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Abstract. The article evaluates the main state programs for the development of agriculture and the social sphere of village, notes their drawbacks. The key directions of increasing the efficiency of these state programs have been identified. Strengthening and full use of the human resources of the village are identified as such. In this regard, the expediency of giving the named types of activity the status of the main tasks of public administration in the development of agriculture and the social sphere of the village, which should be taken into account when developing the considered state programs. Here are formulated prerequisites that are necessary for the successful solution of these tasks - the formation of a capable institution of local self-government and favorable prerequisites for the development of small business in the countryside. It is concluded that the named state programs do not take this into account, and therefore do not have the potential necessary for the sustainable development of the Russian countryside.

1. Introduction
As practice shows, and also follows from the research results of some authors, the state of agriculture and the social sphere of the village is mainly determined by the quality of public administration [1]. It, in turn, depends on how effectively the authorities carry out functions for the development of rural areas.

Currently, to one degree or another, many federal government bodies are involved in the development of these territories. Among them are the President of Russia, the Government of Russia, the Federation Council and the State Duma, which are assigned functions of a strategic nature.

More specific functions of the specialized plan are assigned to line ministries, agencies and other governing bodies.

The socio-economic state of the village indicates that the effectiveness of the performance of functions aimed at its development is still insufficient. Therefore, we set the task to figure out what is the reason for the current situation.

2. Materials and methods
The article uses data from Rosstat, the Ministry of Agriculture of Russia, scientific publications, as well as research methods: monographic, abstract-logical, calculated and expert assessments.

3. Results and discussion
The main part of the functions for the development of agriculture and the social sphere of the village is assigned to the Ministry of Agriculture of Russia. Despite this, its capabilities in solving these
problems are very limited. This is explained by the fact that the key decisions related to the formation of the country's development strategy, including rural areas, are made by the Ministry of Economic Development of Russia.

Experience shows that the development of any industry or territory is based on the successful solution of two tasks - strengthening and effective use of the human potential of the corresponding facility. Despite this, the listed conditions are formed insufficiently (Table 1).

It is known that strengthening of human resources is ensured by equipping the population with new production technologies. This requires not only educating people, but also strengthening the link between education and practice.

Activities for the effective use of human resources can be considered as creation of favorable conditions for the production of goods and services, the participation of the population in solving the problems of development of territories.

The main factors in meeting these requirements are the creation of a capable institution of local self-government (LSG) and the prerequisites for small business [2]. So far, this condition has not been adequately taken into account. In particular, most (about 80%) of budget support goes to large agricultural holdings.

Despite the relatively small budgetary support for other agricultural producers, the authorities are pursuing a policy aimed at increasing their social responsibility in the development of rural areas. This is done despite the fact that most farms have low profitability. Therefore, in relation to them, raising the question of shifting a significant share of social responsibilities onto them is inappropriate. In this regard, the problem of increasing the role of the state itself in solving this problem remains urgent.

Table 1. Arguments testifying to the insufficiently effective fulfillment of tasks for the development and use of the human resources of the village.

| Arguments |
|-----------|
| 1. In connection with the adoption of amendments to the Constitution of the Russian Federation, the institution of LSG became part of the public administration. This means that the named institution is formal in nature. |
| 2. Adoption of the Federal Law “On Amendments to the Federal Law “On the General Principles of Organization of Local Self-Government in the Russian Federation” No. 62-FZ dated 3.04.2017 initiated the process of liquidation of rural settlements and municipal districts at a high rate. |
| 3. A significant part of the functions for the development of small business are not performed or performed at an insufficient level. These include: planning and rational placement of agro-industrial production; work out of a strategy of the agro-industrial complex development and agri-food policy; antitrust support; legal support; innovative support; marketing support; state property management; optimization of business conditions (rules of the game); secure of property rights; control of ecology and product quality and others. One of the main reasons for the current situation is that the structure of the public administration system is not sufficiently focused on the development and effective use of the human resources of the village. |
| 4. The study of state administration functions content applied for the industry shows that most of them (about 78.0%) involve the provision of various types of assistance (support) by state administration bodies to agricultural producers. This provision is not properly taken into account in practice. |
| 5. The system of public administration does not form the rules that would stimulate the development of the social sphere in the countryside [3] and small business in agriculture. |
| 6. The cost of loans for farmers in Russia is 2-7 times higher than in developed countries. |
| 7. In Russia, the tax burden on agricultural producers is also much higher. This, for example, is evidenced by the fact that the ratio of taxes / total costs in the United States is within 3-4%, while in Russia it is not less than 16.0% [4]. |
8. In developed countries, the amount of budgetary support to agricultural producers significantly exceeds the amount of taxes and deductions they pay, in Russia, on the contrary: according to the Ministry of Agriculture of Russia report, the industry gives about 80 kopecks to the budget and extra-budgetary funds per one ruble received from the state.

9. Due to the lack of resources, the majority of domestic farmers cannot modernize their production, and therefore lags behind many foreign competitors, which also aggravates the state of the economy in agriculture and rural areas.

10. There is a monopoly of retail networks, processors and carriers of agricultural products, which also negatively affects the state of the industry and the village as a whole.

11. Weak solvency of the population of the country, which leads to a decrease in the demand and quality of food. Albeit indirectly, this phenomenon hinders the development of agriculture, because it serves as a factor in the deterioration of the health of the nation.

12. Budgetary support provided to agrarians per hectare of farmland in Russia is an order of magnitude lower than in developed countries. In addition, it is not differentiated depending on natural conditions, as is done in the named countries [5,6].

It follows from the above table that the methods of stimulating the development of agriculture and the social sphere of the village are not effective enough. This indicates the need to improve agricultural policy, for which it is necessary to identify the shortcomings of the main state programs for the development of the Russian countryside.

The potential of state programs aimed at the development of agriculture and the social sphere of rural areas. Due to the fact that for a long time it has not been possible to overcome the crisis in rural areas, and the above programs are one of the main instruments of public administration, a very urgent question arises: do these documents have the potential to solve the problems that have accumulated in the countryside and ensure its sustainable development?

To answer it, we studied and evaluated the above-mentioned state programs from the point of view of the question posed (Table 2).

| Name of state programs and their assessment |
|---------------------------------------------|

| **State program for the development of agriculture and regulation of markets for agricultural products, raw materials and food** |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Within the framework of this State Program, it is not planned to increase the budgetary support for the industry. Due to the fact that the credit and tax policy, in fact, remain the same, the State Program does not have the resource for a tangible increase in the efficiency of the industry. So, in its subprogram "Development of agricultural sectors providing accelerated import substitution of the main types of agricultural products, raw materials and food", the main focus was on production indicators, sown area and the number of jobs. However, for the development of the industry, it is also necessary to take into account economic indicators, which are unsatisfactory. So, according to the Ministry of Agriculture of Russia, per one agricultural organization in 2020, accounts payable exceeded 203 million rubles and continues to grow at a high rate. The State Program does not provide any measures to reduce it, without which it is difficult to solve the problems of modernizing production and ensuring its competitiveness. |
| 2. The Subprogram "Technical modernization of the agro-industrial complex" provides for the renewal of equipment. In spite of this, less of it enters the industry than it leaves it due to wear and tear. |
| 3. In the Subprogram "Sustainable Development of Rural Areas", the planned indicator is "the number of planned facilities". However, as with technology, the number of social sphere facilities in rural areas is only decreasing. |
4. In the Subprogram "Stimulation of investment activity in the agro-industrial complex" it is planned to increase the investment attractiveness of the industry and the availability of loans to agrarians. But the mechanisms necessary for this are not provided. The planned 150 billion rubles a year is not enough, and it is difficult for most farms to get a loan.

5. It is possible to ensure the competitiveness of the industry only if the best production technologies are introduced into wide practice. This important condition is not taken into account in the State Program, because it does not provide for appropriate measures. The Russian government understands this, since, in addition to the State Program, it has adopted the "Federal Scientific and Technical Program for the Development of Agriculture for 2017-2025."

State program "Comprehensive development of rural areas" (SP "CDRA")

The main difference between the SP "CDRA" and the similar previous one is the larger budget. As the name suggests, it should ensure the comprehensive development of the village. However, its potential is not enough for this, especially for the integrated development of 100% of rural areas, as provided for in the Sectoral Targeted Programme (STP) "Ensuring state monitoring of rural areas". This is evidenced by the following arguments:

1. The STP "Analytical and informational support of the CDRA" set the goal of "Enhancing the participation of citizens in the implementation of initiative projects to address the priority tasks of rural development, the formation of a positive attitude towards rural areas and rural lifestyles." At the same time, the main conditions for this - the development of LSG and the creation of prerequisites for small business - are not provided for in the SP "CDRA". The same goes for the diversification of the rural economy.

2. In the SP "CDRA" it is planned that 44.6% of its activities will be financed from extrabudgetary sources. In financing the projects of the SP "CDRA", this share is even higher - 63.9%. Due to the weakness of the agricultural economy and the social policy of agricultural holdings, as well as the scanty income of the bulk of the rural population, there is no reason to believe that these plans will come true.

3. It is also devoid of logic that the SP "CDRA" is capable of ensuring the comprehensive development of 100% of rural areas. These doubts are reinforced by the fact that 471,480,542.9 thousand rubles. (29.5%) from the state program budget is planned to be directed to the Far Eastern and North Caucasian federal districts, which received the status of priority territories.

4. According to the Sectoral Programme (SP) “Development of Engineering Infrastructure in Rural Areas”, it is planned to “ensure the commissioning of at least 1.65 thousand km of local water pipelines” and 2.08 thousand km of gas distribution networks. When these goals are achieved, on average, water pipelines for a municipal district will become 0.9 km longer, and a rural settlement - 90 meters. The gas network will be lengthened by 1 km and 100 m, respectively. This will do little to solve the problems of supplying the village with water and gas. Moreover, the length of gas networks and water pipelines does not say anything.

5. The named SP provides for the implementation of at least 20 projects for the complex arrangement of sites. But it is impossible to judge how much they will solve the problems of the village by the number of projects. Besides, on a national scale, 20 projects are nothing.

6. The situation with highways is developing in a similar way. According to them, the SP "Development of transport infrastructure in rural areas" provides for the commissioning of roads based on a municipal district of 1.4 km, and a rural settlement - 140 m.

7. Requirements for the provision of subsidies for improving housing conditions are unaffordable for most of the population and local budgets. So, only those who are able to invest at least 30% of the estimated cost of building or buying a home will be able to receive social benefits. If the municipal authorities reduce the share of co-financing, then the difference should be paid from the low-income local budget.

8. Due to low incomes of the population, there will be no significant demand for preferential mortgages, providing a rate of 0.1-3%. As a result, it will not be possible to fulfill the planned indicators of the SP "CDRA" to improve the living conditions of the rural population.
9. For the construction of housing in the countryside 18,000 rubles per 1 sq. meter are planned (89.5 billion rubles for 5.1 million square meters). First, this is not enough to build comfortable housing, as noted. Secondly, a differentiated approach to rural development measures is required, taking into account natural conditions, which has not been done in the SP "CDRA". Third, the calculations were made without taking into account inflation, that is high in Russia.

10. It is meaningless to build housing in rural areas if there is no required number of jobs. However, this problem did not receive the necessary attention in the Program.

11. 11.5 million rubles per year are planned for training people in the technology of implementing initiative projects, and 10 million rubles a year for the scientific and methodological support of the Program. On average, one region accounts for 135 thousand rubles and 118 thousand rubles respectively. These funds will not be enough to effectively solve the listed problems.

12. The Concept of the SP "CDRA" includes “ensuring the inclusion of the rural population in civil society”. But the SP "CDRA" does not even mention "civil society". It is known that the main prerequisite for the formation of this society is the development of LSG. The solution to this problem is also not provided for in the SP "CDRA".

13. The state program is not aimed at improving conditions for the development of the economy, without which initiative projects cannot be fully implemented.

14. The SP "CDRA" does not imply the introduction of positive changes in the management system of rural areas in order to form the key prerequisites for rural development - decentralization of public administration and the creation on this basis of a full-fledged LSG institution, as well as the formation of favorable conditions for small business. Moreover, small business and consumer cooperation, as a condition for its development, are not even mentioned in it. Practice shows that without solving these problems, it is impossible to ensure the development of the village.

Federal Scientific and Technical Program for the Development of Agriculture for 2017-2025

1. Lack of mechanisms for transferring the agrarian economy to an innovative development path is one of the main drawbacks of the industry development programs. Therefore, the "Federal Scientific and Technical Program for the Development of Agriculture for 2017-2025" has been developed. But the approaches to the solution of the named problem pointed in it differ little from those contained in the previous programs.

2. The Program notes that "currently the most popular domestic technologies based on the latest scientific achievements are not being applied." However, the problem is different - in the absence of financial opportunities for the majority of the formations of the industry to modernize production.

3. In general, the Program does not contain effective mechanisms for the innovative development of the industry. If they were, Russia could increase the export of agricultural products, taking advantage of the fact that due to the pandemic, many countries have reduced their export.

May decrees 2018 (for 6 years - until 2024)

1. Realizing the inadequacy of measures to develop the economy and social sphere, the Russian leadership adopted the next May decrees. They cover education, science, healthcare, culture, ecology, housing, urban environment, highways, backbone infrastructure, small business, labor market, digital economy, international cooperation and the export of domestically produced goods.

2. Decrees pursue a variety of goals, including the growth of the size and life expectancy of the population, its real income; annual improvement of living conditions for at least 5 million families; accelerating the pace of assimilation of new technologies, including the digitalization of the economy; the country's entry into the "five" largest economies in the world; ensuring economic growth rates higher than the world ones; lower inflation; strengthening the export orientation of the economy and others. However, as in other program measures, the Decrees do not contain effective mechanisms for solving the assigned tasks.
4. Conclusions

In general, from the above and a number of other studies [7-9] it follows: the potential of the considered state programs is not enough for the development of agriculture and the social sphere of the village; to solve these problems, people should be put at the forefront of rural governance [10], as well as assessing the authorities for their effectiveness, using scientifically based methods [11].
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