
332.142+351.72

: , 2018, 2 (98), . 33-51

• •

, .
- -
, -
- -
- -
,
- -
1996-1998 .
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -
; ;
; ; - ; - ;
- -
; -
: , 2018, 2 (98)

2000-

2012 .

2014 .

-

, - -

. , -

. -

. -

. -

. -

, -

. -

, -

, -

, -

. -

.

-

-

.

-

, , -

-

-

. -



, , , -
 , ,
 , . -
 , , -
 , .
 , -
 . -
 (-
). -

[1].

, . -
 1 -
 . -
 , -
 . -
 - -



, , . -
-
-
-
-
-

1990-

, [2; 7].
[3; 8; 9].

, -
-
-
-
-

, -
-
-
-

2.

, -
-
-
-
-

2009 2015 .,

2

: - (, -
/ -
-

). – URL: <http://www.politika.su/reg/donory.html> .

«... 10, 2006 2015 ., 25 14: 2001 . (19)»³ –

« – »

« 20 : [6]. . . : «

³ – 10 // . – 2017. – 15 . – URL: <https://www.vedomosti.ru/economics/articles/2017/04/05/684215-regionov-donorov> .

» [6, . XIV].

, -
.
, (, ,).
, -
, :
• ; -
• ;
• ;
• ;
• ;
• ; -
• ;
• .
,
1996–1998 . , -
.
, -
.
50% , 30 , -
(.1). -
-
.
1996 . 1998 . , -
,

(. . 2 3).

2

1998 ., %

		-	
	2,9	4,0	4,6
-	33,7	5,5	5,0
	56,7	20,3	20,5
.	50,8	10,4	13,9
-	2,2	5,7	4,2
-	2,3	5,4	3,7
	4,2	11,5	11,0
-	6,4	11,6	6,1
	4,9	13,9	14,2
-	7,4	10,3	16,8
-	4,0	6,2	7,0
	5,0	5,0	6,5

: [6].

1998 ., %

		-	
():
	4,5	7,4	3,7
	15,1	26,2	18,1
	15,0	24,5	21,2
	12,3	22,4	23,9
	55,1	19,4	33,1
:			
	67,3	49,8	60,5
	48,7	5,9	10,9
	9,6	17,6	14,6
	23,1	32,6	24,9

: [6].

:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

2000-

.3, , -
, , -
:
:
, , -
, , -
2000- , -
:
[7]. , -
, -
, -
, -
, -
, -
[5]. , -
, , -
4. , -
4 , -
4 : -
- 2011. - 4;

		, %					
		2013	2014	2016	2020	2025	2030
(-	36,9	35,1	34,4	34,6	33,6	32,7
(-	37,6	35,8	34,9	34,7	33,6	33,0
/		-0,7	-0,7	-0,5	0,1	0,0	-0,3
		19,3	18,2	17,4	16,6	15,4	14,2
		19,8	18,7	18,0	17,0	15,7	14,5
/		-0,5	-0,5	-0,6	-0,4	-0,3	-0,3
		12,7	12,6	12,4	12,5	12,6	12,9
		13,0	12,8	12,5	12,5	12,5	13,0
/		-0,3	-0,1	-0,02	0,0	0,1	-0,1

2018 2019 2020 / . - ., 2017. -
 URL: http://komitet-bn.km.duma.gov.ru/upload/site7/ONBNiTTP_v_GD_03.07.17.pdf .

2030 , -
 -
 2013 . (.4),
 () 4,2 . .
 (36,9 32,7%).
 9% 2013 . 4,7%
 // :
 . - 2013. - 3 (79).

2030 . ,

1,52 1,1.

2000-

[4].

2013–2014 .,

2015–2016 .

2016 .

,	,	-	,
,	,	,	-
,	,	-	-
-	,	,	-
,	,	-	-
,	,	,	,
,	,	,	,
,	,	,	-
,	,	,	-
,	,	,	-
,	,	-	,
,	,	-	-
,	,	-	,
,	()	,	-
-	,	,	,
,	,	,	,
2016 .	2015 .	.	-
	40	,	
54	.		
-	,		-
,	,	()	-
.	372,6	- 23,63%	-
.	.		-
.	.		-
,			-
,	-	,	-
,	,		-
2,78	1,58	2016 .	-
1,2	.	.	-

2011–2016 . (. 5)

2011–2016 ..

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
	20,86	23,44	24,44	26,77	26,92	28,18
	15,21	16,98	17,91	19,33	21,06	23,34
-	6,00	6,44	6,65	7,23	7,69	8,35
-	1,64	1,62	1,52	1,67	1,62	1,58
,	9,21	10,54	11,26	12,10	13,37	14,99
, %	39,4	37,9	37,1	37,4	36,5	35,8
, %	10,8	9,5	8,5	8,6	7,7	6,8

2018 2019 2020 / .- ., 2017. -
 URL: http://komitet-bn.km.duma.gov.ru/upload/site7/ONBNiTTP_v_GD_03.07.17.pdf .

,

20

,

,

,

.

,

,

.

,

.

,

,

,

,

1. URL: <http://www.apn.ru/opinions/article19459.htm> (: 12.01.2018).
2. : « , » // . – 2001. – 4. – . 32–51.
3. : // : . – 2014. – 1 (81). – . 242–256.
4. . – 2015. – 244 .
5. « – » / . – : - , 2017. – 296 .
6. : , 1999. – 288 .
7. / . – 2001. – 17 .
8. „ „ . – 2017. – 9. – . 63–82.
9. *Lavrovskii B.L., Goryushkina E.A.* Characteristic features of government control over Russia's spatial development // Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences. – 2017. – Vol. 87, No. 4. – P. 370–377.

(,) – -
,
(630090, -
, 17, e-mail: klistorin@ieie.nsc.ru);
-
(630090, , . , 1).
:
, 2018, 2 (98) 49

V.I. Klistorin

INTERLEVEL FINANCIAL FLOWS IN THE BUDGETARY SYSTEM OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The article examines direct and reverse financial flows between the regions and the government. It considers objectives of regional and budgetary policies and discusses methodical problems of estimating the size of financial flows and their interchangeability. We share a view that donor regions and recipient regions should be defined by balance surplus or deficit on all interlevel financial flows, not only based on gratuitous receipts or transfers from the federal budget. This approach makes it possible to eliminate partly the changes in budget legislation as related to allocating financial assistance to the regions. A comparison of the 1996–1998 and present studies shows that the number of donor regions has slightly increased over the period of review. We prove that the consolidation of public finances in Russia has not resulted in a significant decrease in differentiating the levels of regional development. The article reveals a trend: inter-budgetary transfers are partially replaced by direct expenses paid from the federal budget.

Keywords: consolidated budget; financial flows; transfers; direct expenses; donor regions; recipient regions; centralization of financial resources

The publication is prepared within the priority XI.173 (project No. XI.173.1.1) according to the research plan of the IEIE SB RAS

References

1. *Delyagin, M.* (2008). Goskorporatsii: korruptsiya pod vidom modernizatsii. Ekonomicheskoe esse o novykh formakh kontrolya nad aktivami [State-owned corporations: corruption disguised as modernization. Economic essay on new forms of asset control]. Available at: <http://www.apn.ru/opinions/article19459.htm> (date of access: 12.01.2018).

2. *Lavrov, A., J. Litwack & D. Sutherland.* (2001). Reforma mezhbyudzhetykh otnošeniy v Rossii: «federalizm, sozdayushchiy rynek» [Reform of intergovernmental fiscal relations: «federalism building up the market»]. *Voprosy ekonomiki* [Problems of Economics], 4, 32–51.

3. *Lavrovskiy, B.L., E.A. Goryushkina & I.A. Murzov.* (2014). Nalogovo-byudzhetye otnošeniya: sibirskoe napravlenie [Federal fiscal policy for Siberian regions]. *Region: ekonomika i sotsiologiya* [Region: Economics and Sociology], 1, 242–256.

4. *Primakov, E.M.* (2015). Rossiya. Nadezhdy i trevogi [Russia. Hope and Anxiety]. Moscow, Tsentrpoligraf Publ., 244.

5. *Suspitsyn, S.A. & V.V. Kuleshov* (Ed.). (2017). *Metody i modeli koordinatsii dolgosrochnykh resheniy v sisteme «natsionalnaya ekonomika – regiony»* [Methods and Models for Coordinating Long-term Decisions within the «National Economy – Regions» System]. Novosibirsk, Institute of Economics and Industrial Engineering SB RAS Publ., 296.

6. *Makushkin, A.G., A.M. Lavrov, L.N. Bogdanov et al.* (1999). *Federalnyy byudzhety i regiony: opyt analiza finansovykh potokov* [Federal Budget and Regions: Experience in Analyzing Finance Protocols]. Moscow, MAKS Press Publ., 288.

7. *Khristenko, V.B.* (2001). Razvitiye byudzhetnogo federalizma v Rossii: ot razdeleniya deneg k razdeleniyu polnomochiy [The development of fiscal federalism in Russia: from dividing money to separating powers]. *Rossiyskaya gazeta* [Russian Gazette], February 17.

8. *Yushkov, A., N. Oding & L. Savulkin.* (2017). Sudby rossiyskikh regionov-donorov [The trajectories of donor regions in Russia]. *Voprosy ekonomiki* [Problems of Economics], 9, 63–82.

9. *Lavrovskii, B.L. & E.A. Goryushkina.* (2017). Characteristic features of government control over Russia's spatial development. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 87, No. 4, 370–377.

Information about the author

Klistorin, Vladimir Ilyich (Novosibirsk, Russia) – Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Leading Researcher at the Institute of Economics and Industrial Engineering, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (17, Ac. Lavrentiev av., Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia, e-mail: klistorin@ieie.nsc.ru); Professor at Novosibirsk National Research State University (1, Pirogova st., Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia).

26.02.2018 .

© . . ., 2018