



Scan to know paper details and
author's profile

Integrated Assessment of Oecd Member Countries Global Development in the Context of Global Governance

Karamyshev, Dmytro V.

ANNOTATION

The paper substantiates the essence and specificity 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 elaborate 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 in different countries of the world, to be used for determining strategic guidelines of the national 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 got the name of Global Index GI-10. The possibilities of using GI-10 as a global development indicator, taking the OECD countries as an example, are discussed premised on a correlation between socio-humanitarian, and economic and technological components in order to achieve the relevant coordinated global objectives.

The results of integrated assessment of the OECD countries development testify to a high overall development index of this organization, which indicates the efficiency of the Global Governance performance indicator at the level of inter-state associations under the transformational conditions.

Keywords: global governance, global development indicators, integrated index of global development, global Index – GI-10, OECD member countries.

Classification: JEL Code: F63

Language: English



London
Journals Press

LJP Copyright ID: 146441

London Journal of Research in Management and Business

Volume 20 | Issue 2 | Compilation 1.0



Integrated Assessment of Oecd Member Countries Global Development in the Context of Global Governance

Karamyshev, Dmytro V.

ANNOTATION

The paper substantiates the essence and specificity 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 elaborate 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 in different countries of the world, to be used for determining strategic guidelines of the national 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 got the name of Global Index GI-10. The possibilities of using GI-10 as a global development indicator, taking the OECD countries as an example, are discussed premised on a correlation between socio-humanitarian, and economic and technological components in order to achieve the relevant coordinated global objectives.

The results of integrated assessment of the OECD countries development testify to a high overall development index of this organization, which indicates the efficiency of the Global Governance performance indicator at the level of inter-state associations under the transformational conditions.

Keywords: global governance, global development indicators, integrated index of global development, global Index – GI-10, OECD member countries.

I. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Global integration processes determine not only the dynamics and peculiarities of the modern society's functioning and development, but also contribute to the formation of a new system for managing global development with its unique civilization imperatives as to building a new world order. In the modern world, solution to many practical problems faced by both individual national states and the international community as a whole depends on understanding objective global development trends. Creation of a global governance system increasingly affects the forming and implementing of the state policy in different countries. This policy comes from the need to align and reconcile with the proclaimed international principles and concepts of social organization and development.

However, despite a fairly significant number of publications devoted to these issues, there is still a lack of systemic research works on the integrated approach to assessing the effectiveness of governing global development, which 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 elaborated, which is to include integrated developmental dominants, indicators and characteristics complying with the

global values of the world community in the twenty-first century (Karamyshev, D.V., *Theory and Practice of Public Administration*, 2018; Karamyshev, D.V., *Public Administration and Regional Development*, 2018).

The present paper objective is to conduct a study summarizing expert analytical information that contains the aggregated data on an integrated rating of the OECD countries' comprehensive development, obtained from 10 relevant international indices, to be further used as an indicator of Global Governance (GI-10) which characterizes positioning, and opens opportunities for regulatory influence and determining of strategic development benchmarks for both individual countries and interstate entities.

This study is a continuation of the author's previous explorations and presents new findings in the field of a comprehensive assessment of the development of OECD countries by the integrated index of a balanced global development GI-10.

Presentation of the main material

The categorical basis for defining Global Governance is laid by the concept of 'governance' which means the processes of interaction and decision-making of actors involved in collective decisions and actions resulting in creation, strengthening or reproduction of social norms and institutions (Hufty, Marc., 2011). The understanding of governance results in developing an effective collective decision-making system in the context of existence of a large number of entities and in the absence of formalized procedures providing proper conditions and means for controlling compliance with certain rules in relationships between its actors. In another definition, governance is interpreted not only as a managerial activity, but above all as social coordination which facilitates collective action through collective decision-making, although in a horizontal dimension rather than in a vertical one (Heywood, Andrew., 2000).

With regard to Global Governance, it can be characterized most succinctly as finding a collective solution to common problems at the global level (Global Governance 2025: At Critical Juncture, 2010). Global Governance can be described as political interaction of international actors in addressing problems that affect more than one state or region (Rhodes, R. A., 2010), or identification and management of the key problems affecting the entire globe (Groom, A., Powell, D., 1994; Huntington, S., 1996). This implies a function of implementing power in an indirect way, which is more like collective agreements that, subject to the terms, urgency and feasibility of implementation, can be both formal and informal.

The modern concepts of governing the global development of society are largely universal in nature and envisage: firstly, the sustainability of development, based on the idea that the quality of life of people and the state of society are influenced by the totality of social, economic and environmental spheres; secondly, the global nature of processes, multilevelness and publicity and, accordingly, the transparency of governance processes, as well as joint confronting global challenges; thirdly, the focus on the coherence of action between actors – global governance entities – and achievement of public consensus through collective decisions on common issues that primarily relate to security and the future of civilization, made on the basis of shared values and beliefs; in the fourth place, modernization, technological effectiveness, rapid advancement of the latest communication means and the use of large information data arrays.

In order for global governance to be effective, it must be based on common goals and values shared by the entire world community that are clear and feasible, as well as to individual national states (United Nations: homepage; Hayda, Yu.I., 2015; Jackson P., 2015; Karamyshev, D.V., *Public Administration and Regional Development*, 2018; Ursul, A.D., 2018).

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. Nowadays there is a certain number of entities on the international arena that work in the supranational plane. Such organizations may have greater opportunities as to political influence 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 a certain economic and political resource (Okara, D.V., Chernyshev, V.G., Shynkarenko, L.V., 2018). The significance of some of them 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 national states. In this regard, it is wealthy countries, being, in fact, the donors of the above-mentioned international financial institutions, that have a significant influence on the regulation of the world globalization processes (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

However, there are other forms of integration that provide opportunities for even more effective interaction. An attempt to consider the expediency of the opportunities 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 affect most effectively the modern globalization processes of social development. The above mentioned gives grounds for strengthening the political influence of the OECD member countries. Against this backdrop, the Group and OECD, as an organization whose members represent primarily the important

economic interests of the community of states with developed democracies and market economies, can enhance their influence in the field of Global Governance, while maintaining the informal nature of their influence and its inherent advantages over the formalized one. In this regard, the proposed interpretation of Global Governance as not just global management, but as directed global governance and development should rather be accepted (Global Governance, 2015).

However, the OECD objectives are not limited to economic development. Considerable attention is paid to the organization's policies aimed at solving social issues, as well as to issues of international legal relations in various spheres of social development.

Further, the author proposes to focus scientific attention on the material relating to the global development assessment system, which has been described in his publications (Karamyshev, D.V., Theory and Practice of Public Administration, 2018; Karamyshev, D.V., Public Administration and Regional Development, 2018; Karamyshev, D.V., 2019). However, the author deems it necessary to re-emphasize the previous outcomes, since in his opinion they are fundamentally new and should be shared for a coherent understanding of his general idea. On the other hand, a new study presents the results of measuring GI-10 in dynamics, based on the first attempt to summarize a two-year empirical observation of the actual position of countries in the system of rating by integrated development indicators.

Therefore, as noted by the author in the above publications, 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, at the international level including. The most detailed system of development indicators is elaborated by the UN Commissions (UN, embassy in Ukraine, official page). It seeks to assess the

progress towards the main goals set by the UN, that is, 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 the world countries, over 550 indicators are to be analyzed (Cobb, C., Halstead, T., Rowe, J., 1995; Daly, H.E., and J. Cobb, 1989; Indicators of sustainable development: framework and methodologies, 2001; Living Planet Report 2000, WWF, 2001; New Economics Foundation; World Bank, 2006; World Development Indicators; Environmental Sustainability Index Report; Hayda, Yu.I., 2015).

The OECD system of indicators is universally recognized. This organization has developed and widely uses the “pressure-state-reaction“ model. It implies that human activity puts “pressure“ on the economy, social sphere, etc. affecting the quality of life and amount of material wealth, while the society reacts to these changes through general economic and branch-specific policies and through changes in the social consciousness and behavior (“reaction to pressure“). 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 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 as important markers of social design and global governance of social development, and a social development guide for the countries seeking to make changes (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

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 both in socio-humanitarian, and 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 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 the annual assessment of OECD member countries by 10 key indices that form the global development index (Karamyshev, D.V., Theory and Practice of Public Administration, 2018; Karamyshev, D.V., Public Administration and Regional Development, 2018) proposed and implemented by the author.

It should be pointed out that the reference countries are proposed to be considered as demonstrating developmental stability. In other words, it is about what countries and, accordingly, what directions of development can be considered as a reference point for the further use of that experience in order to determine our own priorities in managing the entire national complex without “reinventing the wheel“. Besides, understanding the importance of evaluating mostly the developed European countries, it is also necessary to have the opportunity to analyze the advanced countries of other socio-cultural environments, given that it is a matter of using the system of indicators for the quantitative and qualitative assessment of global social development which by definition is applicable to the entire world community.

Hence, the *What to evaluate?* question was answered by finding an object of observation – a comprehensive development of OECD members as a club 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 (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

The Global Index (GI-10)

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, making judgments about the degree a country's stability, 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 (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

In the world science which studies social processes of different hierarchical levels, the concepts of Global Development Index and Index of Global Development (World Development Indicators) have been considered by different researchers from different angles. However, unfortunately, there is no clear, consistent understanding of the difference between these concepts. Usually they are regarded either as identical or having minor differences. The author believes that there may be both some discrepancies and significant differences between the concepts of the Global Development Index and the Index of Global Development. Thus, on the one hand, the question is about a global approach to assessment of the development of individual countries or groups of countries by a set of aggregates – integrated development indices. In this case, it is appropriate to use the concept of Global Development Index. In the second option, the global development can be understood as world development or all-round changes that are inherent in the development of the world economy, or the development of technologies that are global in nature and are not limited to individual countries or groups of countries. Proceeding from this, there are grounds

to use the concept of the Index of Global Development.

The construction of the Global Development Index or the Index of Global Development presupposes the use of various methodological approaches. Notably, the maximum 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. Taking into account the above trends, in order to comprehensively assess the impact of the 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) (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

'Global' means a generalized, covering the main spheres of social development, 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 (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

The process of determining the parameters of the evaluation system was carried out in a certain sequence on the basis of the formed primary information base. The identified indicators provide the principle of compatibility and comparability of the entities to be evaluated. Global country development indices are determined by calculating the sum of the integrated indices in the defined areas for each country as the subject of evaluation. That is, the formation of indicators of the primary information base is key to ensuring the quality of results and reliance in the evaluation system.

They are presented in the form of a standardized spreadsheet that includes the data collected for the individual entity according to the procedures and rules for collection of reliable, objective and accurate information, confirmed by the relevant published annual reports and subject to verification.

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 a complex of 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 (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

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, that is, adequate to solve the problem, well-known international indexes, created by the most authoritative expert-analytical centers working in the field of research of the global processes concerning the functioning and development of society, on the basis of officially

available annual statistics (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

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 which, 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 ≤ 99.99 , is adjusted by the GDP per capita per purchasing power parity (GDP PPP) (≤ 0.99), which, according to the author, renders some objectification 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 (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

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

No	Index	Developers	Year	Countries
1.	The Human Development Index http://www.hdr.undp.org/	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	2019 for 2018	189
2.	The Social Progress Index https://www.socialprogress.org/	Social Progress Imperative (USA)	2019	149
3.	The Legatum Prosperity Index https://www.prosperity.com/	Legatum Institute Foundation (GBR)	2019	167
4.	The Sustainable Development Goals Index http://sdgindex.org/reports/	Sustainable Development Solutions Network – SDSN (FRA-USA) & Bertelsmann Stiftung (DEU)	2019	162
5.	The Fragile States Index http://www.worldpolicy.org/	Fund for Peace & Foreign Policy Journal (USA)	2019	178
6.	The Global Competitiveness Index http://www.reports.weforum.org/	World Economic Forum (CHE)	2019	141
7.	The 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)	2019	129

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

All 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 – the economic and technological components of the global development policy (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

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, well-known integral assessments, using a rich arsenal of statistical methods of standardization and reduction of indicators. Each of the considered indices performs its analytical mission, is based on an appropriate set of baseline indicators, and is calculated using the aggregation methodology. Also, it should be noted that when defining indicators – the 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 (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

In the expert environment, there are different opinions about the methods of finding 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 the other in the

assessment of global development; that is why the weights of the individual indicators must be different. However, according to the author, such subjectivity is unreasonable, since today there is no objective or reliable method for calculating weights for integral aggregates that characterize the impact of changeable socio-economic and other factors on the global development of society (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

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 subjectivism and bias (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

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 (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

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 even 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, of

course, the analysis of socio-political processes and trends, or institutional foundations and global development features (Karamyshev, D.V., 2019).

As concerns the Global Research which has not been updated in the last two years (this refers to three studies: The BDO's IBC – The International Business Development Index; The Environmental Performance Index), given the credibility of the organizations that conducted them and the scale of the research, as well as the desire to revise the indicators in the light of changing global conditions and trends, so far we dwell only on the latest available data – the results of studies on these indices.

When providing explanations for the Indices containing non-updated data, the following should be noted: for position 7 (Table 1), we first considered replacing the countries' Investment Attractiveness Index for BDO IBC (International Business Compass) with another global measuring – Ease of Doing Business Index (World Bank Group). However, given that GI-10 is a global rating that reflects in its essence global economic development, it has been decided to keep BDO, as it takes greater account of the international dimension, assessing investment attractiveness for international global players, while Ease of Doing Business is a more business-oriented rating, predominantly for domestic business entities. As for position 9 (Table 1), the indicators included in this study are

currently being reviewed, along with their measuring methods. The Secretariat of the International Telecommunication Union consults Member States on this subject and plans to publish the results of the study in 2020. Concerning position 10 (Table 1), the relevant study is conducted biannually and is due to be released in 2020, too.

In view of the above, we present the updated GI-10 Rating, version 2019.1, according to the most recent officially available observations predominantly as of the end of the first quarter of 2020.

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 March 25, 2020 by the ten integrated indices adjusted for GDP per capita by purchasing power parity (GDP PPP) (according to the World Bank) (GDP based on purchasing-power-parity (PPP) per capita. URL : <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP>).

The information is presented in comparison with similar data available for the same period of the last year, which contains the evaluation results mainly for 2018. The mere comparison of the above data, in our opinion, indicates that the methodology for determining GI-10 is relevant, since the fluctuations within the rating evaluation scale are insignificant.

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

OECD Countries Ranking GI-10_2019.1*														
Nº		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	***	Total 2019/1	Total 2018
1.	Australia	6	12	17	38	174(5)	16	10	22	14	21	19	H _I	H _I
		9.4	8.8	8.3	6.2	9.5	8.4	9.0	7.8	8.6	7.9	0.81	84.71	85.21
2.	Austria	20	20	13	5	165(14)	21	15	21	21	8	15	H _I	H _I
		8.0	8.0	8.7	9.5	8.6	7.9	8.5	7.9	7.9	9.2	0.85	85.05	84.35
3.	Belgium	17	19	22	16	161(18)	22	17	23	25	15	20	H _I	H _I
		8.3	8.1	8.8	8.4	8.2	7.8	8.3	7.7	7.5	8.5	0.80	82.40	82.70
4.	Canada	13	9	14	20	172(7)	14	9	17	29	25	22	H _I	H _I
		8.7	9.1	8.6	8.0	9.3	8.6	9.1	8.3	7.1	7.5	0.78	85.08	84.98
5.	Chile	42	37	37	31	150(29)	33	33	51	56	84	57	M _{II}	M _{II}
		5.8	6.3	6.3	6.9	7.1	6.7	6.7	4.9	4.4	1.6	0.43	57.13	56.84
6.	Czechia	26	24	28	7	154(25)	32	24	26	43	33	33	H _{II}	H _{II}
		7.4	7.6	7.2	9.3	7.5	6.8	7.6	7.4	5.7	6.7	0.67	73.87	73.16
7.	Denmark	11	2	1	1	175(4)	10	6	7	4	3	14	vH	vH
		8.9	9.8	9.9	9.9	9.6	9.0	9.4	9.3	9.6	9.7	0.86	95.96	95.14

8.	Estonia	30	25	21	10	146(33)	31	27	24	17	48	37	H _{II}	H _{II}
		7.0	7.5	7.9	9.0	6.7	6.9	7.3	7.6	8.3	5.2	0.63	74.03	72.52
9.	Finland	12	4	5	3	178(1)	11	18	6	22	10	21	vH	vH
		8.8	9.6	9.5	9.7	9.9	8.9	8.2	9.4	7.8	9.0	0.79	91.59	91.27
10	France	26	15	23	4	160(19)	15	28	16	15	2	25	H _I	H _I
		7.4	8.5	7.7	9.6	8.1	8.5	7.2	8.4	8.5	9.8	0.75	84.45	84.54
11.	Germany	4	8	8	6	167(12)	7	12	9	12	13	18	vH	vH
		9.6	9.2	9.2	9.4	8.8	9.3	8.8	9.1	8.8	8.7	0.82	91.72	91.53
12.	Greece	32	30	42	50	129(50)	59	79	41	38	22	49	M _{II}	M _{II}
		6.8	7.0	5.8	5.0	5.0	4.1	2.1	5.9	6.2	7.8	0.51	56.21	55.63
13.	Hungary	43	39	46	25	134(45)	47	38	33	48	43	45	M _I	M _I
		5.7	6.1	5.4	7.5	5.5	5.3	6.2	6.7	5.2	5.7	0.55	59.85	60.14
14.	Iceland	6	6	10	14	173(6)	26	16	20	1	11	12	H _I	H _I
		9.4	9.4	9.0	8.6	9.4	7.4	8.4	8.0	9.9	8.9	0.88	89.28	89.97
15.	Ireland	3	14	12	19	168(11)	24	5	12	20	9	4	H _I	H _I
		9.7	8.6	8.8	8.1	8.9	7.6	9.5	8.8	8.0	9.1	0.96	88.06	89.35
16.	Israel	22	31	31	49	67(112)	20	21	10	23	19	32	M _I	M _I
		7.8	6.9	6.9	5.1	-1.2	8.0	7.9	9.0	7.7	8.1	0.68	66.88	67.08
17.	Italy	29	22	30	30	143(36)	30	40	30	47	16	29	M _I	M _I
		7.1	7.8	7.0	7.0	6.4	7.0	6.0	7.0	5.3	8.4	0.71	69.71	69.40
18	Japan	19	10	19	15	157(22)	6	20	15	10	20	26	H _I	H _I
		8.1	9.0	8.1	8.5	7.8	9.4	8.0	8.5	9.0	8.0	0.74	85.14	85.56
19.	Korea	22	23	29	18	159(20)	13	22	11	2	60	31	H _{II}	H _{II}
		7.8	7.7	7.1	8.2	8.0	8.7	7.8	8.9	9.8	4.0	0.69	78.69	77.89
20	Latvia	39	36	35	24	142(37)	41	37	34	35	37	47	M _I	M _I
		6.1	6.4	6.5	7.6	6.3	5.9	6.3	6.6	6.5	6.3	0.53	65.03	63.62
21.	Lithuania	34	32	33	32	152(27)	39	34	38	41	29	38	M _I	M _I
		6.6	6.8	6.7	6.8	7.3	6.1	6.6	6.2	5.9	7.1	0.62	66.72	65.73
22	Luxembourg	21	16	9	34	169(10)	18	-**	18	9	7	2	H _I	H _I
		7.9	8.4	9.1	6.6	9.0	8.2	8.4	8.2	9.1	9.3	0.98	85.18	87.38
23	Mexico	76	55	67	78	98(81)	48	72	56	87	72	67	L _I	L _I
		2.4	4.5	3.3	2.2	1.9	5.2	2.8	4.4	1.3	2.8	0.33	31.13	31.01
24	Netherlands	10	11	6	9	166(13)	4	4	4	7	18	13	vH	vH
		9.0	8.9	9.4	9.1	8.7	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.3	8.2	0.87	92.27	92.06
25	N. Zealand	14	7	7	11	171(8)	19	13	25	13	17	30	H _I	H _I
		8.6	9.3	9.3	8.9	9.2	8.1	8.7	7.5	8.7	8.3	0.70	87.30	86.92
26	Norway	1	1	2	8	177(2)	17	7	19	8	14	9	vH	vH
		9.9	9.9	9.8	9.2	9.8	8.3	9.3	8.1	9.2	8.6	0.91	93.01	93.40
27	Poland	32	33	36	29	144(35)	37	35	39	49	50	44	M _I	M _I
		6.8	6.7	6.4	7.1	6.5	6.3	6.5	6.1	5.1	5.0	0.56	63.06	63.46
28	Portugal	40	18	26	26	164(15)	34	45	32	44	26	40	M _I	M _I
		6.0	8.2	7.4	7.4	8.5	6.6	5.5	6.8	5.6	7.4	0.60	70.00	69.01
29	Slovakia	36	35	32	27	148(31)	42	39	37	46	28	39	M _I	M _I
		6.4	6.5	6.8	7.3	6.9	5.8	6.1	6.3	5.4	7.2	0.61	65.31	65.50
30	Slovenia	24	21	27	12	163(16)	35	31	31	33	34	35	H _{II}	H _{II}
		7.6	7.9	7.3	8.8	8.4	6.5	6.9	6.9	6.7	6.6	0.65	74.25	75.15
31.	Spain	25	17	25	21	147(32)	23	43	29	27	12	34	H _{II}	H _{II}
		7.5	8.3	7.5	7.9	6.8	7.7	5.7	7.1	7.3	8.8	0.66	75.26	74.57
32	Sweden	8	5	4	2	170(9)	8	11	2	11	5	17	vH	vH
		9.2	9.5	9.6	9.8	9.1	9.2	8.9	9.8	8.9	9.5	0.83	94.33	93.52
33	Switzerland	2	3	3	17	176(3)	5	3	1	3	1	8	vH	vH
		9.8	9.7	9.7	8.3	9.7	9.5	9.7	9.9	9.7	9.9	0.92	96.82	97.82
34	Turkey	59	71	91	79	59(120)	6 ₁	6 ₇	49	6 ₇	10 ⁸	51	L _I	L _I
		4.1	2.9	0.9	2.1	-2.0	3.9	3.3	5.1	3.3	-0.8	0.49	23.29	22.00
35	U.Kingdom	15	13	11	13	155(24)	9	8	5	5	6	24	vH	vH
		8.5	8.7	8.9	8.7	7.6	9.1	9.2	9.5	9.5	9.4	0.76	89.86	90.85
36	USA	15	26	18	35	153(26)	2	14	3	16	27	11	H _I	H _I
		8.5	7.4	8.2	6.5	7.4	9.8	8.6	9.7	8.4	7.3	0.89	82.69	82.99

* – the first version of the study GI-10_2019.1 – according to official latest annual reports at the end of first quarter of this year (as of March 25, 2020).

** – in case the country is not present in the rating, the average value is taken comprising the sum of all available indicators of its development (Luxembourg was excluded from the overall ranking due to its unusual economic structure, especially because of its extraordinarily high capital inflows per capita. These would have greatly distorted the weighting of direct investments in the index calculation – according to figures from BDO 2016).

*** – GDP based on purchasing-power-parity (PPP) per capita "PPP (current international \$)". *data.worldbank.org. World Bank. Retrieved 7 January 2020*

Assessing the dynamics by the countries, we can conclude that the overall rating has proved to be very stable, demonstrating stability in the distribution of the main subjects of evaluation on the rating scale. In general, the top ten have not changed. Switzerland maintains its leadership,

however, it is somewhat less pronounced. With regard to the regional dimension within the total population, stability is demonstrated by the Scandinavian countries. Denmark (+0.82) and Sweden (+0.82) show a strong growth. Noteworthy is the growth of Baltic countries (Estonia (+1.51), Latvia (+1.41), Lithuania (+0.99)). There is some stagnation in the development indicators of the countries of the Visegrad Four ((Poland (-0.40), Hungary (-0.29), Slovakia (-0.19)), with the exception of the Czech Republic (+0.71). The Mediterranean countries improved their positions (Spain (+0.69), Italy (+0.31), Greece (+0.68), Turkey (+ 1.29)).

It is also noteworthy to determine the mean value of the Index for both the entire community of the OECD countries (GI-10_2019.1 = 76.54) and individual regional entities. As an example, the GI-10_2018 and GI-10_2019.1 of Baltic countries can be compared (Table 3).

Table 3: Dynamics of GI-10_2018 and GI-10_2019.1 as exemplified by Baltic countries

No	C	GI-10 2019.1	GI-10 2018	2019.1- 2018
1.	Estonia	74.03	72.52	+ 1.51
2.	Latvia	65.03	63.62	+ 1.41
3.	Lithuania	66.72	65.73	+ 0.99
GI-X Baltic group		68.59	67.29	+ 1.3
GI-X OECD community		76.54	76.49	+ 0.05

As a result of the comparison, we can see that in general, the group of Baltic countries shows positive dynamics of development indicators growth (+1.3) and, accordingly, the Index GI-10_2019.1 Baltic (68.59) compared to last year's observation GI-10_2018 Baltic (67.29). It should be noted that by the indicator – Index of the group GI-10_2019.1 Baltic for this pool of countries it is lagging behind the overall average of the Index of the community (OECD countries (GI-X_2019.1 = 76.54). However, compared to OECD GI-10_2018 (76.49), the gap has been reduced by 1.25 units. Therefore, the forecast data indicate that in case this trend becomes stable, by the integrated indicator GI-X_Baltic the group of

Baltic countries will reach the average level of development of the community GI-X_OECD in 6-7 years; for example, Estonia can do this in two years.

As a result, the ranking of OECD member countries by the global index of sustainable development, that is, GI-10 in 2019 compared to 2018 is as given below (Table 4).

Table 4: OECD member countries' rating by the GI-10 – global index of sustainable development 2019.1 compared to GI-10_2018

No		GI-10 2019.1	GI-10 2018	2019.1/2018
very high level - vH				
1.	Switzerland	96.82	97.82	-1.00
2.	Denmark	95.96	95.14	+0.82
3.	Sweden	94.33	93.52	+0.81
4.	Norway	93.01	93.40	- 0.39
5.	Netherlands	92.27	92.06	+0.21
6.	Germany	91.72	91.53	+0.19
7.	Finland	91.59	91.27	+0.32
8.	U.Kingdom	89.86	90.85	- 0.99
high level I – H _I				
9.	Iceland	89.28	89.97	- 0.69
10.	Ireland	88.06	89.35	- 0.29
11.	N. Zealand	87.30	86.92	+ 0.38
12.	Luxembourg	85.18	87.38	- 2.20
13.	Japan	85.14	85.56	- 0.42
14.	Canada	85.08	84.98	+ 0.10
15.	Austria	85.05	84.35	+ 0.70
16.	Australia	84.71	85.21	- 0.50
17.	France	84.45	84.54	- 0.09
18.	USA	82.69	82.99	- 0.30
19.	Belgium	82.40	82.70	- 0.30
high level II – H _{II}				
20.	Korea	78.69	77.89	+ 0.80
21.	Spain	75.26	74.57	+ 0.69
22.	Slovenia	74.25	75.35	- 1.10
23.	Estonia	74.03	72.52	+ 1.51
24.	Czechia	73.87	73.16	+ 0.71
middle level – M _I				
25.	Portugal	70.00	69.01	+ 0.99
26.	Italy	69.71	69.40	+ 0.31
27.	Israel	66.88	67.08	- 0.20
28.	Lithuania	66.72	65.73	+ 0.99
29.	Slovakia	65.31	65.50	- 0.19
30.	Latvia	65.03	63.62	+ 1.41
31.	Poland	63.06	63.46	- 0.40
32.	Hungary	59.85	60.14	- 0.29
middle level – M _{II}				
33.	Chile	57.13	56.84	+ 0.29
34.	Greece	56.21	55.53	+ 0.68
low level I – L _I				
35.	Mexico	31.13	31.01	+ 0.12
36.	Turkey	23.29	22.00	+ 1.29

All the countries selected for the rating are divided into those with a very high level of development; high development levels I and II; middle development levels I, II and III; low development levels I and II; and a very low level

of development, which is clearly marked on the potential evaluation scale (the maximum number of points is 99.9) (Table 5). The proposed evaluation option is logical, since 10 indicators characterize, in the first place, the balance of the

countries' development. It is also grounded theoretically in terms of the system theory. It sets the minimum step of index evaluation equal to 1. In this case, each of the 10 positions of the integrated global index has a minimum number of components, in total for each block – 10 score

points of the index weight. In summation of the results of measuring the integrated global index of the OECD countries development, it should be noted that a generally high index level of this group of countries indicates its steady and balanced development.

Table 5: Scale of assessment of countries by level of development

Level	Calculation	Value (absolute units)
very High - vH	$100-10 = 90 \times 0.1 = 9.0 \times 10$	90-99.99
High - H		70-89.99
I – first order	$100-20 = 80 \times 0.1 = 8 \times 10$	80-89.99
II – second order	$100-30 = 70 \times 0.1 = 7 \times 10$	70-79.99
Middle - M		40-69.99
I – first order	$100-40 = 60 \times 0.1 = 6 \times 10$	60-69.99
II – second order	$100-50 = 50 \times 0.1 = 5 \times 10$	50-59.99
III – third order	$100-60 = 40 \times 0.1 = 4 \times 10$	40-49.99
Low - L		0-39.99
I – first order	$100-80 = 20 \times 0.1 = 2 \times 10$	20-39.99
II – second order	$100-100 = 0 \times 0.1 = 0 \times 10$	0-19.99
very Low - vL)		Below 0

* - I order - it is the so-called vanguard of the division, that is, the pool (category) of countries that show the best results at a certain level, namely among countries with very high, high, middle or low levels of development in the global sense of the process (global development).

Regarding the distribution of countries on the rating scale by development level, the following should be noted. Given that the results of the balanced global development evaluation by GI-10_2019.1 are transitional and actually contain officially available data mainly for 2018-2019, the methodological approach to the distribution of countries on the scale should also be considered, taking into account both their condition by evaluation results (2018) and by the results of the first version of the evaluation 2019.1. Based on this, for the countries that have slightly lost their ground or, on the contrary, improved their positions compared to the previous year, Table 4 identifies the level of development which mainly corresponds to the comparison of the two measurements – 2018 and 2019.1. This can be explained by the fact that there is not a sufficient empirical basis for unambiguous assessments of the development level for the period under study; consequently, the decision on the distribution should be brought closer to the higher position of the country by the results of the two observations

and remain that way till a complete version of the Index for 2019 is obtained.

With regard to the prospects for further research, in order to form a complete and objective picture of global development, based on comparing retrospective analysis data, and considering the trends, forecasts and prospects, it is the dynamics of changes in the evaluation results over a certain period of time, which takes into account not only the latest ratings, but also evaluation of data for at least a five-year period, that is most important for the assessments. This will make it possible to draw conclusions not only of the prospects for individual countries' development, but also the governance of global development and the effectiveness of public policy impact on its components, with account of the relevant triggers which give impetus to certain processes and launch the appropriate mechanisms.

For taking further steps towards improving the evaluation system, it is very useful to determine the nature and content of the individual

components of integrated development indices, which are a set of ratings and indicators showing the results in a particular area of social development, taking into account its socio-humanitarian and economic and technological components. At the same time, selection of the relevant indicators within the evaluation system implies the establishment of absolute measurements of results in the context of ensuring a reliable evaluation of its positioning in the global dimension. Of particular note is that when identifying the relevant indicators, it is necessary to be guided by certain principles and clearly defined features that form their substantive content which should be unambiguous and reflecting all the basic development characteristics in accordance with the principles of homogeneity and proportionality of indicators determined based on official statistical information.

Another useful quality of the proposed system for assessment of communities, an example of which is the assessment of the OECD countries' development, is the presence in the evaluation system of a vivid parameter – the indicator of development of a particular system (community, grouping) and positioning of the indicator of development of a particular ranking entity relative to the indicator of development of the entire system. It is appropriate that the value of the indicator of system development is an objective border line, relative to which individual countries rank as subjects of assessment on the relevant system evaluation scales, depending on their achieved successes. Measuring of an indicator of a subject (or a group of subjects) in relation to the system – the community allows evaluating the development results of individual regional entities (e.g. Baltic countries, the Scandinavian countries, the Visegrad group, or the Mediterranean countries) and their development prospects within their community.

Besides, the efforts of the evaluation subject, in case it is lagging behind, to reach the level of the system is both a motivational and reinforcing factor for the whole system, which ultimately

provides a synergistic effect during process implementation. However, this may also restrict the membership of countries in certain entities, if by its global index a country does not meet the requirements for joining a particular community. Note that there is no discrimination here; but there is a clear benchmark, that is, the criterion by which a country should be considered as having reached the level of compliance with the conditions of functioning and development of a community of countries, first of all, by the socio-humanitarian and economic and technological criteria.

Therefore, the conducted analysis, in fact, aims to find the most optimal model for the development of supranational entities (communities, associations of countries) in the context of globalization. Comparison of the results of the balanced development of the OECD member countries in the dynamics (over two years) makes it possible to conclude that in general the rating has proved sufficiently stable, demonstrating stability in the distribution of not only individual countries as subjects of evaluation on a relevant scale, but also regional groups of countries, and thus, provides a basis for using these data for analytical forecasts of the strategic prospects for countries' development both in a generalized form and in selected areas.

The analytical support for processes related to the formation of a system for global development governance can be one of the components ensuring its effectiveness. In this case, it seems appropriate to form a system of global development indicators. Proceeding from this, it is expedient to continue the work on the introduction into the scientific discourse and practical use of the integrated index of global development, based on the correlation of socio-humanitarian, and economic and technological components in order to achieve the corresponding coordinated global goals that urge social development, promote innovative thinking, integration processes, increase in investments into the countries' own resource and intellectual potential, enabling them to obtain certain

important social results as well as to unite and consolidate the society around the shared goals and values (Karamyshev, D.V., Theory and Practice of Public Administration, 2018).

The Global Index should become one of the viable strategic indicators of a balanced OECD development, identifying strengths and areas of concern in various public policy areas, which would help making more considered management decisions on global development benchmarks in the context of Global Governance.

LITERATURA

1. BDO IBC International Business Compass. URL : <https://www.bdo-ibc.com>
2. Cobb, C., Halstead, T., Rowe, J. (1995). Redefining Progress: The Genuine Progress Indicator, Summary of Data and Methodology. San Francisco.
3. Daly, H.E., and J. Cobb (1989). For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment and a Sustainable Future. Beacon Press, Boston, MA. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/027046769101100137>
4. Environmental Sustainability Index Report. URL : <http://www.yale.edu/esi>
5. The Failure of the Failed States Index from World Policy Institute. URL : <http://www.worldpolicy.org>.
6. GDP based on purchasing-power-parity (PPP) per capita. URL : <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD?page=1>
7. The Global Competitiveness Index URL : <http://www.reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness>
8. Global Governance (2015). Global Governance: Opportunities and Risks / Ed. V.G. Baranovsky, N.I. Ivanova - Moscow: IMEMO RAS, 2015. - 315 p. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18611/2221-3279-2017-8-2-58-72>
9. Global Governance 2025: At Critical Juncture. (2010). EU Institute for Security Studies, 2010. P. 11. doi: [doi:10.2815/21215](https://doi.org/10.2815/21215)
10. The Global Innovation Index. URL : <https://www.globalinnovationindex.org>
11. Groom, A., Powell, D. (1994). From World Politics to Global Governance – A Theme in Need of a Focus // Contemporary International Relations. L.-N.Y., 1994
12. Hayda, Yu.I. (2015). Sustainable Development: Concepts of Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment // Agrosvit. - No. 2, 2015 - p.3-9.
13. Heywood, Andrew. (2000). Key concepts in Politics / Palgrave key concepts series. – Houndmills, Basingstoke (England): Palgrave Macmillian, 2000. P. 19.
14. Hufty, Marc. (2011). Investigating Policy Processes: The Governance Analytical Framework (GAF). In: Wiesmann, U., Hurni, H., et al. eds. Research for Sustainable Development: Foundations, Experiences, and Perspectives. Bern: Geographica Bernensia, 2011. 403–24. Human Development Report. URL : <http://www.hdr.undp.org>
15. Huntington, S. (1996). The Clash of Civilisation and Remarking of World Order. - New York, 1996. doi: [10.1353/sais.1997.0024](https://doi.org/10.1353/sais.1997.0024)
16. Indicators of sustainable development: framework and methodologies. (2001). Commission on sustainable development. 9-th session, UN, 2001.
17. International Telecommunication Union official page. URL : <http://www.itu.int>
18. Jackson, P. (2015). Introduction: Security and Development // Handbook of International Security and Development. Jackson P., ed. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2015, Pp. 1-18.
19. Karamyshev, D.V. (2018). Dominantes of Global Governance in the Dimentions of Global Development / D.V. Karamyshev // Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Coll. Sci.W. - Kh.: Publishing House of of KRI NAPA "Master". - 2018. -Ed. 4. - p. 8-20.
20. Karamyshev, D.V. (2018). Imperatives of Global Development: Focus on Global Governance / D.V. Karamyshev // Public Administration and Regional Development. - 2018. - No. 2. - p. 365-388. DOI: [10.26693/pard2018.02.365](https://doi.org/10.26693/pard2018.02.365)

21. *Karamyshev, D.V.* (2019). Global Development Index as Indicator of Global Governance: Integrated Assessment of OECD Member Countries Development / *D.V. Karamyshev* // Public Policy and Administration. - 2019, Vol. 18, No 4, p. 377-394. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13165/VPA-19-18-4-01>
22. The Legatum Prosperity Index. URL : <https://www.prosperity.com>
23. Living Planet Report 2000, WWF, 2001. New Economics Foundation URL: <http://www.neweconomics.org>
24. *Okara, D.V., Chernyshev, V.G., 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. Nikolaev, 2018. Ed.22. p. 84-90.
25. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) official page. URL : <http://www.oecd.org>
26. Regional Development Policies in OECD Countries. (2010). Paris, OECD Publishing, 2010. 384 p. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264087255-en>
27. *Rhodes, R. A.* (2010). The New Governance: Governing without Government. From Government to Governance / Bellamy R. and Palumbo A.(eds.) : Ashgate, 2010. pp. 3–4. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x>
28. Social Progress Index. URL : <https://www.socialprogress.org>
29. Sustainable Development Goals Index. URL : <http://sdgindex.org/reports>
30. UN (embassy in Ukraine) official page. URL : <http://www.un.org.ua>
31. United Nations: homepage. URL: <http://www.un.org/en/index.html>
32. *Ursul, A.D.* (2018). From global development to global peace // Global politics. – 2018. – №4.–C.10-20.DOI:10.25136/2409-8671.2018.4.28334 URL: https://nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=28334
33. World Bank. (2006). Where is the Wealth of Nations. The World Bank, Washington D.C.
34. World Development Indicators. URL : <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators>

This page is intentionally left blank

• •