



ISSN 1648-2603 (print)
ISSN 2029-2872 (online)

VIEŠOJI POLITIKA IR ADMINISTRAVIMAS
PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
2019, T. 18, Nr. 4 / 2019, Vol. 18, No 4, p. 377–394.

GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT INDEX AS INDICATOR OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT OF OECD MEMBER COUNTRIES DEVELOPMENT

Karamyshev, Dmytro V.

Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy
for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine;
61001, Kharkiv, 75 Moskovsky Avenue, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1617-3240>

DOI: 10.13165/VPA-19-18-4-01

Abstract. *This paper substantiates both the overall theme and the specific details of applying the system for assessment of global social development, based on the Global Governance concept. It emphasizes the need to form a system of global development indicators and to develop an indicator that could characterize global development in terms of its current condition, dynamics, and its capacity to exert a regulating impact on the global development of different countries of the world. This could then be used for determining the strategic guidelines of nation states' development.*

An original approach has been proposed to measure a balanced development on the basis of an aggregate index – an integrated global development index which was named 'Global Index GI-10'. The possibilities of using GI-10 as a global development indicator, taking the OECD countries as an example, are discussed on the premise of a correlation between socio-political, socio-humanitarian, and economic and technological components, in order to achieve the relevant coordinated global objectives on a common-value basis.

The results of a complex integrated assessment of the OECD countries' development testify to a high overall development index within this organization, which indicates the efficiency of the regulating impact of OECD on the world integration processes. The Global Index GI-10 can be used both as an integrated developmental index of an individual country, and a Global Governance performance indicator at the level of inter-state associations under transformational conditions.

Keywords: *global development, global governance, global development indicators, integrated index of global development, OECD member countries.*

Raktiniai žodžiai: *globali plėtra, globalus valdymas, globalios plėtros rodikliai, integruotas globalios plėtros indeksas, EBPO šalys.*

Introduction

The paradigm of global development in the twenty-first century is characterized by the juxtaposition between the need to preserve individual countries' identities whilst the struggle for control over resources essential to sustaining life continues. Global governance entities include countries that claim to be world leaders, and involve the most powerful states economically and militarily that possess large potential and advanced technologies.

The need for nation states to effectively meet the challenges of globalization stipulates a joint use of these countries' potentials in order to address the problems of living in a globalized social space, all the while preserving diversity. Hence, there is a need for integration of nation states into a community built on certain cooperation principles, with the aim of creating a world actor that makes decisions – in particular those that increase its own significance and competitiveness in the arena of interstate relations (Karamyshev 2018a; Karamyshev 2018b).

Consequently, under these transformational conditions, the resolution of conflict between social needs and opportunities should be seen as the key issue of global social development, as well as the establishment of strategic guidelines for the development of individual national states. This should be included in the framework of global political entities which have the status of international intergovernmental organizations that influence decisions on global developmental problems.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The classics in the world political thought, such as Z. Brzezinski (1997), S. Huntington (1996), P. Kennedy (1993), G. Soros (1998), I. Wallerstein (1992) and others, scrutinized the essence and peculiarities of the transformation of geopolitical processes and world order models. They consider the way in which these models reflect a change in the ratio of civilizational potentials of both individual countries and formal or informal interstate entities integrating them, including by the principle of comparing their aggregate development indices.

Numerous studies testify that solving the problem of the conflict between social needs and opportunities in turn requires establishing an effective system of global governance based on a multilevel public governance of global development. This should be provided in accordance with the Global Governance principles (Baranovsky and Ivanova 2015; Karamyshev 2018a; Karamyshev 2018b; Sokolenko 2000; Ursul 2014; Chumakov 2010; Rhodes 2010; Rosenau 2004; Thakur et al. 2006; Hughes and Wilkinson 2003).

It should be noted that today there are practically no studies that integrate: the problems of forming a system for governing global development; the features of the present stage of its formation or its functioning mechanisms; understanding of its socio-political

essence in terms of modern concepts; value orientations and consensus-based strategic global development guides; or evaluation of its effectiveness taking both individual countries and global interstate entities as examples. The available publications contain the analysis of only some aspects or constituent components of the problem area in question (Gerasina et al. 2015; Ozhevan et al. 2004; Ursul 2014; Groom and Powell 1994; Schweikina 2007; Yerina 2016).

The positioning of individual countries and global interstate entities within the system of international ratings of sustainable, socio-economic, social, innovative, and human development has become a subject of research for a wide circle of scientists, including those in the post-Soviet space (Yerina 2016; Nebava 2009a, 2009b; Okara et al. 2018; Sadkov and Grekov 2006; Fedulova 2009). However, despite a fairly significant number of publications devoted to these issues, there is still a lack of systemic research on the integrated approach to assessing the effectiveness of governing global development. This presupposes not only availability of indicators of the condition and dynamics of the social development in the above areas, but also the possibilities of a comprehensive assessment of the regulatory impact on the global development in different countries as part of global governance. From this perspective, it is clear that as a tool for comparing the results of assessment of various development indicators, including the statistical ones, a universal information-analytical system for social development should be developed. This should include integrated developmental dominants, indicators, and characteristics complying with the global values of the world community in the twenty-first century (Karamyshev 2018a; Karamyshev 2018b).

The present paper objective is the identification of approaches to the system of assessing global social development, a search for relevant development indicators, and the introduction of an integrated global development index (GI-10), which characterizes the state of social development, its dynamics, and possibilities of the regulatory impact on global development in different countries of the world. With that, it is expedient to take into account the operational experience and global impacts of different interstate entities, in particular the ranking of OECD member countries in international ratings. The specification of the measurements and the results of the integrated assessment of the global development of OECD member countries, which could be used as an indicator for Global Governance, is useful in particular for determining the strategic development guidelines for individual nation states. This can include both advanced states and those embarking upon the path towards the democratic transformation of their societies and the social orientation of their market economies.

Presentation of the main material

Today, the role of recognized political entities with the status of international intergovernmental organizations that indirectly influence the designing of solutions to global problems is considerably enhanced in the world development agenda. Currently there is a certain number of entities in the international arena that work in the supra-national plane. Such organizations may have greater opportunities for political influ-

ence than individual states, even those sufficiently influential and economically powerful. The activities of most of them are aimed at developing economic cooperation. These associations are predominantly formed around countries that are regional leaders and have certain economic and political resources (Okara et al. 2018). The significance of some is explained by a substantial impact on the leading international, including non-governmental, financial institutions, that serve as managers of funds channeled for global development projects both at the level of interstate entities and individual nation states. In this regard, it is wealthy countries, being the donors to the above-mentioned international financial institutions, that have a significant influence on the regulation of world globalization processes.

An attempt to consider the expediency of the opportunities of and prospects for the interaction between some key formal and informal international entities that have a direct or indirect influence on making global development decisions has allowed us to specify the role of some of them which, in our opinion, can effectively influence the modern globalization processes of social development.

Global integration processes, trends in deconcentration of the global players' influence, and the emergence of new leading countries, are of interest in terms of the formal focus on the design of an influential international organization – the OECD – the key members of which are both the G7 countries and those trying to acquire the status of new regional leaders. At the same time, other participating countries are also very interesting from the standpoint of implementing various practices aimed at providing comprehensive social development. This is where ideas are centered, and where the most viable draft decisions for global governance can be expertly grounded. Thus, the choice of countries for the the author's original assessment to be discussed further is not arbitrary.

On this basis, in the context of further comprehensive global development and its various components, the author attaches particular importance to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, an international organization which brings together 36 economically developed countries that recognize the principles of representative democracy and a free market economy (The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Official Page). The OECD serves as a platform for organizing multilateral talks on economic, political, social, legal and other issues, including technological ones, that are significant for the countries concerned, as well as carrying out extensive analytical work and issuing recommendations for their comprehensive development. The main objective of the OECD is to achieve the highest level of economic development in its member states by coordinating their policies. The OECD structure is comprised of over 20 specialized committees, as well as autonomous bodies and over 200 working groups that consider a wide range of economic, political, and social issues. It is important to note that the OECD committees deal with the same areas of activity as the key ministries and departments of the national governments. This suggests that the OECD, in contrast to other global entities, conducts a practical monitoring of the global economy and has a real impact on global development processes, which can be regarded as an actual global management in action (Shrepler 1999; Gerchikova 2000; Shynkarenko 2011).

Indicators of social development

A key issue in implementing the Global Governance concept is the need to develop a system of measurements (indices and indicators) for the quantitative and qualitative assessment of global development in accordance with certain target characteristics and the dominant components of the complex process of global governance.

The experience of using the system of indicators for the quantitative and qualitative assessment of social development shows that it is scientifically-based and can be applied practically, including on the international level. The most detailed system of development indicators is outlined by the UN Commissions (UN (Embassy in Ukraine) Official Page). It seeks to assess the progress towards the main goals set by the UN, namely economic growth and combating poverty. Economic growth is considered as a prerequisite and a means of ensuring health, education, security, supply of drinking water, and preservation of nature. To study and compare the development of all countries, over 550 indicators are analyzed (Cobb et al. 1995; Daly and Cobb 1989; UN Commission on Sustainable Development, Ninth Session 2001; WWF 2000; New Economics Foundation; World Bank 2006; World Development Indicators; Environmental Sustainability Index Report).

The OECD system of indicators is universally recognized. This organization has developed and widely uses the “pressure-state-reaction” model. The model indicates cause-and-effect relationship between the economic activity and political and social conditions, helping authorities and the public to see the interconnection of these areas and to develop policies to address these issues. From the point of view of global governance, it is a mechanism for selecting and organizing indicators in a form that is convenient for decision-makers considering important social issues that are not limited to specific industries or territories. The constructive systems of development indicators are also developed by the World Bank Group. The major contribution to the development of the system of indicators is made by the annual reports of the World Bank “Indicators of World Development” (World Development Indicators).

With respect to integrated development indices, we believe that they should be regarded both as important markers of social design and global governance of social development, and a social development guide for the countries seeking to make changes.

Why OECD member countries

Consequently, the development model which tends towards networking and consensus-based decision-making is typical of highly developed countries with stable living conditions, where pluralism in addressing different socially relevant issues is a sign of multilevel public governance. In view of the above, the author proposes to use the integrated indicator – the Global Development Index for the global assessment of the OECD countries development. According to the author, the Global Development Index is the most relevant for the OECD countries that show stable growth rates in socio-humanitarian, economic, and technological terms. Therefore, given the crucial role of the OECD as

an interstate association that incorporates countries having the most powerful potential and biggest impact on global politics, we calculate the suitability of this index primarily for highlighting the dynamic development processes of this particular pool of countries. The foundation for the relevant analytical work has already been laid and confirmed by the first results of an integrated research, which aims to make an annual assessment of the OECD member countries on the basis of 10 key indices that form the global development index (Karamyshev 2018a, 2018b) proposed and implemented by the author, which will be discussed below.

A natural question that emerges is: why is the emphasis placed on the OECD countries, and not on the G20, for example? In our opinion a very simple answer lies above all in the universality of this approach, since to further use the analytics concerning social development in different countries of the world, it is not necessary to look to the most economically powerful world leaders. It is important to find the reference countries whose best practices would be suitable for adaptation – the countries which demonstrate balanced development, including in innovative areas that are not determined or estimated solely by economic indicators and their high resource level, but above all by the prospects for qualitative changes, the rational use of resources, and a socially beneficial experience. According to the author, such reference countries for the greater part of the post-Soviet area can include, for example, the countries of Central Europe (the group of countries of the Visegrád Four), or the Baltic States which in turn are interested in the Scandinavian experience. It should be noted that none of these countries – representatives of the aforementioned geographic or political entities – belong to the pool of the G20. But they are all members of the OECD, which to some extent is another good example and an argument in favor of this organization being a universal and effective actor in the arena of international relations in monitoring the global development of societies, mainly in the leading countries of the world.

Hence, the question of *what to evaluate?* was answered by finding an object of observation – a comprehensive development of OECD members as a group of countries sharing common principles and development goals based on the conceptual approaches to the functioning of a market economy and democratic pluralism. There is only one, more difficult question left – *how to evaluate?* – following the principle of systematicity, balance, and rationality. This relates to the essence of the evaluation and interpretation of the results which is meant, in particular, to show a certain novelty and the author's approach to understanding the process.

The Global Index (GI-10)

At present, there are different methods of evaluating social development and its components. There are two approaches to assessing development outcomes: the first one is in the form of building a system of indicators, each of them reflecting some development aspect. Most often, within the framework of the general system, the same groups of indicators are discerned. The second approach involves constructing an integrated, aggregated indicator, on the basis of which one can gauge a country's degree of stability and levels

of socio-economic development. Aggregation is usually carried out according to several groups of indicators: economic, social, socio-political, and environmental.

The work of O. V. Latysheva presents the results of the rating and integrated characteristics for the separate components of the sustainable development of countries in a global context, based on measurement parameters and the sustainable development profile of some advanced countries, post-Soviet countries, and Ukraine (Latysheva 2016).

The integrated criterion for development is preferred to a system of individual indicators, because it allows observation of how changes in original factors and their correlation affect a country's development. The integrated criterion also allows us to judge the degree of a country's development whilst maintaining an overview of its dynamics – ie the development trajectory or efficiency. However, due to methodological and statistical problems (data collection, reliability, calculations), a generally recognized integrated indicator has not been created yet, although research in this area continues (Vinogradova 2015a).

Taking into account various indicators of development, N. A. Vinogradova composed a methodology for constructing an integrated indicator of social development using the international statistics of the United Nations, the World Bank and other international organizations on 187 countries (Vinogradova 2015b).

Upon availability of a large system of indicators, the best solution to the problem in comparing different objects at different times is provided by an indicator which can combine the information contained in all the considered original indicators, that is, the aggregate indicator. The presence of an integrated indicator of social development allows, with a certain degree of probability, the making of judgments about the degree a country's stability and the optimality of its development trajectory, and is appropriate for decision-making including in relation to the definition of strategic development priorities of individual national states.

In the author's opinion, special attention should be paid to the use of the methodology for assessing global development and its components, as well as the definition of relevant indicators in the system of multilevel public governance of global development.

The construction of the Global Development Index or the Index of Global Development presupposes the use of various methodological approaches. According to Yu. I. Hayda (2015), there are certain contradictions and peculiarities, namely: the problem of determining an optimal number of indicators; the diversity, specificity and inconsistency of information data that characterize different components of global development; and the methodological complexity of integrating diverse factors that have different content and weight. However, the application of the aggregation method in the construction of the Global Index provides the possibility of merging observation objects into large groups and summing up their characteristics, abstracting the differences from between them. Notably, the optimal simplification of the subject of analysis makes it possible to identify and analyze those properties which are unnoticed with a large number of elements in the system under study. In addition, to be able to integrate indicators with different units of measure, a utility function method is used, which allows the evaluation of all indicators on a relative scale from 0 to 1 (Barrera-Roldan 2002).

Taking into account the above trends, in order to comprehensively assess the impact of world global processes on the development of both formalized interstate entities and individual countries, the author proposes to introduce into scientific discourse and further practical use an aggregate indicator in the form of an integrated global development index called *The Global Index* (GI-10).

‘Global’ means generalized, covering the main spheres of social development in a balanced integrated index. In this context, we are talking about the global development index (GI-10), the content of which reflects a country’s complex development. It is proposed to evaluate the index by 10 separate integrated indices, by way of aggregation and generalization. According to the author, it can be regarded as a global index balanced by three components: socio-humanitarian, economic and technological, and socio-political.

As noted, the integrated global development index – *The Global Index* (GI-10) is based on the analysis of official information relating to empirical observations and the evaluation of complex interconnected constant components of development pertinent to different spheres of society – socio-political, socio-humanitarian, economic, and technological that can, among other things, show the level of a country’s balanced development.

The structure of *The Global Index* (GI-10) incorporates aggregate integrated data that reflect the results of the comprehensive development rating of different countries, obtained by 10 relevant (ie adequate for this purpose), well-known international indexes. These are created by the most authoritative expert-analytical centers working on researching the global processes concerning the functioning and development of society, on the basis of officially available annual statistics.

In the context of the study as defined by the author, the integrated *Global Index* (GI-10) includes 10 components that are substantially represented by the relevant indexes, most significant from the point of view of their complexity, comparability, complementarity, and the focus on global development (Table 1). Due to these factors, according to the original methodology, the Global Index (GI-10) can be calculated on a potential evaluation scale ranging from 0 to 100. According to the author’s calculation technique, each of the included indices has a maximum value (≤ 9.99). The integrated *Global Index*, the maximum aggregate value of which is ≤ 99.99 , is adjusted by the GDP per capita per purchasing power parity (GDP PPP) (≤ 0.99) which, according to the author, lends some objectivity and balance to the said index. At the same time, we realize that GDP PPP is no longer determinative in the sense of global development, since the current understanding of the complexity, integration, technological effectiveness, and innovation of global development does not emphasize the dominance of the economic component in the corresponding assessment.

**Table 1. Components of the integrated global index
(The Global Index GI-10)**

No	Index	Developers	Year	Countries
1.	Human Development Index http://www.hdr.undp.org/	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	2018 for 2017	189
2.	The Social Progress Index https://www.socialprogress.org/	The Social Progress Imperative (USA)	2018	146
3.	The Legatum Prosperity Index https://www.prosperity.com/	Legatum Institute Foundation (GBR)	2018	149
4.	The Sustainable Development Goals Index http://sdgindex.org/reports/	The Sustainable Development Solutions Network – SDSN (FRA-USA) & The Bertelsmann Stiftung (DEU)	2018	156
5.	The Fragile States Index http://www.worldpolicy.org/	The Fund for Peace & Foreign Policy Journal (USA)	2018	178
6.	The Global Competitiveness Index http://www.reports.weforum.org/	World Economic Forum (CHE)	2018	140
7.	BDO IBC – International Business Compass https://www.bdo-ibc.com/	BDO & HWWI (DEU)	2018	174
8.	The Global Innovation Index https://www.globalinnovationindex.org/	Cornell University (USA) & INSEAD (FRA) & WIPO (CHE)	2018	126
9.	The ICT Development Index http://www.itu.int/	International Telecommunication Union – UN Specialized Agency (CHE)	2017	176
10.	The Environmental Performance Index http://www.yale.edu/esi/	Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy (USA)	2018	180

The ten component indices are related to the implementation of policies in certain spheres of society (socio-humanitarian, economic, environmental, informational, etc.) at different levels of managerial influence in the system of multilevel public governance of global development. It should be noted that the first five indices to a greater extent reflect the socio-humanitarian component, while the next five indices refer to the economic and technological components of the global development policy.

The present publication does not consider methodological approaches to the calculation and application of the indices that form the basis of the integrated Global Index, since all of them are built by authoritative international non-governmental organizations and expert-analytical centers on the basis of their analytical capacities. They also rely on well-known integral assessments, using a rich arsenal of statistical methods of stan-

standardization and reduction of indicators. Each of the considered indices that performs an analytical role is based on an appropriate set of baseline indicators, and is calculated using the aggregation methodology. It should also be noted that when defining indicators – the chief components of the Global Index – it was taken into account that the closer an indicator is to the average value of indicators in this sphere, the more representative it is of the processes under investigation.

In the expert environment, there are different opinions about the methods of defining the weight given to different indicators which together constitute an integrated index. In particular, it is believed that different indicators have different degrees of objectivity and responsibility for the final result of the evaluation, and each individual domain can take priority over another in the assessment of global development. Therefore, the weights of the individual indicators must be different. However, according to the author such subjectivity is unreasonable, as today there is no objective or reliable method for calculating weights for integrated aggregates that characterize the impact of changeable factors (socio-economic and otherwise) on the global development of society.

In this regard, the author proposes to determine the weights of individual indices underlying the integrated Global Index based on the principles of equality that are innate for the activities of the United Nations and its institutions. Accordingly, each of the aggregated indices is given the same weight coefficient, despite certain potential differences in weight, since the artificial establishment of such discrepancies in the form of giving different weight to the indices during their qualitative evaluation will indicate certain subjectivity and bias.

Since in the author's opinion the matter of determining weight coefficients for individual indices taken into account in the calculation of the Global Index is subjective and does not have an empirical basis, it is proposed to conditionally assign each of the mentioned indices a weight coefficient equal to one.

As noted above, the Global Index reflects the results of the global development assessment on three components: socio-political, socio-humanitarian, and economic and technological. It should be noted that the author focuses more on the socio-humanitarian and economic and technological aspects, and to a lesser extent on the socio-political aspect. This is because, from the viewpoint of evaluation and in the opinion of the expert community and the public concerned, it tends to produce subjective judgments in respect to development under the conditions of unpredictability.

The above approach to distinguishing the dominant components of global development governance correlates with the concept of sustainable development generally accepted by the world community, with its predominantly economic, social, and environmental components, but lacking the focus on socio-political issues or the institutional component. It proves that, in accordance with the goals of sustainable development, it is expedient to lay the emphasis on consensus-based and empirically confirmed components of development, without ignoring the analysis of socio-political processes and trends, or institutional foundations and global development features.

Thus, the realization of the possibilities of a comprehensive assessment of the regulatory impact on global development, in the context of global governance, requires the

formation of a universal information and analytical system of social development. This will include integrated dominants, indicators and characteristics of development to be used further as tools for comparing the results of various evaluations. These will include statistical indicators of development and the creation of strategies, forecasts and plans for both individual countries and other entities, functioning on the territorial or sectoral principles in accordance with global values.

Table 2 summarizes the results of the integrated assessment of the OECD countries' global development based on the available data that are relevant as of January 20, 2019 by the ten integrated indices adjusted for GDP per capita by purchasing power parity (GDP PPP) (according to the World Bank data as of 21.09.2018) (GDP based on purchasing-power-parity (PPP) per capita. URL: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP>).

Table 2. Results of the integrated assessment of the OECD countries' global development

OECD Countries Ranking 2018														
№	Country	Population	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	GDP	Total
1.	Australia	25,232,300	3	15	13	37	170(9)	14	10	20	14	21	19	H _I
			9.7	8.5	8.7	6.3	9.1	8.6	9.0	8.0	8.6	7.9	0.81	85.21
2.	Austria	8,857,960	20	20	15	9	165(14)	22	15	21	21	8	15	H _I
			8.0	8.0	8.5	9.1	8.6	7.8	8.5	7.9	7.9	9.2	0.85	84.35
3.	Belgium	11,454,906	17	17	16	12	163(16)	21	17	25	25	15	20	H _I
			8.3	8.3	8.4	8.8	8.4	7.9	8.3	7.5	7.5	8.5	0.80	82.70
4.	Canada	37,347,300	12	14	8	20	168(11)	12	9	18	29	25	22	H _I
			8.8	8.6	9.2	8.0	8.9	8.8	9.1	8.2	7.1	7.5	0.78	84.98
5.	Chile	19,107,216	44	34	38	38	150(29)	33	33	47	56	84	56	M _{II}
			5.6	6.6	6.2	6.2	7.1	6.7	6.7	5.3	4.4	1.6	0.44	56.84
6.	Czechia	10,637,794	27	26	27	13	153(26)	29	24	27	43	33	34	H _{II}
			7.3	7.4	7.3	8.7	7.4	7.1	7.6	7.3	5.7	6.7	0.66	73.16
7.	Denmark	5,806,015	11	4	5	2	175(4)	10	6	8	4	3	16	vH
			8.9	9.6	9.5	9.8	9.6	9.0	9.4	9.2	9.6	9.7	0.84	95.14
8.	Estonia	1,319,133	30	27	26	16	145(34)	32	27	24	17	48	38	H _{II}
			7.0	7.3	7.4	8.4	6.6	6.8	7.3	7.6	8.3	5.2	0.62	72.52
9.	Finland	5,522,015	15	5	3	3	178(1)	11	18	7	22	10	23	vH
			8.5	9.5	9.7	9.7	9.9	8.9	8.2	9.3	7.8	9.0	0.77	91.27
10.	France	66,992,000	24	16	20	5	160(19)	17	28	16	15	2	26	H _I
			7.6	8.4	8.0	9.5	8.1	8.3	7.2	8.4	8.5	9.8	0.74	84.54
11.	Germany	82,887,000	5	9	14	4	167(12)	3	12	9	12	13	17	vH
			9.5	9.1	8.6	9.6	8.8	9.7	8.8	9.1	8.8	8.7	0.83	91.53
12.	Greece	10,741,165	31	29	52	48	128(51)	57	79	42	38	22	47	M _{II}

OECD Countries Ranking 2018														
№	Country	Population	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	GDP	Total
			6.9	7.1	4.8	5.2	4.9	4.3	2.1	5.8	6.2	7.8	0.53	55.63
13.	Hungary	9,771,000	45	36	42	26	134(45)	48	38	33	48	43	46	M _I
			5.5	6.4	5.8	7.4	5.5	5.2	6.2	6.7	5.2	5.7	0.54	60.14
14.	Iceland	355,620	6	2	11	10	174(5)	24	16	23	1	11	13	H _I
			9.4	9.8	8.9	9.0	9.5	7.6	8.4	7.7	9.9	8.9	0.87	89.97
15.	Ireland	4,857,000	4	11	10	18	173(6)	23	5	10	20	9	5	H _I
			9.6	8.9	9.0	8.2	9.4	7.7	9.5	9.0	8.0	9.1	0.95	89.35
16.	Israel	8,980,600	22	30	37	41	67(112)	20	21	11	23	19	32	M _I
			7.8	7.0	6.3	5.9	-1.2	8.0	7.9	8.9	7.7	8.1	0.68	67.08
17.	Italy	60,395,921	28	21	34	29	143(36)	31	40	31	47	16	30	M _I
			7.2	7.9	6.6	7.1	6.4	6.9	6.0	6.9	5.3	8.4	0.70	69.40
18.	Japan	126,320,000	19	6	23	15	158(21)	5	20	13	10	20	24	H _I
			8.1	9.4	7.7	8.5	7.9	9.5	8.0	8.7	9.0	8.0	0.76	85.56
19.	Korea	51,635,256	22	18	35	19	156(23)	15	22	12	2	60	31	H _{II}
			7.8	8.2	6.5	8.1	7.7	8.5	7.8	8.8	9.8	4.0	0.69	77.89
20.	Latvia	1,920,100	41	39	40	27	142(37)	42	37	34	35	37	48	M _I
			5.9	6.1	6.0	7.3	6.3	5.8	6.3	6.6	6.5	6.3	0.52	63.62
21.	Lithuania	2,793,986	35	31	36	36	152(27)	40	34	40	41	29	37	M _I
			6.5	6.9	6.4	6.4	7.3	6.0	6.6	6.0	5.9	7.1	0.63	65.73
22.	Luxembourg	602,005	21	8	12	22	170(9)	19	*14	15	9	7	2	H _I
			7.9	9.2	8.8	7.8	9.1	8.1	8.6	8.5	9.1	9.3	0.98	87.38
23.	Mexico	126,577,691	74	58	59	84	94(85)	46	72	56	87	72	69	L _I
			2.6	4.2	4.1	1.6	1.5	5.4	2.8	4.4	1.3	2.8	0.31	31.01
24.	Netherlands	17,293,800	10	7	9	11	165(14)	6	4	2	7	18	14	vH
			9.0	9.3	9.1	8.9	8.6	9.4	9.6	9.8	9.3	8.2	0.86	92.06
25.	N. Zealand	4,935,870	16	10	2	17	169(10)	18	13	22	13	17	28	H _I
			8.4	9.0	9.8	8.3	9.0	8.2	8.7	7.8	8.7	8.3	0.72	86.92
26.	Norway	5,323,933	1	1	1	6	177(2)	16	7	19	8	14	10	vH
			9.9	9.9	9.9	9.4	9.8	8.4	9.3	8.1	9.2	8.6	0.90	93.40
27.	Poland	38,433,600	33	32	33	32	148(31)	37	35	39	49	50	44	M _I
			6.7	6.8	6.7	6.8	6.9	6.3	6.5	6.1	5.1	5.0	0.56	63.46
28.	Portugal	10,291,027	41	24	24	31	164(15)	34	45	32	44	26	39	M _I
			5.9	7.6	7.6	6.9	8.5	6.6	5.5	6.8	5.6	7.4	0.61	69.01
29.	Slovakia	5,445,087	38	35	32	24	147(32)	41	39	36	46	28	40	M _I
			6.2	6.5	6.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	6.1	6.4	5.4	7.2	0.60	65.50
30.	Slovenia	2,070,050	25	22	18	8	162(17)	35	31	30	33	34	35	H _{II}

OECD Countries Ranking 2018														
Nº	Country	Population	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	GDP	Total
			7.5	7.8	8.2	9.2	8.3	6.5	6.9	7.0	6.7	6.4	0.65	75.15
31.	Spain	46,733,038	26	19	25	25	149(30)	26	43	28	27	12	33	H _{II}
			7.4	8.1	7.5	7.5	7.0	7.4	5.7	7.2	7.3	8.8	0.67	74.57
32.	Sweden	10,223,505	7	11	6	1	170(9)	9	11	3	11	5	18	vH
			9.3	8.9	9.4	9.9	9.1	9.1	8.9	9.7	8.9	9.5	0.82	93.52
33.	Switzerland	8,526,932	2	3	4	7	176(3)	4	3	1	3	1	8	vH
			9.8	9.7	9.6	9.3	9.7	9.6	9.7	9.9	9.7	9.9	0.92	97.82
34.	Turkey	80,810,525	64	75	93	79	58(121)	61	67	50	67	108	50	L _I
			3.6	2.5	0.7	2.1	-2.1	3.9	2.3	5.0	2.3	-0.8	0.50	20.00
35.	U.Kingdom	66,040,229	14	13	7	14	159(20)	8	8	4	5	6	25	vH
			8.6	8.7	9.3	8.6	8.0	9.2	9.2	9.6	9.5	9.4	0.75	90.85
36.	USA	328,575,000	13	25	17	35	154(25)	1	14	6	16	27	11	H _I
			8.7	7.5	8.3	6.5	7.5	9.9	8.6	9.4	8.4	7.3	0.89	82.99

* – if the country is not present in the rating, the average value is taken comprising the sum of all available indicators of its development

(List of countries and dependencies by population. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_population (based on available data that are relevant as of January 20, 2019))

Conclusions

1. For the countries that are on the path to democratic transformations and a socially-oriented market economy, the Global Index can become one of the most effective and visible strategic indicators of reform implementation in a specific country. It can provide an opportunity for a country to quickly identify its strong positions and bottlenecks in different areas of public policy and, on this basis, take more substantiated managerial decisions regarding development benchmarks. Additionally, the included indices provide a comprehensive picture of development outcomes, and can form the basis for the information behind and analytical framework for the integrated assessment and decision-making on the analyzed and highlighted areas in the system of global development governance from the Global Governance perspective.
2. The results of the integrated assessment of OECD countries' development indicate both a high level of development of most countries that are members of this international organization, and a high aggregate indicator of the organization's development, which proves the effectiveness of the OECD's regulatory influence on the world integration processes.
3. This is evidence of the validity of the OECD as an association of countries with a high potential for development, able to exert a significant influence on the world Global Governance system. Based on the above, it is reasonable to assume that the

OECD can play a leading role in defining both strategic guidelines and mechanisms for social development in the world, taking into account the geographic determinism of the organization's representatives as well.

4. It is also possible to assume the feasibility and predict the applicability of the Global Index GI-10 to determine benchmarks for countries in key issues at the level of the OECD and other interstate non-governmental organizations, in the process of reaching consensus and making collective decisions on the elaboration of strategic documents which relate to the prospects of global development and its components.
5. The Global Index GI-10 can be used not only as an integral indicator of an individual country's development, but also as the indicator of Global Governance performance at the level of global interstate entities in the transformational environments, as well as to develop strategic decisions that have global character and influence on the modern development processes of the world community.

Bibliography

1. Baranovsky, V. G., and Ivanova, N. I., eds. 2015. *Global Governance: Opportunities and Risks*. Moscow: IMEMO RAS.
2. Barrera-Roldan, A. 2002. "Proposal and Application of a Sustainable Development Index." *Ecological Indicators* 2: 251-256.
3. BDO IBC International Business Compass. URL: <https://www.bdo-ibc.com/>
4. Brzezinski, Z. 1997. *The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. New York: Basic Books.
5. Chumakov, A. N. 2010. "Global World: The Problem of Management." *Vek Globalizatsii [Age of Globalization]* 2 (6): 3-15 (in Russian). URL: <https://www.socionauki.ru/journal/articles/130853/>
6. Cobb, C., Halstead, T., and Rowe, J. 1995. *Redefining Progress: The Genuine Progress Indicator, Summary of Data and Methodology*. San Francisco: Redefining Progress.
7. Daly, H. E., and Cobb, J. 1989. *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment and a Sustainable Future*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/027046769101100137>
8. Environmental Sustainability Index Report. URL: <http://www.yale.edu/esi>
9. EU Institute for Security Studies. 2010. *Global Governance 2025: At Critical Juncture*. Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies. DOI: 10.2815/21215
10. The Failure of the Failed States Index from World Policy Institute. URL: <http://www.worldpolicy.org>.
11. Fedulova, L. I. 2009. "Ukraine in International Rating Assessments: Factor of Innovation and Technological Development." *Actual Problems of Economy* 5: 39-53.
12. G20 Official Page. URL: <http://www.g20.org/en/>
13. GDP based on purchasing-power-parity (PPP) per capita. URL: <https://data.world-bank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD?page=1>

14. Gerasina, L. M., Pogribnaya, V. L., Polischuk, I. O. 2015. "Global Civil Society." In *Political Dictionary of Encyclopedias*, edited by M. P. Trebina. Kharkiv: Law.
15. Gerchikova, I.N. 2000. *International Economic Organizations*. M.: Con Saltburn.
16. The Global Competitiveness Index. URL: <http://www.reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness/>
17. The Global Innovation Index. URL: <https://www.globalinnovationindex.org/>
18. Groom, A. J. R., and Powell, D. 1994. "From World Politics to Global Governance – A Theme in Need of a Focus." In *Contemporary International Relations*, edited by A. J. R. Groom and M. Light, 81-90. London: Pinter.
19. Hayda, Y. I. 2015. "Sustainable Development: Concepts of Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment." *Agrosvit* 2: 3-9.
20. Hughes, S., and Wilkinson, R., eds. 2003. *Global Governance. Critical Perspectives*. London: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203302804>
21. Human Development Report. URL: <http://www.hdr.undp.org/>
22. Huntington, S. 1996. *The Clash of Civilisation and Remarking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
23. International Telecommunication Union Official Page. URL: <http://www.itu.int/>
24. Karamyshev, D. V. 2018a. "Dominantes of Global Governance in the Dimensions of Global Development." *Theory and Practice of Public Administration* 4 (63): 8-20. URL: http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/tpdu/2018-4/doc/1/1_1.pdf
25. Karamyshev, D. V. 2018b. "Imperatives of Global Development: Focus on Global Governance." *Public Administration and Regional Development* 2: 365-388. DOI: 10.26693/pard2018.02.365
26. Kennedy, P. 1993. *Preparing for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Random House.
27. Latysheva, O. V. 2016. "Analysis of the Sustainable Development Level of Ukraine in the Global Dimension." *Economy Management: Theory and Practice* 8 (8): 221-233.
28. The Legatum Prosperity Index. URL: <https://www.prosperity.com/>
29. List of countries and dependencies by population. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_population
30. Nebava, M. I. 2009a. "Social Capital as a Factor of Economic Efficiency of Social Policy." *Problems of a Systematic Approach in Economy* 1 (9). URL: <http://jrnl.nau.edu.ua/index.php/EPSAE/article/viewFile/4362/4494>
31. Nebava, M. I. 2009b. "Formation of System for Measuring the Integral Model of Sustainable Economic, Social and Environmental Development." *All-Ukrainian Congress of Ecologists with International Participation, Vynyca 2009*: 573-576. URL: http://eco.com.ua/sites/eco.com.ua/files/lib1/konf/2vze/zb_m/0171_zb_m_2VZE.pdf
32. New Economics Foundation. URL: <http://www.neweconomics.org>
33. OECD. 2010. *Regional Development Policies in OECD Countries*. Paris: OECD Publishing. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264087255-en>

34. Okara, D. V., Chernyshev, V. G., and Shynkarenko, L. V. 2018. "Research of Development of Ukraine on the Basis of the Index of Global Competitiveness." *Global and National Problems of the Economy* 22: 84-90.
35. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Official Page. URL: <http://www.oecd.org/>
36. Ozhevan, M. L., and Piskorskaya, G. L. 2004. "Global Information Society." In *Ukrainian Diplomatic Encyclopedia: in 2 volumes*, edited by L. V. Hubersky et al., 760. Kyiv: Knowledge of Ukraine.
37. Rhodes, R. A. W. 2010. "The New Governance: Governing without Government." In *From Government to Governance*, edited by R. Bellamy and A. Palumbo. London: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x>
38. Rosenau, J. N. 2004. "Governance in the Twenty-First Century." In *Global Governance. Critical Concepts in Political Science*, edited by T. J. Sinclair, 179-209. London: Routledge.
39. Sachs, J., Schmidt-Traub, G., Kroll, C., Lafortune, G., and Fuller, G. 2018. *SDG Index and Dashboards Report 2018*. New York: Bertelsmann Stiftung and Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN).
40. Sadkov, V. G., and Grekov, I. 2006. "On the Effectiveness of Social Development (Issues of Methodologies of Country Measurements)." *Society and Economics* 4: 163-178.
41. Shynkarenko, T. 2011. "Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development." In *Politychna entsyklopediia [Political Encyclopedia]*, edited by Yu. Levenets, Yu. Shapoval, et al., 515. Kyiv: Parliamentary Publishing House.
42. Shrepler, H. A. 1999. *Mezhdunarodnye Ekonomicheskie Organizatsii [International Economic Organizations]*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya.
43. Schweikina, N. C. 2007. "Global Governance as a Subject of Political Research: Conceptual Characteristics." In *Space and Time in World Politics and International Relations: Materials of 4th Convention of the RAMS*, edited by O.N. Barabanova, 24-29. Moscow: MGIMO-University.
44. *Social Progress Index*. URL: <https://www.socialprogress.org/>
45. Sokolenko, V. G. 2000. *Global Management. The Age of Survival of Homo Sapiens*. Moscow: Publishing House "The Scientific Book".
46. Soros, G. 1998. *The Crises of Global Capitalism. Open Society Endangered*. New York: Public Affairs. URL: https://www.georgesoros.com/1998/01/01/the_crisis_of_global_capitalism_open_society_endangered1/
47. Sustainable Development Goals Index. URL: <http://sdgindex.org/reports/>
48. Thakur, R., and Van Langenhove, L. 2006. "Enhancing Global Governance through Regional Integration." *Global Governance* 12 (3): 233-240. doi: 10.5555/ggov.2006.12.3.233
49. UN Commission on Sustainable Development, Ninth Session. 2001. *Indicators of Sustainable Development: Framework and Methodologies*. New York: United Nations. URL: https://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/csd9_indi_bp3.pdf
50. UN (embassy in Ukraine) Official Page. URL : <http://www.un.org.ua/>

51. United Nations: Homepage. URL: <http://www.un.org/en/index.html>
52. Ursul, A. D. 2014. "Global Management: Evolutionary Perspectives." *Vek Globalizatsii [Age of Globalization]* 1 (13): 16-27. URL: <https://www.socionauki.ru/journal/articles/242959>.
53. Vinogradova, N. A., and Zharkikh, E. V. 2014. "World Practices on the Use of Aggregate Indicators in Assessing the Results and Effectiveness of Social Development". *Bulletin of OGIET* 2 (28): 41-49.
54. Vinogradova, N. A. 2015a. *Systems of Estimations of the Final Results and Efficiency of Social Development of the World Community Countries*. Moscow: LLC Sam Poligrafist.
55. Vinogradova, N. A. 2015b. "Modernization of the Methodology for Evaluating the Final Results and the Effectiveness of Social Development". *Journal of Contemporary Economics Issues* 1: 2-15. DOI: 10.24194/11506
56. Wallerstein, I. 1992. *Capitalist Civilization*. Binghampton: Verso.
57. Wilson, J., Tyedmers, P., and Pelot, R. 2007. "Contrasting and Comparing Sustainable Development Indicator Metrics." *Ecological Indicators* 7: 299-314. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2006.02.009
58. World Bank. 2006. *Where is the Wealth of Nations?* Washington D.C.: The World Bank. DOI: 10.1596/978-0-8213-6354-6
59. World Development Indicators. URL: <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators>
60. WWF. 2000. *Living Planet Report 2000*. URL: http://awsassets.panda.org/downloads/lpr_living_planet_report_2000.pdf
61. Yerina, A. 2016. "International Ratings: Statistical Aspects of Calculation and Application. Part II Indices of Innovation and Human Development." *Statistics of Ukraine* 4: 66-75. URL: <http://194.44.12.92:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/2256/1/12.pdf>

Dmytro Karamyshev

Elgesio įžvalgos viešojoje politikoje: Ukrainos atvejis

Anotacija

Straipsnyje, remiantis Global Governance koncepcija, pagrindžiami visuotinės visuomenės plėtros sistemos naudojimo ypatumai. Atkreipiamas dėmesys į poreikį formuoti visuotinės plėtros rodiklių sistemą ir kurti globalų rodiklį, apibūdinantį jo būklę, dinamišką, o taip pat reguliuojamos įtakos pasaulinei plėtrai įvairiose pasaulio šalyse galimybes, su tolesniu naudojimu nacionalinių valstybių plėtros strateginių orientyrų tyrinėjimui.

Siūlomas autorinis požiūris į subalansuotą vystymąsi, remiantis bendru rodikliu – globaliu vystymosi rodikliu – globalios plėtros bendru indeksu, vadinamu Globalus indeksas GI-10. Pabrėžiama galimybė naudoti GI-10 kaip globalaus vystymosi indikatorius EBPO šalių pavyzdžiu, remiantis socialinio ir politinio, socialinio ir humanitarinio, ir ekonominio-techninio sudedamosios santykiais, kad būtų pasiekti atitinkami sutarti globalūs tikslai, pagrįsti bendromis vertybėmis.

Pilno integruoto EBPO šalių vystymosi vertinimo rezultatai rodo aukštą šios organizacijos bendrą vystymosi rodiklį, kuris yra veiksmingas EBPO įtakos pasaulio integracijos procesams indikatorius. Globalus indeksas GI-10 gali būti naudojamas ne tik kaip integruotas atskiros šalies plėtros rodiklis, bet ir Global Governance efektyvumo indikatorius tarpvalstybiniame lygmenyje transformacijos sąlygomis.

Karamyshev, Dmytro V. – PhD in Public Administration, professor at the Social and Humanitarian Policy Department and First Deputy Director of Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.
E-mail: dvk1@i.ua

Karamyshev, Dmytro V. – viešojo administravimo mokslų daktaras, Socialinės ir humanitarinės politikos katedros profesorius, Nacionalinės viešojo administravimo akademijos prie Ukrainos prezidento, Charkovo regioninio viešojo administravimo instituto direktoriaus pirmasis pavaduotojas.
El. Paštas: dvk1@i.ua