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Abstract. The article analyzes state programs as a tool for the development of the digital economy. The author examines the effectiveness of achieving targets. Main problems are caused by incorrect targets. In addition, there is no unified system of evaluation of state programs. The author proposes to solve the problem by changing and supplementing several indicators, developing a uniform methodology for evaluating government programs.
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Getting into the top five countries of the world is a priority for the development of the Russian Federation. This task can be achieved through the development of the digital economy.

According to the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of 05/09/2017 No. 203 [1], a digital economy is defined «as economic activity in which the key factor of production is data in a digital form, processing large volumes and using the results of analyzing which, compared to traditional forms of management, allows to increase the efficiency of various types of production, technologies, equipment, storage, sale, delivery of goods and services».

Digital economy is a series of economic or social processes based on information and communication technologies and implemented through the Internet. A number of authors (Guo S., Ding W., Lanshina T.) believe that in its sense, the «Internet is a digital economy» [2].

The relevance of the study lies in the fact that governmental programs (hereinafter - GPs) can give a significant breakthrough in the development of the digital economy. RUB 1852.1 billion was allocated for the implementation of the GPs in the direction of «Innovative development and modernization of the economy» in 2017, which represents 11% of the total federal budget expenditures and 17% of the total funds allocated for the implementation of all GPs [3]. Consequently, the development of the digital economy in the Russian Federation is one of the main areas in the GPs system.

The analysis of the achievement of target indicators for the studied GP is presented in the table. According to the table, in 2017 only 53% of the established target indicators were reached, which can be considered an unsatisfactory result. The most effective result of the implementation of the GP, listed in the table under №№13, 18, 29 (76-86%). The lowest results were found according to GPs, indicated in the table under №№ 14, 15, 17, 28 (29-56%).

Comparing the data of the Table in the column «The share of achieved target indicators in relation to the 2017 plan» and the data of the consolidated annual report on the implementation and evaluation of the effectiveness of the state programs of the Russian Federation in 2017 [4], you can see that the data is very different. Where the percentage of target fulfillment in the table on GPs is below 60, according to the consolidated annual report on the implementation and evaluation of the effectiveness of state programs of the Russian Federation for 2017, not a single result in the «assessment of indicators (indicators)» column is below 66%.

Thus, based on the data of the consolidated annual report on the implementation and evaluation of the effectiveness of state programs of the Russian Federation following the results of 2017, the most effective implementation can be noted in GPs No. 14, 24, 29, and the least implementation efficiency ac-
according to the GPs No. 15, 28, 30. This is slightly different from the analysis of the data in the Table. From this it follows that at the moment there is no uniform methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of GPs.

Table 1. Assessment of the level of achievement of the target indicators of state programs implemented in the framework of the direction «Innovative development and modernization of the economy» [3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>The name of the program</th>
<th>Number of planned target indicators</th>
<th>The number of target indicators achieved by the 2017 plan</th>
<th>Share of target indicators achieved in relation to the 2017 plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The development of science and technology</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Economic development and innovative economy</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The development of industry and increase its competitiveness</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The development of the aviation industry</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The development of shipbuilding and technology for the development of offshore fields</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Development of the pharmaceutical and medical industries</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Information society</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transport system development</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Development of agriculture and regulation of markets for agricultural products, raw materials and food</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The development of the fisheries complex</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Development of foreign economic activity</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reproduction and use of natural resources</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Forestry development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Energy Efficiency and Energy Development</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lizunov A.M. in his research notes that the GPs is not quite an effective tool for the development of the Russian information society. But he notes that the GP, with due regard to its development and implementation, is a promising direction, which will produce high results in the future [5].

The analysis revealed problems that do not allow the most efficient implementation of the GPs:

1. The use of targets that are not able to reflect the results and effectiveness of activities. For example, in the GP «Development of industry and increase of its competitiveness» such an indicator is used «Domestic expenses for research and development within the framework of the Program at the expense of budget funds». This reflects only the costs attributed to research and development. This information is not a target and should be disclosed in the funding plan for the activities.

2. The repetition of the same indicators without clarifying their differences. For example, the state enterprise «Economic Development and Innovative Economy» and «Information Society» assesses the level of satisfaction of citizens of the Russian Federation with the quality of state and municipal services. Targets are different, and significant differences are not disclosed.

3. The impracticality of the performance measurement system. The result is greatly influenced by external factors that are not related to the implementation of GPs. For example, «Development of the transport system» is an indicator of accidents in the road transport.

4. The lack of a unified methodology for assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of the GPs. For example, in the process of assessing the level of achievement of target indicators for the state-owned enterprise «Development of industry and increasing its competitiveness», it was revealed that only 29% of indicators were achieved in relation to planned values, according to the data from the...
According to the data of the consolidated annual report on the implementation and evaluation of the effectiveness of state programs of the Russian Federation following the results of 2017 [4], for the same GP, the assessment of indicators was 73.8%, and the degree of implementation efficiency was 80.7%.

Based on the identified problems, the following solutions are proposed:

1. Replace the indicator «the number of accidents on road transport» in the SE «Development of the transport system» by «the number of accidents on road transport without taking into account incidents related to the condition of the driver» and add the indicator «the number of accidents on road transport related to the condition of the driver».

2. Replace financial indicators (or add) to those that can reflect the result of the event. For example, in the state enterprise «Development of the industry and increase of its competitiveness», the indicator of internal expenditures on research and development within the Program at the expense of budget funds should be replaced (or added) by «Number of successful research and development within the Program carried out at the expense of budget funds».

3. Exclude the repetition of the indicator of satisfaction of citizens of the Russian Federation with the quality of state and municipal services in the GP «Economic Development and Innovative Economy» and «Information Society» by clarifying the characteristics of this indicator for each GP.

4. Develop a unified methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the GPs.

It can be concluded that the state programs of the Russian Federation occupy an important place in the development of the digital economy. However, every GP has a number of problems, their solution is necessary for a more competent implementation of all governmental programs.
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Аннотация. В статье проводится анализ государственных программ, как инструмента развития цифровой экономики. Автор рассматривает эффективность достижения целевых показателей. Основные проблемы выявлены в некорректности целевых показателей. Кроме этого, отсутствует единая система оценки государственных программ. Автор предлагает решить проблему с помощью изменения и дополнения нескольких показателей, разработки единой методики оценки государственных программ.
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