

Метою статті є визначення та аналіз світових тенденцій розвитку туристичної індустрії в умовах сучасної парадигми соціально-економічного розвитку, а також дослідження чинників, які впливають на розвиток світової туристичної індустрії.

Матеріали та методи. У статті використано такі методи наукового дослідження: економіко-статистичний та індукції, емпіричний (спостереження), прогнозування, логічного та порівняльного аналізу.

Результати дослідження. Проведено аналіз світових тенденцій розвитку туристичної індустрії в умовах глобалізації, інформатизації, політико-економічної нестабільності та терористичної загрози. Визначено чинники, які впливають на розвиток світової туристичної індустрії, формуватимуть географію туристичних потоків та дестинацій у найближчі роки. Досліджено основні трансформації у структурі глобального туристичного попиту. Визначені тенденції обов'язково повинні враховуватись при створенні та вдосконаленні стратегії розвитку будь-якої туристичної дестинації та туристичного об'єкта.

Висновки. Виокремлено основні глобальні тренди розвитку сучасної туристичної індустрії: зміна географічного розподілу міжнародних подорожей; домінування онлайн продажів туристичних послуг; збільшення частки індивідуальних подорожей; зростання сегмента лікувально-оздоровчого туризму; актуалізація попиту на індивідуальні заклади тимчасового розміщення; актуалізація потреби у безпеці; зростання потреби екологічного туризму та відповідності умовам дружнього до природи середовища; поява та виокремлення нових видів туризму; зміна соціально-демографічного портрету споживача туристичних послуг; зміна тривалості та періодичності подорожей тощо. Для збільшення ефективності стратегії туристичного розвитку будь-якої туристичної дестинації та туристичного об'єкта необхідно враховувати зазначені світові тенденції розвитку туристичної сфери в структурних моделях організації ринку послуг.

Ключові слова: міжнародний туризм, світові туристичні тренди, туристична індустрія, Е-туризм, онлайн подорожі.

UDK 351.82-026.564

SHKUROPADSKA Diana, post-graduate student of the Department of Economic Theory and Competition Policy
Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics

RESILIENCE OF THE SECTOR OF STATE GOVERNMENT

The essence of the sector of state government and signs of its resilience are considered. The estimation of the resilience level of the state-owned sector for 2008–2016 was carried out and the main shock effects that occurred in the investigated period were determined.

Keywords: resilience of economy, state government sector, national economy, public finances, shock influences.

© Shkuropadska D., 2017

42

 ISSN 1727-9313. HERALD OF KNUTE. 2017. № 6

Шкуропадская Д. Устойчивость сектора общегосударственного управления. Рассмотрены сущность сектора общегосударственного управления и признаки его устойчивости. Дана оценка уровня устойчивости сектора общегосударственного управления за 2008–2016 годы и определены основные шоковые воздействия, которые имели место в исследуемом периоде.

Ключевые слова: устойчивость экономики, сектор общегосударственного управления, национальная экономика, государственные финансы, шоковые воздействия.

Background. The State Government (SG) is one of the main parts of the national economy that provides socio-economic development, defines the main directions of the political and economic direction of the state policy, serves as the basis for the state to carry out its functions. The sector covers all resources owned and administered by the state, consists of separate economic entities, which enter into economic relations with each other, take economic decisions and bear the responsibility for their implementation. Determination of resilience level of the sector of state government is an important task in view of its impact on all spheres of economic activity, which provides a multiplier effect for the development of the national economy. The SG sector affects the distribution of GDP between institutional sectors and the formation of domestic and external financial resources of the country. All this updates the importance of research into the resilience of the state-owned sector.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. The problem of resilience of economic systems is actively studied by Ukrainian and foreign researchers and economists-practitioners. In particular, academician V. Heiets substantiated an endogenously oriented model of economic development, based on which it is possible to secure a new round [1]. The publications of A. Boyko are devoted to the study of mechanisms to ensure the resilience of Ukraine's economy to global challenges and risks of the present [2]. The nature of shock disturbances and their consequences for the national economy is disclosed in a collective monograph edited by I. Kryuchkova [3]. The publication of L. Charles, D. Evans, A. Marshall [4] is devoted to the study of fundamental macroeconomic shocks. The nature of economic resilience and indicators of its evaluation are disclosed in the publication of M. M. Hermansen [5]. The questions of the justification of SG sector development and public finance are explored by such Ukrainian scholars as T. Bogdan [6], S. Gasanov [7], T. Efimenko [8], V. Kudriashov [9], C. Londar [10], I. Lunin [11], K. Pavliuk [12].

The **aim** of the study is to assess the level of resilience of the sector of national government, which will reveal the main shock effects on the sector and suggest ways to increase its resilience.

Materials and methods. Theoretical and methodological basis of the research are general scientific and special methods of scientific knowledge, the application of which allowed to achieve the set goal: systemic – to

determine the essential characteristics of the resilience of the sector of national government, methods of analysis and synthesis – to study the theoretical and methodological foundations of the resilience of the SG sector, comparison and systematization – to analyze and evaluate the resilience indicators of the SG sector. The information base of the study is presented by the works of Ukrainian and foreign scholars and statistical data of the National Bank of Ukraine, the State Treasury Service, and the Ministry of Finance of Ukraine.

Results. The sector of state government includes institutional units whose activities are related to the fulfillment of tasks and functions of public administration. Its main functions are the provision of socio-political regulation, the provision of goods and services on a non-market basis for their collective or personal consumption by members of society, as well as the redistribution of income and expenditure through transfers and subsidies. SG is a central part of the public sector economy. The separation of the public administration sector as one of the sectors of the economy is due to the fact that the formation of sectors in the system of national accounts was carried out according to the functions of institutional units in economic activity. The SG sector is a prerequisite for the formation of a public finance management system at the national and regional levels.

In the broad sense, under the general government sector, one should understand the totality of central and local government bodies, budget state institutions that finance their expenses through taxes and partly due to property income that they have at their disposal. In researching the resilience of the SG sector, it is worth to determine the essence of the concept of "resilience of the system", to give a description of the indicators of resilience and to substantiate measures to ensure sustainable development.

In particular, the resilience of the economic system is the ability to maintain and build vital parameters and functions at all stages of cyclic development in the conditions of external and internal influences on it [2, p. 44]. Critical analysis of scientific approaches to determining the essence of resilience of the macroeconomic system and its characteristics makes it possible to determine the main signs of the resilience of the SG sector. The stable state of the state-government sector (hereinafter – the object) is characterized by the following features:

- financing of the stable development of the object is provided both in the short and long term by using own and borrowed resources;
- liabilities arising from the attraction of assets under loan conditions do not exert a devastating effect (do not cause a load that becomes a factor in a significant limitation of current expenses financing) for the system of financing the object in future periods;
- there are sufficient reserve funds to finance measures aimed at limiting the possible shock effects (internal and external), which lead to an aggravation of the risks of financing the development of the object [13, p. 56].

Thus, a stable state of the state-government sector implies that costs financing of its current activities is carried out by measures that do not have a devastating effect on financing activities in future periods. When choosing indicators for assessing the level of resilience of the SG sector, methodological approaches were taken as a basis to assessing the level of economic resilience developed by the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation [14] and the methodology for calculating the level of economic security in Ukraine [15], as part of the threshold values of indicators (*table 1*).

Table 1

Indicators for assessing the level of resilience of the sector of state government

Indicator	Characteristics of the indicator	Threshold value, %
Level of GDP redistribution through consolidated budget, %	Displays the amount of financial resources of the state, which are redistributed through the system of public finances, and indicates the degree of centralization of the financial system. It is one of the main factors influencing the rate of economic development of the country	≤ 30
The ratio of the deficit (surplus) of the state budget to GDP, %	Determines the need for state borrowing, affecting the volume of accumulation of public debts and payments for them	≤ 4
Coverage of the consolidated budget deficit due to external borrowings, %	Determines the level of budget financing by external borrowing, %	≤ 30
Volume of transfers from the state budget, % to GDP	Characterizes the level of burden of the state budget at the expense of transfer payments	≤ 15
The share of the state-owned sector in current incomes, %	Characterizes the level of income of public authorities	≤ 20
The level of state and guaranteed by the state of external and internal debt, %	Characterizes the safe level of government debt	≤ 30
The coefficient of sufficiency of international reserves for servicing of external debt	Characterizes the level of international liquidity of the country. The coefficient indicates whether international reserves exceed the amount of planned payments on account of repayment of external debt during the relevant period. Characterizes the ability of the country to implement scheduled payments repayment of external debt to non-residents at the expense of their own reserves	≥ 100
The level of implementation of the plan on the consolidated budget revenues, %	Characterizes the correspondence of the planned budget revenues to the actual ones	≥ 98
Level of implementation of the plan on consolidated budget expenditures, %	Characterizes the compliance of planned budget expenditures with actual ones	≥ 98

Source: compiled and systematized by the author for [14; 15].

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (hereinafter OECD) for the evaluation of resilience SG sector provides 17 indicators to calculate absolute values. Calculation of indicators according to this methodology is foreseen for OECD member countries and determining the level of resilience of the sector occurs as a result of cross-country comparison. Most indicators of OECs are not calculated by the State Statistics Service of Ukraine, therefore the proposed indicators have been adapted to the Ukrainian statistical base. The choice of the above 9 indicators (*table 1*) is due to the fact that they characterize the provision of solvency of the state, taking into account the balance of revenues and expenditures of budgets and the efficiency of the use of budgetary funds. It is economic development and proper financial support that allows resilience of the SG sector. In *table 2* shows the results of calculation of indicators for estimating the level of resilience of SG sector of Ukraine for 2008–2016.

Table 2

**Dynamics of indicators of estimation of the resilience level of the sector
of the state administration of Ukraine for 2008–2016**

Indicator	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Level of GDP redistribution through consolidated budget, %	31.42	29.89	29.05	30.27	31.7	30.2	29.1	29.9	27.9
The ratio of the deficit (surplus) of the state budget to GDP, %	1.32	3.89	5.94	1.79	3.7	4.3	5.0	3.7	3.0
Coverage of the consolidated budget deficit due to external borrowings, %	27.11	120.24	73.06	62.89	24	21.5	54.2	46.8	19.9
Volume of transfers from the state budget, % to GDP	6.2	6.8	7.2	7.3	8.9	8.0	8.2	8.8	8.6
The share of the state-owned sector in current incomes, %	20.01	15.08	15.35	18.16	17.72	16.7	15.6	19.36	19.56
Level of state and guaranteed by the state external and internal debt, % of GDP	20.0	34.8	39.9	36.3	36.5	40.2	70.7	79.4	81.84
The coefficient of sufficiency of international reserves for servicing external debt	170.1	99.94	99.47	84.84	63.49	54.38	19.41	30.61	34.07
The level of implementation of the plan on the consolidated budget revenues, %	97.3	84.06	96.64	100.6	93.01	66.75	92.9	102.6	100.2
Level of implementation of the plan on consolidated budget expenditures, %	92.4	72.73	93.44	93.5	92.4	91.2	88.7	85.6	94.6

Source: calculated and systematized by the author for [16; 17].

The level of redistribution of GDP through the consolidated budget [18, p. 50–51] in 2008 did not meet the threshold (no more than 30 %), which was due to the beginning of the global financial crisis and financial instability in the country. Also, in the period from 2011 to 2013, the indicator slightly exceeded the threshold.

The ratio of deficit (surplus) of the state budget to GDP during the crisis period of 2009–2010 actually exceeded the threshold. In 2011, the decline was characterized by a slowdown in government debt growth. This can be seen as a positive trend, especially against the background of the dynamics of the cost of attracting debt. In the period of 2013–2014, the indicator exceeded the normative value, the reason for which was the fall in volumes of trade and the reduction of economic activity in the occupied territories of Ukraine.

One of the reasons for the increase of the indicator of *covering the consolidated budget deficit due to external borrowing* during the period of 2009–2011 was the global financial crisis, which resulted in a fall in GDP and caused a deterioration of key financial indicators. In 2014–2015, this indicator did not correspond to the threshold that was associated with the beginning of the socio-economic crisis in the country and the decline in GDP.

The volume of transfers from the state budget to GDP for the period of 2008–2016 stayed within the threshold, but gradually increased. The growth of the indicator by 28% in 2016, compared to 2008, indicates an increase in support from the state budget and lower budgets. This also indicates a decrease in their independence, which leads to an increase in risk and potentially unstable solvency [19, p. 322]. The share of the general government sector in the existing revenues for the period under investigation was within the normative scope and did not undergo significant fluctuations. The level of state and guaranteed by the state of external and internal debt was only normative in 2008. In 2008–2009, as a result of the global financial crisis, a decrease in the country's GDP, the growth of the state budget deficit and the deterioration of debt security due to a steep increase in public debt. In 2010, the debt burden on the Ukrainian economy increased, which resulted in a decrease in long-term and short-term credit ratings of the country [20]. The development of the economy in Ukraine in 2014–2015 showed sharply expressed negative trends (GDP reduction by 31.3% in 2015 compared with 2013, reduction of gold and foreign exchange reserves to \$ 5.6 billion, rapid devaluation of hryvnia – 100 % per annum etc.) [21]. All these processes during 2008–2016 negatively affected the dynamics of the size of the state and guaranteed by the state of external and internal debt. The adequacy ratio of international reserves for servicing external debt corresponded to the threshold only in 2008. Analysis of data from the *table 2* leads to the conclusion that Ukraine has never attained the minimum required level (100 %) of this indicator for the last eight years. That is, the country's reserves for covering external debt were not always

enough. The reduction of the country's foreign-exchange reserves during 2013–2016 was due to significant expenditures of the National Bank, which were aimed at maintaining the exchange rate of the national currency and repayment of the state external debt. In the future, the regulator foresees a constant dynamics of international reserves: during the periods of improvement of the market conditions, their growth will increase, while during the periods of strengthening of external pressure it is possible to use them in order to absorb destabilizing shock influences [22]. The level of implementation of the plan for the consolidated budget revenues was in line with the normative value in 2011 and 2015–2016. Failure to implement the budget revenues plan contributes to the increase of the budget deficit. The indicator of the implementation of the consolidated budget revenues plan for 2008–2010 and in 2012–2014 did not meet the threshold, which is the reason why the government is incapable of clearly defining the size of future budget revenues and expenditures. There is also a significant impact on the size of the consolidated budget revenues and expenditures, which is the phase of the economic cycle, which during the downturn entails an increase in budget expenditures and a decrease in tax revenues, and on the contrary in the period of economic growth. The level of implementation of the plan for consolidated budget expenditures for the period 2008–2016 has never reached the normative value. However, over this period, the indicator increased by 21.87% and returned to the pre-crisis value of 2008. Failure to implement the plan on consolidated budget expenditures from year to year indicates:

- insufficiency of consolidated budget revenues;
- inefficiency of budget planning system;
- constant overstatement of budget expenditures in the absence of real sources for their financing;
- the lack of a real link between income and budget expenditures.

Under the resilience of the sector understand its ability after the action of shock effects to return to a state that is not worse than the previous [23, p. 21]. A stable sector of national government should provide for the emergence of macroeconomic shocks, which can be defined as a real sudden change in the conditions of management, which displays the parameters of the economic system for critical values [4, p. 5]. The main macroeconomic shocks that took place in 2008–2016 and influenced the dynamics of the above-mentioned indicators are:

- nominal shocks: reduction of currency offer and devaluation of hryvnia; growth of external debt;
- real shocks: reduction of GDP and volume of goods turnover in the country;
- shocks of demand: reduction of domestic investment of the economy; deficit of foreign trade and balance of payments;
- shocks of offers: increase of tax rates for payments to the budget.

Conclusion. Thus, the level of resilience of the sector of the state administration of Ukraine is unsatisfactory. Only two indicators out of nine corresponded to the thresholds for 2008–2016: the amount of transfers from the state budget to GDP and the share of the state-owned sector in disposable income. All other indicators highlighted the high sensitivity of the SG sector to shock effects and its inability to adapt, to recover, to counteract in the long run. The proposed set of indicators to determine the level of resilience of the SG sector with the use of threshold values to a large extent allows for the assessment and monitoring of the shock effects on the relevant sector and, on this basis, develop measures to warn of adverse and threatening economic development trends. On the basis of the conducted research it will be advisable to propose ways to increase the level of resilience of the sector of national government:

- to cover the budget deficit, the state must ensure the search for real reserves to increase budget revenues, create favorable conditions for taxpayers to develop their activities, increase tax objects;
- to achieve reliability of the forecast of the main macroeconomic indicators, on the basis of which the income and expenditure part of the state budget, volumes and rates of GDP growth, inflation rate, exchange rate are formed;
- use budget funds mainly for state target programs aimed at economic development;
- to improve mechanisms for the implementation of state borrowing and repayment of public debt.

The prospects for further research in this regard are related to the substantiation of mechanisms for ensuring the resilience of the sector of national government of Ukraine.

REFERENCES

1. *Gejec' V. M.* Suspil'stvo, derzhava, ekonomika: fenomenologija vzajemodii' ta rozvytku : monografija. Kyi'v : In-t ekon. ta prognoz. NAN Ukrai'ny, 2009. 864 s.
2. *Bojko A. V.* Mehanizmy zabezpechennja stijkosti ekonomiky Ukrai'ny do global'nyh vyklykiv i ryzykiv suchasnosti. Ekonomika ta upravlinnja nacional'nym gospodarstvom. 2014. № 3 (46). S. 34–41.
3. *Krjuchkova I. V.* Ekonomika Ukrai'ny: shokovi vplyvy ta shljah do stabil'nogo rozvytku : monografija. Kyi'v : In-t ekon. ta prognozuv. NAN Ukrai'ny, 2010. 480 s.
4. *Charles L. Evans David A. Marshall.* Fundamental economic shocks and the macroeconomy. Central Bank of Chile Documentos de Trabajo Working Papers, 2005. № 351. 23 p.

5. *Hermansen M.* Economic Resilience: The Usefulness of Early Warning Indicators in OECD Countries. OECD Economic Department Working Papers. 2015. № 1250. 30 p. URL : http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/economic-resilience-the-usefulness-of-early-warning-indicators-in-oecd-countries_5jrxhgfqx3mv-en?crawler=true.
6. *Bogdan T. P.* Upravlinnja derzhavnym borgom i makrofinansovi ryzyky v ekonomici Ukrainy. *Finansy Ukrainy*. 2011. № 1. S. 13–22.
7. *Gasarov S. S., Kudrjashov V. P., Balakin R. L.* Dosvid JeS z antykryzovogo upravlinnja derzhavnymy finansamy ta jogo vykorystannja v Ukraini. *Finansy Ukrainy*. 2014. № 7. S. 17–30.
8. *Jefymenko T. I.* Podatky v instyucijnij systemi suchasnoi ekonomiky. Kyi'v : NAN Ukrainy, In-t ekonomiky ta prognozuvannja, 2011. 688 s.
9. *Kudrjashov V. P.* Derzhavni finansy v period provedennja reform. *Finansy Ukrainy*. 2012. № 1. S. 41–57.
10. *Londar S. L.* Bjudzhetne prognozuvannja: metodika potrebue vdoskonalennja. *Nezalezhnij auditor*. 2014. URL : <http://n-auditor.com.ua>.
11. *Lunina I. O.* Problemy j perspektivy rozvytku systemy derzhavnyh finansiv v Ukraini. *Finansy Ukrainy*. 2010. № 2. S. 3–12.
12. *Pavljuk K. V.* Rol' bjudzhetu u reguljuvanni social'no-ekonomichnyh procesiv u transformacijnyj period v Ukraini. *Naukovi praci NDFI*. 2007. № 1. S. 14–29.
13. *Kudrjashov V. P.* Stijkist' derzhavnyh finansiv. *Finansy. Podatky. Kredyt*. 2012. S. 54–67.
14. *OECD Home.* Economic resilience: Vulnerability indicators. 2017. URL : <https://www.oecd.org/eco/growth/economic-resilience.htm>.
15. *Metodyka rozrahunku rivnja ekonomichnoi bezpeky Ukrainy : Nakaz Min-va ekonomiky Ukrainy : zatv. vid 19.10.2013.* № 1277. URL : <http://www.me.gov.ua/Documents/List?lang=uk-UA&tag=MetodichniRekomendatsii>.
16. *Oficijnyj veb-sajt Nacional'nogo banku Ukrainy.* URL : <http://www.bank.gov.ua>.
17. *Oficijnyj veb-sajt Derzhavnoi' kaznachejs'koi' sluzhby Ukrainy.* URL : <http://www.treasury.gov.ua>.
18. *Serebrjans'kyj D. M.* Ocinjuvannja rivnja ta efektyvnosti pererozpodilu VVP cherez publichnyj sektor ekonomiky Ukrainy. *Finansy Ukrainy*. 2013. № 4. S. 45–57.
19. *Futerko O. I.* Bjudzhetna bezpeka Ukrainy. Aktual'ni problemy rozvytku ekonomiky regionu. 2013. № 9. S. 319–326.
20. *Novos'olova O. S.* Geneza derzhavnogo borhu Ukrainy ta vitchyznjani tendencii' borgovoi' polityky. *Naukovyj visnyk Uzhgorod. un-tu. Ekonomika*. 2014. Vyp. 43, Ch. 2. S. 143–147.
21. *Oficijnyj veb-sajt ministerstva finansiv Ukrainy.* URL : <http://index.minfin.com.ua>.
22. *Bogdan T. P.* Borgova polityka derzhavy v umovah global'noi' nestabil'nosti. *Ekonomika Ukrainy*. 2013. № 2. S. 4–17.
23. *Kaletnik G. M.* Stijkist' ekonomiky jak faktor bezpeky i rozvytku derzhavy. *Ekonomika Ukrainy*. 2012. № 7. S. 16–25.

The article submitted to editor's office on 23.11.2017.

Шкуропадська Д. Стійкість сектора загальнодержавного управління.

Постановка проблеми. Сектор загальнодержавного управління (ЗДУ) є важливою частиною національної економіки, що забезпечує соціально-економічний розвиток, визначає основні напрями політичного та економічного спрямування держави, слугує основою для виконання державою своїх функцій. Визначення рівня стійкості сектора ЗДУ є пріоритетним завданням з огляду на його вплив на всі сфери економічної діяльності, що забезпечує мультиплікативний ефект для розвитку національної економіки.

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій. Українські дослідники та економісти-практики активно вивчають питання стійкості економічних систем. Проте стійкість сектора ЗДУ потребує більш глибокого дослідження.

Мета дослідження полягає в оцінюванні рівня стійкості сектора ЗДУ, що дасть змогу виявити основні шоківі впливи на цей сектор та запропонувати шляхи забезпечення високого рівня стійкості.

Матеріали та методи. Теоретико-методологічною основою дослідження є загальнонаукові та спеціальні методи наукового пізнання, зокрема: аналізу, синтезу, порівняння та систематизації. Інформаційна база дослідження представлена статистичними даними, працями українських і зарубіжних науковців.

Результати дослідження. Сектор ЗДУ є основною передумовою формування системи управління державними фінансами на національному та регіональному рівнях. Стійкий стан сектора ЗДУ передбачає, що фінансування витрат на його поточну діяльність здійснюється заходами, що не чинять руйнівного впливу на фінансування діяльності в майбутніх періодах. При виборі індикаторів для оцінювання рівня стійкості сектора ЗДУ за основу взято методичні підходи до оцінювання рівня стійкості економіки, розроблені Організацією економічного розвитку і співробітництва та передбачені методикою розрахунку рівня економічної безпеки України в частині порогових значень індикаторів. Основними макроекономічними шоками, що мали місце у 2008–2016 рр. та вплинули на динаміку індикаторів стійкості, є: номінальні: скорочення валютної пропозиції та девальвація гривні; зростання зовнішнього боргу; реальні: скорочення рівня ВВП та обсягу товарообороту в країні; попиту: скорочення внутрішнього інвестування економіки; дефіцит зовнішньоторговельного і платіжного балансу; пропозиції: зростання податкових ставок за платежами до бюджету.

Шоківі впливи швидко поширювалися і мультиплікувалися в секторі ЗДУ та в економіці загалом.

Висновки. На основі проведеного дослідження запропоновано шляхи підвищення рівня стійкості сектора загальнодержавного управління: для покриття бюджетного дефіциту державі необхідно забезпечити пошук реальних резервів збільшення доходів бюджету, створити платникам податків сприятливі умови для розвитку їхньої діяльності; досягти надійності прогнозу основних макроекономічних показників, на основі яких формуються дохідна й видаткова частини державного бюджету, обсягів і темпів зростання ВВП, темпів інфляції, валютного курсу; бюджетні кошти слід використовувати переважно для державних цільових програм, спрямованих на економічний розвиток; вдосконалити механізми здійснення державних запозичень та погашення державного боргу.

Ключові слова: стійкість економіки, сектор загальнодержавного управління, національна економіка, державні фінанси, шоківі впливи.