

THE INTEGRATED SUSTAINABLE RURAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Stoyanets N.

Рассмотрен вопрос комплексной интегральной стратегии сельского развития и комплекс мероприятий относительно улучшения инфраструктуры и социальной сферы сельских населенных пунктов Ключевые слова: социальная сфера, социальная инфраструктура, интегральная стратегия.

Entry. Socio-economic progress of rural locality of Ukraine trends in a period from the beginning of 90th, which was marked native social-economic transformations, have contradictory character, related above all things to the superfluously rapid rates and unsatisfactory social efficiency of these changes on a background of the diversified not enough structure of economy of rural settlements, deepening of problems of realization of social guarantees and social deface of rural inhabitants sufficiently. As a result, reduction of scales and worsening of financial-economic results of functioning of agricultural production and all national APC in Ukraine took place intuitional mechanisms which will be able to set direction and will provide co-ordination of policy of rural development are needed. Development of such intuitional mechanisms foresees creation of the proper structures on national, regional and local levels.

Review of the last sources of researches and publications. The problems of rural areas are interested as famous scientist P. Collier, P. Cooke, I. Falk, G. Hobbs, P. Nukamp, M. Olson, M. Paldam.

Raising of task. In a period reformation the social economic sphere of village found oneself on verge of destruction. Through the crisis state of economy, sharp reduction of the budgetary financing, insolvency and debt of agricultural enterprises, considerably the level of technical equipped (public transport) reduced and a social infrastructure became worse (objects of the cultural setting, school).

Basic material and results. The European Union has an active rural development policy because this helps us to achieve valuable goals for our countryside and for the people who live and work there.

The EU's rural areas are a vital part of its physical make-up and its identity. According to a standard definition, more than 91 % of the territory of the EU is "rural", and this area is home to more than 56 % of the EU's population. Furthermore, the EU's fantastic ranges of striking and beautiful landscapes are among the things that give it its character – from mountains to steppe, from great forests to rolling fields.

Many of our rural areas face significant challenges. Some of our farming and forestry businesses still need to build their competitiveness. More generally, average income per head is lower in rural regions than in our towns and cities, while the skills base is narrower and the service sector is less

developed. Also, caring for the rural environment often carries a financial cost.

On the other hand, the European countryside has a great deal to offer. It gives us essential raw materials. Its value as a place of beauty, rest and recreation – when we look after it – is self-evident. It acts as our lungs, and is therefore a battleground for the fight against climate change. And many people are attracted by the idea of living and/or working there, provided that they have access to adequate services and infrastructure.

This means that the EU's Lisbon Strategy for jobs and growth, and its Goteborg Strategy for sustainable development, are just as relevant to our countryside as to our towns and cities. The EU's rural development policy is all about meeting the challenges faced by our rural areas, and unlocking their potential. Rural development policy does not operate in a vacuum. Many measures are relatively small-scale. But rural development actions can ensure that small-scale local infrastructure is put in place to connect rural communities with major investments under regional and cohesion policies. The significant EU structural funds invested in telecommunications, transport, energy and water infrastructure can be capitalized on via local strategies for diversification and development of agricultural and food sector potential. Rural development can help supply the multiplier effect.

The Lisbon Strategy focuses, among other things, on improving education and training, research and development and the promotion of innovation and sustainability. These are exactly the results the Rural Development tool-box can deliver.

Investing in human capital and skills is crucial to exploiting opportunities for growth and employment in rural areas. These factors cut across the full range of rural development activities as they can contribute to:

- helping people adapt to a more market oriented agriculture;
- promoting new ways of selling/dealing with risk in competitive markets;
- raising economic and employment activity rates;
- encouraging development of micro-businesses;
- facilitating innovation and R&D take-up;
- fostering dynamic entrepreneurship;
- improving management of processes in the agri-food chain;
- encouraging the take-up and use of ICT;

making use of opportunities from improved local infrastructure, and environmental land management.

Environmental win-win situations. Agriculture and forestry remain by far the largest land users, shaping the rural environment and landscape. The provision of environmental goods, particularly through agri-environmental measures, can form a basis for growth and jobs provided through tourism and rural amenities. There is particular scope for innovative approaches that add value to the rural economy by remunerating farmers for environmental services and linking these to diversification into tourism, crafts and training. Similar linkages can be made in the non-food sector.

The adoption of precision-farming techniques can improve the economic and environmental performance of farms. Environmental projects, including management of Nature 2000 sites, can provide important spin-off effects by acting as demonstration/tourism/training projects.

There are opportunities to expand production of biomass and renewable energy sources. This would not only create new economic opportunities in rural regions, but would help Europe respect its greenhouse gas reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol. Measures to develop renewable energy raw materials and processing capacity already operate under the CAP. One example is the aid of EUR 45 per hectare available to farmers who produce energy crops.

Recent surveys show that European citizens appreciate the benefits of changes in the ways the CAP supports farmers and rural areas. 66 % of EU citizens consider the adjustment of the CAP from a system based on production-linked subsidies to one which funds the protection and development of the overall rural economy (as well as providing direct support to farmers) as a good thing.

Although EU public opinion clearly perceives the CAP as continuing to provide value for money, improvements can still be made. The Commission has proposed an amount of EUR 88.75 billion for the new single Rural Development fund over the period 2007-2013. These amounts are necessary to achieve the declared objectives of rural development policy, to permit innovation and diversification outside traditional agri-businesses, and to be able to respond to society's expectations for a competitive agricultural, forestry and food sector which is environmentally sustainable and underpins the socio-economic fabric of EU rural areas.

Rural development policy involves the co-financing by the EU and Member States of a variety of measures. Member States decide on the most appropriate measures for their rural areas from a menu of measures proposed at EU level. The policy epitomizes the 'partnership' element of the Lisbon Strategy, and is essential due to the wide diversity of the EU's rural areas.

The CAP and rural development policy 'make a difference. In the agricultural sector, and in rural areas, the EU is pursuing balanced economic growth and technological improvement, and the creation of new jobs, but without jeopardizing the future standard of living of any region and, above all, in a way that is environmentally sustainable. A market-oriented CAP and a growth-oriented and innovative rural development policy are central elements of this.

Institute of agribusiness and rural development (IARD). IARD is a public, non-for-profit and non-governmental organization, which is situated in Kyiv and is a part of the All-Ukrainian public organization "Ukrainian agrarian confederation". Institute is created on the initiative of the members of UAC in year 2003. Main purpose of the activities of Institute is the development and implementation of new market approaches and methods in the areas of agrarian policy and economics on the state, regional and local levels.

Worldwide, the pervasiveness of poverty and poor delivery of basic services in rural areas of developing countries continue to constrain development efforts. The prevalence of rural poverty provides

major challenges to governments, organizations of civil society and developmental agencies. The failure of many rural development projects during the last three decades has led those involved to consider in more detail the factors that undermined successful outcomes. Prime among these are the issues of inadequate local capacity and the excessive centralization of decision-making.

As part of a global phenomenon, many developing countries (as well as transition economies and even some western industrialized countries) are now discovering that rural (and urban) communities, *if appropriately empowered*, can often manage their own local development efforts, and sometimes considerably better than any agency of the state. A properly worked through system of participation and decentralization holds the promise to provide mechanisms for empowering communities appropriately, though this process is by no means guaranteed.

Decentralization is often espoused in principle, but undermined in fact by institutional arrangements and financial flows that fail to allow communities to articulate and act on their priorities. While it is true that rural local governments are unlikely initially to be able to take on some of the more sophisticated functions associated with decentralization, the gains to rural populations—often ignored and effectively disenfranchised by their urban counterparts—are potentially substantial and worthy of closer scrutiny. It is clear that rural areas stand to benefit just as much, and often proportionately more than urban areas from initiatives designed to build the capacity of local governments to manage their own affairs,

and empower local communities to take responsibility for their own local development programmer.

As policy-makers increasingly recognize the importance of the interrelationships between political, economic and social reforms, so they are discovering that processes of decentralization offer a mechanism through which these reforms can be carried out systematically and in parallel. Decentralization efforts are often accompanied by a broader interest in building more general principles of local empowerment, which include efforts to improve accountability of sub-national governments to their electorates; to increase transparency in their operations; to build more democratic systems of election; to promote greater fiscal autonomy for local authorities; and to build social capital in communities.

Characteristics of Rural Areas. Rural areas throughout the world tend to have similar characteristics. Populations are spatially dispersed. Agriculture is often the dominant, and sometimes the exclusive economic sector, and opportunities for resource mobilization are limited. These characteristics mean that people living in rural areas face a set of factors that pose major challenges to development. The spatial dispersion of rural populations often increases the cost and difficulty of providing rural goods and services effectively. The specific economic conditions in rural areas result in fewer opportunities than in non-rural locations. Consequently, the tax base is limited, so rural areas are rarely able to mobilize sufficient resources to finance their own development programmers, leaving them dependent on transfers from the centre. Factor markets in rural areas often operate imperfectly, rendering the search for efficient outcomes an extremely challenging one. Furthermore, rural areas are often politically marginalized, leaving little opportunity for the rural poor to influence government policies. In many developing countries, policies have also consistently discriminated against agriculture through high levels of taxation and other macroeconomic policies that have adversely affected agricultural performance and the rural tax base. A net transfer of resources out of rural areas has resulted.

Evolution of approaches to rural development. During the 1970s, in an effort to extend the benefits of development to rural people, a regional or area-based approach was developed and adopted by many countries and by many international agencies. The approach aimed to tackle rural poverty in a cross-sectoral manner through integrated rural development projects (IRDPs). But the mixed experience with IRDPs led to the development of a detailed critique, which, among other things, highlighted the failure to involve local people properly in a participatory process and the failure to build capacity as major shortcomings. In addition, an overly centralized, blueprint approach to programmers design left implementation agencies unable to respond to the demands of local people.

The subsequent retreat of national governments and the development agencies from an integrated approach back to more traditional, single-sector approaches left development practitioners looking for new opportunities to support rural development. Recent experience from a number of developing countries suggests that programmers of decentralization accompanied by parallel efforts to promote greater power and autonomy in decision making for local communities can offer genuine opportunities to improve outcomes.

Decentralization. Growing evidence suggests that appropriately empowered and trained rural local governments can make an important contribution to rural development. In this context, it is important that centrally-designed systems of inter-governmental fiscal transfers provide appropriate incentives for local governments. These incentives can be supported by ensuring that budgetary flows are transparent, predictable and autonomous. From the perspective of central governments, the institutional dimensions of decentralization often centre around defining which formal governmental institutions are to be involved and establishing an appropriate legal framework to define relationships between different levels of government. Central governments have not generally sought to define a role for non-governmental institutions. Such institutions are often perceived to be technically backward and managerially incompetent, or to pose a direct threat to the government through political opposition. From the perspective of rural people, however, the institutional situation they confront is likely to be far more complex and varied, comprising a whole range of central and sub-national governmental agencies, parastatal organizations, as well as the full complement of non-governmental institutions, such as religious, cultural, political, social welfare and economic organizations all with their own "rules of the game" and individual objectives.

For a decentralized system to work effectively, co-operation is required at the local level between formal governmental institutions and the range of less formal non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs). The involvement of NGOs and CBOs, as well as individuals themselves, is increasingly being seen as an indispensable part of a participatory process that fosters consensus building. It is at the interface between these formal and informal institutions that the practical implementation of decentralization effectively takes place.

Institutional capacity plays a central role in any decentralization process. Failure of local governments to take advantage of the opportunities provided by decentralization because of a lack of capacity will result in poor outcomes. Local governments and other institutions that cannot adequately administer and account for grants or effectively mobilize local resources will find those powers swiftly

taken back. NGOs and other CBOs that lack managerial capacity or, alternatively, focus on furthering their organization's own ends at the expense of the broader community will undermine successful outcomes. Improved capacity will not, however, on its own solve all the shortcomings, because the overall environment in which such programmers take place is also important. Capacity-building efforts that are carried out in highly centralized systems soon run into limits related to central constraints. Capacity enhancement and devolution of functions must be pursued together and paced to complement each other. Decentralization of fiscal and investment decision-making from national to provincial and local governments contributes to more efficient decision making regarding investments, and to more efficient implementation of projects. Decentralization of resource allocation and investment decisions to municipalities and communities should be accompanied by a clearly defined and well-disseminated system of incentives and penalties to discourage the misuse of funds.

Conclusions. Development of rural territories provides the improvement of economic situation and domestic terms of peasants, and also height of volumes and quality of blessing given by them to all

society. This development gives an opportunity of search of more productive workplaces that provides the improvement of terms of life to the peasants, use of the civilization blessing at level with city-dwellers. Development of rural territories is a difficult process, and his estimation and authentication require application of many criteria. The integration processes of these territories consist of harmonious combination of such elements, as productive development (creation of new workplaces and increase of the real incomes of population), maintenance and guard of natural environment, improvement of rural terms of residence and enriching of cultural heritage. Practice testifies that multifunction development of rural territories in the developed countries was the result of action of many institutes, especially if this process touched the poorly developed regions, regions with a high unemployment rate, unsatisfactory infrastructure and depopulation problems. By creation of new workplaces, new sources of profits of rural population, development of enterprise (by economic activation of rural territories) the specialized governmental agencies engage in at support of the budgetary financing; the suggestions offer public establishments, private organizations cooperating with local administrations also.

Literature

1. Collier, P. Social Capital and Poverty / P. Collier // Social Capital Initiative WP No 4 the World Bank, Washington DC, USA. - 1998. - P.134.
2. Cooke, P., K. Morgan. The Associational Economy / P. Cooke // Firms, Regions and Innovation, Oxford University Press. - 2008. - P.16.
3. Falk, I, S. Kilpatrick. What is Social Capital? / I. Falk // A Study of Interaction in a Community, University of Tasmania, Australia. - 2005. - P.230
4. Gatzweiler, F. Social Capital, Institutional Building and Environmental Governance in CEE Transition Countries, / F. Gatzweiler // Working Paper for the Tran scoop Meeting Ostrom-Hagedorn, Workshop in Bloomington, Indiana, USA. - 2002. - P.14-16.
5. Hobbs, G. What is Social Capital? / G. Hobbs. // A Brief Literature Overview, Economic and Social Research Foundation. - 2000. - P. 1-6. Maskell, P. "Social capital, Innovation and Competitiveness" / P. Maskell // CEBR Business Studies, Working Paper. - 2001. - P.23.
6. Nukamp, P. Spatial Perspectives on Theories of Economic Growth / P. Nukamp, J. Poot // Annals of Regional Science. - 1998. - № 32 (1), P. 7-37.
7. Narayan, D., L. Pritchett (1997). Cents and Sociability / D. Narayan // Household Income and Social Capital in Rural Tanzania, World Bank, Washington DC, USA.
8. Olson, M. The Rise and Decline of Nations / M. Olson // Yale University Press, New Haven, USA. - 2009 - № 42 (1), P. 13-55.
9. Paldam, M. Social capital and sustainability / M. Paldam // "Sustainable development with a Dynamic Economy" DSE Forum, Berlin. - 2008. - P. 43-46.

УДК 338.43.01 : 658

ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНО-ЕКОНОМІЧНІ АСПЕКТИ РОЗВИТКУ СОЦІАЛЬНО-ОРІЄНТОВАНОГО АГРОГОСПОДАРЮВАННЯ

Кравчук І. І.

У статті проаналізовано теоретико-методологічні підходи до питань соціально-орієнтованого розвитку аграрної сфери. Досліджено особливості становлення та організаційно-економічного забезпечення агрогосподарювання в Україні. Виявлено проблеми формування системи локального впливу на соціально-економічний розвиток агросфери. Запропоновано напрями концептуального обґрунтування методології інтегрованих підходів до процесів координації розвитку агросфери.

Постановка проблеми у загальному вигляді. Сучасні умови розвитку аграрного сектора економіки України характеризуються процесами

формування нових організаційно-економічних форм агрогосподарювання, що зумовлено як необхідністю адаптації агробізнесу до глобальних