BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY FOR VALUING ENTERPRISES AND ENHANCING THEIR INVESTMENT ATTRACTIVENESS IN THE DIGITAL ECONOMY

Rafiyeva Zarina Xusanovna
Senior Lecturer, Department of 'Investment and Innovation',
Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service
Abdirasulova Marg'uba Xolmurodovna
Student of Samarkand institute of economics and service
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23682067

Abstract. The digital economy is transforming the economic foundations of enterprise valuation and investment decision-making. Traditional valuation methods, which primarily rely on tangible assets, historical financial performance, and conventional profitability indicators, may underestimate the economic contribution of data, software, intellectual property, digital platforms, and network effects. This study aims to develop an integrated methodological framework for enterprise valuation and investment attractiveness assessment under digital transformation. The research combines a critical review of valuation theory, comparative analysis of income-, market-, and asset-based approaches, examination of Uzbekistan's digital economy statistics, and institutional analysis of national legislation. The proposed framework integrates financial performance, digital capital, technological maturity, cybersecurity, data governance, innovation capacity, and investment risk into a unified assessment system.

Keywords: digital economy, enterprise valuation, investment attractiveness, digital assets, discounted cash flow, intangible capital, network effects, investment risk, Uzbekistan.

Аннотация. Цифровая экономика изменяет подходы к оценке стоимости предприятий и определению их инвестиционной привлекательности. Традиционные методы оценки не всегда отражают экономическую ценность данных, программного обеспечения, интеллектуальной собственности, цифровых платформ и сетевых эффектов. Цель исследования заключается в разработке интегрированной методологии оценки предприятий с учетом финансовых, технологических и цифровых факторов.

Ключевые слова: цифровая экономика, оценка стоимости предприятия, инвестиционная привлекательность, цифровые активы, интеллектуальный капитал, инвестиционные риски, Узбекистан.

Annotatsiya. Raqamli iqtisodiyot korxonalar qiymatini baholash va investitsion jozibadorligini aniqlash yondashuvlarini o'zgartirmoqda. An'anaviy baholash usullari ma'lumotlar, dasturiy ta'minot, intellektual mulk, raqamli platformalar va tarmoq samarasi kabi omillarning iqtisodiy qiymatini to'liq aks ettirmasligi mumkin. Tadqiqotning maqsadi moliyaviy, texnologik va raqamli omillarni birlashtiruvchi integratsiyalashgan baholash metodologiyasini ishlab chiqishdan iborat.

Kalit so'zlar: raqamli iqtisodiyot, korxona qiymati, investitsion jozibadorlik, raqamli aktivlar, intellektual kapital, diskontlangan pul oqimi, tarmoq samarasi, investitsion risk.

INTRODUCTION

The digital economy has fundamentally altered the way enterprises create, capture, and sustain economic value. In industrial business models, competitive advantage traditionally depended on physical infrastructure, production capacity, inventories, and access to financial resources. In digitally intensive enterprises, however, value creation increasingly depends on intangible resources, including proprietary software, customer databases, algorithms, digital distribution channels, technological competencies, and the ability to convert information into commercially viable products and services. These developments require a reassessment of conventional enterprise valuation methodologies and the criteria used to determine investment attractiveness.

Enterprise valuation is not merely an accounting exercise. It is an analytical process through which investors estimate the economic benefits associated with ownership of a business, taking into account uncertainty, the timing of expected cash flows, capital requirements, and the risks associated with future performance. Investment attractiveness, in turn, reflects the capacity of an enterprise to generate sustainable returns while maintaining an acceptable risk profile. Although these concepts are closely related, they should not be treated as interchangeable. A company may possess substantial technological potential without generating sufficient cash flow to justify a high market valuation. Conversely, an established enterprise with moderate growth prospects may remain attractive because of stable earnings, strong governance, and predictable financial performance.

The distinction becomes especially important when digital transformation changes the relationship between current expenditure and future economic benefits. Investments in enterprise resource planning systems, cloud infrastructure, artificial intelligence, cybersecurity, and customer analytics may initially increase operating costs while producing efficiency gains over subsequent periods. Conventional financial indicators may therefore understate the strategic value of such investments if they are interpreted without reference to implementation maturity, expected productivity improvements, and the commercial sustainability of digital capabilities.

International valuation practice recognizes three principal approaches: the income approach, the market approach, and the cost or asset-based approach. Each provides useful information, but each also has limitations when applied to digitally intensive businesses. The income approach captures future economic benefits but depends on assumptions concerning growth, margins, reinvestment, and discount rates. The market approach uses comparable transactions or listed companies, although differences in business models, market power, intellectual property, and platform maturity may weaken comparability. The asset-based approach can provide a useful reference point but may fail to capture internally developed software, organizational knowledge, network externalities, and the economic benefits of accumulated data.

These methodological challenges are particularly relevant to Uzbekistan, where digital transformation has become an explicit policy priority. Presidential Decree No. PF-6079 of 5 October 2020 approved the Digital Uzbekistan–2030 Strategy, establishing a policy framework for digital infrastructure, electronic government, digital economic development, and the expansion of digital technologies across economic sectors. The strategy also emphasizes automation, enterprise management systems, electronic commerce, and the improvement of financial and operational transparency (President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2020). These priorities establish an institutional context in which digital capabilities increasingly influence enterprise productivity and prospects for attracting investment.

Official statistics demonstrate the scale of this transformation. According to the National Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan, gross value added generated by information and communication technology services increased from UZS 3,299.2 billion in 2015 to UZS 33,742.3 billion in 2024. The corresponding 2024 figure was approximately 39.1% higher than the 2023 value of UZS 24,256.0 billion, measured in nominal terms. The increase illustrates the growing contribution of ICT-related activities to the national economy, although nominal growth should not be interpreted as real growth without adjustment for price changes and methodological revisions.

Despite this progress, a methodological gap remains between the growing importance of digital resources and the way enterprise value is commonly assessed. Digital investments are frequently evaluated through isolated indicators, such as software expenditure, the number of digital transactions, or the proportion of automated processes. Such indicators do not independently establish economic value. A digital platform may attract many users but remain unprofitable; a large customer database may have limited commercial usefulness if data quality is poor or legal restrictions prevent its effective use. Similarly, extensive automation may increase productivity while simultaneously introducing cybersecurity vulnerabilities and dependence on external technology providers.

The central research problem is therefore how to integrate financial valuation with the measurement of digital capital, technological maturity, innovation potential, and risk without double-counting economic benefits. The objective of this study is to develop a comprehensive methodology for enterprise valuation and investment attractiveness assessment under digital transformation, with particular attention to the institutional and statistical context of Uzbekistan. The research addresses three interconnected questions: how digital assets should be incorporated into enterprise valuation; how digital capabilities and non-financial factors can be translated into measurable investment attractiveness indicators; and how the proposed methodology can improve the reliability of investment decisions under uncertainty.

The study contributes to the literature by presenting an integrated framework that combines discounted cash flow analysis, market comparability, asset-based valuation, digital capital assessment, and multidimensional risk analysis. Its practical contribution is the development of a methodology that can be adapted to manufacturing companies, service enterprises, digital platforms, and technology-intensive businesses operating in Uzbekistan.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical foundations of enterprise valuation originate in the relationship between expected economic benefits and the resources required to generate them. The income approach, associated with modern corporate finance theory, treats enterprise value as the present value of future cash flows available to capital providers. Damodaran demonstrates that valuation depends not only on projected financial performance but also on the consistency between cash flows, growth assumptions, reinvestment requirements, and the cost of capital. This principle remains valid in the digital economy, although the estimation of future cash flows becomes more complex when business models depend on intangible assets and rapidly changing technologies.

The resource-based view offers a complementary explanation of why certain digital enterprises achieve superior performance. According to Barney, resources that are valuable, rare, difficult to imitate, and difficult to substitute can support sustainable competitive advantage. In digital businesses, these resources may include proprietary algorithms, specialized datasets, software architecture, organizational knowledge, and the capability to integrate technology with customer needs. Nevertheless, possession of a digital resource does not automatically establish its monetary

value. Its economic contribution depends on whether the enterprise can commercialize it, protect it, and maintain its relevance as technologies and customer preferences evolve.

The literature on intangible capital further demonstrates that conventional financial statements may provide an incomplete picture of the productive resources accumulated by enterprises. Lev argues that accounting systems often struggle to reflect the economic significance of intangible investments adequately. Software development, employee training, research, organizational restructuring, and customer acquisition may generate benefits over multiple periods, yet their financial treatment differs according to applicable accounting standards and the nature of the expenditure. Consequently, investors should distinguish between accounting recognition and economic value rather than assuming that the carrying amount of recognized assets represents their full contribution to enterprise value.

Digital platforms introduce another valuation dimension: network effects. Katz and Shapiro explain how the value of a product or service can depend on the number of other users adopting a compatible technology. In platform businesses, additional users may attract more sellers, service providers, advertisers, or complementary developers. These interactions can reinforce demand and lower customer acquisition costs. However, network effects are not universally positive. Congestion, weak trust, low-quality participants, excessive platform fees, and regulatory restrictions may reduce the benefits of scale. Therefore, network size should be assessed alongside user engagement, retention, transaction frequency, monetization capacity, and platform governance.

The market approach also requires adaptation. Comparable-company multiples, including enterprise value to earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization (EV/EBITDA), enterprise value to revenue, and price-to-earnings ratios, are useful when comparable firms share similar growth prospects, capital structures, risk profiles, and business economics. However, applying the same revenue multiple to a mature retailer and a rapidly expanding digital platform may produce misleading results. Digital enterprises often differ significantly in gross margins, customer lifetime value, recurring revenue, acquisition costs, and the proportion of expenditure required to sustain growth.

The International Valuation Standards provide a framework for identifying valuation bases, selecting appropriate methods, and maintaining consistency between assumptions and the purpose of an assessment. The International Valuation Standards Council emphasizes that the valuation method must reflect the characteristics of the asset, the available evidence, and the intended valuation purpose. For digital enterprises, this requires transparent identification of relevant intangible assets, appropriate treatment of forecast uncertainty, and avoidance of double-counting between asset-specific cash flows and the enterprise's overall earnings.

Within Uzbekistan, the Digital Uzbekistan–2030 Strategy provides a national policy foundation for integrating digital technologies into business operations and improving management transparency. The strategy's focus on enterprise automation, digital commerce, and information systems is directly relevant to the valuation problem because these technologies can influence productivity, cost structures, market reach, and the quality of management information.

The legal environment also influences the economic value and transferability of digital resources. The Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Personal Data" establishes a regulatory framework for processing personal information. The Law "On Electronic Commerce" regulates legal relationships associated with electronic commercial transactions, while legislation governing valuation activities provides an institutional basis for professional valuation practice. The Law "On Accounting" is relevant to the preparation and interpretation of financial information. These legal instruments should be considered in their current consolidated versions when conducting a formal

valuation, because compliance requirements, amendments, and sector-specific obligations can affect the usability, transferability, and risk profile of digital assets.

The reviewed theoretical perspectives suggest that no single valuation technique can adequately represent every dimension of digital enterprise value. A more reliable methodology should integrate financial valuation with evidence-based assessment of digital resources, commercial capabilities, governance, and risk. The proposed framework follows this principle while preserving the distinction between enterprise value, asset-specific value, and investment attractiveness.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research employs a conceptual and analytical methodology combining comparative valuation analysis, descriptive statistical analysis, legal-institutional review, and methodological synthesis. The purpose is not to claim an econometric relationship that has not been tested against enterprise-level observations, but to construct a transparent framework grounded in established valuation theory and the observable development of Uzbekistan's digital economy.

The proposed methodology separates valuation into two analytical stages. The first estimates enterprise value using established financial techniques adjusted for digital business characteristics. The second evaluates investment attractiveness through a multidimensional index that incorporates financial performance, digital capital, market position, governance, and risk. This separation prevents a high qualitative score from being interpreted automatically as an increase in monetary value.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The statistical evidence demonstrates the increasing macroeconomic significance of digital activity in Uzbekistan. Gross value added generated by ICT services rose from UZS 3,299.2 billion in 2015 to UZS 33,742.3 billion in 2024. Over the nine-year interval, the nominal value therefore increased by approximately 10.2 times. The corresponding compound annual growth rate was approximately 29.5%, calculated from the initial and final nominal observations. This measure describes the growth of the recorded current-price series; it does not establish an equivalent increase in real output, labor productivity, or the market value of individual enterprises.

The scale of the increase nevertheless provides a relevant context for corporate valuation. As digital infrastructure, programming, data processing, and related services expand, enterprises increasingly depend on technological resources to organize production, reach customers, process transactions, and manage information. The implications extend beyond the ICT sector itself. Manufacturing, logistics, retail, finance, tourism, and professional services may all experience changes in operating efficiency and competitive structure through digital adoption.

The key methodological implication is that digital transformation should be treated as an economic mechanism whose value must be demonstrated through measurable outcomes. Technology expenditure alone is insufficient evidence of value creation. An enterprise implementing an advanced information system may experience temporary disruption, implementation overruns, employee resistance, or increased cybersecurity exposure. The investment creates value only when the resulting benefits, including cost reductions, improved service quality, increased revenue, better asset utilization, or lower operational risk, exceed the associated costs and opportunity costs.

The proposed framework begins with conventional financial valuation but expands the analysis of the drivers behind forecast cash flows. Rather than applying a fixed digital premium to enterprise value, the analyst identifies the causal relationship between each digital capability and expected financial performance. For example, an integrated customer relationship management system may

reduce customer acquisition costs, improve retention, and increase the effectiveness of cross-selling. These effects should be reflected in revenue forecasts, marketing expenditure, and customer lifetime value assumptions. An enterprise resource planning system may improve inventory control, reduce procurement inefficiencies, and accelerate financial reporting. These effects should appear in working capital requirements, operating margins, or risk assessments where evidence supports the adjustment.

Similarly, data analytics can improve demand forecasting and inventory allocation, but the economic benefit depends on data quality, model accuracy, organizational adoption, and the extent to which management decisions actually change. The valuation model should therefore distinguish between the existence of a digital capability and its demonstrated effectiveness.

A practical implementation involves identifying each material digital investment, specifying the expected operational mechanism, establishing a measurable performance indicator, and estimating the resulting cash-flow impact. The analyst should compare projected benefits with implementation costs, ongoing maintenance, staff training, cybersecurity investment, and the risk of technological obsolescence. This approach creates a traceable connection between digital resources and enterprise value. The treatment of intangible assets requires particular care. Internally developed software may have significant economic utility even when the associated expenditure has been recognized as an expense rather than an asset. Conversely, a large software asset balance does not guarantee that the technology remains useful or commercially competitive. The valuation should therefore assess ownership rights, functionality, remaining economic life, maintenance requirements, substitutability, and the extent to which the enterprise depends on third-party providers.

Data should be evaluated according to its lawful availability, accuracy, uniqueness, relevance, and capacity to support revenue generation or operational improvements. Customer records that are duplicated, outdated, or collected without an appropriate legal basis may contribute little or no transferable economic value. A data asset's value is thus conditional on both technical quality and lawful use.

The income approach remains central because investors ultimately acquire a claim on future economic benefits. Its advantage in digital valuation is the ability to incorporate recurring revenue, scalable distribution, lower marginal costs, and improvements in customer retention. Its principal weakness is sensitivity to assumptions. Small changes in long-term growth, customer churn, reinvestment needs, or discount rates can generate substantial differences in estimated value. The market approach offers an important external benchmark. Revenue multiples may be informative for young digital businesses with limited current profitability, while EV/EBITDA may be more suitable for mature enterprises with established operating earnings. However, neither multiple should be applied without considering differences in growth, gross margin, customer concentration, recurring revenue, capital intensity, and profitability. Comparable-company analysis should therefore use a sufficiently broad peer group and explain any adjustments made for structural differences.

The asset-based approach is especially useful when the enterprise owns substantial tangible resources or when the valuation concerns liquidation, restructuring, or a holding company. However, its ability to represent internally generated goodwill, organizational capabilities, platform scale, and future network effects is limited unless these elements are separately assessed in accordance with the valuation purpose and applicable standards. The three approaches should be reconciled rather than mechanically averaged. When a reliable forecast is available, the income approach may receive the greatest analytical weight. Market evidence can test whether the forecast

implies a plausible valuation relative to comparable businesses. The asset-based approach can identify inconsistencies, establish a reference value, or provide a relevant basis when future earnings are uncertain. The final conclusion should explain the relative importance and limitations of each method.

Table 1

Integrated methodology for enterprise valuation and investment attractiveness in the digital economy[1]

Assessment dimension	Key indicators	Recommended analytical method	Implication for investment decisions
Financial performance	Revenue growth, EBITDA margin, FCFF, ROIC, liquidity, leverage	Discounted cash flow and financial ratio analysis	Measures the capacity to generate sustainable returns
Digital capital	Software functionality, data quality, intellectual property, automation coverage	Asset-specific analysis and evidence-based productivity assessment	Identifies digital resources that support future cash flows
Technological maturity	System integration, cloud readiness, analytics adoption, interoperability	Digital maturity assessment and operational benchmarking	Evaluates implementation capacity and technology-related expenditure
Market and network position	Customer retention, recurring revenue, user engagement, platform participation	Comparable-company analysis and unit economics	Assesses scalability, market position, and monetization potential
Governance and transparency	Reporting quality, internal controls, data governance, ownership rights	Legal review, audit evidence, governance assessment	Reduces information asymmetry and strengthens investor confidence
Risk resilience	Cybersecurity, technological obsolescence, concentration, regulatory and currency exposure	Scenario analysis, sensitivity testing, risk-adjusted forecasts	Tests the sustainability of value under adverse conditions

[1] Author's work

The table illustrates that enterprise valuation and investment attractiveness are related but distinct analytical tasks. Financial indicators estimate the capacity to generate economic returns, whereas digital and governance indicators help explain whether those returns can be sustained. Risk analysis determines how uncertainty should influence forecasts, discount rates, and investment decisions. The dimensions should not be interpreted as independent sources of additional monetary value. For instance, a high score for digital maturity should not generate a separate valuation premium if the resulting efficiency gains are already included in projected cash flows. Instead, the index identifies strengths, weaknesses, and the reliability of the assumptions supporting the financial valuation.

The methodology places particular emphasis on digital capital because it can influence both revenue generation and operating efficiency. Digital capital is defined here as the combination of technology-related resources, data capabilities, software, intellectual property, and organizational competencies that enable an enterprise to create economic benefits through digital processes. Its assessment should begin with an inventory of material resources. The inventory should distinguish owned assets from licensed software, outsourced services, and technology provided through subscriptions. This distinction is essential because ownership, contractual rights, transferability, and replacement costs affect both economic value and operational risk.

The next stage links digital resources to operational indicators. For an e-commerce enterprise, relevant measures may include the proportion of repeat customers, average order value, fulfillment cost per order, platform availability, conversion rates, and customer acquisition cost. For a manufacturing company, relevant measures may include machine downtime, production yield, inventory turnover, maintenance costs, and the proportion of processes monitored through integrated systems. For a service enterprise, indicators may include service delivery time, employee productivity, digital transaction share, and customer satisfaction. The selected indicators should be evaluated against historical performance, operational targets, and relevant industry benchmarks. Where the enterprise lacks reliable baseline data, the uncertainty should be disclosed. Claims that a digital investment will produce a specific productivity improvement should not be accepted without operational evidence or a clearly stated estimation method.

Network effects require a separate analytical treatment. The value of a platform may increase when additional participants improve the usefulness of the service for existing users. However, user growth is not equivalent to economic value creation. A platform that attracts users through persistent discounts may exhibit rapid growth while generating negative contribution margins. A robust assessment therefore considers the relationship between acquisition costs, retention, monetization, service quality, and the marginal cost of serving additional users. Customer lifetime value and customer acquisition cost can provide useful evidence, particularly where recurring transactions are observable. Nevertheless, lifetime value estimates must be based on defensible assumptions about retention, contribution margin, discounting, and customer behavior. Overly optimistic assumptions may lead to excessive valuations and poor capital allocation.

For platform businesses, valuation should also consider the possibility that network effects may weaken. Competitors may offer interoperable alternatives, users may switch platforms, or regulatory changes may constrain data sharing and monetization. Concentration among a small number of customers, suppliers, or distribution partners may also expose the business to bargaining power and disruption. These risks should be incorporated into scenario forecasts rather than ignored in favor of a simple growth premium.

Cybersecurity deserves explicit attention because digital operations introduce risks that may not be visible in traditional financial ratios. A security incident may result in service interruptions,

remediation expenditure, customer losses, legal costs, or reputational damage. Valuation should therefore consider the maturity of security controls, incident response arrangements, access management, backup systems, and business continuity procedures. The absence of reported incidents should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of low risk. The legal dimension is equally important. Data protection obligations, intellectual property rights, electronic transaction requirements, and contractual limitations may affect the ability to commercialize digital resources. An asset that cannot lawfully be transferred or used for a proposed purpose may have a lower economic value than an otherwise similar asset without such restrictions. Legal due diligence should therefore precede any material premium attributed to proprietary data or digital technology.

The proposed investment attractiveness index provides a structured mechanism for comparing enterprises across financial and non-financial dimensions. It can support screening, monitoring, and the identification of areas requiring further due diligence. Its purpose is not to produce an apparently objective score without empirical justification, but to organize information that would otherwise remain fragmented. The financial dimension should capture profitability, cash-flow generation, leverage, liquidity, and capital efficiency. Digital capital should reflect the usefulness, maturity, and commercial relevance of technology-related resources. Market position should consider customer retention, competitive differentiation, and the ability to monetize scale. Governance should examine reporting quality, internal controls, legal compliance, and the reliability of information available to investors. Risk resilience should assess exposure to technological, operational, financial, regulatory, and market shocks.

CONCLUSION

The digital economy requires enterprise valuation methodologies to move beyond an exclusive focus on tangible assets and historical financial results. Data, software, intellectual property, digital platforms, organizational capabilities, and network effects can influence future profitability and competitive position, but their existence alone does not establish monetary value. Their contribution must be demonstrated through measurable effects on revenue, operating efficiency, capital requirements, risk, and sustainable cash-flow generation. The proposed methodology combines discounted cash flow analysis, market-based comparison, asset-based assessment, digital capital evaluation, and multidimensional investment attractiveness measurement. Its central principle is the integration of financial and non-financial evidence without double-counting the benefits of digital resources. Scenario analysis, sensitivity testing, and explicit assessment of cybersecurity, legal compliance, and technological obsolescence help ensure that expected benefits are evaluated against the risks and costs required to achieve them.

Official statistics show that the nominal gross value added generated by ICT services in Uzbekistan increased from UZS 3,299.2 billion in 2015 to UZS 33,742.3 billion in 2024. This development reinforces the relevance of digital capabilities to enterprise performance and national economic transformation, while the limitations of current-price data underline the importance of careful statistical interpretation. For Uzbek enterprises, improving investment attractiveness requires more than acquiring new technologies. It requires transparent financial reporting, systematic documentation of digital assets, measurable digital investment outcomes, effective governance, and credible risk management. For investors and valuation professionals, the priority is to connect digital capabilities with defensible financial forecasts and to distinguish demonstrable economic benefits from speculative expectations.

The principal contribution of the study is an integrated, adaptable framework for evaluating enterprise value and investment attractiveness in a digital environment. Its further development through firm-level empirical testing and sector-specific calibration could improve valuation

comparability, strengthen investment decisions, and support the allocation of capital toward enterprises capable of creating sustainable economic value.

REFERENCES

1. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108
2. Damodaran, A. (2012). Investment valuation: Tools and techniques for determining the value of any asset (3rd ed.). Wiley.
3. International Valuation Standards Council. (2024). International valuation standards. IVSC. https://www.ivsc.org/
4. Katz, M. L., & Shapiro, C. (1985). Network externalities, competition, and compatibility. The American Economic Review, 75(3), 424–440.
5. Lev, B. (2001). Intangibles: Management, measurement, and reporting. Brookings Institution Press.
6. National Statistics Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (n.d.). Gross value added created in ICT services (annual). SIAT official statistics database. https://siat.stat.uz/data/3049/?lang=en
7. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2020, October 5). On approval of the Digital Uzbekistan–2030 Strategy and measures for its effective implementation (Decree No. PF-6079). National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. https://lex.uz/docs/-5030957
8. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2003). Law on valuation activity (Law No. 811-II, as amended). National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. https://lex.uz/
9. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2016). Law on electronic commerce (Law No. O‘RQ-385, as amended and subsequently updated). National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. https://lex.uz/
10. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2019). Law on personal data (Law No. O‘RQ-547, as amended). National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. https://lex.uz/
11. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2016). Law on accounting (Law No. O‘RQ-404, as amended). National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. https://lex.uz/