

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Government Programs of Socioeconomic Development of Regions of Russia

V. N. Leksin^{a, c} and B. N. Porfiriev^{b, c}

^a*Institute for Systems Analysis of Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 117312 Russia*

^b*Institute of Economic Forecasting of Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 117418 Russia*

^c*Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, Saint Petersburg, Russia*

e-mail: b_porfiriev@mail.ru

Received January 13, 2016

Abstract—The article shows the importance of assessing the effectiveness of government programs due to the increasingly widespread use of the program approach in the system of public administration, strategic planning, and the formation of budgets at all levels. The problems and the possibilities of assessing the effectiveness of government programs, “Socioeconomic Development of the Far East and the Baikal Region” and “Socioeconomic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation up to 2020” have been considered.

DOI: 10.1134/S1075700716040109

Government programs in the system of public administration, strategic planning, and the formation budgets at all levels. The fundamental change in the role and place of the program approach to public administration that took place in Russia a few years ago has resulted in the need to assess the effectiveness of programs, which is increasingly becoming an assessment of public administration as a whole.

Even in the course of the first administrative reform [1] transition to so-called “management by results” has been declared, which suggests a tough relationship between goals and the costs of achieving them in all structural subdivisions of executive-power bodies. This in turn means mastering software and design technologies and their continued use in the process of state (federal and regional) and municipal administration and, therefore, the constant evaluation of the effectiveness of program decisions. Unfortunately, these intentions, which are exemplified by the foreign practice of this approach to the organization of the public administration that existed at the time, have not been adequately implemented with the decline in interest in the most challenging innovations of the administrative reform [2, pp. 67–77, 162–183].

The Program-Target approach was implemented in a more rigorous and operational form in the budget planning practice. The executive order published (summer 2012) on increasing the efficiency of budget expenditures [3] was included as a constituent part of the program-target principles of the organization of the work of state and municipal executive power in connection with the transition to the program structure of

budget expenditures. At the same time, this orientation towards results has been associated with all types of budgetary expenditures (there was even a steady acronym, ROB, for *result-oriented budgeting*). According to the experts [4, 5], the use of program-target budgeting would allow one to more clearly identify the relationship of the expected results with the costs necessary for this purpose and to give up the preferential allocation of budgetary resources between the various federal bodies, despite that the replacement of Article 179 of the Budget Code, long-term target programs to the Article “Government Programs of the Russian Federation, Government Programs of Subjects of the Russian Federation and Municipal Programs” is not a change in name, but rather an indication of a fundamentally different technology of the formation and approval of the programs, of the obligatory nature of the annual evaluation of the effectiveness of their implementation, etc.

The Russian government in turn regulated the methods, the procedure of development, the implementation, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of government programs in a number of regulatory acts [6, 7]. However, a comprehensive definition of the place and importance of the program-target approach in state and municipal administration was only formulated in the Federal Law “On Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation” [8]. In Article 11 of this law, programs are included in the number of mandatory documents of strategic planning: “documents of strategic planning are developed in a goal setting, forecasting, planning, and programming at the federal level; at the

level of subjects of the Russian Federation; and at the municipal level.” Furthermore, documents of strategic planning, which are developed at the federal level in the context of goal-setting on the sectoral and territorial principle, include the strategy of spatial development of the Russian Federation and the strategy of socioeconomic development of macroregions (the most striking example is the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation), and the documents of strategic planning, which were developed in planning and programming, include government programs of the Russian Federation. As for programming, earlier in this law (Article 7, paragraph 7), it is called “activities of participants of strategic planning on the development and implementation of state and municipal programs aimed at achieving objectives and priorities of socioeconomic development and ensuring national security of the Russian Federation contained in the documents of strategic planning that are being developed to set goals.” According to Article 3, paragraph 4, the latter are “definitions of directions, objectives, and priorities of socioeconomic development that ensure the national security of the Russian Federation.”

In the context of the subject of this article, it is especially significant that the ideology of strategic planning in Law 172-FZ rigidly connects the development of all government programs with the purposes “to achieve the priorities and objectives of socioeconomic development and ensuring national security of the Russian Federation.” The last, in turn, must be pre-defined in the strategy of socioeconomic development, in sectoral documents of strategic planning, in the strategy of spatial development and in the main directions of activity of the Government of the Russian Federation (Article 28).

The order of the Government of the Russian Federation of November 11, 2010 No. 1950-r [9] established a uniform list of government programs to be approved by the government. In accordance with the list, responsible executives should have developed 43 government programs for the Russian Federation. In 2011, two government programs were approved, i.e., “Accessible Environment” and “Information Society.” In 2012–2013, 37 more government programs have been developed and approved. According to the Budget Code of the Russian Federation, in 2014, 39 government programs were updated and brought into compliance with the approved parameters of the federal budget for 2014 and the planning period of 2015–2016. In the same year, 2014, the government program “Socioeconomic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation up to 2020” was approved, 2015 was defined as the first year of its implementation. The actualization of government programs and bringing them into compliance with the approved parameters of the federal budget for 2015 and the planning period of 2016–2017 were not carried out due to the suspension of the corresponding rule of the Budget

Code of the Russian Federation up to January 1, 2016 [10].

By mid-2015, the Government of the Russian Federation had approved 39 government programs¹ grouped into the following five spheres:

(1) a new quality of life, i.e., health, education, family support and improvement of quality of life of socially unprotected population groups, development of the pension system, etc.;

(2) innovative development and the modernization of the economy, i.e., issues of developing industries, science, and foreign economic activity;

(3) balanced regional development, including regional policy, the development of macroregions, and interbudget relations;

(4) ensuring national security, e.g., defense capability and state security;

(5) an effective state, including federal property management, public finance management, the development of financial and insurance markets, foreign policy, and justice.

In the federal budget for 2016, more than 50% of total expenditures are dedicated to implementing government programs. The share of program costs in the budgets of individual regions of the country exceeds 70% and tends toward consistent growth.

Concepts of the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs and methods of evaluating them. The issue of evaluating the effectiveness of government programs is methodologically complex, which is determined last but not least by the insufficiently correct identification of the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness in the previously mentioned regulatory documents of the Russian Government, which determines the procedure for developing these programs. Thus, in paragraph 15 of the Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 588 from August 2, 2010 “On Approval of the Procedure for Developing, Implementing, and Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Government Programs of the Russian Federation,” stated: “The planned effectiveness of a government program ... is evaluated in order to assess the planned contribution of the results of the government program in socioeconomic development and to ensure the national security of the Russian Federation.” In paragraph 16, it is specified that “an obligatory condition of evaluating the planned effectiveness of a government program is the successful (full) implementation in a timely manner of target indicators and indices of the government program planned for the period of its realization, as well as activities.”

¹ Adoption of the government programs “Development of the Pension System for 2017–2025,” “Development of the Military-Industrial Complex,” “Ensuring the Country’s Defenses,” and “Socioeconomic Development of the Crimean Federal District up to 2020” was planned at a later date.

It is also clarified that the following should be applied as the main criteria for the planned effectiveness of implementing the government program: “(a) the criteria of economic efficiency that take into account the assessment of the impact of the expected results of the government program on the various spheres of the Russian economy. Assessments can include both direct (immediate) effects on implementing the government program and indirect (external) effects that arise in conjugated sectors of the Russian economy and (b) criteria of social efficiency that take into account the expected contribution of the implementation of the government program to social development, indicators of which cannot be expressed in the valuation.”

In an interesting study [11] evaluating the effectiveness of government programs, which takes into account the aforementioned broad normative interpretation of this concept, it is emphasized that “in both the budget legislation and the legislation on strategic planning, this is about evaluating the effectiveness of government programs. Thus, this term is understood fairly widely and includes assessing the degree to which the planned results and the socioeconomic effects of the implementation of the program are achieved” [11, p. 80]. Thoroughly analyzing the practice of evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs in the Russian Federation, authors of the study suggested several directions for its improvement, including, in addition to the calculation of the degree of achievement of indicators, the feasibility of taking into account their dynamics by calculating the index of effectiveness of government programs and its correlation with the level of funding. The proposed approaches to evaluating government programs have been tested based on the data on implementing government programs in 2014, which allowed one to reveal the government programs, the implementation of which meets criteria of efficiency, such as the savings of budgetary resources with a high degree of achieving efficiency indicators. It is impossible not to agree with the final conclusions of the considered study; the process of evaluating the effectiveness of government programs requires a greater orientation on taking into account the impact of the implementation of programs to achieve the final results. This requires both improving the quality of developing government programs, in particular ensuring the system’s application of the requirements for forming efficiency indicators of their implementation), and the adjustment of methodological approaches to the evaluation [11, p. 98].

It seems that many of the methodological issues of estimating the effectiveness of government programs could be solved with a clear division of concepts of effectiveness and efficiency in them. We believe that the criteria of the effectiveness of government programs, particularly those belonging to the block “balanced regional development” and designed to exert

regulatory effects on the state of territorial systems of different scale and status, are not identical to efficiency in its traditional interpretation, which implies the ratio of the quantitatively expressed economic effect and the costs of achieving it.

With regard to assessing the effectiveness of the transformation of territorial systems, it is a separate and still poorly developed subject of economic science in connection with the timing spread and the difficulty of isolating the actual economic component of changes in the demographic, social-infrastructure, national-ethnic, natural-resource, environmental, and other potentials of the territory. Nevertheless, this it should be mandatory for this efficiency to be evaluated and taken into account, as government programs consist almost entirely of investment projects [12]. In order to assess their effectiveness (both economic and social), there is an elaborate methodological apparatus, which, in particular, is described in [13].

There are significant differences between the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs that were formulated many years ago;² since then, ideas of the effectiveness criterion were repeatedly reproduced as a special form of evaluation of programs in the context of various investigations. In connection with this, hereinafter, *effectiveness* is understood exclusively as the degree to which a set goals (expected results) are achieved, expressed in quantitative parameters, or in another form that allows one to perform such an assessment. Furthermore, the costs of achieving the set goal (it should be evaluated by the cost-effectiveness indicators); the qualitative or substantive assessment of this goal; or the social, political and other consequences are not important. The criterion is the degree of achievement of the result, i.e., fully implemented, partially implemented, to a certain percentage of completion, or not achieved. Therefore, the quantitative or extremely specific qualitative expression of goals becomes the main condition for assessing the effectiveness of government programs as targeted regulatory impacts on territorial systems, and clearly stated parameters of goals and subgoals of programs are the only possibility of the parametric decomposition of their overall effectiveness.

The aforementioned also defines other fundamental differences between evaluations of the efficiency of program solutions and evaluations of their effective-

² For example, in [14], of which more than ten editions have been issued, in the section “Program Mechanisms of State Regulation of Territorial Development,” there are subsections titled “Expected Result and Its Price,” “Efficiency,” and “Effectiveness of Programs.” In the latter it is noted that “we interpret the effectiveness of programs primarily as a measure of the compliance of its results with a set goal and, secondarily, the degree of approximation to the latter.... Upon assessing the impact of programs on the second criterion, it is important to correctly express the qualitative and quantitative parameters of the program goal as much as possible and, in some cases, also express the tasks that specify it” [14, pp. 356–357].

ness. Efficiency can be assessed at all stages of development and implementation of programs, from the stage of preparatory substantiations for private projects, and effectiveness (in our interpretation of this term) can be only evaluated based on the fact by comparing the degree of already initiated implementation of the program and its particular tasks (subprograms, projects). Economic efficiency can be measured both on individual program projects and, considering the admissibility of integrated projects, including ranked assessments, on programs as a whole. The effectiveness of the majority of government programs in general (unless it is a program to create one whole object, such as a particular transport route) due to their multipurpose character is extremely difficult to estimate. In this case, the reliability of the future evaluation of the effectiveness of government programs directly depends on the concreteness of the formulation of goals and their parametric characteristics. This can be confirmed by comparing the possibilities of evaluating the effectiveness of two substantively similar government programs developed around the same time, i.e., “Socioeconomic Development of the Far East and the Baikal Region” and “Socioeconomic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation up to 2020.”

Government program of the development of the far east and the baikal region: possibilities of evaluating effectiveness. The Ministry of the Russian Federation on the development of the Far East was defined as the responsible executor of the first of the aforementioned programs [15] and eleven federal executive bodies were chosen as the participants of the program³; the feasibility of attracting the latter to directly participate in the program is beyond doubt. Formulations of the goals, objectives, and expected results of the considered program are consistently specified in its passport. Thus, it was initially stated that the program has two main goals, i.e., the accelerated development of the Far East and the Baikal region and improvement of the sociodemographic situation in the Far East and the Baikal region. The assessment of the achievement of these objectives in connection with the use of overly general concepts of *accelerated development* and *improvement* can be quite arbitrary.

Formulations of the tasks of the program slightly clarify the this question as follows:

“(1) the development of transport accessibility and the improvement of the quality of life in the Far East and the Baikal region due to the construction and

reconstruction of sections of automobile roads of regional significance;

(2) the provision of timely and reliable exports of goods manufactured in the Far East, as well as those in transit through the territory of the Far East and the Baikal region due to a significant increase in rail capacity and the development of seaports;

(3) the creation of a basis for improving the population’s mobility in the Far East and the Baikal region by implementing the reconstruction of airports of regional and local importance [15].”

A further approach to assessing the effectiveness of the considered program contains formulations of the expected results (criteria) for its implementation: “(a) eliminating significant interregional disproportions of development based on advancing socioeconomic development of the macroregion;

(b) creating conditions of population growth in the macroregion and improving the overall quality of life;

(c) developing industrial and social infrastructure;

(d) implementing the potential of economic ties with the Asia-Pacific region;

(e) developing traditional activities and formation of prerequisites for creating the core of new high-tech industries in the mining and manufacturing industries;

(f) increasing the level of investment activity by using all types of resources (public, private, foreign);

(g) increasing the volume of investments by 2.2 times by the end of the Program;

(h) creating new high-performance workplaces and the more efficient use of labor resources;

(i) overcoming enclavization processes in the macroregion through the development of transport capacity;

(j) modernizing social infrastructure, including education, health, housing sector and providing a significant increase in the quality of human capital, the standards of quality of life, and social welfare; (k) population growth in the macroregion up to 10.75 million people by 2025 [15].

Each of the listed qualitative criteria for implementing the program may be expressed in quantitative parameters that allow one to assess its effectiveness as the degree to which these parameters are achieved at all stages of its ten-year implementation. In the considered document, some of these parameters (which are unfortunately rare in the practice of government programming) are proposed in a generalized form and include (%) the index of GRP growth (year to year), the index of GRP growth by running total to 2011, proportion of the macroregion in the GRP structure, the proportion of the macroregion in the structure of Russia’s GDP, the proportion of manufacturing industries in the GRP structure of the macroregion, the growth index of investments at comparable prices (year to year), the population as of January 1 (million people),

³ One of them – Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation – was abolished by the beginning of the program. The rest include: Federal Agency of Maritime and River Transport, Ministry of Construction and Housing and Communal Services of the Russian Federation, Federal Air Transport Agency, Ministry of Health, Federal Agency for Railway Transport, Ministry of Energy, Federal Communications Agency, Federal Road Agency, Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation and Federal agency for Fisheries.

and the proportion of the macroregion in the revenues of the consolidated budget of the Russian Federation. These criteria and parameters allow one to evaluate the effectiveness of implementing the program as a whole.

Similar criteria and parameters, i.e., in fact, the expected results of implementation of the program, are clearly stated for each of its subgoals, which allows one to assess the effectiveness of each component of the program. Thus, the final results of the subgoal of the “development of transport and energy infrastructure to ensure the accelerated development of the Far East and the Baikal region and to improve the investment climate in the macroregion” are characterized by the following quantitative parameters, including an increase by 681.2 km in the length of the automobile roads relevant to regulatory requirements for transport and operational condition, an increase in production capacity of ports by 15.65 million t, commissioning after the reconstruction of 40 airport facilities and landing sites of regional and local airlines, the construction of 48 sidings on the Baikal-Amur Mainline, and an increase in freight turnover in the Eastern ground of the Trans-Siberian and Baikal-Amur railways to 587.6 billion ton-km/year [15].

The content of the corresponding formulations set forth in the passport and in the basic text of another government program, “Socioeconomic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation up to 2020,” seems to differ fundamentally from the above-mentioned formulation of the expected results of implementing the government program for developing the Far East and the Baikal region [16].⁴

Government program for developing the arctic zone of the russian federation: specifics of evaluating effectiveness. The Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation was defined as the responsible executor of the program and the Ministry for the Development of the Russian Far East, the Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation, the Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Russian Federation, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation were chosen as the participants in the program. Increasing the level of socioeconomic development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation was announced as the purpose of the program, and strengthening the coordination of the activities of public authorities in the implementation of state policy in the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation and organizing the monitoring of socioeconomic developments in the area were specified as its tasks. So far, these tasks have not been set in any government pro-

gram of Russia, nor in any subjects of the Russian Federation.

The program includes a single subprogram, i.e., “Coordination of the Activities of Public Authorities in the Sphere of Socioeconomic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation” the purpose of which was defined as “creating a system for coordinating the activities of public authorities in the implementation of state policy in the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation,” while its tasks were set as “improving the system of statistical monitoring of indicators of socioeconomic development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation and ensuring the effective management of public resources and legal regulation in the sphere of implementation of state policy in the territory of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation and information support of the government program.”

All of the aforementioned determines the specificity of evaluating the effectiveness of the program as the only one in Russia designed to coordinate the implementation of certain tasks of previously adopted government programs in the Russian Federation (federal target programs of the Russian Federation and activities of the federal targeted investment program) being implemented in the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation.⁵ This is clearly evinced by the passport of the program as follows:

“Target indicators and indices of the program are reflected in other government programs of the Russian Federation implemented in the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation; the composition of indicators is defined in activities of the Interdepartmental Commission on the implementation of the state policy in the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation after the allocation of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation in a separate object of statistical observation.”

However, the belief was also expressed that

“the implementation of the Program along with the activities envisaged by sectoral government programs of the Russian Federation and federal target programs on the development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation will have a positive impact on ensuring national security of the country; growth of its international prestige; socioeconomic development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation” [16].

The evaluation of the effectiveness of the government program under consideration can either characterize the level of coordination of the implementation of tasks of other programs (an extremely complex object of assessment), or give the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation the status of an “object of statistical observation.” In the first case, the assessment of

⁴ Approved by the Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation of April 21, 2014 No. 366 as amended by the Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation of December 17, 2014 No. 1393 on the replacement of the abolished Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation by the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation.

⁵ The text of the program says: “All government programs of the Russian Federation act on the territory of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation as an integral part of the Russian Federation. At the same time, some government programs pay special attention to the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation and allocate measures of public policy specific to this area” [16].

the effectiveness of the whole complex of Arctic tasks and projects contained in coordinated programs should primarily be carried out with respect to these programs, which, however, differ significantly both meaningfully and chronologically.

In particular, these include the state program discussed above, "Socioeconomic Development of the Far East and the Baikal Region"; the federal target program "Risk Reduction and Mitigation of Consequences of Natural and Technogenic Emergency Situations in the Russian Federation up to 2015" in the government program of the Russian Federation "Protection of the Population and Territories from Emergency Situations, Provision of Fire Safety, and Security of People on Water Bodies"; federal target programs "Development of Transport System of Russia (2010–2020)" and "Modernization of the Unified System of Air Traffic Management of the Russian Federation (2009–2020)" in the government program of the Russian Federation "Development of the Transport System"; and federal target program "Development of Civil Marine Equipment for 2009–2016" in the state program "Development of Shipbuilding for 2013–2020." In this regard, let us especially note a complex of programs for developing the social sphere, including the federal target program of education development for 2011–2015 in the government program "Development of Education for 2013–2020" and the federal target program "Culture of Russia (2012–2018)" in the government program "Development of Culture and Tourism for 2013–2020."

The versatile nature of assessments of effectiveness can be shown based on the example of tasks of just one program coordinated as part of the government program "Socioeconomic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation up to 2020," namely, the government program "Environmental Protection for 2012–2020," which proposes organizing comprehensive research in high-latitude areas of the Arctic, including the North Pole drifting stations, studying climate change and its effects, assessing the hydrometeorological regime and climate resources, and developing data funds of Roshydromet and its research and expeditionary fleet. These assessments also provide the functioning of the system of the continuous evaluation of a negative impact on the Arctic of emissions of harmful (polluting) substances by sources located both inside and outside the territory of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation. As part of the reconstruction of the Russian space observation system, launching and ensuring the continued operation of a space hydrometeorological system that consists of at least seven satellites (three geostationary meteorological satellites of the series "Elektro," three polar-orbiting satellites of the "Meteor" series and an oceanographic satellite), as well as creating and ensuring the continued operation of the "Arktika" space system (including two types of meteorological satellites of the "Molniya" type on highly elliptical orbits and at least two analogous satellites on low polar orbits) is expected.

The development of hydrometeorological and heliogeophysical support for activities in the Arctic will be carried out by restoring the level of hydrometeorological and heliogeophysical observations to the minimum necessary to meet the accuracy requirements of short-term weather forecasts and warnings of dangerous hydrometeorological events, including new large-capacity ships (with displacements of 3000–

10000 t) using automatic and automated measurement tools. In addition, it is necessary to construct and equip with modern equipment in order to monitor the condition and pollution of water areas in the Far East and the Arctic regions of Russia, as well as eight new medium-capacity research ships (with displacements of 200–300 t) in order to carry out work of federal significance in the Sea of Okhotsk, the Barents Sea, the White Sea, and other bodies of water. Activities are envisaged to in order create a database of complex research of marine environments, oceans, and seas, which is necessary in order to implement various types of marine activities in the Russian Federation, e.g., navigation along the Northern Sea Route, fishing, naval activities, and national defense.

The work is planned for repairing the damage caused by previous economic activity in the archipelago of Franz Josef Land, including the collection and disposal of barrel packaging and land reclamation. The elimination of the consequences of past economic activities of the oil and gas complex in the delta of the Pechora River in the territory of Nenetsk State Nature Reserve is also planned.

All of these program tasks require evaluating effectiveness in only one direction in order to implement the government program "Socioeconomic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation up to 2020." At the same time, according to the "Strategy for Developing the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation and Ensuring National Security up to 2020," which is claimed as the original concept document of developing the considered program, a number of directions of the development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation and ensuring national security is classified as a priority. These include the comprehensive socioeconomic development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation, the development of science and technology, the creation of a modern information and telecommunication infrastructure, environmental security, and international cooperation in the Arctic.

It is also stated in the strategy that the basic mechanisms of its implementation are the program, other government programs of the Russian Federation, and federal and departmental target programs, as well as sectoral strategies, regional and municipal programs, and programs of large companies that provide measures aimed at the integrated development of the territory of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation. This mosaicism of coordination mechanisms in the considered government program, which is a collection of fragments of already adopted programs, is in contradiction with national significance of the Arctic megaproject and substantially limits the efficiency of the government program.

Both possibilities and problems of developing the subject list of criteria of the effectiveness of the program are illustrated by the subsection of its target. Initially, it states, e.g., that, "in accordance with the pri-

curities of the state policy in the sphere of development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation and, in view of problems in its socioeconomic development, the goal of the program is to increase the level of socioeconomic development of the Arctic zone” [16]. However, a generally accepted criterion of “the level of socioeconomic development” of regions, and moreover, of megaregions (the most extensive and diverse of these regions is the approved Arctic zone of the Russian Federation), does not exist. As has been proved by scientific research and practical experience, neither GRP growth, nor growth in income and increased life expectancy in the population, nor any other single criterion cannot be considered satisfactory.

In the considered government program, it was also proposed to assume that the increase in the level of socioeconomic development of the Arctic zone will be achieved under the following conditions:

“(a) the expansion of the resource base of this zone in order to ensure the country’s needs in various kinds of strategic raw materials;

(b) the establishment in this zone of favorable operational regime;

(c) the protection of the Arctic environment and the elimination of ecological impacts of business activities in the face of increasing economic activity and global climate change;

(d) formations in the area of a single information space;

(e) ensuring a high level of basic and applied research on the accumulation of knowledge and the creation of modern science and the geoinformation basis for managing the Arctic territories, including the development of tools to address defense and security tasks, as well as for the reliable functioning of life support systems and production activities in the natural and climatic conditions of the Arctic);

(f) ensuring the regime of mutually beneficial bilateral and multilateral cooperation of the Russian Federation with the Arctic states on the basis of international treaties and agreements, in which the Russian Federation participates.”

It is assumed that

“the solution to this problem, including through the integration of issues of social development of the Arctic zone in the strategy of long-term socioeconomic development of the federal districts and subjects of the Russian Federation, sectoral strategies, and programs, will ensure the acceleration of socioeconomic development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation” [16].

In principle, it is necessary to select the quantitative parameters that correspond to the listed target criteria. As shown in our previous studies [17–22], the selection of parameters that would characterize qualitative changes in the level of socioeconomic develop-

ment should be regarded as the main task, including the following:

(1) rational, i.e., the cost-effective and environmentally sound removal of any natural resources in conjunction with measures to restore their renewable potential;

(2) the balance of places of applying the labor and settlement system;

(3) the actual diversification of economic activities taking into account economically mutually beneficial links with other areas of the country and foreign countries;

(4) the actual provision of statutory rights of the indigenous population on territories of a traditional nature and rights that arise from the ethnic identity of members of this population;

(5) the consistency of measures of economic, social, and environmental policies of federal, regional, and municipal authorities in the territory of the Arctic zone;

(6) the coordinated involvement of the Russian business structures existing (and assuming to act) in the Arctic zone in the implementation of the strategy of integrated development of this zone;

(7) the widespread implementation of the principles of integrated development of all Arctic territories and statutory exclusive conditions in separate sectors (regions) of the allocated zone taking into account the characteristics of natural-climate, territorial, national, ethnic, or another nature common to the entire Arctic zone.

However, these clarifying criterial bases for improving the level of socioeconomic development should also be complemented by important positions, such as balancing national and corporate interests; applying the strictest environmental and ecological standards and the efficient use of resource-saving technologies; the rational combination of places of residence and temporary stay of people with the unconditional provision of modern conditions of their life support and basic social and cultural needs; the organic inclusion of the restored military presence in the overall concept of the integrated development of the Arctic zone [23]; and the ubiquitous and uninterrupted transport links both inside and outside the zone and the presence of measures of the special state regulation of labor, fiscal, national, and other relations.

The proposed procedure for clarifying and sweeping the approved goals and subgoals of the program in the system of criterial assessments of the effectiveness of its implementation is quite possible to carry out, but it requires making a significant adjustment to the program in the previously mentioned directions. This is also necessary in connection with the requirements of the Federal Law of June 28, 2014 No. 172-FZ “On Strategic Planning” (Article 3, paragraph 11), which normatively stipulates “the principle of measurability

of goals.” It implies that “the possibility to assess the achievement of the goals of socioeconomic development and ensuring national security of the Russian Federation with the use of quantitative and (or) quality target indicators, criteria and methods of assessment used in the strategic planning process must be provided.”

Government program for developing the arctic zone of the Russian Federation: evaluation of the effectiveness in the context of the potential of regulatory impact. When evaluating the effectiveness of the considered government program should be taken into account that the state of economic structures and territorial systems in the region is affected by almost all the regulatory actions of the state. Legal and economic environment of functioning of these systems and conditions for the formation and activities of social and other institutions in the territory of the Arctic zone are influenced by thousands of established federal laws and hundreds of new federal laws adopted each year, tens of thousands of annually updated regulations of the Government of the Russian Federation and federal executive bodies, and the regulations of subfederal and municipal authorities. All of them have the properties of regulatory impacts and, in recent years, a variety of materials, both official and prepared by well-known nongovernmental organizations, in particular “Business Russia,” with assessments of the impact of adoption of legal documents on the socio-economic situation are not published by chance.

In particular, the practice of these assessments was regulated by the Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation of December 17, 2012 No. 1318 “On the Order of Execution by the Federal Executive Bodies of Assessment of Regulatory Impact of Draft Normative Legal Acts, Draft Amendments to Draft Federal Laws and Draft Decisions of the Board of the Eurasian Economic Commission, and on Amendments to Some Acts of the Government of the Russian Federation” [24]. According to paragraph 15 of this Decree, a summary report (see [25]) for this evaluation “is formed by the developer using software tools of the official website and signed by the head of the structural unit of the federal executive authority responsible for the preparation of the draft act.”

Furthermore, a report on the draft act, which has a high degree of regulatory impact, must contain the following information:

- “(a) the degree of regulatory impact of a draft act;
- (b) a description of the problem that the proposed method of regulation is directed at solving and an evaluation of the negative effects that arise from the problem;
- (c) an analysis of international experience in the respective fields of activity;
- (d) purposes of the proposed regulation and their compliance with the principles of legal regulation, program documents of the President of the Russian

Federation, and the Government of the Russian Federation;

(e) description of the proposed regulation and other possible ways of solving the problem;

(f) the main groups of subjects of entrepreneurial and other economic activities, as well as other interested parties, including public authorities, the interests of whom will be affected by the proposed legal regulation, the estimation of the number of these entities;

(g) new functions, powers, duties and rights of federal executive bodies, state authorities of the Russian Federation and local government bodies, or information about their change, as well as a procedure for implementing them;

(h) an assessment of the corresponding costs (potential revenues) of budgets of the budgetary system of the Russian Federation;

(i) new benefits, as well as responsibilities or restrictions for the subjects of entrepreneurial and other economic activities or change in the content of existing duties and restrictions, as well as a procedure for organizing their execution;

(j) an assessment of the costs and revenues of subjects of entrepreneurial and other economic activities related to the need to comply with the established obligations or restrictions or change in the content of these obligations or restrictions;

(k) information on the abolition of duties, prohibitions, or restrictions for the subjects of entrepreneurial and other economic activities⁶;

(l) risks of solving the problem using the proposed method of regulation and risks of negative consequences;

(m) description of methods of controlling the effectiveness of the chosen method of achieving the goals of regulation;

(n) organizational-technical, methodological, informational, and other activities needed to achieve the stated goals of regulation;

(o) indicative indices, monitoring programs, and other ways (methods) of assessing the achievement of the stated regulation goals;

(p) the expected date when the draft act was entered into force, the need to establish transitional provisions (transitional period), as well as to experiment;

⁶ Subparagraph “l” is set out in a new version, which entered into force on October 1, 2015 on the basis of Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation of January 30, 2015 No. 83 [26]. According to the same Resolution, a consolidated report for draft acts with a medium degree of regulatory impact must contain the information specified in subparagraphs “a” – “j” and “l” – “s,” and for draft acts with a low degree of regulatory impact it must contain the information specified in subparagraphs “a,” “b,” “d” – “j,” “l,” “n” and “p” – “s” (see [26]).

(q) information about the placement of the notification, the terms of the submission of proposals in connection with this placement, individuals who submitted proposals and have considered their structural subdivisions of the developer;

(r) information about the performance of independent anti-corruption expertise of draft act;

(s) any other information that, in the developer's opinion, allows one to evaluate the validity of the proposed regulation" [24, 26].

All measures of the regulatory impact of federal, regional, and municipal authorities on the state of territorial systems of different levels as tools of the regional policy are only applied after certain regulations are adopted, but almost none of them pass the above procedure. The list of the most common measures includes about two dozen names, which can be divided as follows⁷:

1) the scale of regulatory impact on territorial systems can be divided into three groups (A, B, and C), in which group A has affects specific components and communications of the territorial system, group B affects the structure of this system as a whole, and group C affects the type of the territorial system;

2) the nature of regulatory impact can be divided into two groups, i.e., those that commonly occur and those that are exclusive and focused on a specific territorial system;

3) the duration of regulatory impact can be divided up as one-time, periodic, and long-term (continuous).

An analysis of the features of various regulatory measures that use the proposed classification of their impact on the state of businesses and territorial systems in the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation allows one to obtain important typological characteristics necessary to meet the challenges of socioeconomic development in the Arctic. In particular, inter-budget subsidization can be represented as a set of measures of regulatory impact that integrate types of impacts with the indices of the groups A, a, 1 or A, a, 2 (in symbolic form, respectively, $\Sigma R_{A,a,1}$ or $\Sigma R_{A,a,2}$); change in the distribution of taxes between the levels of the budget system in the form $\Sigma R_{A,a,2}$; the provision of direct investments in the construction of a large production facility depending on the scale of the system, $\Sigma R_{A,b}$ or $\Sigma R_{B,b}$; decision-making and the allocation of funds for the development of the internal market of the Arctic territories, $\Sigma R_{B,b}$; the allocation and development of investments in the diversification of the economy of an Arctic single-industry city, $\Sigma R_{B,b,3}$ or $\Sigma R_{C,b,3}$; the development of intra- and interregional transport infrastructure of the Arctic zone, $\Sigma R_{B,b,3}$; changes in the organizational-legal status of the Arctic

territories, $\Sigma R_{B,b,3}$; and the implementation of the rehabilitation program of the Arctic depressed areas, $\Sigma R_{B,b,3}$ or $\Sigma R_{C,b,3}$, etc.

It is indicative that only three of the nineteen analyzed measures of regulatory impact on economic and social objects of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation did not provide a long-term effect on their condition and only four did not have a long-term effect on the whole territorial system in general. Furthermore, the degree of influence on the condition of objects in the program and other regulations differed by several times due to the nature of the used measures and the features of the aforementioned objects.

This allows one to distinguish the following main types of transformation of economic structures and territorial systems in the Russian Arctic by the criterion of their sensitivity to particular regulatory impacts, i.e., fully managed, partially managed and unmanaged. Furthermore, the degree of manageability of each of these structures and systems may vary depending on certain regulatory impacts, so the assignment of these structures and systems to one of the above types of transformation can only be based on consideration of all available measures of regulatory impacts and their results. Institutional economic and legal analysis of the forms of the regulation of regional development, as well as the diagnosis of gaps and contradictions of the legislation in this area are set out in the collective monograph of the leading Russian experts [27]. Here, the method of assessing the regulatory impact of legal acts is clarified using criteria for implementing the development procedures and managerial decision-making.

Ideally, the goal of program and other regulatory impacts should be to bring a problematic, i.e., internally unbalanced, territorial system of the Arctic into the stable operation mode. Naturally, ways to achieve stability for particular types of economic structures, territorial systems, and their actual condition are different. Consequently, measures of regulatory impact should also be different taking into account their possible effectiveness in characteristics for the Russian Arctic conditions of abnormally dispersed type of settlements, Arctic monocities, specially protected areas, areas of new industrial developments, areas of compact residence of indigenous peoples, etc.

In the practice of modern public administration, the goals of bringing problematic (internally unbalanced) economic structures and territorial systems into stable operating mode or to keep them in this mode is rarely declared, and directions on using certain regulatory measures are most commonly referred to as *goals*. These are, e.g., the target substantiation of all measures without exception in the system of inter-budgetary relations, programs to reduce unemployment, etc. The same applies to government decisions on the transformation of the condition of territorial

⁷ Designations A, B and C; (a) and (b); (1), (2) and (3) are indexes of the corresponding types of measures.

megasystems, e.g., the Far East, the Baikal region, and the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation.

At the same time, achieving the desired effectiveness is initially complicated by several factors, including the subjective factor in decision-making, the expected a priori high effectiveness of regulatory impacts, the poor choice of institutions that implement these actions, the sluggish reaction of the key actors of the implementation of program solutions to the proposed regulatory impulses, and a lack of long-term government interest in regulating innovations. This can significantly distort the effectiveness of the adopted program “Socioeconomic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation up to 2020” and identifies the need to evaluate its implementation taking into account the considered circumstances.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The article was prepared based on the results of research carried out with the financial support of the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (project 14-38-00009) “Program-Target Management of Complex Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation” (Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University).

¹The article was prepared based on the results of the research carried out with the financial support of the grant of the Russian Scientific Fund (project 14-38-00009) “Program-Target Management of the Complex Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation” (Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University).

REFERENCES

1. Russian Federation Government Decree from October 24, 2005 no. 1789-p On Approval of the Concept of the Administrative Reform in the Russian Federation in 2006–2008. <http://base.garant.ru/188767/>.
2. V. N. Leksin, I. V. Leksin, and N. N. Chuchelina, *The Quality of Public Municipal Management and the Administrative Reform* (Evroproekt, Moscow, 2006) [in Russian].
3. Russian Federation Government Decree from June 30, 2010 no. 1101-r On Approval of the Program of the Government of the Russian Federation for Improvement of the Efficiency of Budget Expenditures for the Period up to 2012 and the Schedule of Events Aimed for Its Implementation in 2010. <http://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/6639347/#ixzz3u-PDEXkXG>.
4. Yu. V. Savel'eva and M. Yu. Savel'eva, “Program budgeting concept: Problems and prospects of implementation,” *Upr. Ekon. Sist.*, No. 11, 33 (2014).
5. E. E. Gubanova, Program budget: Regional level, in *Actual Problems of Economic Science: Materials II Int. Sci. Conf. (Ufa, April 2013)* (Leto, Ufa, 2013), pp. 101–103 [in Russian].
6. Russian Federation Government Resolution no. 588 from August 2, 2010 On Approval of the Procedure for the Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Russian Federation State Programs (ed. July 17, 2015). <http://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/70485826/>.
7. Order of the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation from November 20, 2013 no. 690 On Approval of Guidelines for the Development and Implementation of State Programs of the Russian Federation. <http://www.rg.ru/2014/04/04/metodika-site-dok.html>.
8. Federal Law from 28 June, 2014 no. 172-FZ On the Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation. Collection of the RF legislation from June 30, 2014 no. 26 (Part I), art. 3378.
9. Russian Federation Government Decree from November 11, 2010 no. 1950-r (ed. February 11, 2015) On Approval of the List of the Russian Federation Government Programs. Collection of the RF legislation from November 22, 2010 no. 47, art. 6166.
10. http://minfin.ru/ru/document/?id_4=64713&area_id=4&page_id=2104&popup=Y#ixzz3uVCwkxNT.
11. V. Yuzhakov, E. Dobrolyubova, and O. Aleksandrov, “How to evaluate the effectiveness of government programs: Methodological issues,” *Ekon. Politika*, No. 6, 79–98 (2015).
12. V. N. Leksin and B. N. Porfir'ev, “Problems and prospects for the use of the project approach in the management of the development of the Russian Arctic,” *MIR, Mod. Innovation Dev.* 6 (4), 10–19 (2015).
13. P. L. Vilenskii, V. N. Livshits, and S. A. Smolyak, *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Investment Projects: Theory and Practice* (PoliPrintServis, Moscow, 2015), 5th ed. [in Russian].
14. V. N. Leksin and A. N. Shvetsov, *The State and the Regions. Theory and Practice of the State Territorial Development* (URSS, Moscow, 1997) [in Russian].
15. Socio-economic development of the Far East and Baikal region. http://minvostokrazvitia.ru/upload/iblock/b0e/gp_mvr_visual.pdf.
16. Russian Federation Government Resolution from April 21, 2014 no. 366 On Approval of the State Program of the Russian Federation Social and Economic Development of the Russian Arctic for the Period till 2020. www.rg.ru/2014/04/24/arktika-site-dok.html.
17. V. V. Ivanter, V. N. Leksin, and B. N. Porfir'ev, “Arctic megaproject in the system of state interests and public administration,” *Problem. Anal. Gos.-Upr. Proekt.*, No. 6, 6–24 (2014).
18. V. N. Leksin and B. N. Porfir'ev, “Re-development of the Russian Arctic: Issues of methodology and organization,” *Russ. Ekon. Zh.*, No. 2, 84–104 (2015).
19. V. N. Leksin and B. N. Porfir'ev, “Methodological bases of system diagnostics of the current situation and problems in the Arctic zone of Russia,” *Problem. Anal. Gos.-Upr. Proekt.*, No. 2, 47–59 (2015).
20. V. N. Leksin and B. N. Porfir'ev, “Re-development of the Russian Arctic as a subject of the systematic study of the public program-oriented management: Methodological issues,” *Ekon. Reg.*, No. 4, 9–20 (2015).
21. V. N. Leksin and B. N. Porfir'ev, “The new arrangement of the Arctic: The challenge and the socio-economic

- conomic resource of Russia's future," *Probl. Teor. Prakt. Upr.*, No. 6, 54–60 (2015).
22. V. N. Leksin and B. N. Porfiryev, "Scientific and institutional capacity for complex development of the Russian Arctic zone in the medium and long term perspectives," *Stud. Russ. Econ. Dev.* **26** (6), 555–560 (2015).
 23. I. E. Frolov, "Development of the Russian Arctic zone: Challenges facing the renovation of transport and military infrastructure," *Stud. Russ. Econ. Dev.* **26** (6), 561–566 (2015).
 24. Russian Federation Government Resolution from December 17, 2012 no. 1318 On the Order for the Federal Executive Bodies to Assess the Regulatory Impact of Draft Regulations, Draft Amendments to Draft Federal Laws, and Draft Decisions of the Board of the Eurasian Economic Commission, as well as on Introduction of Amendments to Certain Acts of the Government of the Russian Federation. <http://base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc;base=LAW;n=187957;fld=134;dst=1000000001,0;rnd=0.24161056661978364>.
 25. Order of the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation from May 27, 2013 no. 290 On Approval of the Consolidated Report on the Conduct of Regulatory Impact Assessment, Regulatory Impact Assessment Forms, and Regulatory Impact Assessment Methodology. http://economy.gov.ru/minec/activity/sections/ria/info/lib/doc20130527_08.
 26. Russian Federation Government Decree from January 30, 2015 no. 83 On the Assessment of the Actual Impact of Normative Legal Acts, as well as on Introduction of Amendments to Some Acts of the Government of the Russian Federation (with Amendments and Additions). http://base.garant.ru/70858444/#block_200921#ixzz3x76twRoC.
 27. N. M. Kazantsev, E. M. Bukhval'd, A. R. Bakhtizin, et al., in *Economic and Legal Institutions for Regulation of Regional Development of the Russian Federation*, Ed. by N. M. Kazantsev (ZAO Grif i K, Moscow, 2013) [in Russian].

Leksin, Vladimir Nikolaevich, Dr. Sci. (Econ.), professor, chief researcher; senior researcher
Porfiryev, Boris Nikolaevich, RAS Correspondent Member, professor, deputy director; senior researcher
Translated by S. Avodkova