

МІЖНАРОДНА ЕКОНОМІКА

UDC 327.7:502

DOI: 10.26565/2311-2379-2020-99-09

Volodymyr Hobela

Ph.D.(Economics), Senior Lecturer

Lviv State University of Internal Affairs

26 Horodotska Str.,79007, Lviv, Ukraine

E-mail: vgobela@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7438-2329>**INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
FOR ECONOMIC AND ECOLOGICAL SECURITY**

This article focuses on the study of organizational and institutional support of ecological and economic security at the global level as one of relevant modern research problems. It emphasizes the need for a harmonious combination of economic and environmental tools to ensure harmonious development and considers the concepts of institute, institutional unit, and institutional support. At the global level, the article analyzes approaches to the classification of institutional units of ecological economy and considers the main reasons for the complexity of the classification of international organizations. The classification of institutional units according to general and specific features at the international level is offered. According to general features, the classification provides for the division by time into permanent and periodic. According to the sphere of activity, a division into political-institutional units (integration, security, coordination), economic institutional units (energy, resource, transport and communication, agro-industrial, financial, trade, recreation, and services), social institutional units (social development, cultural and educational, health, and physical education) is envisaged. According to the organizational form, the division into governmental and non-governmental institutional units is proposed. According to the methods and principles of activity, the division into lawful, illegal, and hybrid institutional units is proposed. The expediency of allocating a classification group – hybrid organizations is substantiated. By specific features, the classification provides for the division by territorial distribution (global, regional, and group), based on membership (open, semi-open, and closed), on a structural basis (UN systems and non-UN systems). As a result of study, a system of classification of institutional units for ecological economy at the global level was proposed. The main problems of institutional support of greening at the global level are also highlighted.

Keywords: institute, institutional support, institutional unit, ecological security, economic security.**JEL Classification:** F29, H10, H56, K32, O19.

Formulation of the research problem. Security has become a key concept of today for Ukraine. The hybrid war with the Russian Federation and the COVID-19 pandemic have significantly undermined the country's economic potential. The issue of ensuring not only the national but also the ecological and economic security of the state is especially acute. However, active economic recovery may exacerbate the environmental crisis. The way out of the current situation is possible by ensuring economic development and ecological friendly economic recovery, ensuring the ecological and economic security of the state. Given the European integration and globalization processes, ecological and economic security is a priority for Ukraine. Accordingly, the analysis and characterization of the institutional provision of ecological and ecological security at the global level is an important area of research.

Strengthening ecological and economic security requires an appropriate mechanism for its implementation. In the context of the development of integration processes, it is difficult to underestimate the importance of institutional support for ecological and economic security. This issue requires detailed consideration in both theoretical and applied aspects. That is, importance should be attached to the formation of a system of levers and tools for global ecological and economic security, a harmonious combination of interests of environmental and economic systems to ensure the harmonious development of the world.

Literature review. The study of the problems of institutional support and the essence of the concepts of "institute", "institution" was conducted by foreign and Ukrainian researchers: Hodgson, who considered institutions as systems of long-term rules that shape social interaction (Hodgson, 2006); North, who viewed institutions as rules of the game or constraints in society that steer people's relationships in the right direction (North, 2000); Gordeev, who studied the theoretical meaning of the concept of institutional mechanism and interpreted it as a system of people's roles and relationships by established traditions and rules (Gordeev, 2012); Lozynska, who emphasizes the difficulties of interpretation of the semantic meaning of the concept of the institute by Soviet and domestic scientists, studies environmental management and ecological institutions (Lozynska, 2014); Stephan, Uhlaner, Stride, who have developed the institutional configuration perspective to understand which national contexts facilitate social entrepreneurship and tested opposing propositions from the institutional void and institutional support perspectives (Stephan, Uhlaner, & Stride, 2014). Stupen, considers the concept of institution as a system of formal and informal norms and rules governing relations between economic entities (Stupen & Shumlianskyi, 2015); Kuzmynchuk, who substantiates the role of the state, in its particular its institutions, in strengthening economic security and the need to intensify state regulation of entrepreneurship to implement strategic and tactical measures to ensure economic security (Kuzmynchuk, 2018); Gadzalo, who viewed conceptual ideas of institutional support of balanced environmental management and offered the directions of their interaction is offered (Gadzalo, 2019); Yi Wang, who investigates researched institutional interactions, and explains the final decisions and implementations related to rural development, he described as well the Top-down institution and Bottom-up institution (Yi Wang, 2020).

The works of the following scientists are devoted to the issues of institutional support of ecological and economic security: Drebot, who studied the etymology of the concepts "institute" and "institution", the concept of "institutionalization" and institutional support of nature management (Drebot, 2018); Ivanova, who formulated the basic provisions of the theory of public administration of ecological and economic security of the state and regions (Ivanova, 2013); Ilyashenko, who studied the organizational and economic mechanism of environmental management, which provides for the harmonization of ecological and economic interests at all levels of government and explored the mechanism of ecological security (Ilyashenko, 2013); Kuchmiyov, who proposed a scientific and methodological approach to the formation of organizational and economic mechanism of environmental management on the basis of marketing and formed indicators for assessing the effectiveness of this mechanism (Kuchmiyov, 2013); Khvesyk, Golyan, who studied the institutional mechanism of nature management and its components basic institutes, market institutes, institutes of financial and economic regulation and legal support (Khvesyk & Golyan, 2007); Shevchenko, who studied the institutional support of ecological policy in the context of decentralization (Shevchenko, 2015); Shevchuk, who studied the provision of ecological security in terms of institutional theory (Shevchuk, 2012).

Despite a significant amount of research on the issues of institutional support for ecological and economic security, scientists have little research on the features of institutional support for ecological and economic security at the global level in the context of intensifying international cooperation and taking into account the peculiarities of international law.

Purpose and objectives. The purpose of the study is to characterize the international organizational and institutional support of ecological and economic security. To ensure the goal the research objectives were formed:

- to review of the theoretical meaning of the concepts of an institution, institutional unit, and institutional support;
- to improve the classification of global institutional units that ensure greening while structuring them on general and specific features;
- to complete appropriate conclusions.

Results. To understand the essence of institutional support for economic security, it is necessary to dwell in more detail on the concept of institution, institutional unit, and institutional support. The term "institution" is sometimes understood as the rules of the game in a society, regardless of its scope. In addition, the institute imposes restrictions on activities, with the main role in setting rules and applying restrictions belongs to the state (Gordeev, 2012).

The institute regulates human relations to avoid undesirable consequences of cooperation: avoidance of losses, compensation for damages, minimization of costs of agreements, etc. Also, the institute allows increasing the efficiency of activities through the exchange of information and transfer of experience, organization of training, etc. And after the establishment of these rules and restrictions, the mechanism of implementation of these provisions comes into force. However, we note that it is necessary to distinguish between the concepts of "institution" and "institutional unit". The institute provides appropriate working conditions, and the "institutional unit" ensures the effective achievement of results (Shevchenko, 2015).

Thus, the institute is a system of relations and interrelations between different subjects, which ensures the coherence of the actions of these subjects on the basis of formal norms and rules or informal traditions. That is, the institute is a holistic system that operates to regulate certain relationships.

In the study of institutional security, the ecological and economic security is considered under the concept of the institutional unit – individuals, legal entities, associations of individuals, the government agencies, and intergovernmental associations operating in the system of international legal relations and influencing the global economy and environment. That is, these are organizations that exercise influence and ensure the process of protection, preservation, and reproduction of the environment, taking into account economic, environmental, and legal levers.

Thus, under the concept of institutional support, we will consider a system of levers and incentives, relationships, and relationships between formal and informal actors, formed on the basis of norms, rules of conduct, and traditions in order to ensure their effective functioning (Pitsur & Hobela, 2018). Accordingly, we will assume that the institutional provision of ecological and economic security is a system of levers and incentives, relationships and relations between formal and informal subjects of economic relations, formed on the basis of statutory norms and rules of conduct for effective economic development. When considering the institutional support of ecological and economic security, we will assume that its functioning is ensured at the appropriate levels: global; national; regional; local.

At the global level, the institutional support of ecological and economic security is represented by a large number of international organizations, institutions, foundations, various associations, and specialized events (conferences, summits, meetings, etc.). Most of these institutional units have an impact on economic processes at both the global and national levels. They differ in whether they exert direct or indirect influence, and whether they like influence (advisory, controlling, directive) to a greater or lesser extent. In order to analyze the state and problems of institutional support at the global level, there is a need to classify institutional units by characteristics.

We think that it is necessary to improve the classification of institutional units. Therefore, we propose a division by general features, that is regardless of levels, and specific features that depend on the levels of economic and environmental security. This will make it possible to single out institutions that ensure economic and environmental security and analyze their functional purpose at all levels. The classification of institutional units by general features is presented in Table 1.

Thus, in the temporal dimension, institutional units are divided into permanent and temporary. In particular, permanent organizations include those that operate on a permanent and regular basis (UN, WTO, IMF, and UNESCO). Temporary organizations include organizations that are created for a certain period of time in order to perform a relevant function, achieve certain goals, and perform tasks. Then they cease their activities, cease to exist, or create new organizations (IPO, GATT). It would be appropriate to distinguish another type – periodicals. They include organizations that perform their activities periodically and in general, there is no continuity of their activities. These are mainly various conferences, congresses, forums, etc. (UNEP, World Economic Forum).

Decisions of these institutes are sometimes global in nature and form the main directions of economic and environmental policy and security worldwide (Rio Declaration, UNEP, and Kyoto Protocol). Therefore, we believe that the need for such a category is justified.

According to the organizational and legal basis, we distinguish the following categories: governmental, non-governmental, and mixed. That is the division by composition of participants or by form of organization. The division on this basis is general because the classification can be carried out at all levels. Government institutional units have a formal status, are created, operate, and are controlled by the state in the person of authorized bodies. Non-governmental institutional units are created by legal entities and individuals acting independently and on their own behalf. Mixed

organizations include organizations that are represented by both governmental and non-governmental (business structures, public organizations, activists) units that are not subjects of public administration.

Some scientists distinguish another classification feature – by methods and principles of activity. Accordingly, organizations are divided into legal and illegal (Mokhniy, Yakhno, & Babets, 2007).

Table 1

Classification of institutional units by general features

Features	Type of organization	Organizations
Time	Permanent	WWF, Green Peace, GEF, IRENA, FSC, OSCE, WHO, IAEA, IMF, ILO, FAO, UNESCO, UNIDO
	Periodical	UN Conference on the Environment
Sphere of activity		Political
	Integration	BSEC, GUAM, CEI
	Security	UN, EAPC, OSCE, IAEA
	Coordination	G7, OECD, BSEC, GUAM
		Economical
	Energy	IEA, OPEC
	Resources	CIPEC, AIEK
	Transport	ICAO, IMO, INTELSAT, MCE, UPU
	Agricultural	FAO, IFAD
	Financial	World Bank, IMF, GEF
	Trade	WTO, ICC, UNCTAD
	Tourism	UNWTO, WIPO
		Social
	Social development	ILO, UNICEF
	Cultural, educational	UNESCO, EUROAVIA, International Baccalaureate
	Healthcare	WHO, FIEP, TAFISA, ICRC
		Religious
		Catholic Church, Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)
		Ecological
		«Green peace», WWF, FSC, IUCN, PETA
Form	Government	CEU, WTO, IMF, GUAM, BSEC, UN
	Public	ICRC, «Green peace», WWF, IRENA, FSC
	Mixed	ILO, WHO
Methods and principles	Legal	UN, OSCE, WTO, IMF, ILO
	Illegal	Animal Liberation Front (ALF)
	Hybrid	DPR, LPR, Earth Liberation Front

Source: developed by the author

Given the current conditions and current trends in the world, the classification on this basis becomes particularly relevant. It would be expedient to carry out classification on a methodological basis, to formulate the name of classification feature as methods and principles of activity. Since the goals of many organizations of this type can be quite humane and legitimate, but the methods of achieving these goals and the principles of operation differ from the generally accepted principles of international law, tolerance, and humanity. We also propose to add a third type to the two components of the classification (legal, illegal) – hybrid. Such organizations are usually political organizations. They have their own program and political course, in the legal field they act as parties (Hamas, Hezbollah) or socio-political movements (Taliban). However, they are characterized by so-called military wing. These units do not operate in the legal field, the methods of their struggle are usually not humane and peaceful, but aimed at financial (destruction of financial assets and resources, weakening financial and credit and banking systems, etc.), material (destruction of industrial facilities, infrastructure, communications, etc.), social losses (destruction of cultural monuments, etc.), damage to health or destruction of civilians. It's difficult to establish and prove social service wing involvement in illegal actions of the military wing of the same organization. These are the hybrid type of organizations that have no underground status, and to some extent operate officially. Some states recognize these organizations as terrorists unilaterally, but this may not affect

their legitimacy, as it is necessary to recognize them as illegal by other states. Striking examples are the self-proclaimed territorial entities that are terrorist organizations: DPR, LPR. Most civilized countries do not recognize them as separate territorial units and consider them terrorists. However, recognizing them as independent territorial entities, even by a small number of states (usually two or three), formally gives them legal status and authority in relations with those countries that have recognized them as an independent. Accordingly, such structures are both legal (political parties, territorial movements) and illegal (self-proclaimed territories, terrorist organizations).

These classification features allow the classification of institutional units of ecological and economic security on a general basis. Note that the classification on specific grounds is carried out depending on the levels of ecological and economic security, is at the global, national, regional, and local levels.

As already mentioned, in the context of the development of globalization and integration processes, the growing number of global environmental problems and global warming has a significant impact on international relationships.

Given all these arguments, we believe that it is necessary to structure and classify the subjects of institutional support for greening at the international level. The complexity of the classification of international organizations is due to several objective reasons:

- lack of a single legal framework for regulating their activities, the specifics of international law;
- different goals, functions, goals and objectives that international organizations are called upon to perform;
- the composition of international organizations members is quite diverse, there is no single principle of their formation.

Since international organizations operate on the basis of international law, the specifics of international law should be taken into account. The main sources of international law governing the relationship are international agreements, conventions, international doctrines, and legal customs. The scope of international law applies only to those entities that have concluded relevant international treaties, containing certain rules, and have ratified them. Therefore, when creating international organizations, the most important is the mechanism of adoption, ratification, or implementation of the basic statutory provisions and their consolidation in the legal framework of the participating countries. Particularly acute is the problem of compliance with certain rules, which are unfavorable for the participating countries. In particular, these are the norms of the Kyoto Protocol. Several countries for which these rules are economically impractical have refused to sign the agreement or have revoked it – as the United States. Therefore, the Kyoto Protocol does not apply to entities operating in U.S. jurisdiction.

Considering the general classification of institutional units, we propose to classify them by general and specific features. Classifications on general grounds are subject to institutional units at all levels, and classification on specific grounds is carried out depending on different levels (global, national). Thus, the classification by general features is represented by the following categories:

- time;
- sphere of activity;
- organizational form;
- methods and principles of activity.

The classification of institutional units at the global level by specific features provides the following categories: territorial distribution; membership; structure (Table 2).

Thus, analyzing the classification of institutional units at the global level on a territorial basis, we note that such a division is quite complex, as different scholars offer different approaches and, accordingly, different classification groups. In particular, the division into: global, regional and subregional (Vegesh, 2008), universal and regional (Mokhniy, Yakhno, & Babets, 2007), global and regional (Kozak, Kovalevsky, & Logvinova, 2009). We assume that the following specific components, characteristic for the global level, should be distinguished in relation to the territorial feature:

- global;
- regional;
- group (interstate).

Global organizations include a large number of countries and whose tasks are general, global in nature. That is, global organizations include international organizations operating worldwide, in a broad legal field, and whose members are institutional units from many countries or the countries themselves (UN, WTO, WHO etc.). Regional organizations are those that are formed on a regional basis and are aimed either at developing cooperation in the region or to strengthen the security of the countries of the region (EU, NAFTA, ASEAN). We include group organizations that are formed regardless of territorial affiliation but do not have a significant number of participants or global tasks (OPEC, NATO).

Classification by specific characteristics also includes membership criterion. Accordingly, institutional units at the global level are divided into:

- open access;
- limited access;
- closed access (Vegesh, 2008).

Open organizations are characterized by ease of entry and membership in organizations. Each state decides to join the organization and joins the signing of the relevant international treaty and charter on the basis of which the organization operates. Semi-open are characterized by the fact that the decision to join is made by a majority vote of states that are already members of the organization. Closed includes those organizations that can be joined only with the consent of all member states of the organization (Vegesh, 2008).

Intergovernmental organizations are international organizations that operate for international cooperation. They coordinate the work of member states and the implementation of other functions provided by the statute of the organization. Supranational organizations provide for the integration of member states, and their decisions apply to all legal and natural persons of these states. A striking example of a supranational organization can be the EU (Mokhniy, Yakhno, & Babets, 2007). That is, interstate entities operate basis on cooperation, legal equality, and independence. Their main goal is coordination and coherence of actions, to establish cooperation and partnerships. In turn, supranational entities provide for the gradual integration and implementation of legal norms and management principles of supranational entities in the political, legal financial and economic systems of the participating countries. Interstate entities operate on the basis of equality, while supranational ones on the basis of mutual subordination to the newly created governing institutions.

Another classification feature of institutional units at the global level is structural one. According to this criterion, organizations are divided into the following categories:

- system of organizations associated with the UN;
- system of organizations not associated with the UN (Kozak, Kovalevsky, & Logvinova, 2009).

Table 2

Classification of institutional units by specific features

Feature	Type	Organization
Territory	Global	WWF, Green Peace, GEF, IRENA, FSC
	Region	OSCE, GUAM, BSEC, CEI
	Group	EAPC, Community of Democratic Choice
Membership	Open access	CEI, Council of the Baltic Sea States, EAPC
	Limited access	WTO, BSEC
	Closed access	GUAM, Community of Democratic Choice
Structure	UN-system	<u>UN</u> : United Nations <i>General Assembly</i> , ECOSOC; UNECE.
		<u>Auxiliary</u> : UNDP; UNEP; UNHABITAT
<u>Under UN auspices</u> : WHO, IAEA, IFAD, IMF, FAO, UNESCO, UNIDO		
	Not UN-system	WWF, Green Peace, GEF, IRENA, FSC, OSCE GUAM, BSEC, CEI, Community of Democratic Choice, Council of the Baltic Sea States, EAPC

Source: Developed by the author based on (Vegesh, 2008; Kozak et al., 2009)

Significant shares of international organizations are established, operate under the auspices, or are a part of the United Nations. Such organizations include UNESCO, IAEA, UNIDO, WHO, The World Bank. It should be noted that this category also includes UN programs (Development Program, Environment Program), UN funds (Women's Development Fund, Children's Fund) and UN centers, the Center for Humanities, the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Coordinator. Disasters, the World Food Council, etc.). Organizations, which are not associated with the UN are the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Association of Commercial Banks, and others.

Global institutional support for economic and environmental security can be implemented in different ways. Having analyzed the main schemes of interaction between international institutions and national institutions, we note that ensuring economic and environmental security is carried out through direct funding, grants. It can be concluded that the implementation of measures through the organizations of the UN system should be more effective, as control over implementation is generally entrusted to state institutions and subsidiary bodies of the UN – the Committee on Sustainable Development.

Institutional support for economic and environmental security by the UN system contains a complex system of interaction. Sometimes there is a subordination of one structural unit to two or three others. Accordingly, the analysis shows that institutional support at the global and national levels is not perfect.

It should be noted that in recent years, regional organizations, especially regional economic organizations, have become widespread. Their influence on ensuring the economic and environmental security of the state is growing. In particular, it is believed that delegating significant powers to regional organizations will contribute to international cooperation and economic and environmental security (Haftel & Hofmann, 2017). Therefore, there is a need to pay more attention to this problem.

Conclusions. As a result of the research, the classification of institutional units of greening has been improved, which, in contrast to the existing ones, provides for structuring by general and specific features at the global and national levels, that allows distinguishing institutions that ensure the economic and environmental security of the state. As a result of the theoretical analysis, we can conclude that institutional support on a global scale is not perfect. Many problems need to be addressed in terms of establishing effective mechanisms for interaction between different international agencies to increase their efficiency.

References

1. Hodgson, G. M. (2006). What are institutions? *Journal of Economic Issues*, 40(1), 1-25. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2006.11506879>.
2. North, D. (2000). Institutions, institutional changes and the functioning of the economy. Kyiv: Osnovy. (in Ukrainian)
3. Gordeev, O. K. (2012). Conceptual approaches to the essence of the institutional mechanism. *Public administration: theory and practice: coll. Science. etc. Association of Doctors of Public Administration.*, 3(11), 36-42. (in Ukrainian)
4. Lozynska, T.M. (2014). To the problem of using the terms "institution" and "institution" in the context of institutional analysis. *Business Inform*, 7, 8-13. (in Ukrainian)
5. Stephan, U., Uhlaner, L., & Stride, C. (2014). Institutions and social entrepreneurship: The role of institutional voids, institutional support, and institutional configurations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46, 308-331. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.38>.
6. Stupen, M., Shumlianskyi, B. (2015). Clarification of the conceptual and categorical apparatus of institutional support of investment activity of the forest sector of the economy. *Ukrainian magazine "Economist"*, 1, 27-29. (in Ukrainian)
7. Kuzmynchuk, N. (2018). Economic security in the system of state regulation of entrepreneurship: institutional aspect. *Adaptive control: theory and practice. Economics Series*, 5 (10). (in Ukrainian)
8. Gadzalo, Ya. (2019). Conceptual principles of institutional support of ecological and economic condition of the Carpathian region. *Balanced nature management*, 2, 136-148. (in Ukrainian)

9. Yi, Wang (2020). Institutional interaction and decision making in China's rural development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 76, 111-119. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.04.023>.
10. Drebot, O. I. (2018). Institutional support of nature management: problems of terminology. *Ukraine Economy*, 5, 73-84. (in Ukrainian)
11. Ivanova, T. (2013). Ensuring environmental and economic security as a condition for sustainable development of Ukraine: public administration aspects. *Scientific intelligence in state and municipal administration*, 1, 42-53. (in Ukrainian)
12. Ilyashenko, I. O. (2013). Formation of organizational and economic mechanism of strategic management of natural and man-made and ecological safety on the basis of sustainable development. *Efficient economy*, 1. Retrieved from <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=1713>. (in Ukrainian)
13. Kuchmiyov, V. (2013). The mechanism of environmental safety management of economic systems on the basis of marketing. *Marketing and innovation management*, 2, 251-259. (in Ukrainian)
14. Khvesyk, M. A., & Golyan, V.A. (2007). *Institutional model of nature management in the context of global challenges*: monograph. Kiev: Condor. (in Ukrainian)
15. Shevchenko I. (2015). Institutional support of environmental policy in the context of decentralization. *Economics of nature management and environmental protection*: a collection of scientific papers. Kyiv: SI IEPH NAS of Ukraine, 87-95. (in Ukrainian)
16. Shevchuk, I. V. (2012). Institutional provision of environmental safety in the context of the development of the environmental monitoring system. *Agrosvit*, 21, 55-59. (in Ukrainian)
17. Pitsur, Ya. S., & Hobela, V. V. (2018). Theoretical and methodological analysis of the process of forming the optimal management system of economic security of economic entities. *Scientific Bulletin of Lviv State Department of Internal Affairs*, 1, 227-235. (in Ukrainian)
18. Mokhniy, A. I., Yakhno, T. P., & Babets, I. H. (2007). *International organizations*: a textbook. Kyiv: Center for Educational Literature. (in Ukrainian)
19. Vegesh, M. M. (2008). *Political Science* (international organizations essence and typology): textbook. Kyiv: Knowledge. (in Ukrainian)
20. Kozak, Yu. H., Kovalevsky V. V., Lohvinova N. S. et. al. (Eds.). (2009). *International organizations*: a textbook. Kyiv: Center for Educational Literature. (in Ukrainian)
21. Haftel, Y. Z., & Hofmann, S. C. (2017). Institutional authority and security cooperation within regional economic organizations. *Journal of Peace Research*, 54, 484-498. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343316675908>.

Література

1. Hodgson G. M. What are institutions? *Journal of Economic Issues*. 2006. Vol. 40. Iss.1. P. 1–25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2006.11506879>.
2. Норт Д. Інституції, інституціональні зміни та функціонування економіки. Київ : Основи, 2000. 245 с.
3. Гордєєв О. К. Концептуальні підходи до сутності інституційного механізму. *Публічне управління: теорія та практика* : зб. наук. пр. асоціації докторів з державного управління. 2012. № 3 (11). С. 36 – 42.
4. Лозинська Т.М. До проблеми вживання термінів “інститут” і “інституція” в контексті інституціонального аналізу. *Бізнес Інформ*. 2014. № 7. С. 8–13.
5. Stephan U., Uhlaner L., Stride C. Institutions and social entrepreneurship: The role of institutional voids, institutional support, and institutional configurations. *Journal of International Business Studies*. 2014. Vol. 46. P. 308–331. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.38>.
6. Ступень М., Шумлянський Б. Уточнення понятійно-категоріального апарату інституційного забезпечення інвестиційної діяльності лісового сектору економіки. *Український журнал “Економіст”*. 2015. № 1. С. 27–29.
7. Кузьминчук Н. Економічна безпека в системі державного регулювання підприємництва: інституціональний аспект. *Адаптивне управління: теорія і практика*. Серія «Економіка». 2018. Вип. 5 (10).
8. Гадзало А.Я. Концептуальні засади інституціонального забезпечення еколого-економічного стану Карпатського регіону. *Збалансоване природокористування*. 2019. № 2. С. 136–148.
9. Yi Wang. (2020) Institutional interaction and decision making in China's rural development. *Journal of Rural Studies*. Vol. 76. P. 111–119. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.04.023>.
10. Дребот О. І. (2018) Інституційне забезпечення природокористування: проблеми термінології. *Економіка України*. 2018. № 5. С. 73–84.

11. Іванова Т. Забезпечення еколого-економічної безпеки як умови сталого розвитку України: державно-управлінські аспекти. *Наукові розвідки з державного та муніципального управління*. 2013. № 1. С. 42–53.
12. Ілляшенко І. О. Формування організаційно-економічного механізму стратегічного управління природно-техногенною та екологічною безпекою на засадах сталого розвитку. *Ефективна економіка*. 2013. № 1. URL: <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=1713>
13. Кучмієв В. Механізм управління екологічною безпекою економічних систем на засадах маркетингу. *Маркетинг і менеджмент інновацій*. 2013. № 2. С. 251–259.
14. Хвесик М.А., Голян В.А. Інституціональна модель природокористування в умовах глобальних викликів : монографія. Київ : Кондор, 2007. 480 с.
15. Шевченко І. Інституційне забезпечення екологічної політики в умовах децентралізації. *Економіка природокористування і охорони довкілля*: збірник наукових праць. Київ : ДУ ІЕПСР НАН України, 2015. С. 87–95.
16. Шевчук І. В. Інституційне забезпечення екологічної безпеки в контексті розвитку системи моніторингу навколишнього середовища. *Агроевіт*. 2012. № 21. С. 55–59.
17. Піцур Я. С., Гобела В. В. Теоретико-методологічний аналіз процесу формування оптимальної системи управління економічною безпекою суб'єктів господарювання. *Науковий вісник ЛьвДУВС*. 2018. №1. С. 227-235.
18. Мохній А. І., Яхно Т. П., Бабець І. Г. Міжнародні організації : навчальний посібник. Київ : Центр учбової літератури, 2007. 440 с.
19. Вегеш М. М. Політологія (міжнародні організації сутність та типологія) : підручник. Київ : Знання, 2008. 384 с.
20. Міжнародні організації : навчальний посібник / за ред.: Козака Ю. Г., Ковалевського В. В., Логвиної Н. С. та ін. Київ : Центр навчальної літератури, 2009. 223 с.
21. Haftel Y. Z., Hofmann S. C. Institutional authority and security cooperation within regional economic organizations. *Journal of Peace Research*. 2017. Vol. 54. P. 484–498. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343316675908>.

В.В. Гобела

кандидат економічних наук, старший викладач
Львівський державний університет внутрішніх справ
вул. Городоцька, 26, м. Львів, 79007, Україна

E-mail: vygobela@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7438-2329>

МІЖНАРОДНЕ ІНСТИТУЦІЙНЕ ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ ЕКОЛОГО-ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ БЕЗПЕКИ

Обґрунтовано актуальність дослідження організаційно-інституційного забезпечення екологічно-економічної безпеки на глобальному рівні. Наголошено на необхідності гармонійного поєднання економічних та екологічних інструментів з метою забезпечення гармонійного розвитку. Розглянуто сутність понять інститут, інституційна одиниця, інституційне забезпечення. Проаналізовано підходи до класифікації інституційних одиниць екологізації на глобальному рівні. Розглянуто основні причини складності класифікації міжнародних організацій на глобальному рівні. Запропоновано класифікацію інституційних одиниць за загальними та специфічними ознаками на міжнародному рівні. За загальними ознаками класифікація передбачає поділ за часовим виміром на постійні та періодичні. За сферою діяльності передбачається поділ на політичні інституційні одиниці (інтеграційні, безпекові, координаційні), економічні інституційні одиниці (енергетичні, ресурсні, транспортно-комунікаційні, агропромислові, фінансові, торговельні, рекреація та послуги), соціальні інституційні одиниці (соціального розвитку, культурно-освітні, охорони здоров'я та фізичної культури). За організаційною формою запропонований поділ на урядові та неурядові інституційні одиниці. Відповідно за методами та принципами діяльності запропоновано поділ на правомірні, протиправні та гібридні інституційні одиниці. Обґрунтовано доцільність виділення класифікаційної групи – гібридні організації. За специфічними ознаками класифікація передбачає поділ за територіальним поширенням (глобальні, регіональні та групові), за ознакою участі та членства (відкриті, напіввідкриті та закриті), за структурною ознакою (системи ООН та не системи ООН). В результаті здійсненого дослідження було запропоновано систему класифікації інституційних одиниць забезпечення

екологізації на глобальному рівні. Також виокремлено основні проблеми інституційного забезпечення екологізації на глобальному рівні.

Ключові слова: інститут, інституційне забезпечення, інституційна одиниця, екологічна безпека, економічна безпека.

JEL Classification: F29, H10, H56, K32, O19.

В.В. Гобела

кандидат економічних наук, старший преподаватель
Львовский государственный университет внутренних дел
ул. Городецкая, 26, г. Львов, 79007, Украина

E-mail: vgobela@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7438-2329>

МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЕ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНОЕ ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЕ ЭКОЛОГО- ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЙ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ

Обоснована актуальность исследования организационно-институционального обеспечения экологической и экономической безопасности на глобальном уровне. Отмечена необходимость гармоничного сочетания экономических и экологических инструментов с целью обеспечения гармоничного развития. Рассмотрены сущность понятий институт, институциональная единица, институциональное обеспечение. Проанализированы подходы к классификации институциональных единиц экологизации на глобальном уровне. Рассмотрены основные причины сложности классификации международных организаций на глобальном уровне. Предложена классификация институциональных единиц по общим и специфическим признакам на международном уровне. По общим признакам классификация предусматривает деление по временным измерением на постоянные и периодические. По сфере деятельности предполагается разделение на политические институциональные единицы (интеграционные, вопросы безопасности, координационные), экономические институциональные единицы (энергетические, ресурсные, транспортно-коммуникационные, агропромышленные, финансовые, торговые, рекреация и услуги), социальные институциональные единицы (социального развития, культурно-образовательные, здравоохранения и физической культуры). По организационной форме предложено разделение на правительственные и неправительственные институциональные единицы. Соответственно за методами и принципами деятельности предложено разделение на правомерные, противоправные и гибридные институциональные единицы. Обоснована целесообразность выделения классификационной группы – гибридные организации. По специфическим признакам классификация предусматривает разделение по территориальному распространением (глобальные, региональные и групповые), по признаку участия и членства (открытые, закрытые и закрытые), по структурному признаку (системы ООН но не системы ООН). В результате проведенного исследования было предложено систему классификации институциональных единиц обеспечения экологизации на глобальном уровне. Также выделены основные проблемы институционального обеспечения экологизации на глобальном уровне.

Ключевые слова: институт, институциональное обеспечение, институциональная единица, экологическая безопасность, экономическая безопасность.

JEL Classification: F29, H10, H56, K32, O19.