

# USE OF DIGITAL POTENTIAL IN THE ECONOMY OF THE STATE

*Igamberdieva Kunduz Ergashevna*

*Tashkent State Transport University (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)*

**Abstract.** The paper aims to analyze the features of adaptive governance. Digitalization significantly changes the object of public governance, creates opportunities for distributed management and decision-making. Adaptive governance is aimed at using the capabilities of digital technologies and changing political institutions to increase the adaptive abilities of the political and administrative system in order to maintain stability in critical situations.

**Keywords:** digitalization, adaptive governance, resilience, deliberation.

The digitalization of public administration has a diverse impact on the sustainability potential of socio-technical systems, the ability of its structure, processes, institutions to be rebuilt as a result of external influences, new risks and changing conditions. Political subjects in the space of digital governance act as deliberate actors, the stability of goals and behavior patterns is predetermined by their ability to introspect / reflect, reassess their own trajectories, including through involvement in public analysis and discussion. The active use of technology in modern public administration has two important goals: 1) activating the capacity of the management system to prevent and respond early to possible changes in the socio-political and economic context; 2) through the involvement of diverse social groups, facilitation of the deliberative process in order to find solutions to systemic problems, overcoming which only through the efforts of the state is not effective enough. The resolution of these two goals is provided by a special methodology of adaptive governance, which has been developed in the practice of public administration in Russia and foreign countries. The ability of political and administrative systems to maintain stability in the face of growing critical risks is a significant result of the implementation of adaptive management.

Of research interest are the possibilities and limits of its use in the context of digitalization.

Adaptive management (a term that has been developed in studies of socio-techno-ecological systems (Dietz, Ostrom & Stern, 2003)) in the context of digitalization is considered by researchers as a decentralized decision-making principle based on deliberation (bottom-up management) and public involvement with the goal of mobilization of internal and external parameters of the controlled system and uncertainty reduction (Janssen & van der Voort, 2014). The managed system, therefore, must be able to develop adaptive capabilities and respond to changes in the external environment at the grassroots, organizational level. At the same time, at the highest levels of government, it must maintain internal stability and accountability, properties that are so important for public administration.

Digitalization is changing the speed and pace of functioning of the political and management system, for which adaptive capacities and resources are needed for various levels (less time for operational, project and program adaptation and much more time for adaptation of organizational, institutional and social components). From hierarchical centrally controlled management models, through the active use of digital technologies, there is a transition to distributed management, when the number of inputs and outputs to the system of data entry points increases significantly. There is a decentralization of the data processing process by various subjects and distributed decision making, which requires the coordination of many strategies of the system participants and the search for optimal procedures for the interaction of decision makers (Gilev et al., 2002).

The complexity of the control object goes in three directions. Firstly, digital public administration, implemented on state electronic platforms, provides each participant with the property of activity - platform algorithms create the opportunity for him to independently make decisions, enter information into the system, and together with other participants adjust interaction procedures, including with decision makers. .

Deliberative coordination becomes an internal engine, a coordinator of active participants, solving the problem of coordinating the opinions of citizens, experts, interest groups, politicians, and decision makers. It involves the following three interrelated processes:

1) organizing the exchange of knowledge and competencies between participants in the public discussion, interaction on the platform;

2) "weighing", "visualization" and prioritization of competing points of view;

3) legitimation of the mechanism of division of epistemic labor (authority).

Secondly, a new stage of institutional evolution. Political actors implement the above processes, interact with electronic platforms, directly and indirectly using digital technologies. Institutions change, as Philippe Agre rightly points out, not because of the use of digital technologies (Agre, 2002), but as a result of the opportunities or limitations that technologies provide.

Secondly, a new stage of institutional evolution. Political actors implement the above processes, interact with electronic platforms, directly and indirectly using digital technologies. Institutions change, as Philippe Agre rightly points out, not because of the use of digital technologies (Agre, 2002), but as a result of the opportunities or limitations that technologies provide. with institutions: the technical system must have signal modules capable of producing signals, and the social subsystem must have mechanisms for capturing and interpreting these signals. There are four formats of interaction between the technical and social subsystems.

1. Delegation: the technical system functions autonomously from the social one, key operations are controlled by artificial intelligence, sensors register the stability of the system (for example, monitoring systems, heat maps, schedules, most smart city technologies, etc.). Delegation allows you to free a person from repeated repetition of routine actions, reduce the number of algorithm steps, and simplify the use of digital infrastructure.

2. Programming - the social subsystem sets the parameters for the technical through administration. Artificial intelligence resolves emerging contradictions, errors associated with programmable systems or modules and delegates to them centrally or collectively agreed parameters. Programming allows you to define a framework of rules that coordinate the functioning of the digital infrastructure and social groups that are users (for example, the provision of personal data for profiles, user agreements, permission to use personal data, etc.).

3. Interaction - the social subsystem formats the space of deliberation through direct contacts and participation. Artificial intelligence identifies problem situations and initiates active interventions that must be taken by the participants in the public dialogue (for example, the “We Solve Together” module on the State Services portal, an application / message about a problem from a citizen must be processed within a certain period of time, according to its results, those responsible individuals must publish a report, and a citizen must leave a review - the algorithm informs about the need for certain actions for the participants in the process of “discussing the problem”).

4. Attention - the social subsystem itself becomes a process in which each stakeholder can realize a set of roles - participant, initiator, controller, observer - artificial intelligence fixes the role, creates conditions for interaction (for example, forms a separate "thread" for dialogue), "recognizes » sources of dispute/conflict and helps to resolve them.

It is very important that the technology and algorithms are understandable, the effects of using technologies are visible, and that technology users can re-evaluate their participation and their own goals through the prism of new digital opportunities.

Thirdly, digitalization modifies the decision-making system, which, in addition to being distributed, is characterized by multilevelness: a horizontal plane (distribution) arises - a set of subjects located at the same level of the hierarchy that make a decision (for example, participate in a public discussion of

a project on the Active Portal). citizen" (Moscow) and vote for him. And a vertical plane built on several levels of the hierarchy, on which decision-making subjects are located.

The ratio of vertical and horizontal coordination (hierarchical or polycentric) is set by political factors, the balance of political and administrative components in the digital environment, the desire of political leaders to “rationalize, professionalize and to some extent depoliticize some functions of the state” with the help of technologies, which, according to researchers, reflects tendencies of "managerial democracy".

Digital technologies and political institutions evolving under their influence provide polycentric deliberation or polarized, centralized management (hierarchical organization). In the case of a polycentric deliberative process, the state aims to strengthen the adaptive abilities of the political and administrative system by redistributing responsibility and participation among all political actors, while maintaining sole, centralized control on the one hand. This approach increases organizational flexibility and the ability to apply tactical changes in policy, taking into account public opinion. In the case when the state provides support for distributed decision-making (many agents and decision-making centers), while maintaining responsibility and accountability in a centralized manner, it increases the adaptive capacity of the administrative system through organizational learning and increasing the competence of local authorities and the development of local policies taking into account local features.

#### REFERENCE:

1. Джуманова, А. Б., Игамбердиева, К. Э. (2018). ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ БЕЗРАБОТИЦЫ И ИХ ВЛИЯНИЕ НА РАЗВИТИЕ ЭКОНОМИКИ. Экономика и социум, 10, 243-245.
2. Джуманова, А. Б., Игамбердиева, К. Э. (2021). МЕХАНИЗМ ВЛИЯНИЯ АМОРТИЗАЦИОННОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ НА ПОКАЗАТЕЛИ ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТИ ФИНАНСОВЫЕ РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ РАБОТЫ ЖЕЛЕЗНОДОРОЖНОГО ТРАНСПОРТА. Экономика и социум, 9(88), 338-344.
3. ИГАМБЕРДИЕВА, КЭ (2022). РАЗВИТИЕ БУХГАЛТЕРСКОГО УЧЕТА В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ УЗБЕКИСТАН. Экономика и социум, 1(92), 576-579.