

ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА МЕЖДУ СТРАНАМИ ЮГО-ВОСТОЧНОЙ ЕВРОПЫ В РАМКАХ ЧЕРНОМОРСКОГО ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОГО СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА И ГУАМ

http://e-journal.spa.msu.ru/images/File/avtoreferat_Balasov.pdf

2. Колпакова О.Н. Развитие теоретико-методологических положений по формированию и эффективному использованию интеллектуального капитала предприятия в условиях инновационной экономики. [Текст] : автореф. дис. канд. экон. наук: 08.00.05 / Колпакова Ольга Николаевна, ГОУ ВПО «Башкирская академия государственной службы и управления при Президенте Республики Башкортостан». – Уфа, 2011 [Электронный ресурс] – Режим доступа: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/razvitiie-teoretiko-metodologicheskikh-polozhenii-poformirovaniyu-i-effektivnomu-ispolzovani>.

3. Корпоративный менеджмент. Мастерская бизнес - планирования. [Электронный ресурс] – Режим доступа: <http://www.cfin.ru/itm/crm-review.shtml>

4. Планирование организационно-технического развития предприятия. Необходимость, цель и задачи планирования организационно-технического развития предприятия. [Электронный ресурс] – Режим доступа: <http://www.paragonstate.com/uchebnyj-kompleks-po-discipline-planirovanie-na-predpriyatii/601-planirovanie-organizacionno-texnicheskogo.html>.

РЕЗЮМЕ

У статті розглянуто вдосконалення управління інтелектуальним капіталом.

Ключові слова: інтелектуальний капітал, інструменти управління, система автоматизації, залучення клієнтів, системи підтримки клієнтських відносин.

РЕЗЮМЕ

В статье рассмотрено совершенствование управления интеллектуальным капиталом.

Ключевые слова: интеллектуальный капитал, инструменты управления, система автоматизации, привлечение клиентов, системы поддержки клиентских отношений.

SUMMARY

The article considers the improvement of management Intelligent capital.

Keywords: intellectual capital management tools, automation, customer relations support system.

DCFTA EU - GEORGIA: CHALANGES AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Beruchashvili T., PhD in Economics, MPA, Associate Professor, Ilia State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Siabro O., Deputy of Head of Representation of Georgian Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Ukraine, Master of foreign economic activity, Competitor of the Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine

Sigua G., Head of Representation of Georgian Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Ukraine, PhD, Councillor of Ukrainian Credit-Banking Union

Currently the Government of Georgia is in the process of negotiations for a Free Trade Area with the European Union. In order to obtain an impact on economic growth, Georgia needs a trade agreement of a new generation - a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) that can become the main catalyst for promoting trade and investment opportunities. In order to achieve this objective, the Georgian economy has to undergo far reaching regulatory reforms.

The aim of the present article is to analyze the EU-Georgia trade relations, discuss the concept of the DCFTA, review steps taken by the Government of Georgia in the trade as well as some important trade-related areas, access the challenges related to the DCFTA process and draw conclusions.

EU – Georgia Trade Relations

Although affected by the Russian aggression in 2008 and the global financial crisis, the Georgian economy is progressively recovering: the GDP growth reached 7% in 2011. In 2011 FDI to Georgia arrived at USD 981 million, which is 20% more, than in 2010 [1]. In 2010 Georgia's total foreign trade turnover with EU member states amounted to USD 1.736 billion (increased by 13%). Export reached USD 297 billion (increased by 25%), import amounted to USD 1.439 billion (relatively increased by 10%). During the same period, the share of the EU in total trade turnover of Georgia was 26%, share of export - 19% and share of import - 28% [2]. Bilateral trade continued to improve in 2011 at a steady pace year-on-year. The total foreign trade turnover grew by 36%, compared to the same period of the previous year and amounted to USD 9 247 billion, of which, exports reached a record figure - USD 2 189 billion (grew by 39% compared to the same period of the previous year), and imports reached USD 7 058 billion (grew by 34% compared to the same period of the previous year). In 2011, Georgia's total trade turnover with the European Union grew by 41%, compared to the same period of the previous year and amounted to USD 12 477 billion, of which, exports to the EU grew by 46% and reached USD 424 billion, and imports from the EU grew by 40% and amounted to USD 2 053 billion. The share of the EU in total trade turnover of Georgia made up 27%; of which the share of exports was 19% and share of imports - 29%. Among the top 10 trade partner countries of Georgia in 2011 there were two the EU member states: Germany (5th place), and Bulgaria (8th place) [3]. Georgian exports to the EU are still concentrated in a few commodities of low value added (in particular, primary products such as fuels and mining products formed 69.1% of imports from Georgia). Georgia continued to benefit from the special incentive arrangement for sustainable development and good governance - the GSP+, within the EU Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) that aim to assist in diversifying export and improving its export performance. Though our export capacity is relatively limited, the utilization rate of the GSP+ regime by the Georgian exporters is quite high. Georgia makes an overall good use of GSP (utilization rate of 87% in 2006), but there is still a room for improvement. At the same time the GSP+ treatment is not a "gift forever". It will be lifted as the country overcomes economic difficulties. Naturally Georgia is strongly interested in long-term legal framework for trade and economic integration opportunities with the EU provided by the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) agreement [4].

The prospect of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) between Georgia and the EU offers a new momentum to the Government of Georgia undertake reforms in trade-related spheres. After the Russian aggression to Georgia in August 2008 the EU's readiness to step up activity in this direction was expressed in the European Council Conclusions of 1st September 2008 [5]. Later in the same year the European Commission (EC) was tasked with assessing Georgia's degree of preparedness regarding DCFTA negotiations. In March 2009 the EC submitted to the Government a set of recommendations focused on the preparation for launching of the future DCFTA, which included a list of key and additional recommendations on trade related issues covering competition, food safety, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, standardization, intellectual property rights, capacity building, est. [6]. The preparation for the DCFTA negotiations was considered as is one of the central elements on the EU-Georgia agenda. Since 2009, the Government committed itself to implementation of the key recommendations: hence, all necessary institutional structures have been established under the personal supervision of the Prime-Minister as well as necessary expertise mobilized to facilitate consultations with the European Commission.

As it was stated in the Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Warsaw Summit "the Eastern Partnership will seek to further support political and socio-economic reforms in the partner countries, facilitating comprehensive approximation towards the European Union, leading progressively to economic integration in the EU Internal Market, and therefore to the creation of an economic area between the EU and partner countries. The Association Agreements with comprehensive reform agendas and, where appropriate, with Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas (DCFTAs) as an integral part, are the cornerstones of relations under the Eastern Partnership" [7].

ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА МЕЖДУ СТРАНАМИ ЮГО-ВОСТОЧНОЙ ЕВРОПЫ В РАМКАХ ЧЕРНОМОРСКОГО ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОГО СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА И ГУАМ

The formal negotiations on the EU-Georgia Association Agreement were opened in July 2010, and DCFTA negotiations have been officially launched on December 12, 2011. First round of talks was successfully held in March and next is planned for June 2012. There is high commitment of the Government to continue implementation of necessary reforms in DCFTA related areas in order to swiftly progress in negotiations.

Concept of DCFTA

The concept of deep and comprehensive trade is a very ambitious, sensitive and complex issue. Traditionally, standard free trade agreements foresee mutual opening of markets for goods and services by eliminating/abolition import tariffs and quotas. The reason that this agreement is called "Deep and Comprehensive" is that it would go much further [8]. It would be "comprehensive" because it would cover a wide array of trade-related issues and it would be "deep" because it aims at eliminating 'behind the border obstacles to trade throughout various sectors of the economy, as well as high level of regulatory convergence and setting standards compatible with those of the European Union, thus partially opening/extending the EU internal market to the partner country. The EC Communication on A Strong European Neighborhood Policy defines the measures towards further economic integration for the partner countries: *'tailor-made deep and comprehensive free trade agreements, including measures to reduce non-tariff barrier through regulatory convergence, are the keys to increased economic integration with ENP partners. A DCFTA should cover substantially all trade in goods and services between the EC and the ENP partner as well as strong legally-binding provisions on the implementation of trade and economic regulatory issues'* [9]. The regulatory convergence is expected in the areas, such as customs, technical regulations, standards and conformity assessment procedures, restrictions, sanitary and phytosanitary issues, establishment and company law, services, movement of capital and current payments, movement of persons including workers and social security coordination, taxation, competition policy and state aid, intellectual and industrial property rights, statistics, public procurement, enterprise policy as well as public internal financial control.

The EU intends to negotiate such agreements with all willing and able partners in its Neighborhood, especially countries of the Eastern Partnership (Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan). This process offers to the entire European Neighborhood a powerful instrument for further economic integration. Progress towards a harmonized regulatory framework, along with substantially liberalized trade, will bring intensified trade and investment flows. The objective of establishing a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area will form an integral part of the new Association Agreements, with a commitment to start negotiations on a WTO-compatible deep and comprehensive free trade area as soon as the partner country is sufficiently advanced in its preparation to negotiate, implement and sustain the effects of a far-reaching liberalization [10].

Economic implications

The ENP Action Plan for Georgia indicates that the European Commission carries out the feasibility studies before entering negotiations with a prospective partner about an extended trade agreement. The Feasibility study for Georgia was undertaken by the UNDP (2007) as well as the CASE/Global Insight (2008). These studies have examined key aspects of the Georgian economy and its regulatory environment and possibilities of its integration with the EU, ranging from simple free trade to very deep and comprehensive free trade between the EU and Georgia. The results pointed out the positive aspects for the EU-Georgia future free trade arrangements: *"a free trade agreement between Georgia and the EU is feasible, since Georgia has already taken liberalizing measures going considerably beyond a classic Simple FTA and on the other hand Georgia benefits from the EU GSP+"*. Both of the above-mentioned studies indicate that a DCFTA between the EU and Georgia would largely increase the gains from a trade. Economists estimate that Georgian preparations for a DCFTA would imply "heavy costs in the short run, for both public and administrations and the private sector, of achieving full compliance with EU economic rules and standards" [11]. Even so, a feasibility study on the possible impact of a DCFTA in Georgia concludes that the country would considerably benefit from this agreement in the long-term. In addition thanks to WTO membership since 2000, set of relevant international standards of commercial, industrial, financial policy are already established in the country. So, experts estimate that a Georgian-EU DCFTA could increase FDI from \$2.3 billion (in 2008) to up to \$11.36 billion in 2020. Furthermore, the comprehensive set of reforms resulting from the DCFTA along with more wide-ranging measures, like on competition and anti-corruption, could lead to a rebranding of Georgia as a favorable investment location and lead to economic gains for Georgia as high as 6.5% of the country's GDP [12].

Steps taken by the Government of Georgia

As it was mentioned in the EU report on Implementation of the European Neighborhood Policy in Georgia - Progress in 2011, *"Georgia persevere with implementing the remaining key recommendations, which set out the necessary reforms, in the key trade-related regulatory areas prior to the negotiations for a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA)"*. In December 2011, the EU concluded that the progress made by Georgia was sufficient to launch DCFTA negotiations.

The Georgian government has put special emphasis to legal approximation, institutional strengthening, capacity-building and implementation of reforms in key areas relevant for the DCFTA. Since 2010 Significant progress was made in the implementation of the EU's DCFTA Preparedness Assessment recommendations. In all key priority areas (Technical barriers to trade (TBT), sanitary and phytosanitary issues (SPS), intellectual property rights (IPR) and Competition) strategies were agreed with the EC and adopted by the Government. The special DCFTA Legislative Package has been developed including the following legislative acts: Food/Feed Safety, Veterinary and Plant Protection Code; Law on Free Trade and Competition; Code on Product Safety and Free Movement of Goods.

It should be emphasized that the above mentioned legislative acts are in full compliance with the relevant Governmental Strategies and Programmes, which were agreed with Commission services. The aim of the DCFTA Legislative Package is the following: Approximation of Georgian legislation with relevant EU acquis; Consolidation of domestic legislative base into a comprehensive single piece of legislation in each area; Enabling smooth implementation of relevant Governmental Strategies; Creation of background for effective implementation of the DCFTA negotiation process.

The DCFTA Legislative Package was prepared by relevant state institutions under the coordination of the Prime Minister's office. Special Working Groups were created for this purpose in each of the three areas - Food Safety, TBT and Competition policy.

In parallel, it was decided to mobilize various new EU assistance instruments such as TAIEX, comprehensive institution building (CIB) and TWINNING to assist the DCFTA related institutions. For that reason, the inter-ministerial working group has already identified the following priorities for support: Customs, Procurement, Rules of Origin, Intellectual Property Rights, Competition, Standardization, Food Safety and capacity building.

On the **competition policy**, the draft "Law on Free Trade and Competition" and the **Code on Safety and Free Movement of Products**, which has been elaborated by the inter-governmental working group, is submitted to the Parliament of Georgia. The Draft Code incorporates two horizontal directives (General Product Safety Directive and Liability for Defective Products) that will enter into force simultaneously with adoption of the Code itself. In order, to develop **market surveillance** capacities in accordance with best international practices, from 2011, the Technical Supervision Inspection (operating under the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development) has been transformed into the Technical and Construction Inspection (TCI). At this stage, the TCI conducts supervision of lifts and cableways according to the Government of Georgia's Strategy on Standardisation, Accreditation, Conformity Assessment, Technical Regulation and Metrology, and Programme on Legislative Reform and Adoption of Technical Regulations. The new **Code on Food Safety, Veterinary and Plant Protection** has been drafted aiming at implementation of Comprehensive Strategy and the Legislative Approximation Programme in Food Safety. The Code also intends to ensure compliance of the Georgian SPS legislation with the respective legal acts of the EC *acquis* as envisaged in the Comprehensive Strategy and the Legislative Approximation Programme in Food Safety. The Code has been submitted to the Parliament of Georgia. With respect to **intellectual property rights (IPR)**, Georgia started acting on the recommendations of the 2010 Independent UNDP Study on Piracy and Counterfeiting, notably by establishing an Inter-Agency Coordinating Council on Copyright Protection including all stakeholders as well as establishment of a High-Tech Crime Unit and collection of statistics on border seizures of counterfeit goods. The electronic **public procurement** system was made bilingual (Georgian/English) as of September 2011. The State Procurement Agency (SPA) reports considerable savings (15-20%) after the introduction of new e-procurement scheme. Regarding **sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS)** issues, Georgia started implementation of the food safety strategy. The SPS legislation including a framework law (Food Safety Code) is under preparation. The Food Safety Agency's statute is adopted and EU supported Twinning project on SPS capacity building was successfully launched. Currently the SPS border controls are under implementation [1].

ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА МЕЖДУ СТРАНАМИ ЮГО-ВОСТОЧНОЙ ЕВРОПЫ В РАМКАХ ЧЕРНОМОРСКОГО ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОГО СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА И ГУАМ

Since 2009 the Government has active dialogue with Civil society National platform, trade unions, and business associations on the DCFTA related issues. The Government representatives regularly participate in the discussions to promote a public dialogue on the EU-Georgia DCFTA - Negotiations through Stakeholder Collaboration, and enhance public awareness on new opportunities and priorities.

Challenges related to the DCFTA process

As it was mentioned earlier, the DCFTA related process is very sensitive and ambitious phase of economic integration that requires good understanding of the subject as well as careful organization and implementation insuring broad participation of all relevant stakeholders. The negotiations need to include the areas of economic potential and interest for the parties involved, and cover nearly all trade. As noted in the December 2008 EC Communication, such differentiation needs to remain at the heart of the Eastern Partnership [10].

The recent experience of the so called new Member States has underlined the heavy costs in the short run, for both public administrations and the private sector, of achieving full compliance with EU economic rules and standards. This was in fact achieved only with very substantial financial and technical assistance, along with the political incentive of full membership. Some experts argue that “the burdensome regulatory changes imposed on Georgia are equivalent to taxing Georgian production—endangering her growth, the sustainability of her reforms and of her successful fight against corruption, which is so crucial for her long term development. More broadly, the EU should design a pro-growth DCFTA process based on an integrated sequence of successive sets of commitments” [13].

As concept of DCFTA involves high level of regulatory convergence, for the countries without membership perspective in the EU or even stake in the EU internal market similar to the European Economic Area (EEA) arrangement, Scope and sequence of this regulatory convergence has to be well defined. In this regards it is desirable to develop more specific benchmarks for the regulatory convergence (in terms of specific EU norms) and suggestions of its sequence. It is particularly relevant in the area of food safety and, to a lesser extent, in the area of TBT. It might be also helpful with regard to the competition acquis, IPR, public procurement, customs and other trade related areas. For this purpose the cost and benefit analysis or rather regulatory impact analysis has been undertaken within the EU supported project - GEPLAC, on some technical regulations as well as the broad implications of the acquis under the scope of the European Energy Community. However, experts suggest more general assessment based on the logic of the acquis and the relevance of its objectives with respect to developmental needs of the country. This could be developed by the European Commission as it was the case in 1995 when the EC produced a White Book on approximation of legislation. [14]

It has to be noted the the ongoing the EU-Georgia Association Agreement talks already provide these benchmarks, that makes some part of the of the regulatory approximation a subject of negotiations.

It is expected that painful, costly and time-consuming process of the economic convergence and alignment with the Aquis would be well recognized by our European partners. Therefore, Georgia would be given an opportunity to agree with the EU on relevant calendar of regulatory approximation and convergence. It seems that a gradual, step by step approach coupled with timely and comprehensive EU support is the most appropriate strategy to advance on this direction.

Conclusions

As we see the prospect of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) between Georgia and the EU offers a new momentum to the Government of Georgia undertake reforms in trade-related spheres, especially in the technical barriers to trade (TBT), sanitary and phytosanitary issues (SPS), intellectual property rights (IPR) and Competition.

There is general agreement among experts that the deep and comprehensive approach to trade is a very ambitious, sensitive and complex issue. Economists estimate that Georgian preparations for a DCFTA would imply “heavy costs in the short run, for both public and administrations and the private sector, of achieving full compliance with EU economic rules and standards”. Even so, a feasibility study on the possible impact of a DCFTA in Georgia concludes that the country would considerably benefit from this agreement in the long-term. Furthermore, the comprehensive set of reforms resulting from the DCFTA along with more wide-ranging measures could lead to a rebranding of Georgia as a favorable investment location.

To this end, the joint efforts and good coordination of the Government with all other stakeholders with timely and comprehensive EU assistance it crucial to continue implementation of necessary reforms in DCFTA related areas in order to swiftly progress in negotiations with the EU.

REFERENCES:

1. Georgia's Progress Report on Implementation of the ENP Action Plan 2011, State Minister's office on European and Euro-Atlantic Integration, April, 2011
2. Implementation of the European Neighborhood Policy in 2009: Progress Report Georgia, Brussels, 12/05/2010, (http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/progress2010/sec10_518_en.pdf).
3. Implementation of the European Neighborhood Policy in Georgia Progress in 2011 and recommendations for action Brussels, 25/05/2012, EC, HR of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy
4. K. Gogolashvili, “Convergence of the regulatory framework – Important challenge for trade and investment”, Georgian European Policy and Legal Advice Centre (GEPLAC), 2008
5. Presidency Conclusions, Extraordinary European Council, Brussels, 1st September, 2008 (http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/102545.pdf).
6. Preparatory process for future negotiations of a deep and comprehensive free trade agreement (DCFTA) between the EU and Georgia, Follow-up of the Commission services' fact-finding trade mission to Georgia on 13-15 October 2008, Overview of issues where additional progress is necessary, March, 2009.
7. Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit, Warsaw, 29-30 September 2011, Council of the European Union
8. Vincentz Volkhart, ‘Measures to Diversify and Promote Exports in Georgia’, *GEPLAC Policy Paper*, 28 July 2006.
9. Commission of the European Communities, *Communication on 'A Strong European Neighborhood Policy'*, COM (2007) 774 Brussels, 2007
10. Commission of the European Communities, *Communication on 'Eastern Partnership'*, COM (2008) 823, Brussels, December 3, 2008.
11. Case/Global Insight (2008). *Economic Feasibility, General Economic Impact and Implications of a Free Trade Agreement between the European Union and Georgia*. Final Report, 8 May.
12. UNDP. (2007). *Assessment of the Impact of Potential Free Trade Agreement between the EU and Georgia*.
13. K. Maniokas, “Concept of the DCFTA and its implication for Georgia, GEPLAC papers, Tbilisi, 2009
14. P. Messerlin and others, “An appraisal of the EU's trade policy towards its Eastern Neighbors: the case of Georgia”, The Center for European Policy Studies, Brussels, 2011

SUMMARY

Currently the Government of Georgia is in the process of negotiations for a Free Trade Area with the European Union. In order to obtain an impact on economic growth, Georgia needs a trade agreement of a new generation - a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) that can become the main catalyst for promoting trade and investment opportunities. In order to achieve this objective, the Georgian economy has to undergo far reaching regulatory reforms, especially in the technical barriers to trade (TBT), sanitary and phytosanitary issues (SPS), intellectual property rights (IPR) and Competition. The Georgian government put special emphasis to legal approximation, institutional strengthening, capacity-building and implementation. There is high commitment of the Government to continue implementation of necessary reforms in DCFTA related areas in order to swiftly progress in negotiations.

Keywords: Deep and comprehensive Free Trade (DCFTA), regulatory approximation/convergence, economic integration, EU acquis.

РЕЗЮМЕ

В настоящее время правительство Грузии находится в процессе переговоров о зоне свободной торговли с Европейским Союзом. Для того чтобы влиять на экономический рост, Грузия нуждается в торговом соглашении нового поколения - глубоком и всестороннем соглашении о

ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА МЕЖДУ СТРАНАМИ ЮГО-ВОСТОЧНОЙ ЕВРОПЫ В РАМКАХ ЧЕРНОМОРСКОГО ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОГО СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА И ГУАМ

свободной торговле (DCFTA), которое может стать главным катализатором развития торговли и инвестиционных возможностей. Для достижения этой цели, экономика Грузии должна пройти всесторонние регуляторные реформы, особенно в сфере технических барьеров в торговле (ТВТ), санитарных и фитосанитарных норм (SPS), прав интеллектуальной собственности (IPR) и конкуренции. Грузинское правительство уделило особое внимание сближению правовых норм с европейскими, укреплению организационной структуры, созданию возможностей и их реализации. Существует высокая решимость правительства продолжать осуществление необходимых реформ в DCFTA и смежных областях для того, чтобы быстро продвигаться в переговорах.

Ключевые слова: глубокое и всестороннее соглашение о свободной торговле, нормативное сближение/ схождение, экономическая интеграция.

РЕЗЮМЕ

В данный час уряд Грузії знаходиться в процесі переговорів про зону вільної торгівлі з Європейським Союзом. Для підтримки економічного зростання, Грузія потребує торгової угоди нового покоління - глибокої і всебічної угоди про вільну торгівлю (DCFTA), яка може стати головним катализатором розвитку торгівлі та інвестиційних можливостей. Для досягнення цієї мети, економіка Грузії повинна пройти всебічні регуляторні реформи, особливо в сфері технічних бар'єрів у торгівлі (ТВТ), санітарних та фітосанітарних норм (SPS), прав інтелектуальної власності (IPR) і конкуренції. Грузинський уряд приділив особливу увагу зближенню правових норм з європейськими, зміцненню організаційної структури, створенню можливостей та їх реалізації. Існує висока рішучість уряду продовжувати здійснення необхідних реформ в DCFTA і суміжних областях для того, щоб швидко просуватися у переговорах.

Ключові слова: глибока і всебічна угода про вільну торгівлю, нормативне зближення / сходження, економічна інтеграція.

МЕХАНІЗМ КЛАСТЕРИЗАЦІЇ ТА ВПЛИВ ФОРМУВАННЯ ЛАНЦЮГА ДОДАНОЇ ВАРТОСТІ КЛАСТЕРНОГО ОБ'ЄДНАННЯ НА СТРУКТУРНУ МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЮ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО ГОСПОДАРСТВА

Білий О.І., аспірант відділу комплексних проблем державотворення Інституту законодавства Верховної Ради України

Структурна модернізація національного господарства потребує використання дієвих механізмів, важливу роль серед яких відіграє формування кластерних об'єднань («кластеризація»). Поєднуючи у єдиній системі (мережі) видобувні, виробничі, збутові потужності (підприємства) сучасні кластерні об'єднання неухильно залучають до виробничого процесу велику кількість нових суб'єктів господарювання, створюють нові робочі місця, формують попит на нові товари та послуги, що, у свою чергу, обумовлює виникнення «мультиплікативного ефекту» як основи стабільного економічного зростання національної економіки. Переваги кластеризації мають бути використані державою. Державна підтримка розвитку кластерних об'єднань має стати одним з базових пріоритетів економічної політики в Україні. Особливу увагу в Україні слід приділити державній підтримці формування технологічних кластерів, що виникають у сфері «критичних технологій» та відповідають базовим пріоритетам інноваційно-інвестиційного розвитку. Реальний потенціал щодо формування кластерів в Україні має будівництво та сільське господарство. Саме ці галузі найбільшою мірою впливають на розвиток галузевої економіки, на розвиток внутрішнього ринку. Мультиплікативний ефект, що може виникнути на рівні національної економіки внаслідок формування кластерів – виконує роль «амортизатора» щодо підтримки економічного зростання на внутрішньому ринку країни навіть за наявності системного негативного впливу світової фінансової кризи на розвиток національної економіки. Така постановка проблеми свідчить про актуальність та вагомий практичний значення дослідження означеної теми, про актуальність даної статті.

Окрім економічних проблем створення кластерних об'єднань та наслідки їх впливу на розвиток національної економіки представлені у наукових дослідженнях українських вчених. Так, переваги та ризики створення кластерних об'єднань у системі аграрного виробництва дослідили В.Г.Ткаченко та В.І.Богачев [1, с. 182]. Перспективи розвитку регіональних морських кластерів в Україні та їх вплив на формування світового ринку послуг у сфері морських перевезень визначила І.М. Колесник [2, с. 131]. Вагомий зв'язок кластеризації та розвитку інноваційного потенціалу промислових підприємств прослідковується у дослідженнях І.В.Багрова та Т.І.Тищенко [3, с. 18]. Як дієвий інструмент регулювання інноваційного розвитку регіонів досліджує потенціал формування кластерів Т.О. Савостенко [4, с. 63]. Т.А.Тищук розглядає потенціал кластерів в аспекті забезпечення стійкості національної економіки [5]. В цілому, слід зазначити, що основна увага українських вчених при дослідженні ролі та впливу кластерних об'єднань на розвиток національної економіки України зосереджена, переважно, на організаційних та економічних аспектах цього процесу. Водночас, на нашу думку, вплив кластерів на структурну модернізацію національної економіки більш вагомий, оскільки під час виробничої діяльності кластерних об'єднань створюється ланцюг доданої вартості, формується новий виробничий попит та мультиплікативний ефект, що позитивно впливає на економічне зростання національної економіки. Засади такого підходу щодо дослідження впливу кластерів на структурну модернізацію національної економіки започаткували свого часу Д.М.Кейнс [6] та В.В.Леонтьев [7; 8].

Мета статті полягає у висвітленні ролі та впливу формування ланцюга доданої вартості кластерного об'єднання на структурну перебудову національної економіки країни, моделюванні міжгалузевих зв'язків, дослідженні позитивного впливу мультиплікативного ефекту внаслідок формування кластерних об'єднань (у сфері будівництва та аграрного виробництва) на економічне зростання України.

Для досягнення мети у статті розглядаються наступні завдання:

- визначити потенціал формування кластерної організації виробництва з урахуванням галузевої спеціалізації та унікальної технологічної структури кластерних об'єднань;
- дослідити особливості формування ланцюгу доданої вартості кластерного об'єднання, що забезпечує мультиплікативний ефект на рівні національної економіки (і який формується при збільшенні попиту на кінцеву продукцію кластеру);
- проаналізувати ефективність формування мережевої структури (на основі створення кластерного об'єднання), яка забезпечує максимальне залучення вітчизняних суб'єктів господарювання до міжгалузевих зв'язків кластеру;
- здійснити моделювання ланцюга доданої вартості, що виникає на основі міжгалузевих зв'язків кластеру (метод міжгалузевого балансу Леонтьєва) та прослідкувати мультиплікативний ефект формування динаміки доданої вартості кластерного об'єднання як основи для здійснення структурної модернізації національного господарства;
- визначити резерви імпортозаміщення в процесі формування кластерних об'єднань.

Кластерна організація виробництва спроможна забезпечити прискорення темпів та підвищення якості економічного зростання завдяки формуванню ланцюга зростання доданої вартості. Налагодженість партнерських зв'язків, покращання інформаційного обміну та «ефекти переливу» створюють умови для швидкого поширення інноваційних ідей та технологічних рішень у межах кластеру. Мережева організація кластеру є сприятливим середовищем для стимулювання бізнес-активності, оскільки вона сприяє створенню нових робочих місць, активізує підприємницьку діяльність у виробничій сфері та сфері інфраструктурного забезпечення через формування раніш відсутніх ланок у ланцюгу доданої вартості кластеру, які мають можливість швидше створюватися та розвиватися завдяки кластерним зв'язкам.