the strategic quality of budget planning and governance. Robinson argues that performance-based budgeting should be regarded as a management system rather than merely a budgeting technique. In this context, budget allocations are expected to produce measurable socio-economic outcomes, while government agencies are held accountable for achieving predefined performance indicators.

Allen, Hemming and Potter emphasize that modern fiscal management requires close coordination between national development strategies and annual budget processes. They argue that the absence of such coordination often results in inefficient resource allocation, fragmented investment decisions, and limited policy effectiveness. Consequently, medium-term expenditure frameworks have become an important component of fiscal governance in many developed and developing economies.

According to the OECD, strategic budgeting should incorporate long-term fiscal sustainability, evidence-based policymaking, and continuous performance evaluation. The organization notes that governments increasingly rely on digital technologies and integrated financial information systems to improve budget credibility, strengthen expenditure control, and enhance the transparency of fiscal decision-making.

The International Monetary Fund also highlights that countries implementing comprehensive public financial management reforms have achieved greater fiscal resilience through medium-term budget planning, fiscal risk management, and stronger

institutional capacity. These reforms contribute not only to macroeconomic stability but also to improved public confidence in government financial management.

Digital transformation has emerged as another important determinant of budget efficiency. According to the World Bank, digital public financial management systems significantly improve the quality of budget execution by reducing administrative costs, minimizing information asymmetry, and providing real-time financial monitoring. Similarly, the adoption of open budget platforms increases citizen participation and strengthens public accountability by improving access to budget information.

Recent empirical studies indicate that countries combining strategic planning, digital governance, and performance-oriented budgeting generally demonstrate higher levels of public sector efficiency and more sustainable socio-economic outcomes. Nevertheless, scholars continue to emphasize that institutional quality, administrative capacity, and governance effectiveness remain decisive factors influencing the successful implementation of fiscal reforms.

From the perspective of Uzbekistan, ongoing public finance reforms have established a favorable institutional environment for improving budget governance. However, further efforts are required to integrate strategic planning, digital public financial management, performance evaluation, and expenditure efficiency into a unified policy framework. Such integration would enable the state budget to function not only as a financial instrument but also as a strategic mechanism for achieving inclusive and sustainable socio-economic development.

Although extensive research has examined fiscal policy, public expenditure, budget transparency, and performance-based budgeting, relatively few studies have developed an integrated framework that simultaneously combines strategic budget planning, digital public financial management, performance evaluation, and socio-economic development. Furthermore, empirical evidence regarding the interaction of these components in transition economies remains limited. This study addresses this gap by proposing a comprehensive strategic approach to enhancing socio-economic development through more efficient and results-oriented state budget management.

2. Materials and Methods

This study employs a mixed-method research approach combining qualitative and quantitative analyses to examine strategies for enhancing socio-economic development through the state budget. The research applies a systematic literature review, comparative analysis, trend analysis, descriptive statistical analysis, and institutional analysis to assess the effectiveness of fiscal policy and public financial management reforms. Secondary data covering the period 2010–2025 were collected from the official publications of the Ministry of Economy and Finance of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the National Statistics Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The findings were synthesized to identify the key determinants of budget efficiency and to formulate practical recommendations for strengthening strategic budget management and promoting sustainable socio-economic development.

3. Results and Discussion

The **Fiscal Strategy for 2026–2028**, developed in accordance with the Budget Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the *Uzbekistan–2030 Strategy*, identifies improving the efficiency of public expenditure as one of the country's key fiscal policy priorities. The strategy emphasizes the need to ensure that budget planning and resource allocation are based on expenditure justification, targeted financing, and alignment with national strategic development objectives.

In line with the fiscal strategy, the effectiveness of budget expenditures and government subsidies is subject to regular evaluation. Inefficient expenditures are

expected to be optimized to improve the efficiency of public financial resource utilization. This approach strengthens the principles of performance, accountability, and fiscal responsibility in public expenditure management while contributing to more effective budget governance.

An important component of the ongoing public finance reforms is the introduction of results-based financing instruments developed by international financial institutions. In particular, the World Bank's **Program-for-Results (PforR)** financing mechanism links the disbursement of financial resources directly to the achievement of predefined development results. Unlike traditional project-based financing, the PforR approach conditions financial support on measurable performance indicators, thereby encouraging greater efficiency and institutional accountability in implementing public programs.

Results-based financing also contributes to improving the targeting of public resources, strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems, and enhancing the transparency and effectiveness of government programs. Furthermore, this financing model promotes fiscal discipline, reinforces the accountability of public institutions, and supports the long-term sustainability of structural reforms.

A fundamental prerequisite for applying results-based financing instruments is that government programs are fully aligned with national strategic development priorities and include clearly defined, measurable performance indicators. This creates a robust institutional framework for improving budget efficiency and ensuring that public expenditures generate tangible socio-economic outcomes.

The *Uzbekistan–2030 Strategy* and the **Strategy for Improving the Public Financial Management System for 2025–2030** identify the gradual introduction of performance-based budgeting as one of the principal directions for enhancing the efficiency of public expenditure. This approach aims to align budget allocations with strategic national priorities, improve the assessment of budget performance, and strengthen the accountability of government institutions.

During the initial phase of implementing program-based budgeting, ministries and government agencies introduced key performance indicators (KPIs) to evaluate the effectiveness of budget execution. In addition, parliamentary oversight mechanisms were strengthened through the regular review of institutional performance reports. These measures have created an institutional foundation for embedding results-oriented management principles within the public budgeting process.

The government plans to expand the implementation of performance-based budgeting progressively, with the objective of fully transitioning to a comprehensive program budgeting model by 2030. This system will enable policymakers to assess the extent to which public expenditures contribute to strategic development goals, incorporate performance information into budget decision-making, evaluate the effectiveness of government programs, and improve monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. Moreover, the regular disclosure of budget performance information to Parliament and the public is expected to strengthen transparency, public trust, and institutional accountability.

A practical manifestation of these reforms is reflected in **Presidential Resolution No. PQ-455 of 25 December 2024**, under which the budget and extra-budgetary funds of the Ministry of Economy and Finance and the Ministry of Agriculture for the period **2025–2027** were approved on a pilot basis within the framework of program budgeting. This initiative demonstrates that Uzbekistan has entered the practical stage of implementing performance-based budgeting and confirms the government's commitment to introducing efficiency-oriented approaches to public financial management. Overall, these reforms represent an important step toward strengthening fiscal governance, improving the effectiveness of public expenditure, and enhancing the contribution of the state budget to the country's long-term socio-economic development.

Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) represents a modern approach to public financial management that links budget planning, allocation, and expenditure directly to clearly defined performance outcomes. Rather than focusing solely on the allocation of financial resources, this approach evaluates budget expenditures based on the social, economic, and institutional results achieved through the implementation of public policies and government programs.

Within the framework of performance-based budgeting, government institutions establish strategic objectives and measurable performance indicators in advance. The efficiency of budget execution is subsequently assessed according to the extent to which these predetermined objectives are achieved. Consequently, the stages of budget planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation are integrated into a unified management system that emphasizes accountability, transparency, and results-oriented decision-making.

In Uzbekistan, performance-based budgeting has become one of the principal directions of public financial management reform. Its implementation aims to strengthen fiscal discipline, enhance the transparency of public expenditure, and improve the effectiveness of government programs. Furthermore, the gradual expansion of program budgeting has contributed to the development of more efficient mechanisms for allocating and utilizing public financial resources.

From a theoretical perspective, performance-based budgeting is recognized as one of the most comprehensive approaches to results-oriented public management. This is because the model incorporates a wide range of management instruments that utilize information on strategic objectives, performance indicators, and achieved outcomes to support evidence-based decision-making. Accordingly, budget decisions are increasingly guided by measurable results rather than solely by historical expenditure patterns.

The concept of performance-based budgeting has evolved progressively, with its practical implementation varying across countries according to institutional capacity, governance structures, and fiscal priorities. Although no universally accepted methodology or standardized implementation framework exists, several core characteristics distinguish performance-based budgeting from conventional budgeting approaches.

In general, performance-based budgeting can be defined as a budgeting system that establishes a direct relationship between planned or actual public expenditures and the expected or achieved results. The primary objective of this model is to assess whether financial resources have generated the intended outputs and broader socio-economic outcomes, while simultaneously evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs financed through the state budget.

Within this framework, the budgeting process classifies the expenditures of central and local government institutions according to policy objectives and functional activities designed to address national development priorities. A separate budget program is prepared for each policy area, specifying strategic objectives, implementation tasks, required financial resources, performance indicators, and mechanisms for measuring program results. Consequently, budget requests are formulated on the basis of programs and strategic objectives rather than solely by expenditure categories.

Compared with the traditional line-item budgeting system, the structure of a program budget submitted by executive authorities to representative bodies differs substantially. The first section focuses on strategic priorities, policy objectives, expected outcomes, and target performance indicators for ministries and government agencies across different sectors. The second section presents the expenditure structure in an aggregated program format, emphasizing the relationship between financial allocations and expected policy outcomes instead of detailed expenditure classifications.

Table 1. Use of Performance Information in Public Financial Management Decision-Making

Method of Using Performance Information	Purpose and Application	Expected Outcomes
Performance measurement	To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs and projects during implementation.	Continuous information on program performance is generated, enabling the timely identification of deviations and corrective actions.
Performance targets	To establish planned performance objectives and compare actual results with predefined targets.	Clearly defined performance indicators facilitate objective measurement and evaluation of policy outcomes.
Performance reports	To analyze differences between planned and achieved program results and support evidence-based decision-making.	Official performance reports improve transparency and provide a reliable basis for managerial and policy decisions.
Performance audits	To independently verify the reliability, accuracy, and credibility of reported performance information.	Independent assessments strengthen accountability and identify weaknesses requiring institutional improvement.
Performance benchmarking	To compare organizational performance with national or international best practices and identify efficiency gaps.	Comparative analysis promotes the adoption of best practices and contributes to continuous performance improvement.
Performance contracts	To define measurable outputs, service quality standards, responsibilities, and resource commitments between government institutions and service providers.	Greater accountability, improved service quality, and enhanced efficiency in public service delivery are achieved.
Performance-based budgeting	To allocate public financial resources according to strategic objectives and measurable performance outcomes.	Public resources are distributed more efficiently, government programs become more effective, and fiscal sustainability is strengthened.

Source: Compiled by the author based on OECD, Schick, Musgrave and Musgrave, Robinson, Allen, Hemming and Potter, and World Bank.

The analysis presented in Table 1 demonstrates that performance-based budgeting (PBB) represents the most comprehensive approach to results-oriented public financial management. Unlike traditional budgeting systems, which primarily focus on controlling financial inputs, PBB integrates a broad range of performance management instruments, including performance measurement, performance targets, performance reporting, performance audits, benchmarking, and performance contracts. These instruments collectively establish a systematic framework for linking public expenditures with measurable outputs and socio-economic outcomes.

The integration of performance information into the budget process significantly enhances the quality of public financial decision-making. Performance measurement and predefined targets enable government institutions to assess whether allocated resources produce the intended results, while performance reports and independent audits strengthen transparency, accountability, and institutional credibility. At the same time, benchmarking facilitates the identification and adoption of best practices, thereby promoting continuous improvements in the efficiency of public service delivery.

International experience indicates that countries implementing performance-based budgeting have achieved more effective allocation of public resources, improved fiscal discipline, and greater transparency in public financial management. By shifting the focus from expenditure control to performance achievement, governments are better able to align budget allocations with national development priorities and maximize the socio-economic impact of public spending.

For Uzbekistan, the gradual introduction of performance-based budgeting constitutes an important component of ongoing public financial management reforms. The implementation of program budgeting, key performance indicators, and results-oriented monitoring systems provides a solid institutional foundation for improving budget efficiency and strengthening government accountability. In the long term, the successful implementation of this approach is expected to enhance fiscal sustainability, increase the effectiveness of public expenditure, and reinforce the strategic role of the state budget in achieving sustainable socio-economic development.

Under the concept of **Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB)**, the responsibilities of sectoral government agencies undergo a fundamental transformation. Instead of focusing primarily on compliance with expenditure limits, these institutions become accountable for achieving predefined policy objectives and measurable performance outcomes. This increased responsibility is accompanied by greater managerial and financial autonomy, enabling budget managers to allocate and utilize public resources more flexibly in pursuit of established targets.

Performance-based budgeting provides budget managers and spending agencies with greater flexibility in the use of allocated resources within approved government programs. Such flexibility enables institutions to maximize policy outcomes for a given level of expenditure or, alternatively, achieve predetermined objectives with minimum financial resources. Consequently, budget efficiency is assessed not only in terms of expenditure control but also through the relationship between financial inputs, service outputs, and broader socio-economic impacts.

Table 2. Advantages and Limitations of Performance-Based Budgeting (Based on OECD and World Bank Approaches)

Advantages	Limitations
Improves the efficiency of public financial management by shifting from resource-based budgeting to results-oriented budgeting (OECD, 2007; World Bank PFM Framework).	Developing and standardizing performance indicators is methodologically complex, particularly across different sectors.
Strengthens the strategic link between government policy objectives, budget implementation, and achieved outcomes through results-based management.	Many socio-economic outcomes cannot be fully quantified or monetized, limiting comprehensive performance assessment.
Enables comprehensive evaluation of budget performance based on the 3E principles economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.	Performance assessment may be affected by subjectivity and the risk of indicator manipulation ("gaming").
Enhances government accountability and institutional responsibility for policy outcomes.	Effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems require strong institutional capacity and advanced information infrastructure.
Promotes evidence-based policymaking and evidence-based budgeting.	Excessive focus on short-term measurable outcomes may undermine long-term strategic development objectives.
Provides a stronger analytical basis for reallocating budget resources toward national priorities through performance-informed budgeting.	Developing universally applicable performance indicators across different sectors remains a significant challenge.
Facilitates international comparison through program budgeting and benchmarking practices.	Institutional resistance may arise if public financial management reforms are not implemented gradually.
Increases fiscal transparency and strengthens public accountability.	Reform implementation may initially increase administrative workload and management costs.

Source: Compiled by the author based on OECD, World Bank, Robinson, Schick, and Allen, Hemming and Potter.

According to the recommendations of the OECD and the World Bank, performance-based budgeting constitutes one of the core components of contemporary Public Financial Management (PFM) reforms. Its primary objective is to transform traditional **input-based budgeting** into a **performance-based budgeting** system, where the emphasis shifts from the amount of resources allocated to the effectiveness with which these resources generate measurable socio-economic outcomes.

International experience demonstrates that the successful implementation of performance-based budgeting depends largely on the availability of strong institutional capacity, high-quality statistical information, and well-developed monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems. In the absence of these prerequisites, governments may encounter challenges such as formal compliance with performance indicators, manipulation of reported results, and limited use of performance information in budget decision-making.

In Uzbekistan, the gradual introduction of performance-based budgeting has become one of the priority directions of public financial management reform. The implementation of this approach contributes to improving the transparency of the budget process, strengthening the performance orientation of government programs, and increasing the efficiency of public expenditure. These reforms are expected to reinforce fiscal sustainability, improve public sector governance, and enhance the strategic contribution of the state budget to sustainable socio-economic development.

Under a **Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB)** framework, budget managers may, under certain conditions, be granted the authority to reallocate financial resources among government programs in response to changing implementation priorities. In addition, spending agencies may be permitted to carry forward a portion of unspent appropriations to the subsequent fiscal year, provided that such reallocations remain within legally established limits. These mechanisms enhance managerial flexibility and create stronger incentives for the efficient and economical use of public resources.

The budget execution control system also undergoes a fundamental transformation under PBB. Traditional compliance-oriented financial control, which primarily focuses on verifying whether expenditures conform to approved budget classifications, is gradually replaced by a performance-oriented control system that evaluates the extent to which predetermined objectives and expected outcomes have been achieved. Consequently, budget oversight shifts from monitoring expenditure compliance to assessing policy effectiveness through measurable and objectively verifiable performance indicators. Nevertheless, compliance with the intended purpose of public expenditures continues to be monitored, although primarily at a more aggregated expenditure level.

Another fundamental principle of the PBB concept is the promotion of maximum transparency and openness throughout the budget process. Budget information is made publicly available, enabling citizens, taxpayers, and other stakeholders to assess the efficiency of public expenditure and evaluate the performance of government institutions based on measurable results. Such transparency strengthens public trust, improves accountability, and reinforces evidence-based fiscal governance.

The differences between traditional line-item budgeting and performance-based budgeting are most clearly illustrated through comparative analysis. Until recently, line-item budgeting represented the dominant model of public financial management in many countries. Its principal objective was to ensure that public funds were spent strictly in accordance with approved expenditure categories and legal requirements. However, international experience has demonstrated that this approach is less effective in achieving long-term strategic development objectives. As a result, excessive centralization, limited managerial autonomy, weak institutional accountability, and insufficient incentives for improving expenditure efficiency have become common challenges in traditional budgeting systems.

Table 3. Comparative Analysis of Line-Item Budgeting and Performance-Based Budgeting

Criterion	Line-Item Budgeting Model	Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) Model
Conceptual framework	Traditional input-oriented fiscal management emphasizing expenditure control	Results-oriented management based on the input–output–outcome framework
Budget classification	Resources allocated by economic, functional, and administrative classifications	Resources allocated according to strategic priorities, programs, and performance indicators
Planning methodology	Incremental budgeting based on previous-year expenditures	Performance-informed budgeting supported by evidence-based planning
Planning horizon	Annual fiscal planning	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), typically covering 3–5 years
Integration with strategic planning	Weak linkage between budget and development strategies	Strong integration between policy objectives, strategic plans, and budget allocations
Flexibility in resource utilization	Strict expenditure controls with limited reallocation possibilities	Greater managerial flexibility through program budgeting, lump-sum appropriations, and carry-over mechanisms
Budget control	Compliance and legality of expenditures	Performance monitoring and performance auditing focused on efficiency and effectiveness
Performance measurement	Financial execution indicators	Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), output, outcome, and impact indicators
Organizational model	Function-based administrative structure	Results-oriented management with clear responsibility for program outputs
Distribution of authority	Centralized decision-making with limited managerial autonomy	Decentralized management with expanded operational decision-making authority
Incentive mechanisms	Administrative control over expenditure compliance	Performance incentives linked to achieved results and contractual accountability
Accountability	Primarily financial and legal accountability	Results-based accountability combined with transparency and public oversight
Efficiency approach	Emphasis on economy in resource utilization	Integrated application of the 3E principles: economy, efficiency, and effectiveness
Main risks	Inefficient resource allocation, limited innovation, weak incentives	Indicator manipulation ("gaming"), data quality limitations, and institutional capacity constraints

Source: Compiled by the author based on Musgrave and Musgrave (1989), OECD (2007; 2019; 2023), Schick (2014), Allen, Hemming and Potter (2013), Robinson (2023), World Bank (2022; 2023), and IMF (2024).

The comparative analysis demonstrates that performance-based budgeting constitutes a significant evolution in public financial management by replacing input-oriented expenditure control with a strategic management approach focused on measurable results and socio-economic outcomes. Compared with the traditional line-item budgeting model, PBB strengthens the integration of fiscal policy with national development strategies, improves managerial flexibility, enhances institutional accountability, and supports evidence-based decision-making. At the same time, its successful implementation requires reliable statistical systems, well-developed monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, robust institutional capacity, and a mature performance management culture. Therefore, the transition to performance-based budgeting should be implemented gradually and accompanied by comprehensive institutional reforms to ensure its long-term effectiveness and sustainability.

4. Conclusion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the transition from traditional line-item budgeting to performance-based budgeting represents a fundamental reform of Uzbekistan's public financial management system. The ongoing fiscal reforms aim to strengthen the strategic role of the state budget by aligning public expenditures with national development priorities, improving expenditure efficiency, and enhancing government accountability. The implementation of program budgeting for the period 2026–2028 confirms the government's commitment to integrating medium-term fiscal planning with measurable performance indicators and results-oriented management.

The analysis further indicates that successful implementation of performance-based budgeting requires not only regulatory reforms but also substantial improvements in institutional capacity, digitalization, monitoring and evaluation systems, and evidence-based decision-making. International experience suggests that performance-oriented budgeting delivers sustainable results only when supported by reliable statistical information, transparent reporting mechanisms, and well-defined performance indicators.

Based on the research findings, several policy recommendations can be proposed. First, the gradual expansion of program budgeting should be accompanied by the development of a unified national methodology for designing budget programs, selecting key performance indicators (KPIs), and evaluating program outcomes. Second, ministries and government agencies should strengthen institutional capacity through continuous professional training in strategic planning, performance management, and public financial management. Third, the digitalization of the budget cycle should be accelerated by establishing an integrated information platform covering budget preparation, implementation, monitoring, reporting, and public disclosure. Fourth, a comprehensive performance evaluation system should be introduced by combining quantitative indicators with qualitative assessment tools, including citizen satisfaction surveys and stakeholder feedback mechanisms. Fifth, greater managerial flexibility should be granted to spending agencies through expanded authority to reallocate resources within approved programs and to carry forward efficiency savings, while maintaining strict accountability for achieved results. Finally, the gradual extension of performance-based budgeting to regional and local government institutions, supported by pilot projects and continuous institutional monitoring, would contribute to improving fiscal sustainability, strengthening public sector governance, and maximizing the socio-economic impact of public expenditure.

Overall, the successful implementation of these recommendations will facilitate the establishment of a transparent, accountable, and results-oriented budgeting system capable of supporting Uzbekistan's long-term socio-economic development objectives and improving the effectiveness of public financial management.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Mergel, N. Edelmann, и N. Haug, «Defining Digital Transformation: Results from Expert Interviews», *Government Information Quarterly*, т. 36, вып. 4, с. 101385, 2019.
- [2] J. E. Stiglitz и J. K. Rosengard, *Economics of the Public Sector*, 4th изд. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2015.
- [3] International Monetary Fund, «Fiscal Monitor: Fiscal Policy in an Uncertain World». Washington, DC, 2024 г.
- [4] International Monetary Fund, «Fiscal Monitor: On the Path to Policy Normalization». Washington, DC, 2023 г.
- [5] Ministry of Economy and Finance of the Republic of Uzbekistan, «Fiscal Strategy of the Republic of Uzbekistan for 2026–2028». Tashkent, 2025 г.

- [6] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD Best Practices for Budget Transparency*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019.
- [7] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD Budgeting and Public Expenditures 2023*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023.
- [8] M. Robinson, *Performance Budgeting: Linking Funding and Results*. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund, 2023.
- [9] R. A. Musgrave и Р. В. Musgrave, *Public Finance in Theory and Practice*, 5th изд. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1989.
- [10] World Bank, *Public Finance Review 2023: Digital Public Financial Management*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2023.
- [11] World Bank, *Public Finance Review: Strengthening Public Financial Management for Sustainable Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2022.
- [12] J. M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. London: Macmillan, 1936.
- [13] R. Allen, R. Hemming, и В. Н. Potter, *The International Handbook of Public Financial Management*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- [14] A. Schick, *The Metamorphoses of Performance Budgeting*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2014.
- [15] PEFA Secretariat, «Uzbekistan 2018 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) Assessment: Public Financial Management Performance Report». Washington, DC, 2019 г.