

## References

- [Divisi Pendidikan]. 2013. Program SDP. Bogor: Lembaga Pengembangan Insani
- [Divisi Ekonomi]. 2014. *Laporan Caturwulan Program Kerang Hijau*. Ciputat: Dompot Dhuafa.
- . 2014. *Report Direktorat Divisi Ekonomi*. Ciputat: Dompot Dhuafa.
- . 2015. *Laporan Tahunan Program Sinabung*. Ciputat: Dompot Dhuafa.
- . 2015. *Program Pemberdayaan Peternak Sapi Rancah Ciamis*. Ciputat: Dompot Dhuafa.
- . 2015. *Profil Program Ekonomi Dompot Dhuafa*. Bogor: Lembaga Pengembangan Insani.
- Ife, J. 1995. *Community Development Creating Community Alternatives- Vision, Analysis dan Practice*. Melbourne (AU): Longman
- Kountur, R. 2003. *Metode Penelitian untuk Penulisan Skripsi dan Tesis*. Jakarta: PPM
- Prijono, S., Pranarka, AMW. 1996. *Pemberdayaan: Konsep, Kebijakan dan Implementasi*. Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies
- Pebrian, S. 2012. *Pengaruh Pelaksanaan Program Pemberdayaan Desa (Ppd) Terhadap Keberdayaan Masyarakat Desa Di Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi*. Jurnal SEPA : Vol. 9 No.1 September 2012 : 64 – 73.
- [Tim Baznas]. *Praktik Rentenir dan Solusi Zakat*. [diunduh 2014 Desember 14]. Tersedia di <http://pusat.baznas.go.id/berita-artikel/praktik-rentenir-dan-solusi-zakat/>
- [World Bank]. 2009. *Improving access to financial services in Indonesia vol 2*. [Diunduh 2016 April 5]. Tersedia di <http://www.worldbank.org>
- . 2013. *Kemiskinan Perkotaan dan Ulasan Program*. [diunduh 2016 April 10]. Tersedia di <http://www.worldbank.org>
- Satrio, T., Yuni, M. 2014. *Social Trust Fund*. Ciputat: Dompot Dhuafa.
- Saleh, Darwin, Z. 2013. *Potret Dhuafa Perekonomian Indonesia*. Jakarta: Expose.

# Analysis of National Measures Fostering Innovations in Developed Countries and Adaptability to Their Current Social and Economic Conditions in Ukraine

Marjana S. Shkoda

Kiev National University of Technology and Design  
Ukraine

## Introduction

The government formulates objectives, principles and priorities for the effective functioning of science and innovation. It is necessary to recognize the differences between science, technology and innovation policy. In the first case, the state is aimed to obtain new scientific knowledge and its implementation into modern industries and technologies. The goal of innovation policy is to create and use of innovations that can satisfy personal and social needs [1]. The main vector of innovation policy is aimed at the existing economic system. The application of science and technology underlines the creation of innovation and it depends on various elements of HR production.

At the state level innovation policy is carried out into three areas: 1) planning – setting up goals and objectives based on priorities of innovation development; 2) programming - development, creation and implementation of state scientific-technical and innovation programs; 3) regulation of state innovation policy through direct and indirect methods.

The direction of scientific and technical knowledge functionally depends on the institutional environment of innovation. Government policy encourages innovation in the economy that in its turn impact on the overall socio-economic situation in the country. Government controls the innovation sphere by formulating goals, principles and priorities in regulatory policy. Lacks in Ukraine of the established law regulations, organizational forms, public support for innovation brings to analyze the relevant international experience.

According to analysis of the practice of forming innovative development in the EU, it identifies the number of key principles: 1) legislation of intellectual property; 2) freedom of scientific and technical work; 3) combination of complex and

interconnected natures of direct and indirect measures of the state regulation; 4) the principle of subsidiary financing in innovation (public authorities and the private sector) projects with major economic and social importance for the country; 5) the concentration of resources in priority areas of research; 6) coordination of innovation policy with the overall socio-economic; 7) protection of national interests by stimulating innovative international cooperation. Proved that the choice of priorities of the state innovation policy by using sustainable economic growth, improving the production quality of domestic products in the domestic and foreign markets, based on an analysis of current and projected scientific, technical, labor, infrastructure and other barriers to development.

Innovative policy, at the present stage of development, in leading countries fulfills the fundamental function of sustainable socio-economic growth and maintaining high national competitiveness.

This study generalizes practices of development and implementation of innovative policies in the countries that are leading the global innovation. These countries long maintained the leading position in innovative development, or gained significant achievements in this area. For the short period, they accumulated substantial experience in management and intensification of innovation in different economic conditions and could provide national model of the innovation process. Using this experience, many countries have raised the effectiveness of the national innovation and achieved significant results in the formation of innovative development models.

### **Key results**

In world practice, the most common are the levers of stimulate innovation development:

- the possibility of tax credits for research and investment activity (so-called "tax holidays" related costs for innovative purposes);
- reducing pay taxes on the increase innovation spending;
- deferral of tax payments for an extended period on the profits gained from the implementation of innovative projects;
- tax exemptions on dividends in legal and physical entities that have been received through shares of the implementation of innovation;
- use tax exemptions on profits from order fulfillment and joint research and development;
- the relationship benefits on the basis of priority of the projects;
- reducing the tax rate on profits gained from the application of know-how, patents, grants and other intangible assets, including intellectual property;
- reduction of income tax on the devices and equipment for universities, research institutions other innovative institutions;
- deduction of income taxes contribution to charities and financial support for innovation;
- enrollment share of profits of innovation in special accounts, followed by preferential tax treatment in case of consumption of innovative purposes.

The directions of innovative development of Ukraine for the analysis of the experience of Great Britain and France as the leading European countries with relatively schemes suitable regulatory policy innovation.[8] An example of analysis can also serve Poland, which was recently carried out significant economic reforms in the field of innovation. The leading attribute of small innovative and leading European countries is phenomenally high level of basic science, funded mostly by the state. In Sweden and the Netherlands the leading role played by national Academy of Sciences. Similar structures have national innovation systems, developing fundamental and university research on selected areas that are also publicly funded business support for applied research.

The regional concentration of efforts in science and technology is a feature of Denmark, Finland and Switzerland. It should be noted that these states are leaders in the world rankings of competitiveness of economies.[3,7] In East Asian, innovation cycle, usually has no fundamental component and even partially applied science. These

innovative models are focused mainly on the export of high-tech products, with technologies borrowed in countries with 'traditional model'. The most striking example of this model of innovation is Japan. Most important feature of the national innovation system in Japan is a focus on providing high quality products exports in high-tech field.

In addition to traditional methods of influence on the development of exports such as preferential loans and export insurance, is partial exemption exporters taxes, direct subsidies, state comprehensive help exporters promote their sale activities, etc.. The Japanese government widely used all this indirect methods. The Japanese model of integration of science and industry, defines the architecture of entirely new cities technology, concentrating of high-tech research, development and manufacturing. The project to create techno - one of the most important strategic directions of the Japanese government, to maintain the country's strong position of technological leadership.[9] As pointed out an American expert on Japanese techno S. Tatsuno, techno strategy - a strategy is the breakthrough in new areas through the development of a network of regional centers of higher technological level. This strategy is intellectualization of the whole Japanese economy [2].

Alternative models of innovative development found in application of countries that have significant experience in fundamental and applied science. Countries, where agriculture is still plays the leading role in economy, do not differ powerful reserves of raw materials, processing technology or selling, which could be national competitive advantage. As a result, the innovation cycle is missing data unit, basic and applied sciences, and virtually has no high-tech cycle. Generally, countries with such innovation policy focuses on borrowing and distribution, and not on creating new technologies; development of education in economics, management, sociology and psychology; in training staff for the financial and banking sectors; in certain sectors of light industry, creative industry and recreation. Examples of such innovative models of development can be noted national innovation systems of Thailand, Turkey, Portugal, Chile and Jordan. [3]

The author stipulates that Ukraine needs to form individual model innovation. Ukraine have historically high level of basic science, high industrial and agricultural potential, which can enable model by building full innovation cycle. In addressing problems with financing innovative process, should focus on the development of venture capital market, the existence and scope of which is a principal factor for the intensification of innovation. The analysis of international experience, the share of venture capital in the total costs of the development and implementation innovative process depends on intensity of the national innovation process. Countries like USA, Israel, UK, Canada and others. have made significant progress in strengthening and enhancing the effectiveness of national information systems through the development of venture capital market and the formation mechanisms of the use of public investment resources through the market [4,8].

In the US, the "core" venture capital market form more than 900 large companies and venture capital funds that invest annually more than 35 billion dollars. US innovation development [6].The state encourages the formation of venture capital firms and research centers, experimental centers, venture companies and may have first 5 years wholly or partly financed from the state budget. In Europe, there are more than 500 venture capital funds [10]. Venture capital is actually the main source of funding for innovative entrepreneurship and innovation. Significantly, in all OECD countries in 2014, it accounted for about 0.12% of total GDP (0.10% in 2013). Over the past few years, US and UK attracted 50% of all venture capital in OECD countries [10].

Building an effective regulatory policy in innovative system in the developed world is accompanied by a steady trend of expansion and deepening of partnership between the state and the private sector in the intensification of innovation. For this purpose, special arrangements are formed, partnerships that include mechanisms of the initiatives of the parties, implementation of joint decisions of state participation in innovative projects, or cooperation between public institutions and private companies (such as public, private and government programs, centers, associations, etc.).

### Conclusions.

Thus, based on the assessment of the possibilities of using foreign practice in the current socio-economic conditions, the country stipulates that the purpose of the state innovation policy within the national innovation system of Ukraine should be continuously improve productivity and competitiveness of domestic producers on the basis of technological modernization of the national economy, innovative increase of their activity in new products, services, technologies, methods of organization and management of economic. Addressing the lack of effective government institution mechanisms for implementing this strategic priorities for innovation is possible by combining the best practices and efforts in education, scientific, industrial and market structures is the key goal in the innovative process through creation of special associations interested in the end goal. For example, through the creation of "innovation clusters" for primary sectors under the public-private partnership.

### References

1. Capital markets in PPP financing: where we were and where are we going? : / European PPP Expertise Centre, 2010. — Pp. 19–22.
2. Chenery H. Structural Change and Development Policy : / H. Chenery. — Baltimore, 1979
3. European Innovation Scoreboard 2003 :. European Commission, 2003. — Nov. 2003.
4. Guidelines for Successful Public — Private Partnerships : / European Commission Directorate-General Regional Policy, 2003. — 100 p.
5. How to ensure the success of the PPP: Annual report 2011 :. — Ernst & Young Global Limited, 2012. — 53 p.
6. Romer P.M. Endogenous Technological Change // Journal of Political Economy, 1990. V. 98. №5. P.S. 71.
7. Shapira P. US National Innovation System: Science, technology and Innovation Policy development. — Global Limited, 2012. — 63 p.
8. The World Bank. Public Private Partnerships in Infrastructure Resource Center: / M. Wolf. — London, 2012.
9. Wolf M. The Japanese Conspiracy : / M. Wolf. — London, 1983.
10. World Development Indicators 2012 / The World Bank, 2012. — 287 p.

## The impact of Eurasian economic union on capital flows in Kazakhstan

Olga Valentinovna Koshkina

University of International Business, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Irina Valeryevna Onyusheva

dr.iris@mail.ru

Olga Iosifovna Mayer

Chelyabinsk State University, Kostanay branch, Kazakhstan

### Abstract

The objective of this article is research of the impact of Eurasian Economic Union on capital flows in Kazakhstan. With this purpose the stages of Eurasian Economic Union (EurAsEU) have been analyzed. Macroeconomic criteria have been collected for the period from 2008 to 2014. Foreign trade turnover in the EurAsEU countries, volume of foreign trade, main social and economic indexes of states-members of the Common Economic Area, import and export, gross domestic product, investments to the fixed capital have been collected and analyzed. Correlation analysis has been carried out, conclusions and recommendations have been provided. The obtained 99% correlation coefficient confirms the hypothesis of the effect of participation in EurAsEU over capital flows in Kazakhstan. On the basis of the estimated model it was concluded of the effect of republican budget expenses, long-term credit interests for individuals over capital flows in Kazakhstan.

### Key-words

capital flows, customs union, Eurasian Union, common economic area