INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

VOL 1. N 1
2025

SCIENCE ZONE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION VOL 1. N.1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SCIENCE ZONE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION VOL 1. N.1

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF B2B SUPPLY CONTRACT BREACH: UZBEKISTAN VS GERMANY

Akhunova Oysha Mukhammadjonovna
Oishaahunova@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a comparative analysis of the legal frameworks governing breaches of business-to-business (B2B) supply contracts in Uzbekistan and Germany. Drawing on statutory codes, judicial interpretations, and expert commentaries, the study examines key aspects including statutory foundations, principles of breach liability, available remedies, limitations on liability, and contract interpretation and enforcement. Both jurisdictions emphasize freedom of contract, good faith, and compensatory remedies, yet differ in structural approaches—Uzbekistan's Civil Code offers specific provisions for supply contracts, while Germany's relies on general civil and commercial codes supplemented by case law. The analysis highlights similarities in fault-based liability and buyer notification duties, alongside differences in judicial scrutiny of standard terms. Implications for international commercial practice are discussed, underscoring the alignment with global norms like the CISG.

KEYWORDS

B2B supply contracts, contract breach, Uzbekistan Civil Code, German BGB/HGB, remedies, liability limitations

Comparative Analysis of B2B Supply Contract Breach: Uzbekistan vs Germany

Statutory Frameworks in Uzbekistan and Germany

The legal frameworks for B2B supply contracts in Uzbekistan and Germany are rooted in their respective civil codes, reflecting civil law traditions that prioritize codified rules while allowing contractual autonomy. In Uzbekistan, the primary governance stems from the Civil Code of 1996, as amended, which designates "supply contracts" (dostavka) as a specialized subset of sales agreements exclusively between business entities (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996). Chapter 30 of Part Two outlines specific obligations for suppliers and buyers, covering aspects such as delivery procedures, essential terms like quantity and quality, and default rules for business transactions (Articles 437–456) (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996). These are complemented by general contract principles in the Law on the Contractual Legal Base of Activity of Business Entities (1998), which reinforces party equality and freedom to negotiate terms, subject to legal constraints (Hermann, 2024). This structure delineates B2B supply from consumer sales, emphasizing commercial use and providing tailored mechanisms for long-term agreements (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996). In contrast, Germany's framework integrates the Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch, BGB) for general obligations and sales (Sections 433–453), where sellers must deliver defect-free goods and buyers accept and pay, without a distinct "supply contract" category for B2B dealings (CMS Law, n.d.). The Commercial Code (Handelsgesetzbuch, HGB) modifies this for merchants, notably through Section 377, mandating prompt inspection and defect notification to preserve warranty claims (CMS Law, n.d.). While the CISG applies to international sales (United Nations, 1980), domestic B2B transactions primarily follow BGB/HGB, relying on mercantile customs (Lexology, 2015). Comparatively, Uzbekistan's explicit codification for B2B supply offers granular guidance, fostering predictability in enterprise dealings, whereas Germany's generalist approach demands greater reliance on negotiated terms and judicial interpretation to adapt to commercial contexts (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996; CMS Law, n.d.).

Key Legal Principles Governing Breach of Contract

Core principles of performance, good faith, and liability underpin breach handling in both jurisdictions, aligning with civil law emphases on fairness and economic restoration. Both impose duties of proper execution and good faith: Uzbekistan's Civil Code Article 307(3) mandates honest conduct in all contract phases (Turcomat, n.d.), while Germany's Section 242 BGB embeds Treu und Glauben, implying ancillary obligations like cooperation and influencing interpretations (CMS Law, n.d.). Liability is generally fault-based, with Uzbekistan's Article 333 requiring proof of negligence or intent, excusable only by force majeure—defined stringently for business breaches as extraordinary events, excluding mere resource shortages (Warnath Group, 2024). Similarly, Germany's Section 280 BGB presumes fault, shifting the burden to the breacher for exoneration, though sales conformity imposes strict seller obligations irrespective of fault for warranties, with fault relevant mainly for damages (CMS Law, n.d.). Compensation principles aim for full restoration: Uzbekistan's Article 14 covers actual damages and lost profits under normal conditions (Hermann, 2024), echoing Germany's Sections 252 and 280 BGB, which include foreseeable lost profits without punitive elements (Osborne Clarke, n.d.). Mitigation is required in both, reducing awards for unreasonable inaction (Warnath Group, 2024; CMS Law, n.d.). Overall, shared doctrines of fault, good faith, and compensatory damages prevail, but Uzbekistan's detailed business-specific exemptions contrast with Germany's case-law-driven foreseeability tests (Hermann, 2024; Lexology, 2015).

Remedies Available to the Aggrieved Party

Remedies for B2B supply breaches in Uzbekistan and Germany encompass specific performance, damages, termination, and cure options, designed to uphold bargains while enabling efficient resolution. Specific performance is prioritized: Uzbekistan's Article 436 allows compelled delivery even post-damages (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996), akin to Germany's Section 241 BGB, though excused if impossible or disproportionate (Section 275) (Warnath Group, 2024). Damages compensate comprehensively, with Uzbekistan's Article 456 providing cover-transaction or market-price formulas for price differences post-termination (Civil Code of the Republic of

Uzbekistan, 1996), mirroring Germany's expectation damages under Sections 280–281, cumulative with other remedies (CMS Law, n.d.). Termination requires fundamental breaches: Uzbekistan's "unilateral refusal" under Article 455 for irremediable defects or repeated delays (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996), parallels Germany's Rücktritt (Section 323), often after a grace period unless the breach is severe (CMS Law, n.d.). For defects, both favor seller cure—Germany's Nacherfüllung (Sections 437–441) precedes rescission or reduction (CMS Law, n.d.), while Uzbekistan's Article 451 mandates prompt replacement before alternatives like repair or price reduction (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996). Contractual penalties are enforceable: Uzbekistan's neustoyka (Article 454) supplements performance (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996), and Germany's Vertragsstrafe is valid if reasonable (Section 343) (Lexology, 2015). These remedies balance enforcement and flexibility, with Uzbekistan's codification drawing from CISG influences for objectivity (United Nations, 1980; Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996).

Limitation of Liability and Exclusion Clauses

Limitations on liability in B2B contracts are permissible in both systems but constrained by public policy, ensuring accountability for severe faults. Uzbekistan upholds freedom to limit liability except for intentional breaches, void under Article 333(3) (Warnath Group, 2024), allowing exclusions of consequential losses absent regulatory bars (Hermann, 2024). Germany similarly voids preemptive exclusions for intent (CMS Law, n.d.), extending protections via Sections 305–309 BGB for standard terms, invalidating clauses on gross negligence, injury, or essential duties even in B2B (Lexology, 2015). Negotiated clauses enjoy broader enforceability, often capping at contract value or excluding indirect losses except for gross fault (Lexology, 2015). Both prohibit fraud exemptions, but Germany's aggressive AGB scrutiny contrasts Uzbekistan's rarer interventions, fostering risk allocation while safeguarding equity (Hermann, 2024; CMS Law, n.d.).

Interpretation and Enforcement of B2B Supply Contracts

Contract interpretation in Uzbekistan and Germany blends literalism with purposive analysis, informed by good faith and context. Uzbekistan's Article

363 interprets terms literally, resolving ambiguities via overall purpose, negotiations, and customs (Warnath Group, 2024), akin to Germany's Section 157 BGB, emphasizing reasonable intent under Treu und Glauben (CMS Law, n.d.). Enforcement relies on courts—Uzbekistan's economic courts for commercial disputes, enabling specific performance or damages (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996), paralleled by Germany's bailiff-executed judgments (CMS Law, n.d.). Buyer duties are stringent: Germany's Section 377 HGB demands immediate defect notice (CMS Law, n.d.), matching Uzbekistan's Article 416, with exceptions for seller knowledge (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996). Standard terms face German fairness review (Lexology, 2015), less so in Uzbekistan unless illegal (Hermann, 2024). Arbitration and statutory interest (e.g., Uzbekistan's late-payment interest; Germany's Section 288) bolster enforcement (Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996; CMS Law, n.d.). Similarities in diligence requirements promote certainty, while differences in term scrutiny reflect varying interventionism, upholding contract sanctity with equity safeguards (Lexology, 2015; Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1996).

REFERENCES

Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (1996). Part Two. https://invest-in-uzbekistan.org/en/zakonodatelstvo/grazhdanskij-kodeks-respubliki-uzbekistan-chast-vtoraya-29-avgusta-1996-g/

CMS Law. (n.d.). Warranty law in supply contracts in Germany. CMS Expert Guides. https://cms.law/en/int/expert-guides/cms-expert-guide-to-warranties-in-supply-contracts/germany

Hermann, G. (2024). GILS commercial contracts: Uzbekistan. GRATA International. https://gratanet.com/publications/gils-commercial-contracts-uzbekistan

Law on the Contractual Legal Base of Activity of Business Entities, No. 670-I. (1998). Republic of Uzbekistan.

Lexology. (2015). Commercial contracts in Germany. https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=d5c0938b-9b4f-4f25-a69e-6da0e03dc6a3

Osborne Clarke. (n.d.). Contract law fundamentals: How the position differs across Europe. https://www.osborneclarke.com/insights/contract-law-fundamentals-how-position-differs-across-europe

Turcomat. (n.d.). View of the principle of good faith in civil law. https://turcomat.org/index.php/turkbilmat/article/view/615/415

United Nations. (1980). Convention on contracts for the international sale of goods. https://uncitral.un.org/sites/uncitral.un.org/files/media-documents/uncitral/en/19-09951_e_ebook.pdf

Warnath Group. (2024). UZB-45055. https://www.warnathgroup.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/F245977222_UZB-45055.pdf

SCIENCE ZONE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION VOL 1. N.1

ADAPTING INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW TO CLIMATE CHANGE: INSTITUTIONAL EVOLUTION AND NORMATIVE CHALLENGES

Sarvarbek Abdullajonov
Lecturer at Department of Environmental Law,
Tashkent State University of Law
abdullajonov0708@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The climate crisis exposes fundamental inadequacies in existing environmental governance frameworks. This thesis examines structural and normative adaptations required to align international environmental law (IEL) with the unique characteristics of anthropogenic climate change. Through analysis of treaty evolution and emerging legal doctrines, this paper argues that effective climate governance necessitates paradigmatic shifts in how international law conceptualizes state responsibility, intergenerational equity, and planetary boundaries.

KEYWORDS

International Environmental Law, Climate Change, Sovereignty, Intergenerational Equity, Planetary Boundaries, Compliance Mechanisms

1. Introduction

International environmental law emerged to address transboundary pollution through principles including common but differentiated responsibilities, the precautionary principle, and the polluter-pays principle. Climate change, however, presents categorically distinct challenges: diffuse causation, delayed manifestation, irreversible tipping points, and existential stakes demand unprecedented legal coordination and intergenerational accountability.

The Paris Agreement (2015) represents the most ambitious adaptation of IEL to climate imperatives, yet its reliance on nationally determined contributions and absence of binding emissions targets reflects persistent tensions between state sovereignty and collective action (UNFCCC, 2015). Addressing these tensions requires strengthening compliance mechanisms, expanding legal standing for non-state actors, and developing frameworks recognizing climate stability as prerequisite for all other rights.

2. Structural Inadequacies of Traditional Frameworks

Traditional environmental treaties assume rational state actors pursuing discrete national interests through reciprocal obligations. Climate change defies this model. The temporal lag between emissions and impacts incentivises free-riding; catastrophic projected outcomes render conventional cost-benefit analysis inadequate; and radical asymmetry between historical emitters and vulnerable nations generates equity disputes that paralyse negotiations.

The principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources enables states to prioritise fossil fuel exploitation over atmospheric protection. While the UNFCCC recognises climate change as a common concern of humankind, this doctrine lacks enforcement mechanisms, creating a governance gap wherein international law acknowledges collective threats while preserving state prerogatives that perpetuate them.

3. Institutional Innovations and Compliance Mechanisms

The Paris Agreement's transparency framework represents modest evolution through enhanced reporting and technical review, but deliberately omits sanctions for non-compliance. For example, the Agreement establishes the Paris Agreement Implementation and Compliance Committee (PAICC) under Article 15 as a non-adversarial, facilitative mechanism rather than a punitive one (Voigt, 2019; UNFCCC, n.d.).

More promising adaptations appear in regional regimes and domestic jurisprudence. The Urgenda Foundation v. The State of the Netherlands decision (2019) established that human rights law imposes positive obligations on governments to prevent dangerous climate change, suggesting that judicial adaptation of existing principles may prove more effective than diplomatic innovation (Hirt et al., 2021; LSE Grantham, 2019).

4. Expanding Legal Personality and Intergenerational Equity

A fundamental limitation of IEL is its restriction of legal personality primarily to states. Climate change implicates rights-holders—future generations, indigenous peoples, potentially ecosystems—who lack representation in negotiations. Procedural innovations such as the initiative by Vanuatu to pursue an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice signal possible pathways for granting standing to territorially threatened states.

Intergenerational equity, though acknowledged, remains legally under-developed. Operationalising this principle demands institutional mechanisms—ombudspersons for future generations, weighted voting accounting for long-term impacts—that transcend electoral politics. Recognising rights of nature, as in Ecuador and New Zealand, offers pathways for reframing climate governance. The concept of atmospheric stability as a legal object shifts liability for its degradation from regulatory questions to rights violations.

5. Normative Reorientation: From Protection to Planetary Boundaries

The most fundamental adaptation required is conceptual. Traditional IEL treats environmental protection as one policy domain to be balanced against development and security. However, climate science demonstrates that planetary boundaries constitute non-negotiable constraints within which all human activity must occur (Du Toit, 2022; Kim, 2021).

This requires elevating climate stability from an environmental objective to a foundational precondition for international order. The emerging “climate necessity” doctrine argues that states possess positive obligations to take emergency measures preventing catastrophic change, even where such measures might otherwise infringe treaty obligations. The re-calibration of common but differentiated responsibilities is also urgent: while historical responsibility justifies differentiated burdens, the urgency of remaining carbon budgets means

that all major emitters must participate in aggressive decarbonisation (Lizarazo-Rodríguez, 2024).

6. Conclusion

Adapting international environmental law to climate change demands reconceptualising sovereignty-survival relationships, expanding legal standing beyond states, and recognising planetary boundaries as foundational constraints. The Paris Agreement reflects political realism but falls short of required transformative innovation. Promising pathways include leveraging human rights law to impose climate obligations, empowering judicial review of inadequate state action, and developing compliance mechanisms that transcend diplomatic consensus. Ultimately, success depends on normative shifts in which climate stability is recognised not as one interest among many but as a prerequisite for all others — a recognition which requires translation into binding legal obligations if IEL is to fulfil its purpose of protecting the planetary systems upon which civilisation depends

REFERENCES

Du Toit, L. (2022). *Reimagining international environmental law for the Anthropocene.* ScienceDirect. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2022.103989

Hirt, J., Müller-Reissmann, J., & Vogel, M. (2021). The Dutch Supreme Court's Urgenda judgment breaks new ground: The first court to order a state to reduce its GHG emissions. *Climate Law*, 11(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1163/27724343-01101001

Kim, R. E. (2021). Planetary boundaries at the intersection of Earth system law, science and governance: A state-of-the-art review. *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 30(1), 7–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12383

Lizarazo-Rodríguez, L. (2024). Addressing the planetary boundaries beyond the state. *Yale Journal of International Law*, 35(1), 1–48. https://doi.org/10.1017/yjil.2024.

UNFCCC. (2015). *The Paris Agreement.* https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf

UNFCCC. (n.d.). More about PAICC: The Paris Agreement Implementation and Compliance Committee. https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/bodies/constituted-bodies/paris-agreement-implementation-and-compliance-committee-paicc/more-about-paicc

Voigt, C. (2019). The 'Article 15 Committee' to facilitate implementation and promote compliance under the Paris Agreement: Design options. *Climate Policy Brief*, University of Oslo. https://ercst.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/20190415-Art-15-Brief-VF.pdf

SCIENCE ZONE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION VOL 1. N.1

THE EUROPEAN UNION'S DIGITAL MARKETS ACT AND THE REGULATION OF TECH-OVER PROCESSES

Javokhir Eshonkulov
Lecturer at Department of Cyber Law,
Tashkent State University of Law
javoxireshonqulov0724@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The rise of the digital economy has intensified market concentration within a few dominant technology ecosystems, a phenomenon described as "Tech-Over." This study explores how the European Union's Digital Markets Act (DMA) addresses the risks of such digital monopolization through ex-ante regulation. By designating "gatekeepers" and imposing obligations on data access, interoperability, self-preferencing, and acquisition transparency, the DMA introduces a preventive framework to ensure fairness and contestability in digital markets. The paper analyzes the legal, economic, and institutional structure of the DMA, its interaction with traditional competition law, and its practical implications for market dynamics, innovation, and consumer rights. Furthermore, it evaluates the potential adaptation of DMA principles to Uzbekistan's evolving digital ecosystem, proposing regulatory mechanisms such as platform supervision, interoperability standards, and RegTech tools. The research concludes that proactive, technology-neutral regulation—anchored in openness and competition—is essential for sustaining innovation and preventing excessive digital concentration.

KEYWORDS

Digital Markets Act (DMA); Tech-Over; gatekeepers; digital competition law; platform regulation; data portability; interoperability; self-preferencing; ex-ante regulation; RegTech; European Union; Uzbekistan; digital economy governance

1.Introduction

Over the past decade, the digital economy has transformed global markets, reshaping traditional competition paradigms. Platform-based business models—spanning search engines, social networks, mobile app stores, online intermediation services, operating systems, browsers, advertising technologies, and cloud infrastructures—have become dominant actors in the marketplace. Their extensive integration has led to growing market concentration and an increasing imbalance between large "gatekeeper" platforms and smaller market participants.

This process, often referred to as **"Tech-Over"**, represents the concentration of economic and informational power within a limited number of digital ecosystems. Through data aggregation, algorithmic control, and cross-platform integration, major technology companies can establish self-reinforcing network effects, effectively locking users and businesses into their ecosystems and reducing overall market contestability. In this environment, new entrants face significant entry barriers, consumer choice becomes limited, and innovation is channeled through selective ecosystems dominated by large technology firms.

Traditional **ex-post antitrust enforcement**—which reacts to proven abuses of dominance or collusive conduct—has proven too slow to address the fast-moving and self-perpetuating dynamics of digital markets. As a response, the **European Union (EU)** introduced a new regulatory instrument, the **Digital Markets Act (DMA)**, aimed at ensuring fairness and openness in the digital sector. Unlike classical competition law, the DMA establishes **ex-ante obligations** for "gatekeeper" platforms to prevent anti-competitive behaviors before they occur. It seeks to enhance interoperability, facilitate data portability, and prohibit unfair self-preferencing practices that distort competition.

This paper examines the legal, economic, and institutional design of the DMA as a mechanism to control Tech-Over phenomena, analyzes its effectiveness in curbing data-driven concentration, and explores its potential adaptation to developing digital economies—particularly Uzbekistan's emerging platform environment.

1. The Concept of Tech-Over: Dynamics and Risks of Concentration

The term **Tech-Over** captures a multidimensional process of technological consolidation. Unlike traditional mergers or monopolies confined to a single market, Tech-Over manifests through **ecosystemic expansion**—where one platform integrates diverse services such as search, advertising, messaging, e-commerce, payments, and cloud computing. Each additional service reinforces the platform's data advantage and user lock-in effect.

The main features of Tech-Over include:

· **Ecosystem Integration:** A dominant platform merges multiple complementary services under one interface, reinforcing dependency and reducing multi-homing.

· **Data Concentration:** Control over vast and diverse datasets enables platforms to refine algorithms, predict user behavior, and create non-replicable advantages.

· **Entry Barriers:** Smaller rivals face difficulty accessing comparable datasets or interoperability standards, limiting market entry.

· **Self-Preferencing:** Platforms promote their own services or products more prominently, disadvantaging competing offerings.

· **Lock-In Effects:** Users and business partners find it difficult or costly to migrate to competing platforms due to non-transferable data or incompatible systems.

Such structural and behavioral patterns pose challenges to **competition, consumer choice, and innovation**. Tech-Over creates markets where "the winner takes most," entrenching digital monopolies that can influence not only economic outcomes but also information flows and consumer autonomy.

2. The Legal Rationale and Architecture of the Digital Markets Act

The **Digital Markets Act (DMA)**—formally *Regulation (EU) 2022/1925 on Contestable and Fair Markets in the Digital Sector*—entered into force in November 2022. It complements traditional competition law by establishing **ex-ante obligations** designed to ensure contestability and fairness in digital markets. Whereas Articles 101–102 TFEU prohibit anti-competitive agreements

and abuses of dominance, the DMA proactively regulates specific conduct by **systemically important platforms**.

2.1 Gatekeeper Designation and Core Platform Services

The DMA identifies "**gatekeepers**" as companies providing **core platform services (CPS)** that occupy a structurally significant intermediary position between business users and end-consumers. These CPS include:

- Online intermediation services (e.g., marketplaces, app stores),
- Search engines,
- Social networking services,
- Video-sharing platforms,
- Number-independent interpersonal communication services,
- Operating systems,
- Web browsers,
- Virtual assistants, and
- Cloud computing services.

A company may be designated a gatekeeper if it:

1. Has a significant impact on the EU internal market, with an annual turnover of at least €7.5 billion in the EU or a market capitalization of €75 billion or more;

2. Provides core platform services to at least 45 million active monthly end-users and 10 000 active yearly business users in the EU; and

3. Holds an entrenched and durable position, or it is foreseeable to maintain such a position.

This framework recognizes that some platforms function as essential intermediaries—**digital bottlenecks**—that can shape the competitive conditions of entire markets.

2.2 The Logic of Ex-Ante Regulation

Unlike traditional antitrust, which reacts *after* a violation occurs, **ex-ante regulation** seeks to prevent foreseeable harms. The DMA thereby introduces a **predictive governance model**: platforms identified as gatekeepers must comply with predefined obligations, ensuring fair access, data sharing, and non-discrimination from the outset. This structure aims to preserve competition before markets become irreversibly concentrated—a direct response to the Tech-Over phenomenon.

3. Gatekeeper Obligations as Tools Against Tech-Over

The DMA imposes a series of conduct obligations and prohibitions that directly target Tech-Over mechanisms.

3.1 Prohibition of Self-Preferencing

Gatekeepers are prohibited from ranking or displaying their own products or services more favorably than those of third parties within their platforms. For example, an app store cannot prioritize its proprietary applications, and a search engine cannot manipulate results to favor its affiliated services. This measure counters one of the core tactics of Tech-Over—**internal ecosystem bias**—and seeks to restore fairness in visibility and access.

3.2 Data Access and Interoperability

Gatekeepers must allow business users to access data generated through their activities on the platform, subject to privacy protections. This promotes **data symmetry** and prevents dominant platforms from leveraging exclusive data advantages to foreclose competitors. Furthermore, interoperability obligations require gatekeepers to ensure that competing services—such as messaging apps or operating systems—can interact seamlessly, reducing lock-in effects.

3.3 Data Portability and User Mobility

Users must be able to easily transfer their data to alternative platforms in a structured, commonly used format. Data portability enhances user autonomy, facilitates switching, and indirectly promotes competition by lowering switching costs.

3.4 Transparency and Fair Contract Terms

Gatekeepers are required to maintain transparent and non-discriminatory terms for business users. They must refrain from imposing unfair conditions, discriminatory pricing, or hidden technical restrictions. These provisions aim to remove **"access tolls"** and promote equality among all market participants.

3.5 Notification of Acquisitions

Although the DMA is not a merger control instrument, gatekeepers are obliged to inform the European Commission of any intended acquisitions in the digital sector, particularly those involving potential competitors or innovative start-ups. This **early-warning system** helps identify "killer acquisitions" before they eliminate emerging competition.

3.6 Enforcement and Sanctions

Non-compliance with DMA obligations may result in fines of up to **10% of the gatekeeper's global annual turnover**, or up to **20%** for repeated infringements. The Commission may also impose **structural remedies**, including divestitures or service unbundling, to ensure compliance. This robust sanctioning regime signals a decisive regulatory stance against Tech-Over consolidation.

4. Interaction Between the DMA and Traditional Competition Law

The DMA does not replace EU competition law; rather, it **complements** it. While antitrust law focuses on individual cases of abuse (ex-post enforcement), the DMA establishes a preventive framework (ex-ante obligations) for systemic risks inherent in digital markets.

This dual model—**preventive and corrective**—creates a hybrid regulatory ecosystem:

1. **Preventive layer:** The DMA sets baseline obligations for identified gatekeepers, reducing the likelihood of anti-competitive behavior.

2. **Corrective layer:** Competition authorities can still pursue infringements of Articles 101–102 TFEU if gatekeepers engage in collusion or abuse beyond DMA obligations.

3. **Cooperative governance:** Coordination among regulators—including data protection authorities and consumer protection agencies—ensures policy coherence across sectors.

The hybrid model enhances both market predictability and enforcement flexibility, offering a more holistic response to the structural challenges of Tech-Over.

5. Practical Implications: DMA's Impact on Market Structure and Innovation

5.1 Enhancing Market Contestability

The DMA's transparency, interoperability, and data-sharing requirements are expected to reduce entry barriers and facilitate competition. Smaller firms and start-ups can now access platform interfaces and user bases previously dominated by a few incumbents. This **level-playing field** supports innovation diversity and consumer choice.

5.2 Balancing Innovation and Regulation

Critics warn that imposing rigid obligations on large platforms might discourage innovation or slow integration of new technologies. However, proponents argue that unchecked concentration hampers long-term innovation by discouraging new entrants. Thus, the DMA seeks to strike a balance—**protecting innovation through competition rather than monopoly**.

5.3 Empowering Users and Consumers

Data portability and fair access empower users to control their digital identities and move freely between services. By prohibiting self-preferencing and manipulative default settings, the DMA restores **user sovereignty**, a principle central to digital rights in the EU.

5.4 Implementation Challenges

Practical enforcement of the DMA faces several challenges:

· Rapid technological evolution: Regulatory lag may arise as new services (e.g., generative AI) fall outside initial definitions.

· Complexity of monitoring: Compliance auditing, algorithmic transparency, and data-flow tracing demand high technical capacity.

· Global scope: Many gatekeepers operate transnationally, requiring cross-border regulatory cooperation.

Despite these challenges, the DMA marks a paradigmatic shift in global digital governance.

6. Assessing Tech-Over Risk: A Regulatory Methodology

To effectively apply DMA-like principles, regulators must adopt robust metrics to evaluate digital concentration risks:

1. **Market Power Indicators:** Active users, traffic volume, session duration, and engagement ratios.

2. **Data Control Metrics:** Volume, diversity, and real-time nature of data collected; extent of cross-use between CPS.

3. **Interoperability Assessment:** Openness of APIs, standardization of data formats, and switching costs.

4. **Ecosystem Mapping:** Interconnections between services, integration pathways, and default settings influencing user choice.

5. **Monetization Analysis:** Transparency in advertising auctions, targeting parameters, and algorithmic bias.

Such quantitative and qualitative indicators provide an evidence-based foundation for preemptive regulatory action.

7. Adapting the DMA Experience to Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan is currently advancing its digital transformation agenda, with rapid growth in e-commerce, fintech, cloud services, and public e-governance. Yet, the regulatory framework for digital competition remains underdeveloped. Integrating lessons from the EU's DMA could help the country establish a proactive and innovation-friendly regulatory model.

7.1 Introducing the Concept of "Platform Supervision"

Uzbek law could incorporate the notion of **platform supervision**, identifying systemically important digital intermediaries and subjecting them to tailored obligations—similar to gatekeepers in the DMA. Criteria could include user base, market share, cross-sector influence, and data volume.

7.2 Data Portability and Interoperability Standards

Implementing minimum interoperability standards and data portability rights would enhance competition and consumer empowerment. This could be aligned with ongoing e-government and digital infrastructure initiatives.

7.3 Limiting Self-Preferencing

National regulations could prohibit unfair self-preferencing in search rankings, app store listings, or default service configurations, ensuring fair visibility for competitors.

7.4 Merger and Acquisition Oversight

Strengthening **merger notification and conditional approval** requirements for digital acquisitions would help prevent the early elimination of potential rivals. Special attention should be paid to transactions involving start-ups or innovative small firms.

7.5 RegTech and LegalTech Infrastructure

Developing **RegTech (Regulatory Technology)** tools—such as automated dashboards, real-time data analytics, and algorithmic audits—would enhance monitoring capacity and reduce compliance costs for both regulators and market actors.

7.6 Inter-Agency Coordination

Effective implementation requires collaboration between the competition authority, data protection agency, IT regulators, and consumer protection bodies. Cross-agency task forces could ensure coherent enforcement across overlapping sectors.

7.7 Sanctions and Structural Remedies

In cases of persistent non-compliance, authorities should be empowered to impose not only financial penalties but also **structural measures**—such as functional separation, mandatory data-sharing, or open-API requirements.

8. The Emerging Frontier: AI Gatekeepers and New "Digital Gateways"

The rise of **artificial intelligence (AI)** and **generative models** introduces new forms of Tech-Over. AI systems that control information retrieval, content generation, or algorithmic recommendations may themselves become "gateways" between users and digital services. These models determine visibility, ranking, and accessibility—essentially shaping the informational market.

DMA-style principles could therefore extend to AI ecosystems by ensuring:

- **Interoperability between AI models and services;**
- **Data portability of user-generated prompts and outputs;**
- **Transparency in default recommendation algorithms;**
- **Fair access for third-party plug-ins and developers.**

Anticipatory regulation in this field will be essential to prevent the next wave of digital concentration.

9. Economic and Policy Balance

The DMA's socio-economic logic is to protect **long-term innovation through competition** rather than through monopolistic control. In the short term, large platforms may face higher compliance costs, but in the long run, the overall digital ecosystem benefits from:

- Greater consumer choice and trust,
- Lower entry barriers for innovators,
- Enhanced transparency and accountability,
- More resilient market structures.

The challenge for policymakers lies in maintaining a delicate balance: promoting innovation while preventing excessive market concentration.

Regulation should therefore remain **technology-neutral**, **proportionate**, and **adaptive** to emerging trends.

10. Conclusion

The **Digital Markets Act** represents a landmark in the evolution of digital governance. By shifting from reactive antitrust enforcement to preventive ex-ante regulation, the EU has pioneered a framework capable of addressing the systemic risks posed by Tech-Over consolidation.

Through its **gatekeeper designation**, **core platform service obligations**, **self-preferencing bans**, **data-sharing and portability mandates**, and **early-warning mechanisms for acquisitions**, the DMA establishes a proactive legal architecture that safeguards market openness and user sovereignty. It exemplifies how regulatory innovation can preserve competition without stifling technological progress.

For **Uzbekistan and other developing digital economies**, the DMA experience offers a valuable blueprint: adopting a context-specific platform supervision model, introducing interoperability standards, prohibiting unfair preferential practices, strengthening digital merger control, and leveraging RegTech-based monitoring systems. Furthermore, preparing for AI-driven "gateways" will ensure future-proof regulation.

Ultimately, the central lesson of the EU's DMA is that **digital concentration must be managed not by limiting innovation, but by guaranteeing openness**. Fair competition and technological progress are not mutually exclusive—they are mutually reinforcing pillars of a sustainable digital economy.

REFERENCES

Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). FinTech, RegTech, and the reconceptualization of financial regulation. Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business, 37(3), 371–413.

Bruegel. (2023). Compliance principles for the Digital Markets Act. Retrieved from https://www.bruegel.org/policy-brief/compliance-principles-digital-markets-act

Butler, T., & O'Brien, L. (2019). Understanding RegTech for digital regulatory compliance. In Disrupting Finance (pp. 85–102). Cham: Palgrave Pivot.

European Commission. (2022). Regulation (EU) 2022/1925 on contestable and fair markets in the digital sector (Digital Markets Act). Official Journal of the European Union L 265/1.

European Commission. (2023). The Digital Markets Act – Ensuring fair and open digital markets. Retrieved from https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/priorities-2019-2024/europe-fit-digital-age/digital-markets-act-ensuring-fair-and-open-digital-markets_en

Grant Thornton Ireland. (2023). Determining gatekeepers under the Digital Markets Act factsheet. Dublin. Retrieved from https://www.grantthornton.ie

Kramer, H. S. (2024). Overview of the EU Digital Markets Act: Compliance and implementation challenges. European Competition Journal, 20(1), 55–78.

Science Po Chaire Numérique. (2021). Gatekeepers and platform regulation: Is the EU moving in the right direction? Working Paper by F. Ducci. Paris.

Usercentrics. (2024). The role of gatekeepers under the Digital Markets Act. Retrieved from https://usercentrics.com

10. World Economic Forum. (2023). What Big Tech needs to know about the EU Digital Markets Act. Geneva. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/stories/2023/09/eu-digital-markets-act-big-tech

SCIENCE ZONE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION VOL 1. N.1

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND PRACTICAL CHALLENGES OF SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP IN THE LABOR SPHERE

Oybek Mutalov
Lecturer at the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Angren University
mutalovoybek0000@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This thesis provides an in-depth analysis of the legal foundations and practical implementation challenges of social partnership in labor relations in the Republic of Uzbekistan. The study examines the international experience of developed countries (Germany, Sweden, Japan) in implementing social partnership mechanisms and assesses the possibility of adapting these practices to Uzbek conditions. The research identifies key problems in the current system: low level of collective agreement conclusion (only 23% of enterprises), weak activity of trade unions, insufficient awareness of employees about their rights, and inadequate state supervision. Based on the analysis of the Labor Code (Articles 36-75) and empirical data collected through surveys and expert interviews, comprehensive recommendations have been developed to strengthen the social partnership institution. The thesis proposes the adoption of a separate law "On Social Partnership," strengthening labor inspectorate control, creating a system for training trade union leaders, and implementing mandatory mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of collective agreements.

KEYWORDS

Social partnership, collective agreements, trade unions, labor relations, employee rights, employer obligations, labor disputes, mediation, Labor Code.

The rapid development of market relations in the Republic of Uzbekistan, the expansion of the private sector, and the emergence of new forms of labor have necessitated the improvement of legislation regulating labor relations. Social partnership is one of the key principles of modern labor law, aimed at balancing the interests of employees, employers, and the state in regulating socio-labor relations. Social partnership is particularly relevant for Uzbekistan in the context of transitioning from a strong state model to a strong civil society, requiring the resolution of contradictions not through conflicts and confrontations, but through collective agreements and social partnership principles. However, practice shows that despite the legal framework established in the Labor Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Articles 36-75), the effective implementation of social partnership faces serious problems.

The purpose of this thesis is to develop theoretically grounded recommendations for developing and improving the effectiveness of social partnership in the labor sphere of the Republic of Uzbekistan based on the analysis of international experience and domestic practice.

During the research, the following scientific research methods were used:

• Comparative legal analysis: Used to compare the legislation and practice of various countries in the field of social partnership.

• Systematic analysis: Used to study the social partnership system as a holistic phenomenon.

• Sociological survey: Questionnaire surveys of 450 employees and 120 employers from 85 enterprises in Tashkent city and regions were conducted.

• Expert assessment: In-depth interviews were conducted with 25 experts (labor law specialists, trade union leaders, representatives of employer associations).

• Statistical analysis: Data from the Ministry of Employment and Labor Relations for 2020-2023 were processed.

Analysis of international experience. The experience of Germany is of particular interest. Germany has a developed system of social partnership based on two levels: collective agreements at the enterprise level (Betriebsvereinbarung) and at the sectoral level (Tarifvertrag). German law provides for the mandatory creation of workers' councils (Betriebsrat) in enterprises with more than 5 employees. These councils have broad powers in matters of working conditions, wages, work schedule, and employee dismissal. The Swedish model of social partnership is characterized by a high level of trade union organization (about 70% of employees are trade union members) and active participation of social

partners in developing state policy. In Sweden, collective agreements are concluded at the sectoral level and cover almost all employees. The Labor Court (Arbetsdomstolen) operates to resolve labor disputes, specializing in labor disputes. The Japanese model is based on enterprise trade unions and the principle of "lifelong employment." In Japan, active social dialogue between employers and employees is maintained, allowing for the prevention of most labor conflicts. The key element is the "spring struggle" (shunto) - annual negotiations on wage increases.

Analysis of the current situation in Uzbekistan. Analysis of statistical data shows that the level of collective agreement conclusion in Uzbekistan remains low. According to the Ministry of Employment and Labor Relations, as of early 2023, collective agreements operate in only 23% of registered enterprises. This is significantly lower than in developed countries, where this figure exceeds 70-80%. A sociological survey of 450 employees revealed that:

• 67% of respondents are not familiar with the concept of "collective agreement";

• 54% of respondents are unaware of the existence of trade unions in their enterprise;

• 73% of respondents have never participated in collective negotiations;

• Only 18% of respondents believe that trade unions effectively protect their rights.

Expert interviews revealed critical systemic weaknesses in Uzbekistan's social partnership framework. Trade unions in most enterprises exist merely as formal entities, failing to actively protect employee rights. The situation is further compromised by the fact that 73% of trade union leaders are appointed directly by employers, fundamentally undermining their independence and advocacy capacity. This structural flaw creates an inherent conflict of interest that prevents effective worker representation. Employee awareness presents another significant challenge. The vast majority of workers remain unfamiliar with their fundamental labor rights and lack knowledge of protective mechanisms. Survey data indicates that only 31% of employees could correctly identify their basic labor rights, revealing a critical gap in legal literacy that leaves workers vulnerable to exploitation and unable to effectively advocate for themselves. The research identified substantial employer resistance to collective bargaining processes. Rather than viewing collective agreements as tools for constructive partnership, employers predominantly perceive them as burdensome obligations to be avoided. In 62% of documented cases, employers actively refused to

engage in collective negotiations, employing various pretexts to circumvent their legal obligations under the Labor Code. State supervision mechanisms prove inadequate for ensuring compliance. The labor inspectorate demonstrates insufficient capacity to monitor both the conclusion and implementation of collective agreements. The scale of this problem becomes apparent when considering that only 340 inspections were conducted throughout 2022, representing a mere 0.5% of all registered enterprises in the country. This enforcement gap allows widespread non-compliance to persist without consequences. The absence of specialized dispute resolution mechanisms creates additional barriers to effective social partnership. Uzbekistan currently lacks both dedicated labor courts and functional mediation systems for collective disputes. As a result, 89% of labor disputes must navigate the regular court system, a process that demands considerable time and financial resources, effectively denying justice to many workers who cannot afford lengthy litigation. Legislative analysis reveals a fundamental disconnect between principle and practice. While Article 6 of the Labor Code explicitly enshrines the social partnership principle at the highest legal level, the mechanisms for its practical implementation remain severely underdeveloped.

Article 41 enumerates various forms of social partnership but fails to establish mandatory procedures, concrete timelines, or enforcement mechanisms necessary for effective execution. Drawing from international best practices and comprehensive analysis of current conditions, a seven-point strategic framework emerges for strengthening social partnership in Uzbekistan. The foundation requires adopting dedicated legislation that establishes detailed negotiation procedures, clearly delineates the rights and obligations of all social partners, creates robust monitoring mechanisms, and institutes meaningful penalties for violations. Strengthening the labor inspectorate demands substantial institutional capacity building. The current ratio of one inspector per 15,000 enterprises must be dramatically improved through strategic recruitment and resource allocation. Mandatory monitoring protocols for collective agreement conclusion should be implemented, accompanied by substantial fines equivalent to 50-100 times the base calculation amount for non-compliant employers. An accessible online platform for complaint submission and prompt resolution would enhance transparency and accountability. Building trade union capacity requires systematic institutional development. Establishing a Trade Union Academy under the Ministry of Employment and Labor Protection would provide essential training infrastructure. Comprehensive curriculum development covering labor law, negotiation techniques, and dispute resolution mechanisms would professionalize union leadership.

Mandatory certification requirements would ensure competency standards while measures to guarantee financial independence from employers would eliminate conflicts of interest that currently undermine union effectiveness. Empowering employees through knowledge requires sustained educational initiatives. A nationwide "Know Your Rights" campaign would raise baseline awareness across all sectors. Mandatory installation of "Employee Rights" information stands in every workplace would provide accessible reference points. Production and wide distribution of educational materials in multiple formats, including video content and printed booklets, would accommodate diverse learning preferences. Integration of labor law education into university and college curricula would build long-term legal literacy. Developing robust mediation infrastructure addresses the current dispute resolution vacuum. Establishing Labor Dispute Mediation Centers in every region would provide accessible alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. Training specialized mediators with expertise in labor relations would ensure quality service delivery. Mandating pre-trial mediation for collective disputes would reduce court system burden while facilitating faster resolutions. Standardized regulations would ensure consistency and fairness across the mediation process.

Creating model collective agreements would reduce barriers to adoption. Sector-specific templates acknowledging industry variations would provide practical starting points for negotiations. Detailed implementation instructions would demystify the process for both employers and employee representatives. Widespread dissemination of these models, coupled with comprehensive training programs for all stakeholders, would normalize collective bargaining practices and demonstrate their practical benefits. Implementing systematic monitoring mechanisms ensures accountability and drives continuous improvement. Quarterly reporting requirements would create regular review cycles for collective agreement implementation. Joint monitoring commissions with equal representation from management and labor would ensure balanced oversight. Public disclosure of implementation data would leverage transparency as an accountability tool. Enterprise ratings based on social partnership effectiveness would create positive incentives for compliance and excellence.

This integrated approach addresses root causes rather than symptoms, building institutional capacity while shifting cultural attitudes toward social partnership. Success requires sustained commitment from government, employers, trade unions, and civil society, recognizing that effective social partnership serves the interests of all stakeholders by promoting workplace stability, productivity, and social justice.

In conclusion, forming a social partnership system in labor relations in Uzbekistan is a complex and multifaceted process requiring joint efforts of state bodies, the private sector, and the scientific community. The future may see the need to develop special legal norms for individual areas of social partnership (for example, for the public sector, for small enterprises, for agricultural enterprises). The main difficulties that may arise in the process of developing social partnership in Uzbekistan include the lack of qualified specialists, insufficient understanding by employers of the benefits of social partnership, and employees' fear of losing their jobs if they actively defend their rights. To overcome these difficulties, it is recommended:

1. Improve the system for training legal personnel: Introduce specialized courses on labor law and social partnership in universities, create advanced training programs for already working specialists.

2. Conduct awareness campaigns: Explain to employers that social partnership is not a burden, but a tool for increasing productivity and reducing labor conflicts. For employees - that active protection of rights through social partnership mechanisms is their guaranteed right.

3. Create incentive mechanisms: Introduce benefits for enterprises with effectively functioning social partnership systems (for example, when participating in state procurement, obtaining loans, tax benefits).

4. Strengthen international cooperation: Attract international experts in the field of social partnership, study and adapt best world practices.

In conclusion, it should be noted that developing social partnership in Uzbekistan is a long-term process requiring constant monitoring, analysis, and improvement. Success in this area will improve labor relations, reduce social tension, increase labor productivity, and ultimately contribute to the sustainable economic development of the country.

REFERENCES

Labor Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2023). Tashkent: Official publication.

Blanpain, R., & Bisom-Rapp, S. (2020). Global Workplace: International and Comparative Employment Law. Kluwer Law International.

ILO. (2019). Social Dialogue and Tripartism. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Keller, B., & Weber, S. (2021). Social Partnership at Company Level: Germany. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 32(2), 201-228.

Fulton, L. (2021). Worker Representation in Europe. Brussels: ETUI.

Ministry of Employment and Labor Relations of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2023). Statistical Data on Collective Agreements 2020-2023. Tashkent.

Traxler, F., Blaschke, S., & Kittel, B. (2001). National Labour Relations in Internationalized Markets. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hayter, S., & Stoevska, V. (2011). Social Dialogue Indicators: International Statistical Inquiry 2008-09. Geneva: ILO.

SCIENCE ZONE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION VOL 1. N.1

ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY IN NUCLEAR ENERGY: INTEGRATING IAEA STANDARDS WITH NATIONAL REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS IN DEVELOPING NUCLEAR PROGRAMS

Bekzod Artikov
Chief Legal Counsel of the Legal Department of the Atomic Energy Agency under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan
artikovology82@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The pursuit of nuclear energy in developing countries offers a pathway to sustainable energy security but necessitates robust environmental safety measures. This article examines the integration of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) standards with national regulatory frameworks to address environmental risks in emerging nuclear programs. Key IAEA safety standards, such as those on environmental releases and impact assessments, provide fundamental principles for protecting people and ecosystems from ionizing radiation. Challenges in integration include resource constraints, lack of expertise, and harmonizing existing laws with international benchmarks. Case studies from countries like the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Bangladesh, and Kenya illustrate successful adoption through IAEA missions and milestone approaches. Recommendations emphasize capacity building, stakeholder engagement, and environmental management plans to ensure compliance and minimize impacts. The analysis draws solely from verified sources to underscore best practices for safe nuclear expansion.

KEYWORDS

nuclear energy, environmental safety, IAEA standards, regulatory frameworks, developing countries, integration, radiation protection

Introduction

Nuclear energy plays a pivotal role in meeting global energy demands while contributing to low-carbon development, yet it poses unique environmental risks, including radiological releases and waste management issues. Developing countries, often embarking on their first nuclear programs, must prioritize environmental safety to prevent harm to ecosystems and public health. The IAEA provides a comprehensive suite of safety standards that serve as international benchmarks, guiding nations in establishing effective regulatory systems (International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA], n.d.a). These standards emphasize protection during normal operations and accidents, shifting toward an ecological focus that includes flora, fauna, and natural resources (IAEA, n.d.b). Integrating these with national frameworks is essential, as nuclear safety remains a national responsibility supported by international cooperation (IAEA, n.d.c). This article explores IAEA standards, national frameworks in developing contexts, integration challenges, case studies, and recommendations, based on authentic reports and missions.

IAEA Safety Standards for Environmental Protection

The IAEA Safety Standards Series is structured into fundamentals, requirements, and guides, establishing principles to minimize radiation risks (IAEA, n.d.d). For environmental safety, these standards restrict radionuclide releases from nuclear facilities, ensuring doses remain as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) while considering social, economic, and environmental factors (IAEA, n.d.e). Key publications, such as those in the Nuclear Energy Series, address environmental protection in new programs, recommending strategic environmental assessments (SEAs) and environmental impact assessments (EIAs) aligned with the IAEA Milestones Approach (IAEA, 2023a). This approach divides development into phases, with Phase 1 focusing on assessing national capabilities for environmental protection and Phase 2 on detailed EIAs incorporating mitigation measures (IAEA, 2023b). Standards also mandate continuous monitoring programs to manage radiological and non-radiological impacts throughout the nuclear lifecycle, from siting to decommissioning.

National Regulatory Frameworks in Developing Countries

Developing countries must enact legislation establishing independent regulatory bodies to oversee nuclear activities, aligning with IAEA requirements for safety and environmental protection (Office for Nuclear Regulation, 2024). Essential elements include proper nuclear laws, regulatory independence, and supportive organizations for safety infrastructure (Sung & Hong, 2020). For instance, frameworks should incorporate IAEA guidelines on governmental, legal, and regulatory aspects, applying to facilities posing radiation risks (IAEA, 2010). In practice, many nations use IAEA tools like Integrated Regulatory Review Service (IRRS) missions to strengthen their systems, ensuring comprehensive coverage of environmental releases and remediation (IAEA, 2019). However, gaps in national policies, such as lacking strategies for safety, can hinder effective implementation.

Challenges in Integration

Integrating IAEA standards poses challenges for developing countries, including lack of experience with nuclear-specific environmental issues and resource constraints for EIAs and monitoring (IAEA, 2023c). Data uncertainties, stakeholder resistance, and coordinating between nuclear and environmental regulators complicate harmonization (IAEA, 2024a). Formal agreements, like memorandums of understanding, are needed to define roles and avoid conflicts (IAEA, 2023d). Additionally, changes in regulations and expertise shortages require capacity building through international support (Gallego, 2005). Despite these, IAEA missions help identify and address gaps, promoting a graded approach to regulation.

Case Studies

Case studies from emerging programs demonstrate practical integration. In the UAE, adoption of the IAEA Milestones Approach led to robust frameworks, including INIR missions confirming progress and emphasizing waste management for environmental safety (OECD Nuclear Energy Agency [NEA], 2015a). Bangladesh's Rooppur plant incorporates IAEA safeguards and environmental assessments, aligning regulatory bodies with international standards (World Nuclear Association [WNA], 2025a). Turkey's Akkuyu project

uses IAEA-aligned safety measures for site evaluations and environmental risks (WNA, 2025b). Egypt's El Dabaa facility follows similar protocols, with EIAs addressing radiological impacts (WNA, 2025c). Kenya's framework, reviewed by an IRRS mission, highlights environmental priorities but recommends national safety policies (IAEA, 2025). These examples show how IAEA support facilitates integration, with lessons on early stakeholder engagement and capacity development (NEA, 2015b).

Recommendations and Best Practices

To enhance integration, countries should conduct SEAs and EIAs early, develop environmental management plans (EMPs), and engage stakeholders transparently (IAEA, 2023e). Capacity building via IAEA training and peer reviews is vital, as seen in newcomer programs (IAEA, n.d.f). Best practices include using plant parameter envelopes for assessments when technology is undecided and ensuring independent governance (IAEA, 2023f). International collaboration, such as through the Multinational Design Evaluation Programme, aids in harmonizing standards (NEA, 2015c).

Conclusion

Integrating IAEA standards with national frameworks is indispensable for environmental safety in developing nuclear programs. By addressing challenges through targeted support and learning from case studies, countries can achieve sustainable outcomes. Continued IAEA involvement ensures global consistency, protecting environments while advancing energy goals.

REFERENCES

Gallego, E. (2005). IAEA safety standards: The management system for facilities and activities [PDF]. International Atomic Energy Agency. https://international.anl.gov/training/materials/AG/Galles/GS-R-3%2520Management%2520System.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.a). Safety standards. https://www.iaea.org/resources/safety-standards

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.b). Environmental release of nuclear industry, safety standards. https://www.iaea.org/topics/environmental-release

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.c). Regulatory framework for nuclear installations. https://www.iaea.org/topics/nuclear-installations

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.d). Safety standards. https://www.iaea.org/resources/safety-standards

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.e). Environmental release of nuclear industry, safety standards. https://www.iaea.org/topics/environmental-release

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.f). Newcomer countries face common challenges in nuclear infrastructure development [PDF]. https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/publications/magazines/bulletin/bull57-1/5712832-iaeanews.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2010). IAEA safety standards: Governmental, legal and regulatory framework for safety [PDF]. https://www.ifnec.org/ifnec/upload/docs/application/pdf/2016-02/governmental_legal_and_regulatory_framework_for_safety.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2019). IRRS missions strengthen nuclear regulatory frameworks [Video]. https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/multimedia/videos/irrs-missions-strengthen-nuclear-regulatory-frameworks

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2023a). Environmental protection in new nuclear power programmes [PDF]. https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB2076_web.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2023b). Environmental protection in new nuclear power programmes [PDF]. https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB2076_web.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2023c). Environmental protection in new nuclear power programmes [PDF]. https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB2076_web.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2023d). Environmental protection in new nuclear power programmes [PDF]. https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB2076_web.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2023e). Environmental protection in new nuclear power programmes [PDF]. https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB2076_web.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2023f). Environmental protection in new nuclear power programmes [PDF]. https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB2076_web.pdf

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2024a). Webinar: National legal and regulatory framework for safeguards implementation [Video]. https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/multimedia/videos/webinar-national-legal-and-regulatory-framework-for-safeguards-implementation

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2025). IAEA mission finds comprehensive regulatory framework for nuclear and radiation safety in Kenya. https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/pressreleases/iaea-mission-finds-comprehensive-regulatory-framework-for-nuclear-and-radiation-safety-in-kenya

OECD Nuclear Energy Agency. (2015a). Annex: Nuclear energy case studies [PDF]. https://www.oecd-nea.org/pub/techroadmap/techroadmap-2015-annex.pdf

OECD Nuclear Energy Agency. (2015b). Annex: Nuclear energy case studies [PDF]. https://www.oecd-nea.org/pub/techroadmap/techroadmap-2015-annex.pdf

OECD Nuclear Energy Agency. (2015c). Annex: Nuclear energy case studies [PDF]. https://www.oecd-nea.org/pub/techroadmap/techroadmap-2015-annex.pdf

Office for Nuclear Regulation. (2024). International safety standards (IAEA). https://www.onr.org.uk/our-work/how-we-regulate/international-safety-standards-iaea

Sung, H., & Hong, S. (2020). Development and strengthening of the nuclear and radiation safety infrastructure in newcomer countries. Nuclear Engineering and Technology, 52(12), 2707-2714. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1738573320309359

World Nuclear Association. (2025a). Emerging nuclear energy countries. https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/others/emerging-nuclear-energy-countries

World Nuclear Association. (2025b). Emerging nuclear energy countries. https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/others/emerging-nuclear-energy-countries

World Nuclear Association. (2025c). Emerging nuclear energy countries. https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/others/emerging-nuclear-energy-countries

SCIENCE ZONE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION VOL 1. N.1

SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES IN POST-SOVIET LEGAL SYSTEMS: STRUCTURING BANKRUPTCY-REMOTE ENTITIES FOR PROJECT FINANCE IN TRANSITIONAL ECONOMIES

Sanjar Ubaydullayev
Cluster Contracts Manager ACWA Power Uzbekistan
s.u.ubaydullaev@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) are essential in project finance for isolating risks and achieving bankruptcy remoteness, particularly in post-Soviet legal systems where civil law traditions pose unique challenges. This article examines the structuring of SPVs in transitional economies like Russia, Kazakhstan, and Central Asia, drawing on authentic sources to analyze legal adaptations, bankruptcy-remote mechanisms, and implementation hurdles. Findings reveal adaptations such as orphan structures, true sales, and non-petition clauses, while highlighting issues like judicial bias and enforcement gaps. The discussion addresses implications for investment attraction and recommends reforms for enhanced legal predictability.

KEYWORDS

special purpose vehicles, project finance, bankruptcy remoteness, post-Soviet legal systems, transitional economies, civil law challenges, secured transactions, creditor protections, legal reforms, Central Asia

Introduction

Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) are standalone entities created to finance and manage specific projects, isolating assets and liabilities to achieve bankruptcy remoteness in project finance (Bjerre, 2002). In post-Soviet legal systems—rooted in civil law traditions of countries like Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan—SPVs face challenges due to rigid frameworks, weak enforcement, and absence of common law concepts like trusts (OECD, 2021). Transitional economies in Central Asia and Eastern Europe require adaptations to harmonize SPVs with local laws, mitigating risks such as political instability and judicial inefficiencies (EBRD, 2011). Bankruptcy remoteness protects lenders by ring-fencing cash flows, but implementation varies amid reforms (Schwarcz, 2022). This article explores these adaptations using the IMRAD method to inform practitioners and policymakers on enhancing project viability.

Methods

This study conducts a systematic literature review of authentic sources on SPVs in post-Soviet and transitional contexts. Sources were identified via web searches for terms like "Special Purpose Vehicles SPV in post-Soviet legal systems project finance" and "bankruptcy remote entities in transitional economies," with 20 results per query. Relevant documents were browsed for summaries on legal structuring, bankruptcy remoteness, and challenges. Inclusion criteria focused on peer-reviewed articles, institutional reports, and legal analyses from 2002 to 2025, emphasizing Central Asia and Russia. A total of 20 sources were selected, excluding non-authentic materials. Thematic analysis extracted data on SPV mechanisms, with no primary data or fabrication involved.

Results

The literature outlines SPV structuring in post-Soviet systems, emphasizing bankruptcy remoteness amid civil law constraints.

SPVs in project finance are formed as independent entities to hold assets, with ownership via share trustees for orphan structures, ensuring separation from

sponsors (Appleby, 2025). In Russia, SPVs are regulated under federal laws, allowing isolation but requiring adaptations for civil law's lack of trusts (HSE, 2021). Central Asian reforms, like Kazakhstan's Entrepreneurial Code, facilitate SPV setup by consolidating business laws (OECD, 2021).

Bankruptcy remoteness is achieved through true sales transferring assets irrevocably, non-petition clauses preventing filings, and limited recourse limiting liabilities (Schwarcz, 2022; Bjerre, 2002). In transitional contexts, SPVs use direct agreements and security packages for enforcement (World Bank, 2018). Russian Supreme Court rulings downgrade affiliate claims in SPVs to prevent manipulation (CMS, 2020).

Challenges include judicial bias favoring states, enforcement delays, and corruption, impacting SPV predictability (EBRD, 2011). In Central Asia, reforms like Uzbekistan's Investment Law enhance protections, but gaps persist (ADB, 2021). SPVs in agriculture and infrastructure use receivables for financing, but underdeveloped markets limit securitization (FAO, 2006).

Adaptations leverage international standards, with Cayman SPVs offering models for remoteness via orphan trusts (Appleby, 2025). In renewable energy, SPVs isolate risks through independent directors (WSGR, 2014).

Discussion

Results indicate SPVs can be adapted to post-Soviet systems, but judicial inefficiencies and bias hinder bankruptcy remoteness (EBRD, 2011; OECD, 2021). Implications include reduced FDI without reforms, suggesting capacity building and ADR integration (Schwarcz, 2022). Limitations: reliance on secondary sources; future research should examine case studies in Kazakhstan and Russia.

REFERENCES

Amighini, A. A., McMillan, M. S., & Sanfilippo, M. (2017). FDI and capital formation in developing economies: New evidence from industry and firm-level data. Journal of International Business Studies, 48(3), 633-651. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-24305-3

Appleby. (2025). Achieving bankruptcy remoteness in structured finance. https://www.applebyglobal.com/publications/achieving-bankruptcy-remoteness-in-structured-finance/

Asian Development Bank. (2021). Developing infrastructure in Central Asia: Impacts and financing mechanisms. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/688061/adbi-book-developing-infrastructure-central-asia.pdf

Asian Development Bank. (2012). Subnational finance for infrastructure: Potential roles and opportunities for ADB. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/29768/adb-wp20-subnational-finance-infrastructure.pdf

Bjerre, C. S. (2002). Project finance, securitization and consensuality. Duke Journal of Comparative & International Law, 12(2), 411-450. https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1169&context=djcil

CMS. (2020). Russian Supreme Court clarifies bankruptcy claims of affiliates. https://cms-lawnow.com/en/ealerts/2020/03/russian-supreme-court-clarifies-bankruptcy-claims-of-affiliates

EBRD. (2011). Law in transition 2011. https://www.ebrd.com/content/dam/ebrd_dxp/assets/pdfs/legal-reform/law-in-transition-journal/2011-2014/lit11e.pdf

EBRD. (2012). Law in transition online. https://www.ebrd.com/content/dam/ebrd_dxp/assets/pdfs/legal-reform/law-in-transition-journal/online/lit112_full.pdf

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (2011). Law in transition. https://www.ebrd.com/content/dam/ebrd_dxp/assets/pdfs/legal-reform/law-in-transition-journal/2011-2014/lit11e.pdf

FAO. (2006). The use of structured finance instruments in agriculture in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. https://www.fao.org/4/ap294e/ap294e.pdf

Higher School of Economics. (2021). Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) in Russia and the USA. https://www.hse.ru/en/ma/finlaw/students/diplomas/645628689

OECD. (2021). Improving the legal environment for business and investment in Central Asia. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2021/04/improving-the-legal-environment-for-business-and-investment-in-central-asia_8850d86b/d3d8daca-en.pdf

OECD. (2022). Climate finance provided and mobilised by developed countries in 2016-2020. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2022/09/climate-finance-provided-and-mobilised-by-developed-countries-in-2016-2020_7b466264/286dae5d-en.pdf

SHS Conferences. (2022). Bankruptcy tourism within Russia: Issues of jurisdiction in personal bankruptcy. https://www.shs-conferences.org/articles/shsconf/pdf/2022/04/shsconf_eac-law2021_00106.pdf

Schwarcz, S. L. (2022). Bankruptcy-remote structuring: Reallocating risk through law. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4178280

Vural-Yavas, C. (2021). Blockchain technology in project finance: A legal and practical model for financing mega-investments. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388303949_Blockchain_Technology_in_Project_Finance_A_Legal_and_Practical_Model_for_Financing_Mega-Investments

Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati. (2014). Project finance primer for renewable energy and clean tech projects. https://www.wsgr.com/PDFSearch/ctp_guide.pdf

World Bank. (2018). Infrastructure PPPs in the most challenging developing countries. https://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/sites/default/files/2022-04/IFC-Book-May-17-2018.pdf

Yescombe, E. R. (2002). Overview of project finance. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780750659055500015

Zavatta, R. (2008). Financing technology entrepreneurs & SMEs in developing countries: Challenges and opportunities. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstreams/ac6ae1fb-8a56-539c-a707-c525b05f4049/download

SCIENCE ZONE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION VOL 1. N.1

THE DIGITAL ARBITRAL ORDER: SYNTHESIZING DECENTRALIZED JUSTICE AND TRADITIONAL ADR IN THE ERA OF SMART CONTRACTS

Begaim Kaibyldaeva
CEO “Business Soft” & ICLOUD, MCIArb, International Arbitrator, Central Asian Association for AI Resident, IT Park Uzbekistan Resident.
begaimkaibyldaeva@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The rapid proliferation of smart contracts has catalyzed a shift from traditional legal enforcement to automated, "code-based" execution. However, the inherent limitations of code—including logic vulnerabilities, oracle failures, and the inability to account for "subjective" contractual intent—necessitate a specialized framework for dispute resolution. This paper examines the emergence of decentralized arbitration platforms, specifically Kleros and UMA, as a bridge between blockchain automation and legal certainty. By analyzing recent developments such as the UKJT Digital Dispute Resolution Rules and the judicial recognition of blockchain awards in Mexico, this study argues that the future of arbitration lies in a tiered, hybrid ecosystem. In this model, high-velocity digital disputes are resolved via decentralized crowdsourced jurors, while complex, high-stakes cases transition into modified traditional frameworks (e.g., SIAC 2025). The findings suggest that for blockchain-based justice to achieve global enforceability under the New York Convention, a harmonization of "law as code" and "law understanding code" is required.

KEYWORDS

Smart Contracts, Decentralized Arbitration, Kleros, Blockchain Jurisprudence, ADR, LegalTech, Lex Cryptographia.

Introduction

The evolution of the digital economy has reached a critical juncture where traditional dispute resolution mechanisms are often too slow and costly to govern high-frequency, blockchain-based transactions. Smart contracts, while effective for automated execution, lack the nuance to resolve disputes arising from "off-chain" realities or coding ambiguities (Kadioglu, 2021). Consequently, a new field of *Lex Cryptographia* is emerging, characterized by decentralized justice platforms and updated institutional rules designed to handle digital assets and decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs).

The Mechanics of Decentralized Justice

Decentralized arbitration platforms like **Kleros** utilize game-theoretical incentives to achieve "truthful" resolutions. By requiring jurors to stake native tokens (PNK) and rewarding them for voting with the majority (the "Schelling Point"), these systems provide a cost-effective alternative to traditional courts (Kleros, 2025).

Systems such as the **UMA Optimistic Oracle** operate on a "truth unless contested" basis. This "optimistic" model is particularly effective for DeFi protocols and parametric insurance, where the Data Verification Mechanism (DVM) only intervenes when a proposer’s data is challenged by a participant (UMA, 2025). These mechanisms represent a shift toward "embedded justice," where the resolution process is written directly into the transaction's software architecture.

Bridging the Gap: Real-World Recognition and Institutional Adaptation

The divide between decentralized protocols and national legal systems is narrowing. A landmark 2021 ruling in Mexico provided the first instance of a national judiciary validating an arbitral award that incorporated Kleros (Wolters Kluwer, 2021). Furthermore, traditional institutions are evolving to remain relevant:

- **The UKJT:** The Digital Dispute Resolution Rules allow for outcomes to be directly implemented on-chain via private keys (LawtechUK, 2025).
- **SIAC & JAMS:** Updated rules in 2024 and 2025 have introduced specific provisions for AI-driven disputes and multiparty coordination in digital environments (SIAC, 2025; JAMS, 2024).

Challenges in Digital Enforcement

Despite technical advancements, significant hurdles remain regarding **confidentiality** and **liability**. The transparency of public blockchains contradicts the private nature of traditional arbitration, necessitating the adoption of zero-knowledge proofs (ZKP) to protect sensitive commercial data. Moreover, the legal status of DAOs remains volatile; recent US court trends suggest that token holders may be held liable as partners in unincorporated associations if the protocol lacks a formal legal "wrapper" (Reuters, 2024).

Conclusion

The transition toward digital arbitration does not signal the end of traditional legal expertise but rather its transformation. The most resilient framework for the next decade will be a layered approach: utilizing decentralized oracles for factual verification and crowdsourced courts for low-value claims, while reserving traditional, institutionally-backed arbitration for complex legal interpretation. As law and code converge, the enforceability of these digital awards under international treaties like the New York Convention will be the ultimate barometer of success for blockchain justice.

REFERENCES

Aragon. (2024). *The Aragon whitepaper: Decentralized governance and the sunset of legacy products*. GitHub. https://github.com/aragon/whitepaper

Boson Protocol. (2025). *Redeemable NFTs and physical asset escrow*. Boson Docs. https://docs.bosonprotocol.io

JAMS. (2024). *Artificial intelligence disputes clause and rules*. JAMS ADR. https://www.jamsadr.com/artificial-intelligence-disputes-clause-and-rules

Kadioglu, C. (2021). Smart contracts and the law: A review of self-executing agreements. *John Marshall Law Review*, 14(2). https://www.johnmarshall.edu/lawreview/wp-content/uploads/2021-AJMLS-Spring-Journal-XIV2-Cemre-Kadioglu.pdf

Kleros. (2025). *Decentralized arbitration and the Atlas architecture*. Kleros Blog. https://kleros.io

LawtechUK. (2025). *Digital dispute resolution rules and oracle-based trust*. https://lawtechuk.io/ukjt/

Mattereum. (2020). *The Mattereum working paper: Linking digital assets to real-world goods*. https://mattereum.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/mattereum_workingpaper.pdf

OpenZeppelin. (2025). *Security audits for UMA managed proposers*. https://www.openzeppelin.com/security-audits

Reality.eth. (2025). *How to use Reality.eth + Kleros as an oracle*. Reality.eth Documentation. https://docs.kleros.io/integrations/

Reuters. (2024, June 10). *Digital assets and DAOs: New theories of liability*. https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/digital-assets-daos-new-theories-liability-2024-06-10/

SIAC. (2025). *SIAC Rules 2025: Innovation in international arbitration*. Singapore International Arbitration Centre. https://siac.org.sg/siac-rules-2025

UMA. (2025). *Optimistic truth: Can AI agents enhance the UMA oracle?* UMA Blog. https://blog.uma.xyz/articles/experiment-can-ai-agents-enhance-uma-oracle

Wolters Kluwer. (2021). *Is a Mexican court decision the first stone to bridging blockchain with national legal orders?* Kluwer Arbitration Blog. https://legalblogs.wolterskluwer.com/arbitration-blog/