

INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR FINANCING INSURANCE PROJECTS IN THE DIGITAL ECONOMY: PEER-TO-PEER INSURANCE AND MICROINSURANCE PLATFORMS

Olimov Shukurulla Dilshodjon o'g'li
TSUE, Faculty of Accounting Student
e-mail: awertro1522@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Not far off, digital tools began shifting how finance works - insurance included. Old-style systems often struggled with uneven knowledge, costly paperwork, plus limited reach among poorer groups; now tech-powered options press against those limits. Instead of top-down designs, new paths emerge through shared risk networks and bite-sized policies online. Evidence from five nations - the U.S., China, Germany, Kenya, India - shows patterns between 2020 and 2025: claims payouts dropped from about 61% to near 50% in peer-led setups during that window. At once, worldwide protection for small-scale earners nearly doubled, rising from 290 million to more than 540 million covered lives. Behind these shifts sit ideas borrowed from cooperation theory, cost-efficiency thinking, distributed ledgers like blockchain, smart automation methods. Alongside gains come hurdles - not every rule fits what runs outside traditional firms. Looking closely at how these platforms might work in developing nations like Uzbekistan reveals complex hurdles alongside real potential, given minimal insurance access and widespread financial exclusion. While limited coverage remains an issue, expanding digital tools could open new paths forward - especially when regulation blends government oversight with private initiative. Evidence points to combined approaches in policy and collaboration between sectors as key drivers behind broader adoption of tech-based insurance solutions.

Keywords: Peer-to-peer insurance, microinsurance, digital economy, insurtech, blockchain, financial inclusion, smart contracts, insurance platforms, risk pooling, emerging markets, digital transformation, RegTech

INTRODUCTION

Right now, the insurance world faces a turning point. Long shaped by statistical methods, it served broad groups fairly well - yet kept missing those most at risk. In 2024, about four billion individuals still lack access, according to the Insurance Information Institute. That gap highlights both social urgency and potential worth tens of billions. Meanwhile, new tools like blockchain, smart algorithms, and cell-based services are shifting what's possible. These changes might reshape how coverage works - down to its core logic.

One reason these models stand out? They rethink how protection works without relying on big companies. Peer-to-peer setups gather people who choose each other to form small circles that split potential losses among themselves. When those shared funds fall short, standard insurers cover what remains. Instead of broad networks, some systems target individuals earning less, giving them basic plans at lower costs. These smaller policies usually reach users through cellphones, skipping offices entirely. Funding often comes from collected contributions,

adjusted to fit tighter budgets. Rather than copying old frameworks, they build fresh paths using digital tools and trust within communities.

Little research exists on these models, even as business attention rises - especially regarding funding methods, growth limits, or actual results. Because of this gap, figuring out how to design and fund digital insurance initiatives that balance financial viability with wide societal benefits becomes pressing - not just in theory, but also in practice.

This piece aims at three connected goals. One, building a clear theory behind peer-to-peer insurance and microinsurance amid digital finance shifts forms its core starting point. Following that, worldwide patterns since 2020 come into view through real-world figures up to 2025, along with close looks at top platforms operating in varied countries. Then comes focus on how such models might work in less developed markets - Uzbekistan stands out here, given coverage still sits under 1% of economic output while digital payment systems grow fast thanks to state-led plans called Digital Uzbekistan 2030.

Research Methodology

This study uses several methods at once, blending theory-based insights with numerical review of existing market information. Because the issue has two sides - knowing why things happen needs conceptual thinking, whereas measuring performance relies on real-world data - the approach combines both. Starting from abstract reasoning, it moves into measurable outcomes, linking ideas to observable results through mixed techniques.

Examining six nations - Uzbekistan, India, Kenya, China, Germany, and the United States - forms the core of our method. Each country reflects a different phase in insurance market growth, along with unique approaches to regulation. Looking at patterns side by side helps spot both common trends and local variations. Rather than assuming one-size-fits-all outcomes, we balance broad insights with attention to detail. Descriptive statistics support these observations with measurable data. Case studies then add depth, showing how systems operate in real settings. Taken together, the methods avoid oversimplification without losing clarity.

Figures come from publications by the IAIS, Swiss Re Institute, Munich Re, the Microinsurance Network, plus Statista and GlobalData industry records. When precise numbers remain undisclosed, approximations follow from CAGRs noted across sector analyses, then filled in using standard interpolation methods. Tables include information spanning 2020 to 2025; values for 2025 reflect forecasts built on verified patterns observed through late Q3 of 2024.

One way to look at the data is through official company releases, along with documents submitted to regulators. Academic papers help fill gaps, while news articles add context from real-world reporting. When it comes to Uzbekistan, insights also come from government bodies like the Ministry of Finance. Information flows in from the Insurance Market Development Agency, known as IMDA. Another contributor: the Strategy Center for Reforms, which offers policy-level detail.

One reason shapes the choice here: gathering fresh surveys worldwide would demand too much time and effort. Still, that gap is acknowledged openly within the findings. Another point supports this path - existing published materials on the field happen to be detailed, consistent,

rarely seen in similar areas. Later sections hint at ways firsthand work might follow. The ending marks where new studies could step in.

Theoretical foundations and conceptual framework

Rethinking insurance in the digital age

Pooling many unrelated risks lets insurers forecast total claims accurately - a foundation built on classical insurance principles. Yet such reliance on size creates barriers. Precision demands volume, which tends to exclude minor exposures. Small-scale needs often go uncovered when spread across distant communities. Large organizations dominate here, simply because they can afford the math. Limited reach makes niche protection too costly under traditional models. Mobile platforms plus automated systems cut costs once blocking microinsurance growth. Real-time details gathered through phones or connected gadgets reduce risks tied to limited information. Blockchain-based agreements settle claims fast, removing long waits common in older models. Digital tools reshape limits that previously held back access.

What emerges goes beyond small upgrades in offering coverage. It marks a real change in handling financial protection altogether. Peer-based models appear as one clear example of this evolution. Another takes shape through compact, accessible plans designed for limited budgets. Each reflects deeper changes now underway across the field. Focus turns next to these two forms in closer view.

Peer-to-Peer insurance: Architecture and Economics

Groups sharing part of their payments to cover minor costs together define peer-to-peer insurance, also found in studies under names like social or community-based models, yet rely on standard policies when bigger risks appear. Older forms resemble mutual setups that lasted hundreds of years - though today's tech-driven versions behave unlike any past version.

Most people enter this system by joining a circle of around ten to thirty others who share comparable risks. One part goes toward backing extreme cases, while the rest lands in a collective fund - usually between two and four out of every ten units paid. Money left when twelve months pass might come back to participants or stay for future coverage. Members gain personally if claims stay low, since smaller payouts mean greater returns overall. What stays unused benefits everyone who held back on filing. Savings grow quietly when few ask for help. What drives this system makes sense economically. Peer-to-peer setups tackle two long-standing issues in insurance: skewed risk pools and careless behavior after coverage begins. When people join groups through mutual trust or common traits, risky applicants are less likely to dominate. Since one member's payment covers another's claim within the circle, reckless choices tend to decline. A different kind of balance emerges when stakes feel personal. Surprising results emerge from Lemonade, a U.S.-based insurance company traded on public markets. Its Giveback initiative sends leftover premium funds to nonprofits selected by customers. This practice links closely to fewer fraudulent claims than typical sector averages show. Data suggests behavior shifts when people feel their choices matter. What stands out is how transparency might shape honesty. Instead of keeping unused money, sharing it appears to influence integrity. Policyholders act differently under such conditions. Lower dishonesty

trends appear alongside charitable giving patterns. Evidence points toward social accountability playing a role. Not profit alone drives these outcomes.

Microinsurance: Definition, Scope, and Financing mechanisms

Usually, microinsurance means policies designed so that both payments and benefits match what poorer families can afford. While the Munich Re Foundation along with the International Labour Organization once set a ceiling - under USD 1.50 monthly per individual, adjusted for buying power - that figure now feels too narrow due to rising prices. Real-world plans today often serve people living on under USD 4 each day. These services protect against shocks like medical bills, dead animals, failed harvests, storms, or burial spending.

Small amounts collected from each client make standard agent systems hard to sustain financially. Because payouts need speed, any delay risks deepening hardship for families without savings. Where rules exist, they often fail simplicity needs - clinging instead to formats built for conventional insurance models. Distribution through digital platforms or community groups slips outside familiar legal boundaries.

Across digital systems, new paths emerge. In East Africa, mobile money links - built through M-Pesa working alongside BIMA and Britam - enable small premium payments sent by SMS, skipping traditional banking entirely. When weather sensors detect too little rain or strong winds, parametric policies activate on their own, removing field assessments that once drove up expenses. From phone usage patterns, artificial intelligence now judges risk exposure, making product development far less expensive than before.

Global market trends: Data analysis 2020–2025

Quantitative overview

Shown here is how P2P insurance and microinsurance evolved between 2020 and 2025 - shifting slowly from fringe concepts toward core parts of finance. Numbers pulled from sources like IAIS, Swiss Re, the Microinsurance Network, and GlobalData highlight just how fast that change has moved. Yet behind each figure lies a broader pattern: systems once seen as temporary fixes are now built into larger structures. Not long ago these models tested only in small groups; today they shape wider risk-sharing networks. What began as limited trials now influences standard offerings across regions. Though different in design, both approaches gain ground where traditional coverage falls short. Their rise ties closely to access gaps exposed during global disruptions. One after another, markets adopt pieces once considered too narrow to matter. Still visible is the early phase energy - but it channels now into lasting frameworks.

Table 1 Global P2P Insurance and Microinsurance Market Indicators, 2020–2025

Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Global P2P insurance market size (USD bn)	0.7	1.2	2.1	3.4	5.1	7.3
Active P2P platforms globally (units)	38	54	71	89	112	138
Global microinsurance coverage (mn people)	290	320	370	420	481	540
Microinsurance market value (USD bn)	38.0	42.5	49.1	56.8	64.2	73.5
Avg. loss ratio in P2P models (%)	61.2	58.7	55.4	53.1	51.8	50.3
Blockchain-based insurance contracts (mn)	0.3	0.8	1.7	3.2	5.9	9.4
Customer satisfaction score, P2P vs traditional (%)	72 vs 58	74 vs 59	76 vs 60	79 vs 61	82 vs 63	84 vs 64

Looking closer at Table 1 reveals notable patterns. From 2020 onward, the worldwide peer-to-peer insurance sector climbed from USD 0.7 billion up to an expected USD 7.3 billion by 2025 - showing yearly expansion near 60%, much faster than traditional insurers who saw only 3–5%. Meanwhile, access to small-scale insurance rose sharply: numbers jumped from 290 million individuals covered to beyond 540 million, adding around 86 million insured each year. On financial performance, something subtle yet significant emerged - loss ratios in P2P setups dropped consistently, sliding from 61.2% down to 50.3%, hinting at better screening methods and fewer fraudulent claims as operations grow. Further ahead lies another shift: agreements built on blockchain surged from just 300,000 contracts in 2020 to nearly 9.4 million forecasted for 2025, signaling movement past early tests into live usage.

P20 platforms pull ahead when it comes to customer approval - Table 1’s last line makes that clear. A difference of 14 points marked their edge back in 2020. Come 2025, forecasts suggest this lead grows, hitting 20. Such momentum shifts more than brand rankings - it nudges how markets balance power. Regulators across regions now see a pattern: digital-first models align closely with user needs. That alignment shapes policy decisions, opening space for tailored oversight where trust matters most.

International experience: Case studies

United States: Lemonade and the AI-powered P2P model

Lemonade started in New York back in 2015, quickly turning into the go-to case when discussing peer-to-peer insurance worldwide. Instead of relying solely on conventional methods, it blends artificial intelligence for risk assessment, a mobile-first approach for user interaction, while also reshaping how group funding pools operate. Behind the scenes, its digital assistant named Maya wraps up evaluations in about a minute and a half, handling clear-cut claims faster than many realize - often done before traditional firms even begin. While legacy providers stretch timelines across days or longer, this startup delivers speed few

match. By mid-2020, specifically July, it stepped onto the NYSE stage, pulling in just shy of \$320 million through its public debut.

Though many insurers keep leftover funds, Lemonade sends unused premiums to charities selected by customers. This setup shapes behavior in subtle ways. When people join, they pick a cause that matters to them. At year's end, whatever remains in pooled payments goes toward those causes instead of company profits. Knowing claims might shrink donations appears to discourage false filings. The emotional weight of possibly harming a chosen charity adds friction to dishonest decisions. Data shared in Lemonade's 2023 report shows property policies had a 64% gross loss ratio. That figure falls under the national average of 71% for similar plans. Losses tied to fraud were roughly one-third less than typical across the field.

China: ZhongAn and the Digital microinsurance revolution

Starting in 2013 through collaboration among Alibaba, Tencent, and Ping An, ZhongAn Online P&C Insurance took shape. Unlike traditional models, its path offers distinct insights. Entirely digital, it focuses on clients tied to China's e-commerce platforms and short-term work arrangements. By late 2023, more than 84 billion policies were active under its name. That volume surpasses what the whole American insurance sector managed during the same timeframe. Each contract typically brings in less than one U.S. dollar. Such minimal returns stem from intentional choices - spreading risk across vast numbers of tiny exposures.

From Alibaba's online shopping activity, ZhongAn pulls live behavior patterns to set prices on return coverage for packages. Insurance linked to workout stats comes from fitness applications, adjusting premiums based on movement. When flights stall, air traffic records activate payout systems without manual claims. By 2024, losses took up just under half of revenue - 46.8%. Across Chinese insurers handling similar products, the typical share was far higher: nearly two-thirds. Tighter predictions stem less from picking safer customers, more from sharper analytics.

Germany: Friendsurance and the Hybrid model

Starting in 2010, Germany's Friendsurance introduced peer-to-peer insurance to Europe. Rather than acting as an insurer, it functions through partnerships with traditional carriers. Customers join circles - often made up of acquaintances or coworkers. Small claims come out of shared group contributions. When incidents exceed those amounts, the backing company steps in. At closing time each year, leftover money flows back to members directly. This return happens as refunds, never as charitable gifts. The structure blends collective responsibility with conventional coverage support.

Though Friendsurance claimed in its 2023 report a nearly 50% drop in claims among peer-group customers compared to traditional policyholders, researchers have questioned whether the design or customer profile drives such results. Social ties and financial awareness may play larger roles than shared risk structures, according to several studies. Still, business outcomes support the approach - since launching as Bsurance in Australia back in 2017, the firm now oversees more than EUR 85 million in premiums by 2024.

Kenya: BIMA and Mobile microinsurance

Since 2010, BIMA has worked in parts of sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia, showing how microinsurance through mobile platforms can succeed even when smartphones remain rare. Despite limited access to advanced devices, almost everyone owns a basic phone - this widespread reach becomes the foundation. Instead of apps or web links, customers use USSD codes, similar to menu-based prompts, to buy and manage coverage. Accident plans and daily hospital payments form the core offerings, accessible without data networks. Each payment comes straight from prepaid airtime credit, sidestepping traditional billing hurdles. For users, the process slips quietly into everyday habits, needing little explanation. Over time, small transactions build consistent protection, shaped around local realities.

Across Kenya, BIMA reached 3.8 million active users by 2024, collecting USD 62 million yearly in premiums. Though its loss ratio stands at 58.7%, exceeding figures seen on advanced platforms like Lemonade or ZhongAn, this stems partly from real financial vulnerabilities among low-income groups and steeper operational demands across fragmented African regions. Yet compared to traditional safety nets - such as rotating savings circles or local burial cooperatives - the metric shows marked improvement. Shifting those informal systems into structured insurance models has yielded measurable social benefits.

Table 2 Comparative Analysis of Leading P2P and Microinsurance Platforms, 2024

Country / Platform	Model Type	Year Founded	Users (million), 2024	Premium Pool (USD million), 2024	Loss Ratio (%)
USA – Lemonade	P2P / AI-based	2015	2.1	420	49.2
Germany – Friendsurance	P2P hybrid	2010	0.4	85	52.1
China – ZhongAn Online	Digital micro	2013	15.3	1,240	46.8
UK – Neos / By Miles	IoT / Usage-based	2016	0.6	140	54.3
Kenya – BIMA	Mobile micro	2010	3.8	62	58.7
India – Digit Insurance	Digital P2P	2017	5.2	380	51.6
Uzbekistan – Kapital Sug'urta (pilot)	Traditional (pilot micro)	2022 (pilot)	0.04	3.1	67.4

Technology architecture: Blockchain, AI, and Smart contracts

One reason digital insurance works better than old-style systems lies in three key tech foundations. Looking closely at each helps explain how these platforms behave, along with when their model might work elsewhere. What makes blockchain stand out is its ability to tackle a core issue - unequal knowledge and shaky trust between customer and provider. Once policy details, payments, and past claims go onto a tamper-proof record everyone can check, arguments, tricks, or fake filings become far less likely. In Europe, certain companies have already tested this idea; take AXA's Fizzy system or Etherisc's farming coverage built on

Ethereum, where payouts happen by themselves if set rules trigger - for instance, flights late by more than 120 minutes or rain falling short of a preset mark.

Across the insurance process, artificial intelligence finds uses in varied roles. During underwriting, systems that understand human language pull key details from messy inputs - like posts online, driving records, or aerial photos - spending far less than older number-crunching methods. When it comes to handling claims, visual analysis tools study phone-uploaded images to estimate harm done to assets, shrinking reliance on face-to-face inspectors. To catch deceitful filings, network-based algorithms spot odd links among customers, mechanics, and clinics by tracing how they connect.

Across digital spaces, mobile systems paired with application interfaces deliver services directly to people. When someone books a ride or buys online, insurance can appear right then - no extra steps needed - thanks to seamless links inside apps like transport networks, shopping sites, or phone-based banks. This setup, called embedded insurance, skips traditional hurdles by aligning protection with everyday actions. From 2020 to 2024, such offerings expanded fast, rising 35% each year. Worldwide premiums hit seventy billion US dollars, figures from the Embedded Insurance Association show.

Advantages, limitations, and regulatory challenges

Advantages

Among these benefits, lower operational costs stand out due to reduced overhead. A key factor behind savings is automated underwriting through algorithms instead of manual reviews. Peer networks often enable faster claims processing compared to traditional insurers. Trust emerges more readily when members share similar risks or backgrounds. Transparency in payouts tends to increase participant confidence over time. Access expands into underserved areas where standard policies rarely reach. Customization improves because data allows finer segmentation than broad categories. Feedback loops help adjust premiums dynamically based on real-world outcomes. These models thrive where community involvement replaces distant bureaucracy

Operating expenses drop sharply when digital channels replace physical ones. Because claims handling shifts online, fewer staff members manage more tasks. Underwriting grows faster once algorithms take over routine decisions. Smaller premiums become viable since overhead shrinks dramatically. Profit margins widen where legacy systems once slowed progress. Efficiency climbs when paperwork disappears and approvals speed up.

Fraud drops when peers monitor each other in peer-to-peer setups - automation through coded contracts in small-scale insurance further cuts false claims while sidelining backroom manipulation. Though oversight shifts from individuals to systems, dishonest reporting fades where rules run without human intervention. Where trust is distributed, cheating finds fewer openings; built-in logic replaces loose promises, leaving little room for deceit during payouts. Most people without access to traditional insurance gain some shield against sudden losses through microinsurance. These systems reach communities long left out of financial safety nets. Protection comes when unexpected events strike, often worsening hardship. By softening blow after blow, they help interrupt cycles where poverty deepens on its own. Coverage arrives just as risks pile up, easing pressure across fragile households.

With quicker digital claims handling, customers feel more satisfied. Satisfaction grows further when they can clearly track their policies. These improvements lead to stronger loyalty compared to typical market results. Retention rises noticeably under such conditions. Performance stands out when transparency meets speed.

From user interactions on digital platforms emerge detailed records of behavior. These data streams support ongoing refinement of products, while improving accuracy in assessing risks over time. As activity unfolds online, patterns form - shaping how services evolve and adapt. Through repeated use, systems gather insights that inform both design updates and more nuanced evaluations of exposure.

Limitations and risks

Yet excitement around peer-to-peer and small-scale insurance models needs balancing with clear-eyed scrutiny of their shortcomings. Attention should turn to underlying weaknesses that persist across systems.

What makes peer-to-peer insurance tricky? Risk links between members. Pooling works well only if each person's risk stands apart from others'. Yet when people in a group face shared dangers - say, living near one another during heavy rains or working together on a project - the safety net thins out just at crunch time. Designers can't ignore this. Relying on friendships or workplace ties to form groups opens the door to such overlaps. Building checks that prevent tight clusters isn't easy, especially when connections grow naturally through social circles.

Most people who require affordable insurance cannot use digital tools meant to help them. Digital systems demand resources like stable internet, working phones, mobile IDs - things many lack. Take rural sub-Saharan Africa: fewer than four out of ten have smartphones there. Without devices that work, apps offering coverage fail before they start. A solution built on tech leaves behind those without it.

Supervisors worry about regulatory gaps exploited by some firms. Early peer-to-peer ventures often called themselves tech providers instead of insurers, sidestepping rules on financial reserves, risk calculations, and safeguards meant for customers. Problems grew once these systems collapsed - seen clearly in initial blockchain-based coverage attempts - where users received nothing after failures. Such cases weakened public confidence while exposing broader vulnerabilities.

Profitability at scale still lacks proof across most peer-to-peer insurance platforms. Despite being the best-known example, Lemonade ended 2023 with a deficit of 227 million U.S. dollars - marking eight years straight of financial shortfalls. Yet improvements in claims costs relative to premiums, along with rising customer numbers, hint that larger operations might eventually yield profits. Funding continues flowing from backers willing to wait, even so, long-term success in crowded marketplaces has not been confirmed.

Prospects for emerging economies: The case of Uzbekistan

One reason Uzbekistan draws attention? It shows how digital insurance might evolve in economies shifting form. Insurance there remains thin - just 0.6% of GDP in 2023, far below both world levels at 7.0% and neighboring countries averaging 1.2%. Premiums totaled near

\$312 million that year, climbing about 15% per year. That pace seems quick only when you recall where it started.

Though gaps in finance shape hurdles, they open space for peer-to-peer and small-scale insurance models in Uzbekistan. With nearly two-fifths of adults unbanked by 2024 standards, access limits linger. Rural zones see fewer than three out of ten households online via high-speed links. Meanwhile, laws governing digital property and automated agreements continue evolving slowly. As noted in an agency report covering 2023 into 2024, systems meant to test new insurance tools remain only ideas on paper so far. Since then, little visible movement has occurred.

Eighty-nine percent of people in Uzbekistan had access to mobile phones by 2024, while mobile payments expanded quickly after new digital tools like Click, Payme, and Uzum Pay appeared. Although farming supports nearly three out of ten workers and contributes close to one-fifth of national output, protection from climate and harvest losses remains absent across most of the sector. Mobile-based parametric microinsurance could meet this need effectively, given current technological reach. Backing comes from state strategy: Digital Uzbekistan 2030 names fintech - and insurtech within it - as a focused area for development.

Starting small, Kapital Sug'urta's 2022 microinsurance trial reached about 40,000 people by 2024, collecting \$3.1 million in premiums - proof that overlooked groups will join if coverage comes via trusted digital paths at low cost. While its 67.4% loss ratio exceeds established systems, it stays inside sustainable margins; efficiency should improve once more users sign on.

Starting small makes sense. First step: weather-based crop coverage for those growing cotton and wheat - clear risks, ready-made support via state subsidies, strong effect on rural households. Following that, health cost sharing among freelance laborers could emerge through local mahalla units, already trusted hubs for collective decisions. Later still, linking everything to ID3.0 enables live updates from sensors, syncing personal records with shifting conditions across regions.

CONCLUSION

One clear sign of change: insurance finance now operates differently because of peer-to-peer platforms and digital microinsurance. Evidence detailed here shows these approaches are past trial stages - they work in real markets and reach underserved populations. From 2020 to 2025, the P2P sector expanded about ten times over. At the same time, microinsurance brought official protection to close to 250 million more individuals. Meanwhile, smart contract-driven policies jumped from under a million to almost ten million. Such growth points not to small tweaks, rather, it reflects deep shifts in how risk gets shared and funded.

Across varied landscapes - from tech hubs like Silicon Valley to remote areas in Kenya and the digital marketplaces of Shanghai - firms such as Lemonade, ZhongAn, Friendsurance, BIMA, and Digit Insurance show similar patterns despite differing contexts. Though rooted in distinct regions, their success stems not from location or tools alone. Instead, common ground appears in how they reshape processes to lower barriers in insurance access. Customer outreach expands through mobile networks, tapping populations traditional systems fail to engage economically. Incentives shift toward mutual benefit, moving away from outdated one-sided

structures. Efficiency gains arise by streamlining interactions, minimizing overheads tied to legacy methods.

One step forward for nations like Uzbekistan involves creating test environments tailored to insurance innovation, where peer-to-peer and parametric models can operate under oversight prior to standard regulations taking effect. Not far behind, efforts tied to national digitization plans could include education campaigns focused on basic insurance understanding, especially aimed at rural communities, self-employed individuals, and those working outside formal employment. Another path emerges through shared investment between state bodies and private firms, directing funds toward essential tools such as internet access in remote areas and systems that confirm user identities online - foundations without which small-scale digital coverage cannot survive.

What stands out most clearly? These results suggest insurance - often seen as slow to change - now faces deep structural shifts. Though built for old-style, money-heavy companies, current rules might not fit new tech-driven systems powered by networks and real-time information. That gap opens up vital questions worth exploring further.

REFERENCES

1. Lemonade, Inc. (2023). Annual Report 2023: Form 10-K. New York Stock Exchange. <https://ir.lemonade.com/annual-reports>
2. Swiss Re Institute. (2024). Sigma No. 1/2024: World insurance: Riding out the storm. Swiss Reinsurance Company Ltd. <https://www.swissre.com/institute/research/sigma-research/sigma-2024-01.html>
3. Microinsurance Network. (2024). World Map of Microinsurance 2024: Annual Report and Industry Survey. Luxembourg: Microinsurance Network. <https://www.microinsurancenetwerk.org/>
4. International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS). (2024). Global Insurance Market Report 2024. Basel: IAIS Secretariat.
5. ZhongAn Online P&C Insurance Co., Ltd. (2024). 2023 Annual Results Announcement. Hong Kong Stock Exchange Disclosure. <https://www.zhongan.com/en/investor-relations/>
6. Eling, M., & Lehmann, M. (2018). The impact of digitalization on the insurance value chain and the insurability of risks. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance — Issues and Practice*, 43(3), 359–396. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41288-017-0073-0>
7. Biener, C., Eling, M., & Schmit, J. T. (2014). Regulation in microinsurance markets: Principles, practice, and directions for future development. *World Development*, 58, 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.12.018>
8. Meyers, G., & Van Hoyweghen, I. (2020). Enacting actuarial fairness in insurance: From fair discrimination to behaviour-based fairness. *Science and Technology Studies*, 33(4), 44–61. <https://doi.org/10.23987/sts.65220>
9. Munich Re Foundation. (2023). Microinsurance: Scale, innovation, and sustainability. Munich: Munich Reinsurance Company. <https://www.munichre.com/en/solutions/for-industry-clients/microinsurance.html>
10. GlobalData. (2024). InsurTech Industry Outlook 2025: Market Analysis Report. London: GlobalData Plc.

11. Uzbekistan Ministry of Finance. (2024). Annual Report on the Development of the Insurance Market in Uzbekistan, 2023. Tashkent: Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Uzbekistan.
12. Insurance Market Development Agency of Uzbekistan (IMDA). (2024). Statistical Bulletin: Insurance Market Indicators Q4 2024. Tashkent: IMDA.
13. Awondo, S. N., Gao, M. M., & Hollenbeck, B. (2023). Peer-to-peer insurance and adverse selection. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 90(2), 381–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jori.12397>
14. Chen, T., & Xu, Z. (2022). Digital finance, insurance inclusion, and risk mitigation in developing economies. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 74, 101816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2022.101816>
15. World Bank. (2024). Financial Inclusion Global Database (Findex) 2024: Measuring Financial Inclusion and the Fintech Revolution. Washington, DC: The World Bank Group. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/globalindex>