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Abstract. The article shows that the achievement of the thresholds pointed in the Food Security Doctrine for the period up to 2030 does not ensure that the per capita consumption of basic foodstuffs is brought up to rational norms. The need to improve the sustainability of food security in Russia is noted. It has been established that this problem has not received due attention in the indicated Doctrine. The main factors on which the success of solving this problem depends are listed. These include the development of the economy and an increase in employment and income of the population, the optimization of inter- and intra-sectoral relations, the creation of favorable conditions for the development of small business in agriculture, an increase of the regions' self-sufficiency with basic types of food. Expressed the expediency of reflecting the listed factors in the section "Risks and Threats to Food Security" of the named Doctrine. The necessity of taking effective measures aimed at taking these factors into account has been substantiated.

1. Introduction

Since ancient times, each country has been striving to ensure its food security. As a result of mastering effective technologies, some of them managed to solve this problem in general. However, in most countries (approximately 80-85%), including Russia, to some extent it remains insufficiently resolved. With this in mind, in 2010 the Food Security Doctrine of the Russian Federation was adopted. In the course of its implementation, it became clear that some positions of this document need to be clarified and supplemented. In this regard, a new version of the Doctrine was approved in 2020. A new indicator of Food Safety was introduced - the level of self-staple food, which is calculated as the ratio of the volume of domestic agricultural production, raw materials and food to the volume of their domestic consumption. In the previous Doctrine, as this indicator, "the share of relevant products in the commodity resources of the domestic market" was provided, which did not meet the requirements of food security.

Other clarifications and additions have been made to the Doctrine. In particular, thresholds were raised for a number of products: sugar and vegetable oil - from 80% to 90%; fish and fish products - from 80% to 85%. The list of products for which thresholds are provided has been expanded. Among them are the seeds of the main agricultural crops (the level of self-sufficiency is at least 75%), vegetables and melons (the level of self-sufficiency is at least 90%), fruits and berries (the level of self-sufficiency is at least 60%).
The measures taken in recent years by the Russian Government to develop the agro-industrial complex have made it possible for certain types of products to reach the threshold values of the Doctrine. Among them are potatoes, vegetable oil, meat and meat products, sugar. However, despite this, the level of consumption of some basic types of products does not correspond to the rational standards adopted in the country. These include, first of all, milk and dairy products, vegetables and melons, fruits and berries (Table 1).

| Product                  | Threshold in Doctrine (not less,%) | Level self-sufficiency, % | Attitude actual consumption to rational norm, % |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Potato                   | 95                                | 95.1                      | 94.5                                          | 98.9                                          |
| Meat and meat products   | 85                                | 105.3                     | 101.0                                         | 95.9                                          |
| Milk and dairy products  | 90                                | 83.9                      | 61.8                                          | 72.0                                          |
| Vegetables and melons    | 90                                | 87.7                      | 69.5                                          | 77.1                                          |
| Fruits and berries       | 60                                | 40.2                      | 26.1                                          | 62.0                                          |
| Eggs*                    | -                                 | -                         | -                                             | 120.8                                         |

* these products belong to the main ones, although thresholds for them are not provided in the Doctrine

Several relevant conclusions follow from the table below:

1. Reaching the thresholds in the Doctrine does not guarantee that the level of self-sufficiency is in line with rational consumption standards.

2. Excessive consumption of bakery products and eggs is evidence that the main reason for the non-compliance of consumption with the specified norm is the insufficient purchasing power of the population.

3. A significant lag of actual consumption from rational norms indicates the presence of problems in food supply.

Logically, the main problems in the field of food security of the country should have been reflected in the "Risks and Threats" section of the Doctrine. However, this has not been done sufficiently. For example, it has not been noted that they are caused by the shortcomings of the system of state management of agriculture. Along with this, the named section does not mention such a particularly important factor as "the sustainability of food security".

It should be noted that in recent years a number of publications [1,2] have touched upon the problem of food security sustainability. At the same time, in Russian science and practice, this topic remains insufficiently studied.

2. Materials and methods
The article is based on data from Rosstat, the Ministry of Agriculture of Russia, information from publications of famous scientists dealing with this problem. In preparing the article, monographic, abstract-logical, computational-constructive and expert research methods were used.
3. Results and discussion

After examining the problem of ensuring the sustainability of food security, we came to the conclusion that the main reasons that impede its solution are the following:

1. The focus of the agri-food policy on the preferential financial, administrative and other support of large agricultural holdings. Small business support in agriculture is carried out on a leftover basis, which hinders its development.

2. Disproportions in inter-sectoral relations, which led to overpricing of resources and services purchased by agricultural producers. This complicates the activities of agricultural producers, reduces the level of their profitability and competitiveness.

3. Disproportions in intra-industry relations. They are mainly caused by deficiencies in the relationship between agricultural production and processing enterprises.

4. Weakness of the mechanisms of socio-economic development of municipalities, regions and Russia as a whole. The main reasons for this are the excessive centralization of public administration, including inter-budgetary relations, and flaws in the personnel policy in the authorities.

5. Underestimation of the need to stimulate self-sufficiency in the regions with the main types of agricultural products and food.

6. Budgetary support for the agrarian sectors of the constituent entities of Russia, based on subjective factors, which leads to an unfair distribution of financial assistance between agricultural producers.

From the analysis of the above reasons, it follows that they are generated by the shortcomings of state management of agriculture, and therefore are primary in relation to the risks and threats to food security provided for in the Doctrine (the only exceptions in this regard are natural and climatic risks). For example, the basis of veterinary and phytosanitary risks, sanitary-epidemiological and social threats, the deterioration of the demographic situation in rural areas and the loss of continuity of the rural lifestyle is mainly based on the monopolization of property and the concentration of production in agriculture. This is explained by the fact that priority budgetary and other support of large agricultural holdings has led to a decrease in attention to the development of small businesses in rural areas. As a result, rural areas have high unemployment, low incomes, and attractiveness for living and working. As a result, as large agricultural holdings displace small-scale farms and other small forms of farming from the market of agricultural products and foodstuffs, the demographic situation in the Russian countryside worsens, the process of population outflow from it and, accordingly, the exposure of rural areas is intensifying [3,4].

Imbalances in inter-sectoral and intra-sectoral relations led to the fact that agriculture again became a donor for related monopolized industries, supplying it with resources and rendering services. Among them are banks, processing, trade and transport enterprises, warehouses for products, and other formations. The result of all this was that together with the state, they annually pump out at least 1.3 trillion rubles from the agricultural sector. Conversely, only a little more than 10% of these funds are returned to agricultural producers in the form of subsidies and grants. However, even of these, about 50% is again withdrawn in the form of taxes and payments, leaving the peasantry with a debt burden of more than 2 trillion rubles [5].

To this it should be added that the situation with increasing the sustainability of food security is complicated by imperfect mechanisms for the socio-economic development of municipalities, constituent entities of the Russian Federation and Russia as a whole. The validity of this conclusion is convincingly evidenced by the following fact: at present, at least 40 program measures are being implemented in the country aimed at solving the economic and social problems of the Russian countryside, including those aimed at improving the quality of life of the rural population. Despite this, the citizens of the country practically do not feel the positive impact of the measures carried out within the framework of these programs. Moreover, the situation in many areas is even worsening. In particular, the purchasing power of the population has been declining for six years in a row, which contributes to a decrease in demand for high-quality food. This, on the one hand, has a negative impact
on the health of the population, on the other hand, it prevents an increase in the sustainability of food security.

The state of affairs in the field of the formation of sustainable food supply is aggravated by the fact that so far it has not been possible to take effective measures to create new jobs for the citizens of the country by creating favorable conditions for the development of the economy. Instead, the Russian Government is stimulating the influx of labor from abroad, the number of which, according to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, in some periods reaches 11 million people (in the past two years it has slightly decreased due to the pandemic). And this despite the fact that, according to our estimates, there are at least 15-17 million unemployed in the country.

To a large extent, most of the entrepreneurial structures also suffer from the insufficient efficiency of the system of state management of the economy. Convincing evidence of this is the results of a large-scale survey conducted in 2016-2018 by VCIOM (Russian Public Opinion Research Center www.wciom.ru). More than 1400 employees of the management of various sectors of the Russian economy were respondents in it, of which more than 8% represented agriculture, hunting and forestry, and fishing.

The main conclusion that was made as a result of this survey is the following: during the surveyed period, the conditions for doing business in Russia tended to clearly deteriorate. According to the respondents, the main reasons for this were [6]:

1. The lack of a clear and understandable the Russian Government program focused on the development of the country's economy.
2. High energy prices.
3. Low demand in the domestic market.
4. High corruption burden.
5. Lack of qualified personnel.
6. Excessive tax burden.
7. Inconsistency with the quality requirements of the judicial system.
8. Violation of the principles of healthy competition by representatives of the shadow business.

Unfortunately, the assessment of the current situation in the country does not give basis to believe that in the foreseeable future it will be possible to significantly reduce the negative impact of these factors on the domestic economy, including ensuring the necessary stability of food security.

If the above reasons affecting the sustainability of food security are, to one degree or another, touched upon in state programs for the development of agriculture, the problem of self-sufficiency in the regions with the main types of agricultural products and food is almost not reflected in them. Despite this, it has been and remains among the most urgent factors of sustainable food supply in the country. This is due to the fact that the higher the autonomy of the regions in the field of self-sufficiency in food, the higher the stability of the state in force majeure circumstances, including natural anomalies, military operations and other unforeseen situations. Therefore, in recent years, this problem has become the focus of attention of a number of scientists [7-11].

At the same time, the practical impact of these studies is still low, since the authorities responsible for agriculture currently do not pay sufficient attention to the issues under consideration. As a result, in the system of state management of the agricultural sector, there are no effective mechanisms for leveling the operating conditions of its subsectors, taking into account the peculiarities of the climatic and economic conditions of territories focused on self-sufficiency of food in the regions. Naturally, it doesn't mean that activities should be taken regardless the costs. As with everything else, this issue should be kept within reasonable limits.

The violation of the principle of leveling the operating conditions, as well as the granting of privileges to individual regions in the distribution of budgetary support to agricultural producers led to excessive disparities in food production. This also began to hinder the growth of the level of self-sufficiency of the regions with food. Ultimately, the noted was a factor that has a negative impact on the stability of food security in Russia. To illustrate what has been said, here are two typical examples:
1. In terms of bioclimatic potential, the Belgorod and Kostroma regions located in the Central Federal District do not differ much from each other (in the first of them it is 1.26, in the second - 0.94). Despite this, according to Rosstat data on the per capita production of the products provided for in the Doctrine, the Belgorod Oblast is significantly superior to the Kostroma Oblast. This is especially true for meat, for which the specified discrepancy in 2019 was 49 times (in the Belgorod region 885 kg per person, in the Kostroma region - 18 kg). At the same time, meat producers of the Belgorod region have to purchase a significant part of animal feed in other regions, where agricultural producers cannot develop meat industries due to low budget support.

2. Imbalances in the production of basic food products are also observed within the regions. For example, the Tambov region is one of the regions with the most favorable natural conditions for the production of fruits and berries. However, shortcomings in planning agricultural production led to the fact that in 2019 only 26 kg of fruits and berries were produced per capita in the region, while consumption was 56 kg at a rational rate of 100 kg.

4. Conclusions
In Russia, after the default of 1998, significant problems arose with the import of food. In this regard, the Russian government was forced to strengthen budgetary support for agricultural producers. As a result, significant progress has been achieved in improving the country's food security. However, this problem is still far from being solved. Thus, the volumes of production and personal consumption of such important products as milk and dairy products, fruits and berries, vegetables and melons are significantly lower than the rational norms. Along with this, the risks and threats in this area remain high. Minimizing them requires increasing the resilience of food security. To solve this problem, it is necessary to carry out many organizational and economic measures, including creating favorable conditions for the development of small business in agriculture, optimizing intersectoral relations and relations within the agro-industrial complex, increasing the purchasing power of the population and the level of self-sufficiency of food in the regions. The implementation of these measures presupposes the improvement of public administration not only in agriculture, but also in the socio-economic complex of Russia as a whole. Otherwise, in the foreseeable future, it will not be possible to ensure sustainable economic availability of food for the country's population.
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