

Продовження таблиці 1

1	2	3	4	5	6
Луганська	0,393	0,340	0,387	0,866	1,139
Львівська	0,527	0,567	0,571	1,075	1,008
Миколаївська	0,448	0,463	0,493	1,032	1,066
Одеська	0,437	0,469	0,456	1,072	0,972
Полтавська	0,579	0,533	0,528	0,921	0,992
Рівненська	0,450	0,509	0,464	1,131	0,911
Сумська	0,451	0,468	0,443	1,036	0,948
Тернопільська	0,462	0,492	0,511	1,064	1,040
Харківська	0,567	0,579	0,538	1,020	0,930
Херсонська	0,367	0,403	0,403	1,098	0,998
Хмельницька	0,466	0,508	0,497	1,090	0,978
Черкаська	0,458	0,460	0,464	1,006	1,007
Чернівецька	0,464	0,534	0,535	1,150	1,002
Чернігівська	0,358	0,409	0,407	1,144	0,994

* джерело: розрахунки авторів на основі [2-3]

Аналізуючи динаміку інтегрального індикатору сталого розвитку на основі індексу росту за 2014-2015 рр. можемо сказати, що в більшості регіонів спостерігається тенденція до зростання, і лише в Донецькій, Київській, Луганській та Полтавській областях значення показника зменшилось. Щодо індексу росту за 2015-2016 рр., то здебільшого значення індикатору значно знизилось в переважній кількості областей, порівняно з попереднім періодом. Наприклад, в Чернівецькій, Черкаській, Львівській та Івано-Франківській областях показник залишається стабільним, без значних коливань, тоді як в Донецькій, Луганській, Миколаївській і Київській областях спостерігається зростання значення індикатора. Якщо порівнювати аналізовані періоди для Чернігівської області, то можна сказати, що індекс росту індикатора сталого розвитку зменшився на 0,15.

Управління станом регіону як відкритою динамічною системою, вимагає постійного контролю за дотриманням основних параметрів його розвитку в межах певних інтервалів. У контексті сталого розвитку ці параметри можна вважати соціо-еколого-економічними стандартами, тобто еталонами, які не можна порушувати, а тому їх необхідно постійно контролювати.

Отже, ситуація вимагає додаткового дослідження з метою розрахунку комплексної системи заходів підвищення індикаторів сталого розвитку регіонів України.

Список використаних джерел

1. Шкарупа, Олена Василівна. Еколого-економічна оцінка стану регіону в контексті екологічно сталого розвитку: Автореф. дис ... канд. екон.наук / О. В. Шкарупа . – Суми : Б. в., 2008 . – 21 с.
2. Соціальні індикатори рівня життя населення. Статистичний збірник / Державна служба статистики України. - К.:ТОВ «Август Трейд», 2017. - 198 с.
3. Регіони України. Статистичний збірник [Електронне джерело] – Режим доступу: <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/>

Inna Khomenko, Economics (Dr.), associate professor,
Professor of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Economics,
Julia Kryvolap, student of group EPt-171
Chernihiv National University of Technology (Chernihiv, Ukraine)

THE STATE OF INNOVATIVE ACTIVITIES IN UKRAINE AND THE WORLD: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

The development of society and economic stability depend on the effective development of scientific and technological progress in the country. The processes of innovation require the study and analysis of the current state and prospects for the introduction of innovations in enterprises. This is necessary for assessing the efficiency of the regions of Ukraine, introducing innovations by economic entities and their impact on the development of regions and the country's economy as a whole.

Among the last published works in which the peculiarities of innovative processes in the Ukrainian economy were analyzed, we can mention the works of such researchers: Cherep AV, Yurkevich O. M., Reznik N.P., Androsova O.F., Ilyashenko S.M., Mikitiuk P.P., Seniv B.G. and other.

Over the past few years, the theme of innovation has captured the corporate and political spheres of the planet. For two consecutive years, the World Economic Forum in Davos is devoted to the Fourth Industrial Revolution and its consequences in all spheres.

Global institutions see technology as the main driver of development and the main condition for the survival of companies and countries. However, Ukrainian business is mostly local. He is almost uninterested in the essence of global processes, the role of innovation and the possibilities for their implementation, while officials are destroying the remnants of the country's innovative potential.

At the technological level, Ukraine's industry is one third behind the EU indicators, with a share of high-tech production in exports lagging behind by 4-8 times, and energy efficiency by 10. Due to the introduction of new technologies, GDP growth in Ukraine is 0.7% against the 60-90% in the developed countries of the world. During the years of independence, the number of researchers in the field of technical sciences in Ukraine has decreased by 3.5 times. The development of new types of technology has decreased by 14.3 times, and the share of innovation-active industrial enterprises is 5 times higher.[8]

Government programs have recently appeared in Ukraine, which propose the transition of the economy to the innovative way of development, as well as state support for innovation, in addition, the draft innovation code of Ukraine is considered, and the creation of a National Venture Company is being discussed. Despite the fact that both the Ukrainian government and academics agree that innovative processes are in a bad situation, since there are no significant changes in this area for many years. There is no innovation development strategy in Ukraine, and the international experts "Digital Advent 2020" has been in the Cabinet for more than half a year.

Worldwide research expenditures from 1998 to 2013 doubled in Western countries, while in South Asia, spending on science grew 4.4 times over the same period, almost twice overtaking global GDP growth. At the same time, most of these costs - money does not state, but business. It should be noted that among the countries of the European Union, Portugal has the lowest indicators of innovation activity - 26% and Greece - 29%, but even these indicators are twice as high as in Ukraine. Compared to countries with countries such as the Netherlands (62%), Austria (67%), Germany (69%), Denmark (71%) and Ireland (74%), this gap with Ukraine is almost five times.

A global survey of company executives in 2017 showed that half of companies believe that innovation activity has a significant effect on revenue growth due to sales growth. Every fifth innovation leader is expecting an increase of 15% in the next five years.[9]

Innovation of the company is also a significant factor in the influx or outflow of talent. Deloitte has found that two thirds of young employees in the world are going to change their jobs in the next three years, and Dell and Intel's research has shown that two out of five will go through low-tech companies.

Ukraine in the global innovation rating of Global Innovation Index in 2017 ranked 50th place, with the component components of the index - "innovative communications", "assimilation of technologies", "creative goods and services", "influence of knowledge" - Ukrainian business is on very low positions. It is not surprising that in the Global Competitiveness Rating of the Global Innovation Index the country ranked 85th out of 138.

This situation is influenced by the macroeconomic environment, politics, and the conditions for doing business. But unlike these factors, the introduction of innovations is in the hands of owners and business managers. Moreover, in spite of the crisis, Ukraine has effective tools for introducing technological innovations.

Innovative economy requires a high level of science that provides for the development of new developments, a system of market testing and the selection of cost-effective developments, as well as mechanisms for organizing new production on their basis. Effective innovation activity is possible only on condition of mutually beneficial partnership between the state and business.

Separately, neither the state nor the business is able to translate the economy into an innovative way. World experience shows that the financing of research and development is carried out at the expense of the state, business participation is limited to a small number of specific orders. Organization of production is the prerogative of business; the state predominantly acts as a regulator.

The implementation of innovations can only be done in business, since the buyer is an entrepreneur whose competition forces to make changes, or an entrepreneur who creates a new business. Moreover, the first realizes innovation only in the event that it does not satisfy the position of the company on the market and in order to achieve a competitive advantage, he is ready to take risks. Those companies that have a stable position in the market and do not experience a particular pressure from competitors do not need "breakthrough" innovations, only evolutionary improvements are enough to manage such enterprises.

Due to the lack of appropriate innovation infrastructure, targeted state programs, transparency of business conditions for the future, leave innovative ideas at the level of ideas that are often implemented outside Ukraine. Functioning special zones, technology parks, innovation funds pursue a variety of goals, which often have no relation to business results.

The Law of Ukraine "On Innovation Activity" states that innovations are newly created or improved competitive technologies, products or services, as well as organizational and technical decisions of an industrial, administrative, commercial or other nature that significantly improve the structure and quality of production of the social sphere. Therefore, innovation is considered as a separate category, which is characterized by its own value, but the commercial effect of the innovation is not determined.

In addition to protecting their own products and services from counterfeiting, the patents of companies bring a significant income when implemented. According to experts, the patent portfolio of Microsoft is more expensive than the IBM, since the value of innovation is determined not so much by their quantity but by high quality.

In recent years, in the list of the best innovative companies, more and more large software and computer software manufacturers, according to Fascon magazine, in 2011 the list of leaders is headed by Apple, Twitter and Facebook.

Features of the activities of large innovative companies that determine the nature of their growth, is considered in the work of K. Christensen. Here are some of these features.

- the activities of large companies are aimed at obtaining high profits by their investors, the production of products that is in demand from consumers, so they can face the problem of financing radical developments that are not very interested in the consumer due to the lack of development of the market.
- in order to maintain high capitalization and attract new investments, they need sustained growth, which is ensured by high incomes; therefore, such companies are oriented towards major markets. At the same time, the steady state of the company is determined by its current short-term indicators.
- the successful implementation of large-scale investment projects requires qualitative analysis and planning, which is easier to do on the existing, rather than new market, which is difficult to predict.

Completely different problems arise in small innovative enterprises. The substantiation of the experience of the operation and development of innovative companies shows that many of them started their activities from small businesses, violating the steady state of large companies in the market. Small businesses can have a significant impact on the development of the economy, if so-called "subversive" technologies are applied, with the creation of completely new proposals that change the market. Breakthrough technologies are generally not included in the current commercial interests of large players in the market, and many innovative products are brought to market stage in small firms, which over time, after market selection, can take leading positions, such as the company Silion Graphics, Netscape Telecommunication, Google, Skype, which have become leaders in their segments.[10]

Consequently, a favorable environment for the development and growth of small innovative forms, which would allow the idea to be brought forward to the stage of production, is one of the most important conditions for an effective implementation of the strategy of innovative development of the state.

At the same time, the policy of development of small innovative business should be focused on solving problems of financing such companies. At the initial stage of development, they do not have sufficient own resources for development, they are limited in lending opportunities, including due to lack of collateral, their activities are characterized by increased risks, the period for returning to profitable activities of the project often exceeds 23 years.

According to the report "Innovation Capacity Index 20102011, Ukraine ranked 61st in the ranking in 2011. Kazakhstan and Russia occupy 54 and 56 seats, respectively, with Poland remaining 40th in place, as in the previous period, with a steady increase in Azerbaijan. the country rose from 74 to 50 in the ranking due to strengthening its position in all sub-indexes, especially in terms of "Institutional environment", "Quality of normative legal provision" and "Conditions for research and development" [1-4].

Leaders on the Innovation Capacity Index 20102011 pp. There are Sweden, Switzerland and Singapore. The United States and Canada rank 5th and 7th respectively, Germany is 20th and France ranked 24th. In addition, in 20102011 pp. Indonesia showed a significant growth, rising to 11 positions to 77 places, as well as Brazil, which moved from 87 to 81 place. India lost 3 positions and took 88th place, Argentina, having shifted by 2 positions, took 68th place.

Solving the problems of financing small innovative enterprises is most often associated with the use of venture investment mechanisms. Venture capital has become one of the main tools for the growth of Western companies, due to the venture financing of such companies as DEC, Apple, Copaq, Sun, Microsoft, Intel, Silicon Group, Google, Skype. Venture financing is also used by EU countries, Taiwan, China, Israel and others.

More than 600 venture funds are registered in Ukraine, more than 100 of them operate, but their activity is mainly construction, trade in energy resources, some funds are financing other traditional projects or small food innovations [8]. Such activity of domestic venture funds is evidence of the lack of incentives to invest in innovative projects at high risk. So far, domestic venture capital is not investing in innovative projects, since investments in certain sectors of the traditional economy have a rather high level of profitability in relatively short terms of investment and in a low level of risk; the organizational form of venture funds performs an "instrumental" function, which allows to optimize taxation lawfully way.

A positive shift in the domestic innovation business sector could be the adoption of the Law "On Venture Funds for Innovation Development". To date, there is its project, where the first attempt is made to determine the legal framework for the creation of a new financial instrument that would ensure that the direction of investment flows into innovative sectors of the economy. Such a tool should be venture funds for innovation development.

The development of the venture industry in Ukraine is hampered by the following negative factors: weak legislative framework, lack of investment resources (according to current legislation, individuals and institutional investors can not invest in venture funds), stock market weakness and lack of guarantees for a venture investor that would restrict its risks, underdevelopment of the informal sector of venture business.

The recently adopted Tax Code further complicates the situation: there are no provisions for such an element of innovation infrastructure as technology parks, interrupted by the interaction of small enterprises using the simplified taxation system, and other legal entities. Declared tax breaks for some industries (ship and aircraft) do not solve the problem, as these industries are loss making, so they can not use their profits for their own development soon. In connection with the above, the implementation of the National Program for the Promotion of Small Business Development in Ukraine is still problematic. Conclusions The state should be the main source of funding for the development of scientific and technological activities and innovation. An important factor for raising the innovation level of Ukraine is the development and application of advanced technologies and high-tech products.

In the course of the study, it was found that, compared with European countries in Ukraine, the share of enterprises using information from state research institutes and universities is higher in their activity. But the percentage of innovative enterprises using their own or private sources of information (consultants and advisory associations) is higher than the percentage of those using public sector information, which indicates that the link between the public and the business sector is rather limited.

In addition to the financial obstacles of innovative enterprises (insufficient funds in the middle of the organization and increased competition in the markets), there are problems finding partners for cooperation.

Accordingly, one can conclude that the legislative framework for closer cooperation between the state and business sectors should be developed, since Ukraine will only be economically stable and well-developed with effective, stimulating enterprise development.

REFERENCES

1. Burlaka V. Priorities of Innovation Development in the Ukrainian Economy / V. Burlak // Business Bulletin. 2010. - No. 12 (199) [Electronic resource]. - Access mode: <http://www.ucci.org.ua/synoppsi/dv/2010/dv1012131.u.html>.
2. Semenov AS, Venture financing of innovation activity / AS Semenov, AI Kashirin // Innovations. - 2006. - No. 1. - P. 2937.
3. About the Recommendations of the Parliamentary Hearings on the theme: "The Strategy of Ukraine's Innovation Development for 2010-2020 in the context of Globalization Challenges": Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine // Bulletin of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. - 2011. - No. 11.
4. Law of Ukraine "On Innovation Activity" No. 40IV of June 4, 2002 [Electronic resource]. - Access mode: <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?Nreg=4015>.
5. Dezhina, I.G. Mechanisms of stimulation of commercialization of researches and developments / I.G.Dezhina, B.G. Saltykov. - Moscow: IETP, 2004.
6. Official Website of the US Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) [Electronic resource]. - Access mode: <http://www.uspto.gov>.
7. Christensen K. Dilemma Innovator / K. Christensen. M.: Alpina Business Bouks, 2004.
8. Official UAIB website [Electronic resource]. - Mode of access: <http://www.uaib.com.ua>.
9. The Tax Code of Ukraine dated 02.12.2010 №2755VI [Electronic resource]. - Access mode: <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?Nreg=275517>.
10. The Innovation fir Development Report. [Electronic resource] Access mode: <http://www.innovationfordevelopmentreport.org/ici.html>
11. Shkarlet, S. M. Actual problems of formation and funding of the state road funds / S. M. Shkarlet, I. O. Khomenko, V. V. Kontseva // Науковий вісник Полісся. - 2017. - № 3 (11). Ч. 1. - С.16-20.
12. Хоменко І.О. Перспективи впровадження і фінансування проектів державно-приватного партнерства у сфері транспортної інфраструктури / І.О. Хоменко, І.О. Середюк, С. М. Козловська // Фінансові дослідження. - 2017. - № 2 (2). - С.47-53.
13. Khomenko, I. O. Current state and features of financing of the road sector/ I. O. Khomenko, V. V. Kontseva, A. O. Bezuglyi // Науковий вісник Полісся. - 2017. - № 4 (12). Ч.2. - С. 201-205.
14. The Global0 Competiveness Reports 2012-2013 [Electronic Resource]. Access mode: [http://www.weforum.org/docs/WEFGlobal Competiveness Reports 2012](http://www.weforum.org/docs/WEFGlobal%20Competiveness%20Reports%202012).