УДК:

FOREIGN EXPERIENCE OF THE STATE REGULATION OF THE INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT AND THE EXPEDIENCY OF ITS USAGE IN UKRAINE

Viktoria Verbovytska[1]

The national economy should provide a transparent fast movement of goods, capital, finance, without the shadow economy and corruption. National Ministry is unable to provide such treatment conditions in our society. The main problem is the lack national innovative systems that would ensure increased production, improvement of scientific and technological progress, increased competitiveness and more.

Completion of the research used modern domestic scholars in the field on issues of regulation of innovation development - M. Dmytrenko, O. Novodon, M. Voynarenko A. Skull, L. Oleynikova, O. Cherep, as well as foreign scholars - Brzezinski Z., Drucker P., Porat M. and Toffler A. and others.

At the present stage the innovation development of the economy belongs to the main state priorities of the domestic policy such highly developed countries like the USA, Japan, the European Union and several countries in South East Asia.

In countries that hold the leadership in the global economy and policy, economic policy, providing innovative growth, is characterized by the following features: forecasting, strategy definition and programming of the national economic and technological development in the long term perspective(at least 15-20 years); participation in the formation of the single world scientific and technological space and market high-tech products; consolidation in the market of high-tech products on the basis of the technological specialization (which reflects the development of critical technologies in the country); the formation of the national innovation systems integrated internationally - these systems cover the full range of institutions that ensure the generation of knowledge and innovation, development and commercialization of new technologies; active government support conditions that enhance the quality of human resources (human capital);close cooperation between business and the state, active economic diplomacy and promotion regime the development of new segments of the global market.

Ukraine has to overcome the impact of high rivalry, growing in terms of the integration process, to build an effective NIS. The desire of the more active international scientific and technological cooperation of Ukraine requires the development of the appropriate state innovation policy that takes into account the experience and success of the European Union [1].

The practice of research the questions on NIS development confirms the need to strengthen the technological competitiveness of the country, due to the development of new mechanisms for innovation and technological improvement of the national economy. These innovative factors will serve to create conditions for the formation, accumulation and effective usage of knowledge, technology and investment resources that provide the full range of competitive benefits of the technological advance in one or more areas of the technological leadership of the country as a whole.

In terms of the integration of Ukraine into the European Union, the experience of countries that joined the European Union continues to be very valuable; countries with "small economies," which have had successful adaptation to the EU levels are of special interest.

[1] *студ. Кіровоградський національний технічний університет*
Науковий керівник: Савіцька І.М., асистент Кіровоградський національний технічний університет

Despite the fact that Ukraine cannot be attributed to the countries with small economies, peculiarities of the innovative development of the countries with the small economy of Northern, Western and Central Europe who were able to achieve high knowledge intensity of GDP (over 2.7%), causing some interest. Their economies are characterized by a high level of involvement of both the business and state sector financing of the ID; in the countries with middle (below 2%) and low knowledge intensity of GDP (less than 1%) contribution of the state sector in the ID compared to the more significant contributions to the business sector; a high level of involvement in the process of internationalization of the ID; the ID concentration in several sectors (pharmaceuticals, automotive industry, radio, television and telecommunication equipment, computer and related services); enhancing the role of the university sector in the implementation of the ID; a transition towards a broad application of indirect incentives along with measures to stimulate direct the ID. This made it possible to identify three models of the stimulation of the innovative development of the European countries to develop practical recommendations to improve the mechanism for implementing the innovative development of Ukraine:

1) Scandinavian model - developed institutional environment; high level of the involvement of the business and state sector in the financing of the ID; the prominent role of the university sector in the implementation of the ID; the specialization of the ID as in high and middle-technological areas and low-tech; the use of direct measures of the stimulation (financing of new high-tech companies in the presowing stage, innovative procurement and grants aimed at supporting innovative start-ups, public-private partnerships in strategic areas of the innovation vouchers for risk assessment of the innovative projects;

2) Western European model - the continuous improvement of the institutional environment; the prevalence of the business sector in the financing of the ID; a significant proportion of the university sector in the implementation of the ID; the concentration of the ID in the middle-technological industries; a combination of direct (loans, guarantees to banks for loans and grants to support entrepreneurship, establishment of spin-offs and start-ups, innovation vouchers) and indirect (investment incentives, tax deductions aimed at technology transfer and the creation of new innovative small and medium enterprises (SMEs), tax relief on expenditure on research and development incentives;

3) Central Europe model - developed institutional environment; a high proportion of the state sector in the financing of the ID from foreign sources; a significant proportion of the state sector in the implementation of the ID; the concentration of the ID in the middle-technological areas where large multinational corporations operate, and low innovation activity of the domestic firms; the transition towards the use of indirect incentives (tax deductions aimed at attracting foreign direct investment (FDI) in the ID, the development of the innovation infrastructure, stimulating cooperation between enterprises and research institutes) in the aftermath of the global financial crisis, along with direct measures (privileged guarantees on loans from financial subsidy to pay interest on the loan, innovation vouchers, grants and subsidies for joint investment projects on technical equipment for SMEs) [2, p.44-45].

However, the innovativeness of the EU countries, despite the presence of the economic crisis, increases every year, but the gap between the leaders and those who are behind, also continues to grow. This follows from the Innovation Scoreboard of 2013, published by the European Commission, showing the positions of individual states – members of the EU. In the Innovation Scoreboard of 2013 states – members of the EU are divided into four groups: Innovation leaders: Sweden, Germany, Denmark and Finland - countries that achieved results significantly higher than the EU average; countries that are catching up with the leaders: the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Belgium, the United Kingdom, Austria, Ireland, France, Slovenia, Cyprus and Estonia - all countries with results above the EU average; moderate innovators: Italy, Spain, Portugal, Czech Republic, Greece, Slovakia, Hungary, Malta, Lithuania – the result is below the EU average; innovators with modest results: Poland, Latvia, Romania and Bulgaria, which have much lower results than the EU average. Poland in recent years has allocated more

funds to support innovation [3].

So, the negative impacts on the formation and development of the innovative component in the economic structure in many countries, including the EU countries also have economic and political crises of global and local character. Especially clearly this is manifested in the current period due to events in the south and east of Ukraine. Economic and political crises that have developed in Ukraine in early 2014, at the end of the year continued to deepen. The scale and duration of these crises dominate all previous crises that affected the economy of Ukraine. At the same time economies of the members of the EU, the USA, Russia and some other countries suffered heavy losses.

References

1. Levchenko O.M. (2009). Profesionalnyi potentsial: rehuliatorni mekhanizmy innovatsiinoho rozvytku [Professional potential: regulatory mechanisms of innovation development]. Kirovohrad: KOD **[in Ukrainian].**
2. Titarenko H. Analysis of foreign experience of the state regulation of the innovation development and the expediency of its usage in Ukraine // Problems of Science. - 2014. - № 11- 12. - P. 44-45).
3. http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/