

Institutionalising Dialogue Between Parliament and Government: The Uzbek Model of Executive Representation in The Legislature

Umidjon Qurbonovich Sulaymonov

Independent Researcher, Tashkent State University of Law, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Received: 08 Feb 2026 | Received Revised Version: 24 Feb 2026 | Accepted: 10 Mar 2026 | Published: 31 Mar 2026

Volume 08 Issue 03 2026 | Crossref DOI: 10.37547/tajpslc/Volume08Issue03-17

Abstract

This article examines the emerging Uzbek model of executive representation in the legislature through the institution of the Authorized Representative of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Oliy Majlis. The study argues that this institution reflects a broader transformation in executive–legislative relations: from a predominantly formal understanding of separation of powers toward structured procedural cooperation between the Government and Parliament. The article analyses the constitutional and statutory foundations of the institution, its legal nature, functional role in law-making, parliamentary oversight and government accountability, and its place within the broader evolution of Uzbekistan's public law system. Particular attention is given to the distinction between parliamentary oversight actors and executive actors that facilitate the Government's participation in oversight procedures. The article also places the Uzbek model in a comparative perspective by examining how different constitutional systems organise communication between the executive and the legislature. It concludes that the Authorized Representative is not a parliamentary body, not a member of the legislature, and not an independent subject of parliamentary oversight, but rather a special governmental official responsible for ensuring institutional liaison, procedural coordination and timely information exchange between the Cabinet of Ministers and the chambers of the Oliy Majlis. The article suggests that further development of this institution should focus on clearer statutory regulation, digital monitoring of inter-institutional procedures, analytical standards for governmental responses, and safeguards preserving parliamentary independence.

Keywords: Uzbekistan, Oliy Majlis, Cabinet of Ministers, executive–legislative relations, parliamentary oversight, government accountability, authorized representative, separation of powers, institutional dialogue, constitutional reform.

© 2026 Umidjon Qurbonovich Sulaymonov. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The authors retain copyright and allow others to share, adapt, or redistribute the work with proper attribution.

Cite This Article: Umidjon Qurbonovich Sulaymonov. (2026). Institutionalising Dialogue Between Parliament and Government: The Uzbek Model of Executive Representation in The Legislature. *The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology*, 8(03), 131–139. <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajpslc/Volume08Issue03-17>

1. Introduction

Relations between parliament and government occupy a central place in modern constitutional governance. The separation of powers does not mean complete isolation of the legislative and executive branches. On the contrary, the functioning of a contemporary constitutional state requires regular communication,

legally defined procedures, political accountability and institutional channels through which the executive and legislature interact. Parliament adopts laws, approves or reviews key state policies, exercises oversight and demands accountability. Government implements laws, prepares legislative initiatives, executes public policy and provides explanations, reports and information to the legislature.

In many constitutional systems, the quality of governance depends not only on the formal distribution of powers, but also on the institutional mechanisms that organise cooperation between branches of government. Poorly coordinated relations between parliament and government may lead to delays in law-making, incomplete implementation of legislation, weak parliamentary oversight and insufficient governmental accountability. Conversely, institutionalised dialogue may improve the quality of legislative drafting, strengthen executive responsibility and make parliamentary control more effective.

The Republic of Uzbekistan provides an interesting case for the study of executive–legislative coordination. During the years of independence, Uzbekistan has gradually developed the constitutional and legal foundations of its state institutions, including the Oliy Majlis (Parliament), the Cabinet of Ministers (Government) and the mechanisms of parliamentary oversight. Since 2017, the evolution of statehood and the legal system in Uzbekistan has gained a more dynamic character and reached a qualitatively new stage. In this period, reforms aimed at strengthening the role of Parliament, enhancing government accountability, improving law-making and developing parliamentary oversight became particularly significant.

One of the institutional innovations of this period is the establishment of the position of the Authorized Representative of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Oliy Majlis. This position was introduced by the Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP–3294 of 28 September 2017 “On the Introduction of the Position of the Authorized Representative of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan”. Later, the constitutional and legislative basis of government–parliament relations was further developed, especially after the adoption of the new edition of the Constitution in 2023 and the Constitutional Law “On the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan” in 2024.

The institution of the Authorized Representative is especially important because it does not simply duplicate existing governmental or parliamentary structures. It represents a specific legal mechanism for ensuring cooperation between the Cabinet of Ministers and the chambers of the Oliy Majlis. Its main function is to coordinate the Government’s participation in law-

making, parliamentary oversight and accountability procedures. In this sense, Uzbekistan’s experience may be described as a model of executive representation in the legislature, but this concept must be understood carefully. The Authorized Representative is not a member of parliament, not a parliamentary official and not a subject of parliamentary oversight. Rather, the institution functions as a governmental liaison mechanism within parliamentary procedures.

The purpose of this article is to analyse the Uzbek model of executive representation in the legislature from the perspective of constitutional law and institutional design. The article addresses four main questions. First, what is the constitutional and legal context in which the institution of the Authorized Representative emerged? Second, what is the legal nature of this institution? Third, what functions does it perform in law-making, parliamentary oversight and government accountability? Fourth, what are the main directions for further improving this institution?

The article is based on doctrinal legal analysis, formal legal interpretation, systemic analysis of Uzbek legislation and limited comparative legal observation. The focus is primarily normative and institutional. The article does not claim to provide a comprehensive empirical measurement of the practical effectiveness of the institution. Instead, it examines how the institution is legally constructed and what role it may play in the broader system of executive–legislative relations.

2. Constitutional Context of Executive–Legislative Relations in Uzbekistan

The constitutional foundation of executive–legislative relations in Uzbekistan is the principle of separation of powers. The Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan establishes that the system of state power is based on the separation of legislative, executive and judicial powers. This principle defines the structural logic of state governance: the legislature, the executive and the judiciary each have their own constitutional status, competence and institutional independence.

However, separation of powers in a modern constitutional system should not be interpreted as the complete absence of interaction between branches of government. The legislative and executive branches are independent, but they are also functionally interconnected. The legislature cannot effectively perform its functions without information on the

implementation of laws and government policies. The executive cannot effectively implement state policy without legislative support, budgetary approval and legal regulation. Thus, constitutional governance requires both separation and cooperation.

The Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan is the national Parliament and exercises legislative power. Its two chambers — the Legislative Chamber and the Senate — participate in law-making, parliamentary oversight, budgetary processes and other constitutionally defined functions. The Cabinet of Ministers is the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan and forms part of the executive branch. The Constitutional Law “On the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan” defines the Cabinet as the highest executive body, responsible for ensuring the implementation of the Constitution, laws, decisions of the chambers of the Oliy Majlis and acts of the President.

The constitutional and statutory framework also establishes the accountability of the Government. The Cabinet of Ministers is responsible before the Oliy Majlis and the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. The Prime Minister and members of the Government may present reports and explanations before Parliament. The Government also participates in legislative activity through the right of legislative initiative and through the preparation and submission of draft laws.

The development of parliamentary oversight is another important dimension of executive–legislative relations. The Law “On Parliamentary Oversight” defines the subjects and forms of parliamentary oversight. Such oversight may include parliamentary inquiries, deputy and senator inquiries, committee hearings, reports of officials, review of state programmes and other legally established procedures. At the same time, Government Hour has a specific procedural nature: under Article 10¹ of the Law “On Parliamentary Oversight”, it is conducted by the Legislative Chamber of the Oliy Majlis.

These forms require not only legal rules, but also practical mechanisms for preparing information, coordinating responses and ensuring that executive bodies comply with parliamentary procedures. In this context, the need for a specialised mechanism of interaction between the Cabinet of Ministers and the Oliy Majlis becomes evident. Parliamentary oversight and government accountability cannot be effective if the exchange of information between state bodies is

irregular, delayed or fragmented. Similarly, the quality of legislative drafting depends on timely coordination between ministries, government departments, parliamentary committees, factions and chamber administrations. The institution of the Authorized Representative responds to this practical and legal need.

3. The Emergence of the Authorized Representative of the Cabinet of Ministers in the Oliy Majlis

The position of the Authorized Representative of the Cabinet of Ministers in the Oliy Majlis was introduced in 2017. The establishment of this institution should be understood within the broader context of reforms aimed at improving the organisational and legal mechanisms of interaction between the Government and Parliament. The Presidential Resolution No. PP–3294 emphasised the need to improve cooperation between the Cabinet of Ministers and the chambers of the Oliy Majlis, increase the participation of the Government in law-making and parliamentary oversight, and strengthen governmental responsibility for the implementation of socio-economic development tasks.

The creation of the position reflected a shift in the understanding of executive–legislative relations. Instead of treating communication between Parliament and Government as an occasional or purely administrative matter, the reform introduced a specialised official responsible for ensuring systematic interaction. This indicated that parliamentary dialogue with the executive required institutionalisation.

The Authorized Representative was placed within the structure of the Cabinet of Ministers. This is important for understanding the legal nature of the institution. The Authorized Representative is not attached to the Parliament as a parliamentary official. He or she acts on behalf of the Cabinet of Ministers and helps organise the Government’s cooperation with the Oliy Majlis. This institutional placement prevents confusion between parliamentary oversight and executive participation in oversight procedures.

The tasks of the Authorized Representative include coordinating the activities of structural units of the Cabinet of Ministers, ministries, state committees, other executive bodies and local executive authorities in relation to draft laws and other documents considered by the chambers of the Oliy Majlis. The Authorized Representative also participates in organising the presentation of the Government’s position on draft laws,

state programmes and other matters discussed in Parliament. In addition, the institution assists in ensuring the participation of the Cabinet of Ministers in parliamentary oversight over the implementation of laws, state programmes and other areas of government activity.

The later development of legislation strengthened the role of this institution. The Constitutional Law “On the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan” contains a separate provision on the Authorized Representative. Article 39 of this law provides that the Authorized Representative ensures close cooperation between structural units of the Cabinet of Ministers, republican and local executive authorities in the preparation of draft laws and other documents considered by the chambers of the Oliy Majlis, organises the cooperation of the Cabinet of Ministers with the Oliy Majlis in law-making, and assists in the participation of the Cabinet of Ministers in parliamentary oversight.

The inclusion of this provision in a constitutional law is significant. It means that the institution is no longer based only on a presidential act and subordinate regulation, but also has a statutory foundation at a higher level of legal regulation. This strengthens the institutional legitimacy of the Authorized Representative and confirms its importance within the system of executive–legislative relations.

4. Legal Nature of the Uzbek Model of Executive Representation

The phrase “executive representation in the legislature” may be interpreted differently in different constitutional systems. In some parliamentary systems, ministers are often members of parliament and directly participate in parliamentary proceedings. In other systems, executive representatives may attend legislative sessions, present draft laws or respond to questions, but they are not members of the legislature. In Uzbekistan, the Authorized Representative should be understood as a special governmental official responsible for liaison and procedural coordination.

The first essential feature of the Uzbek model is that the Authorized Representative is not a member of the legislature. The institution does not create an additional parliamentary mandate and does not merge executive and legislative authority. The Authorized Representative does not vote on laws, does not participate in parliamentary decision-making as a deputy or senator, and does not exercise parliamentary powers.

The second essential feature is that the Authorized Representative is not a parliamentary body or official of either chamber of the Oliy Majlis. The institution belongs to the executive branch, more precisely to the system of the Cabinet of Ministers. Its function is to represent and coordinate the Government’s position in parliamentary procedures, not to direct parliamentary bodies or influence parliamentary independence.

The third essential feature is that the Authorized Representative is not a subject of parliamentary oversight. The Law “On Parliamentary Oversight” defines the subjects of parliamentary oversight, including the chambers of the Oliy Majlis, their committees and commissions, factions, deputies, senators and other legally specified actors. The Authorized Representative is not listed among these subjects. This is not a technical detail, but a matter of constitutional logic. Parliamentary oversight must be exercised by parliamentary actors, not by an executive official.

The fourth essential feature is that the Authorized Representative facilitates the Government’s cooperation with parliamentary oversight subjects. Article 24¹ of the Law “On Parliamentary Oversight” reflects the role of the Authorized Representative in assisting the participation of the Cabinet of Ministers in parliamentary oversight procedures. This means that the Authorized Representative helps ensure that the Government prepares necessary information, explanations, reports and responses, but does not replace parliamentary oversight itself.

Therefore, the legal nature of the institution may be described as follows: the Authorized Representative of the Cabinet of Ministers in the Oliy Majlis is a special governmental official who ensures organisational, legal and informational coordination between the Cabinet of Ministers and the chambers of the Oliy Majlis in law-making, parliamentary oversight and government accountability procedures.

This definition allows the institution to be distinguished from three adjacent categories. It is not a parliamentarian; it is not a parliamentary oversight actor; and it is not a minister with independent sectoral competence. It is an institutional liaison mechanism created to improve the procedural quality of interaction between the executive and legislature.

5. Functional Areas of the Authorized Representative

The role of the Authorized Representative can be analysed through three main functional areas: law-making, parliamentary oversight and government accountability. These areas are closely connected, but each has its own legal and procedural logic.

5.1. Law-making

The Cabinet of Ministers has the right of legislative initiative. It may prepare and submit draft laws to the Legislative Chamber of the Oliy Majlis. In practice, many draft laws require the involvement of several ministries, agencies and local executive bodies. Legislative proposals may concern budgetary issues, administrative reforms, socio-economic policy, public services, state programmes or implementation of international obligations. Such draft laws often require legal, financial, economic and organisational justification.

The Authorized Representative contributes to the coordination of this process. The institution helps ensure cooperation between government bodies during the preparation of draft laws and other documents submitted to Parliament. It may assist in organising the Government's position on draft laws and in ensuring that responsible ministries are ready to explain the content, purpose and expected consequences of legislative proposals.

The Law "On the Procedure for Preparing Draft Laws and Submitting Them to the Legislative Chamber of the Oliy Majlis" provides important rules on the participation of legislative initiative subjects and the Government in draft law preparation. Within this framework, the Authorized Representative performs a coordinating function. The purpose is not simply to send documents from the Government to Parliament, but to ensure that the Government's participation in the legislative process is coherent, timely and legally substantiated.

This function is especially important during parliamentary committee discussions and factional review. Draft laws may generate questions, objections or proposals from deputies and parliamentary factions. The Government must be able to respond clearly and consistently. If different ministries provide contradictory explanations, the quality of parliamentary deliberation suffers. The Authorized Representative helps reduce such risks by coordinating the Government's position.

Thus, in the law-making process, the Authorized Representative acts as an institutional bridge between governmental drafting and parliamentary deliberation. This does not limit Parliament's freedom to accept, amend or reject draft laws. Rather, it improves the informational and procedural environment in which Parliament considers government-initiated legislation.

5.2. Parliamentary oversight

Parliamentary oversight is one of the key instruments of democratic accountability. It allows Parliament to examine how laws are implemented, how public resources are used and how executive bodies perform their duties. In Uzbekistan, parliamentary oversight includes several forms, such as parliamentary inquiries, deputy and senator inquiries, committee hearings, reports of officials, review of state programmes and other procedures established by law. Government Hour is also a form of parliamentary oversight, but it should be distinguished from general parliamentary and Senate procedures: under Article 10¹ of the Law "On Parliamentary Oversight", Government Hour is conducted by the Legislative Chamber of the Oliy Majlis.

The Authorized Representative does not conduct parliamentary oversight. This must be emphasised because confusion on this point may distort the constitutional balance. Oversight belongs to Parliament and its legally recognised subjects. The Authorized Representative belongs to the executive branch. However, parliamentary oversight can function effectively only when executive bodies provide timely, complete and reliable information. This is where the Authorized Representative plays an important role.

When a parliamentary inquiry, deputy inquiry or senator inquiry concerns the activities of the Cabinet of Ministers or executive bodies, relevant information must be collected from responsible ministries and agencies. Answers must be prepared within legal deadlines, signed by competent officials and submitted through appropriate channels. Senator inquiries are regulated within the procedural framework of the Senate and should be distinguished from Government Hour, which belongs to the practice of the Legislative Chamber. The Authorized Representative may assist in organising these processes within the Government.

The same applies to committee hearings and, within the Legislative Chamber, to Government Hour. Government Hour is a specific form of parliamentary oversight

conducted by the Legislative Chamber, during which members of the Government and heads of state administration bodies may provide explanations on issues within their competence. This procedure requires the preparation of materials, identification of responsible officials, coordination of factual information and, where necessary, follow-up measures after parliamentary discussion.

Article 24¹ of the Law “On Parliamentary Oversight” is particularly important in this regard. It reflects the idea that the Authorized Representative assists the Cabinet of Ministers in providing support to parliamentary oversight subjects. This confirms the legal distinction between oversight and assistance. Parliament oversees; the Government responds; the Authorized Representative helps organise the Government’s response.

The practical significance of this distinction is considerable. If the Authorized Representative were treated as a parliamentary oversight actor, this would blur the boundary between Parliament and Government. If, however, the institution is correctly understood as an executive liaison mechanism, it strengthens oversight without undermining the independence of parliamentary actors.

5.3. Government accountability

Government accountability before Parliament is closely related to parliamentary oversight, but it is not identical to it. Parliamentary oversight refers to the activities of parliamentary subjects aimed at examining executive activity. Government accountability refers to the obligation of the Government, the Prime Minister, ministers and other executive officials to provide reports, explanations and information to Parliament.

The Constitutional Law “On the Cabinet of Ministers” strengthens the legal basis of government accountability. It regulates the status of the Cabinet of Ministers, its responsibility before the Oliy Majlis and the President, the legislative initiative of the Government, and reporting mechanisms involving the Prime Minister and members of the Government.

The Authorized Representative does not personally replace the accountability of the Government or its members. Ministers remain responsible for their sectors. The Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet remain the political and legal actors accountable before

Parliament. However, accountability procedures require preparation. Reports must be coordinated, factual materials must be collected, questions must be addressed and parliamentary recommendations must be followed up. The Authorized Representative may assist in ensuring the procedural and informational organisation of these processes.

This is especially important for complex forms of accountability, such as annual reports, reports on state programme implementation, budget-related materials and Government Hour in the Legislative Chamber. These procedures involve not only political communication, but also legal, statistical and administrative information. Without an institutional mechanism of coordination, there is a risk of delay, inconsistency or insufficient quality of information.

Therefore, the Authorized Representative contributes to what may be called procedural accountability. This concept does not mean that the representative is politically accountable instead of the Government. Rather, it means that the representative helps organise the procedures through which government accountability is exercised.

6. The Uzbek Model in Comparative Perspective

The Uzbek model of executive representation in the legislature may be better understood when placed in a comparative perspective. Different constitutional systems use different mechanisms to organise executive–legislative communication.

In the United Kingdom, the fusion of executive and legislative personnel is a central feature of the Westminster model. Ministers are usually members of Parliament and participate directly in parliamentary debates, questions and committee proceedings. Executive representation in Parliament is therefore built into the political constitution itself.

In Germany, the Basic Law provides that members of the Federal Government have the right, and upon request the duty, to attend sessions of the Bundestag and its committees. The German model preserves the distinction between government and parliament, but ensures formal channels for executive participation in legislative work and parliamentary accountability.

In France, members of the Government may participate in parliamentary proceedings and defend government

bills. The Constitution of the Fifth Republic establishes a strong executive, but also provides legal mechanisms for government responsibility before Parliament and for parliamentary discussion of government policy.

In Japan, the Constitution allows the Prime Minister and ministers to appear before the Diet to answer questions and explain government policy. This reflects a model in which the executive participates in legislative procedures while remaining institutionally distinct from the legislature.

Some post-Soviet legal systems also provide for government representatives in parliament or for officials responsible for government–parliament interaction. These mechanisms differ in legal status, political role and institutional design.

Compared with these models, the Uzbek institution of the Authorized Representative has several distinctive features. First, it is a specialised governmental position created specifically for interaction with Parliament. Second, it is not based on the fusion of ministerial and parliamentary mandates. Third, it is connected not only with law-making, but also with parliamentary oversight and government accountability. Fourth, its role is primarily organisational, procedural and informational rather than political in the narrow sense.

This makes the Uzbek model an interesting example of institutionalised dialogue between Parliament and Government. It does not reproduce the Westminster model, where ministers are part of Parliament. It does not simply rely on occasional ministerial attendance. Instead, it creates a permanent executive liaison mechanism within parliamentary procedures.

The comparative value of this model lies in its attempt to balance separation and cooperation. The institution seeks to improve communication between branches without formally merging them. It helps the executive participate in parliamentary processes while preserving the legal independence of Parliament.

7. Challenges of the Existing Legal Regulation

Despite its importance, the institution of the Authorized Representative still faces several legal and practical challenges. These challenges do not mean that the institution lacks legal basis. On the contrary, the institution has a legal foundation in presidential acts, statutory provisions and relevant procedural legislation.

The problem is rather that the legal regulation of the institution is dispersed across several normative acts and requires further systematisation.

The first challenge is the need for clearer definition of the legal status of the Authorized Representative. Current legislation identifies the main functions of the institution, but further clarification is desirable regarding its rights, duties, limits of participation in parliamentary procedures, interaction with ministries and responsibility for procedural delays.

The second challenge is the quality and timeliness of information provided by executive bodies. The Authorized Representative may coordinate information flows, but the effectiveness of this role depends on the discipline of ministries and agencies. If responsible bodies delay information or provide incomplete data, the representative's coordinating role becomes less effective.

The third challenge is the risk of excessive bureaucratisation. If every communication between Government and Parliament is over-formalised, the institution may become an additional administrative layer rather than a facilitator of effective dialogue. Therefore, procedural rules must be clear but not unnecessarily burdensome.

The fourth challenge relates to digital transformation. Modern parliamentary–governmental interaction requires electronic document flow, deadline monitoring, analytical databases and secure channels for information exchange. However, digital tools must not replace legal responsibility, political accountability or parliamentary independence. They should support, not dominate, constitutional processes.

8. Reform Prospects

Further improvement of the Uzbek model of executive representation in the legislature should focus on several directions.

First, the legal status of the Authorized Representative should be systematised. Legislation should clearly define the institution as a special governmental official ensuring organisational and legal cooperation between the Cabinet of Ministers and the chambers of the Oliy Majlis in law-making, parliamentary oversight and government accountability procedures. It should also clarify that the Authorized Representative is not a subject of

parliamentary oversight and does not exercise parliamentary powers.

Second, the regulation of information exchange should be improved. Ministries, agencies and local executive authorities should have clear duties to provide timely and complete information to the Authorized Representative when parliamentary procedures require governmental responses. Deadlines, formats and responsibility for poor-quality information should be specified.

Third, analytical standards should be developed for materials submitted to Parliament. Government responses to parliamentary inquiries, draft law justifications and reports should include legal analysis, factual data, financial implications and implementation mechanisms. This would improve the quality of parliamentary deliberation and oversight.

Fourth, digital monitoring mechanisms should be introduced or strengthened. A secure electronic system for monitoring government–parliament interaction could track draft laws, parliamentary inquiries, deputy and senator inquiries, committee recommendations, Government Hour questions within the Legislative Chamber and implementation of parliamentary decisions. Such a system should operate within the Cabinet of Ministers and support timely coordination with Parliament.

Fifth, training and professional development should be organised for officials involved in executive–legislative interaction. Ministries and agencies should understand the legal significance of parliamentary oversight and government accountability. This would help transform parliamentary procedures from formal obligations into effective instruments of responsible governance.

These reforms would strengthen the institutional capacity of the Authorized Representative and improve the quality of executive–legislative dialogue in Uzbekistan.

9. Conclusion

The institution of the Authorized Representative of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Oliy Majlis represents an important development in the constitutional and administrative evolution of Uzbekistan. It reflects the transition from a purely formal understanding of separation of powers toward a model of structured procedural cooperation between Parliament

and Government.

The Uzbek model of executive representation in the legislature is distinctive. The Authorized Representative is not a member of Parliament, not a parliamentary official and not a subject of parliamentary oversight. Instead, the institution functions as a special governmental mechanism for coordinating the Cabinet of Ministers' participation in law-making, parliamentary oversight and accountability procedures.

This model helps institutionalise dialogue between the legislative and executive branches. It provides a channel through which the Government can present its position, respond to parliamentary requests, prepare information and coordinate its participation in parliamentary procedures. At the same time, the model preserves the constitutional independence of Parliament, provided that the limits of the representative's role are clearly observed.

The development of this institution is especially relevant in the context of Uzbekistan's post-2017 reforms, the 2023 constitutional renewal and the adoption of the Constitutional Law "On the Cabinet of Ministers" in 2024. These reforms have strengthened the role of Parliament, expanded mechanisms of government accountability and created new demands for procedural coordination between state institutions.

Further improvement of the institution should focus on clearer legal regulation, digital monitoring, analytical standards, procedural discipline and safeguards for parliamentary independence. If developed carefully, the Authorized Representative may become a key element of Uzbekistan's model of responsible, coordinated and constitutionally balanced governance.

References

1. Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/7172673>
2. Constitutional Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan". <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/7172673>
3. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Chamber of the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan". <https://lex.uz/ru/docs/6808021>
4. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On the Rules of Procedure of the Senate of the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan".

- <https://lex.uz/ru/docs/6808027>

5. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On the Procedure for Preparing Draft Laws and Submitting Them to the Legislative Chamber of the Oliy Majlis”. <https://lex.uz/ru/docs/6808528>
6. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Parliamentary Oversight”. <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/6819813>
7. Presidential Decree of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF–21 of 16 February 2026 “On Additional Measures to Consistently Continue and Bring Reforms to a New Stage within the Framework of the Priority Directions of National Development until 2030.” <https://lex.uz/docs/8052981>
8. Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. RP–3294 of 28 September 2017 “On the Introduction of the Position of the Authorized Representative of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan”. <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/7549223>
9. Bagehot, W. The English Constitution. London, 1867.
10. Duverger, M. Institutions politiques et droit constitutionnel. Paris. 1970.
11. Strøm, K. “Parliamentary Government and Legislative Organization.” In: The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions. Oxford University Press, 2006.
12. Martin, S. “Parliamentary Questions, the Behaviour of Legislators, and the Function of Legislatures.” 2011.
13. Hakimov, R.R. Parliament in the System of State Power: Problems of Theory and Practice. Tashkent, 2012.
14. Turdiev, Kh.U. Issues of Improving the Organisational and Legal Mechanism of Relations between Parliament and Government. Tashkent, 2021.