

ORIGINAL PAPER



DOI: 10.26794/2304-022X-2025-15-1-48-61

UDC 338.025(045)

JEL H11

Program-Targeted Management in the Public Administration System: Features and Prospects

N.S. Sergienko

Financial University, Moscow, Russia

ABSTRACT

The **objective** of this study, the results of which are presented in this article, is to analyze the fundamental principles and mechanisms of program-targeted management (PTM) that shape modern public administration practices in the Russian Federation. The author highlights that a key advantage of the program-targeted approach is the close alignment of planned activities with financial resources, ensuring targeted, prioritized, and efficient expenditures at every stage. The study examines the key features of PTM implementation, ranging from regulatory and legal frameworks and budget coordination to the introduction of a project-based approach and interdepartmental cooperation. The article provides a detailed discussion of common issues, including formalistic planning, insufficient coordination between levels of government, and challenges in monitoring results. The author concludes that the combination of PTM principles ensures its coherence, transparency, and effectiveness, enabling public authorities to achieve their socio-economic objectives and respond promptly to emerging challenges. A significant part of the research focuses on prospects for improvement, which include enhancing digitalization, transparency, and accountability for achieved outcomes. As **a result of the study**, a set of measures is proposed to improve PTM efficiency, including updated planning standards, the development of a unified digital platform, and greater involvement of expert communities. These measures can serve as a guideline for modernizing state programs and successfully implementing long-term national priorities.

Keywords: budget; public administration; program-targeted approach; results; target program; efficiency; budget expenditures; monitoring; national project; effectiveness; resources

For citation: Sergienko N.S. Program-targeted management in the public administration system: Features and prospects. *Upravlencheskie nauki = Management Sciences*. 2025;15(1):48-61. DOI: 10.26794/2304-022X-2025-15-1-48-61

INTRODUCTION

Programme-targeted management (PTM) has gradually become one of the key tools of public administration in Russia. Its current role is strategic orientation. By means of PTM, the priorities of the National Security Strategy,¹ presidential decrees, federal laws and other documents are incorporated into state programmes and national projects. They become a “road map” for the implementation of long-term development objectives and providing a clearer strategic focus. At the same time, the superior advantage of PTM is the close linkage of planned activities with budget financing, which allows for the targeted allocation of resources based on priorities and target indicators, as well as the each-stage monitoring of cost-effectiveness. Twenty years of experience with the introduction of results-based budgeting (implemented through PTM) in Russia suggests the definition of measurable objectives and indicators to be achieved within the framework of relevant programmes and projects. Usually, the latter are the responsibility of a few ministries and levels of the Government, which helps to increase the responsibility of both managers and implementers highly accountable.

Nowadays, the programme-based approach is a tool for coordination and inter-agency interaction, so that the joined efforts and resources should become the basis for synergy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To substantiate the prerequisites of goal setting and budgeting, which have become the key elements of programme-targeted management in modern Russia, allow the basics of the formation of programme-based planning [1–4]. The characteristics of domestic legal

and regulatory framework of programme-targeted management are considered in the context of strategic public administration in the research works [4, 5]. The issues of practical implementation of PTM and national projects (their peculiarities and impact on the socio-economic development of our country, as well as methods of improving the effectiveness of programmes and projects are thoroughly analysed by Russian scientists [6–10]. Some of these studies focus on methods of assessing the social impact of government programmes and optimization of financial management to sophisticate it [11–14]. The international experience with results-targeted management and budgeting serves as a basis for the development of PCS in various countries, including Russia [15–20]. Studies on the impact of the digital economy on transformation of public administration, as well as on the importance of big data and digital technologies, prove the existence of examples of successful implementation of the latest technological developments into PTM [21]. Therefore, ongoing scientific research and the introduction of innovative approaches are key factors for the further development of programme-targeted management.

STAGES AND PRINCIPLES OF PROGRAMME-TARGETED MANAGEMENT

At the current stage in Russia, programme-targeted management is regulated by a few normative and legislative acts, namely: the Constitution of the Russian Federation, the Budgetary Code of the Russian Federation (BC RF), federal laws and presidential decrees, methodological recommendations of various agencies. Altogether, they provide the structure, processes and mechanisms necessary for effective planning, implementation and control of state programmes. Based on these documents, we sum up the main principles of

¹ The Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of 02.07.2021 No. 40 “On the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation”. URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/47046> (accessed on 20.01.2025).

programme-targeted management in the following way at *Table 1*.

Let us consider the main stages of the introduction and application of programme-targeted management (from the early 2000s to 2025), also reflecting the political, economic and social changes in our country.

At the beginning of the 21st century, Russia had to reform PTM, and by 2000–2025, it has become one of the key instruments of public administration.

This was necessary to improve the efficiency of budget spending and the quality of public services. In the 2000s, the concept of programme-targeted management began to emerge. Foreign experience and international best practices inspired domestic founders of PTM. Conventionally, the year of 2001 was the starting point, when this concept of programme-targeted management was implemented at the federal level to increase transparency and accountability in public administration. However, by 2003–2004, the first legal acts adopted to regulate the principles and mechanisms of PTM included presidential instructions and Government resolutions.

From 2005 to early 2010, there was a period of an active development and adoption of normative documents defining the structure, processes and tools of the PTM. The legislative basis with the norms of the Budgetary Code of the Russian Federation introduced in 2004 set out the principles of the budget process and its link with programme-targeted management. The adoption of the Federal Law No. 172-FZ “On Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation”² consolidated the basic principles of PTM and the mechanisms for planning and implementing state programmes.

In 2006–2010, the first national projects in such areas as health care, education, infrastruc-

ture, etc. became the basis for the practical application of PTM at the federal and regional levels.

The expansion of the State’s strategic objectives in 2010–2015 led to the active performance of PTM and improvement of its tools on a solid methodological level. The launch of several national projects, including dozens of programmes financed by the federal budget and aimed to solve national priority tasks, as well as strengthening of the role of regional programme-based projects, contributed to a closer integration of federal and local initiatives.

In 2016–2020, introduction of digital technologies and increased transparency laid the foundation both for improved monitoring and reporting, as well as for assessing the effectiveness of projects targeted by the programme, based on the established Unified Digital Platform (UDP) specially for monitoring the implementation of Government programmes. The UDP ensured data availability and transparency of processes. Electronic reports and online systems to monitor the progress of programme implementation contributed to increasing the accountability of State entities and strengthening the role of independent audit and public control over the implementation of programme-targeted projects.

Sophistication of PTM mechanisms and their adaptation to new challenges in the years of 2021–2025 has become a factor in shifting the focus to optimise processes and increase flexibility and adaptability to external and internal changes. This has also facilitated the introduction of “accountability for results” mechanisms, with the personal assignment and responsibility of managers to specific programmes and projects. Therefore, at the current stage, it is required to actively develop inter-ministerial coordination, improve the quality of data for monitoring and assessment, and furthermore digitalise the processes of programme-targeted management. Special attention is neces-

² Federal Law No. 172-FZ “On Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation dated 28.06.2014. URL: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_164841/?ysclid=m7diu4tzg5460757793 (accessed on 20.01.2025).

Table 1

Basic principles of program-targeted management

No.	Principle	Content
1.	Unity of regulatory and methodological framework	The use of uniform standards, methods and regulations in the development, implementation and evaluation of State programmes; ensuring comparability of data and targets at different (federal, regional, local) levels of management
2.	Clear goal setting, result-orientation	Formulation of specific and measurable objectives to achieve them within a defined timeframe, focusing on achieving results and measuring impact, not just on the process of implementation
3.	Systemic and integrated character	Considering problems and objectives in a broad context, taking into account interrelationships between different directions and levels; seeking integrated consideration of all factors (economic, social, technological, etc.) in planning process
4.	Resource alignment	Linking strategic priorities to specific funding sources determined in the budget cycle. Ensuring balance between strategic priorities, available resources and expected socio-economic impacts
5.	Transparency and accountability	Open reporting on the use of budget funds and on the results achieved, with mandatory control by the supervisory bodies, such as Court of Audit, Federal Treasury, and by the public
6.	Inter-agency coordination	Establishing interaction between different agencies, ministries, regional and local authorities meanwhile avoiding duplication of functions and resources
7.	Flexibility and adaptability	Ability to timely adapt the purpose and mechanisms of programme implementation for changing external conditions (economic, political, social), combined with project management mechanisms to respond rapidly to emerging challenges
8.	Non-stop monitoring and evaluation of performance	Systematic tracking of intermediate and final results using defined indicators, analysing the reasons for deviations from the plan and making the necessary adjustments to improve performance

Source: compiled by the author.

sary to pay not only to the sustainability of programmes, but also to their ability to react quickly to changes and integration of innovative technologies.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAMME-TARGETED MANAGEMENT

Over the past two decades, the Russian experience related to the application of programme-targeted management allows us to identify and summarise its characteristics.

Firstly, it is a complex multi-level system, which determines the goal-setting interrelationship at all levels of public administration. State and federal target programmes, national projects and departmental plans are implemented at the federal, regional and municipal levels and they complement each other. However, in some cases, the interaction between their levels remains fragmented.

Secondly, formal regulation, and, consequently rigid frameworks originated, as well as a large

number of regulatory documents, become a constraint: all this makes impossible to provide a flexible approach to programme implementation. Particularly, because this complicates the procedure for making changes and adjustments. The tasks of programme-targeted management are strictly related to budgeting: project funding is determined within the budget cycle. A shift is declared towards a results-oriented approach: each programme should have clearly defined objectives and targets.

Thirdly, in line with the priorities of the State policy, national projects regarded as “locomotives” of development have a tangible impact on the socio-economic development of the country and they cover strategically important areas: health, education, infrastructure, etc. Special attention is paid to vertical responsibility for the implementation of national projects and the involvement of the top-level officials of the Government.

Fourthly, the symbiosis of project-based and programme-based approaches makes it viable to increase the number of objectives for solution in the public administration system. Thus, public administration uses increasingly project offices and project management methodologies, including those based on digital instruments. Their aim is to increase flexibility and speed of implementation of tasks, while maintaining transparency and controllability of all processes.

Finally, developed information systems lead to better real-time monitoring of the progress of projects and public programmes. A united digital platform able to consolidate data at all levels will ensure a long-shot focus on inter-agency cooperation. Collaboration between different agencies, ministries and regional authorities is important to achieve significant results. Individual State programmes provide for the integrated solution of “cross-cutting” tasks in digital transformation, ecology, etc. including further introduction of the “responsibility-for-results” mechanism and simultaneous preservation of elements of “traditional” bureaucracy.

Therefore, the aim of PTM development should be to achieve a balance between flexibility and sustainability. On the one hand, it is necessary to respond quickly to economic, social and technological changes, meanwhile, on the other hand, stability of programme objectives and predictability of budgetary commitments are important.

Thus, the current Russian model of programme-targeted management is a combination of a rather complex organisational structure: a rigid regulatory framework and a desire to focus on results in combination. At the same time, challenges remain in terms of cross-sectoral coordination, the need to make timely adjustments and the development of an effective monitoring system. However, the trend towards digitisation, strengthening of project methodologies and involvement of independent experts generate positive conditions for further improvement of PCS in Russia.

PROGRAMME-TARGETED MANAGEMENT: DIRECTIONS OF DEVELOPMENT

One of the current trends in the development of programme-targeted management have been the introduction of principles and technologies of modern management, such as project management. The development of the latter, as well as digital monitoring tools, lead to elevate the role of the PTM and reach a new level: from formal planning to dynamic and transparent management. Digitalised processes, involving a single monitoring platform, use big data and online reporting, simplify implementation control and improve the quality of analysis. Besides, the development of the programme-based approach occurs via increased involvement of public participants and experts. The PTM increasingly involves the public in discussion of its objectives, indicators and results, while independent experts make a qualitative assessment of project

design and implementation. Such openness strengthens trust in public institutions and facilitates the formation of a feedback loop in adaptation of programmes.

It is important to point out the significance of the target and programmatic approaches in building the mechanism of adaptation to meet new challenges in the system of public administration. Currently, as external economic, technological, and geopolitical factors turn out to be more and more changeable, programme-targeted management allows flexible revision of the State's goals and priorities, so that the State, subject to an effectively built system of monitoring and adjustment, is able to promptly direct resources to any new or more vulnerable areas.

The above point of view confirms the thesis that the role of PTM in the Russian public administration system continues to grow: it becomes an essential central element in the processes of planning and implementation of strategic priorities. At the same time, in order to increase efficiency, it is necessary to maintain a balance between formal regulations and the ability of the State system to respond quickly to current challenges, as well as to strengthen transparency, coordination and responsibility of all participants in State programmes.

At the same time, due to federal relations, it is necessary to distinguish the institutional specific aspects of the Russian model of programme-targeted management. As was mentioned above, PTM involves the interaction of different levels of federal, regional and municipal Government aiming to achieve common socio-economic goals. However, one of the major problems is the disconnection between the indicators of the target programmes implemented at these levels. This hampers effective planning and implementation of programmes, impedes monitoring of these processes and reduces all-round performance.

First of all, since each Governmental level develops and uses only its own indicators, such

an approach leads to inconsistency of goals and objectives: in this case, federal-level programmes are more often not continued partially, or in full in regional and in local programmes, which makes it more difficult to achieve national goals.

Secondly, if different methods used to assess the effectiveness of similar projects, the same results may be evaluated differently at each level of the Government and it makes difficult to run comparative analysis and generalisation of data.

Thirdly, due to different indicator systems, there is practically no exchange of information between the different levels of government involved in decision-making. This reduces the transparency and accountability of management processes and makes it difficult to coordinate resources: disparity in parameters and criteria leads to lack of balance between the priorities in resource allocation, which, in turn, can lead to competition for budget funds and inefficient use of them. It seems to be, that the reason for the disparity of indicators is the lack of a single standard and, consequently, the use of different approaches to assess the effectiveness of programmes.

Fourthly, one cannot ignore the significance of the recommendatory nature of PTM guidelines and regulations at different levels, depending on local conditions and priorities.

The disparity of indicators make it difficult to assess the all-round project performance and sometimes it leads to underestimation, which hinders well-based management decisions.

Finally, introduction and maintenance of consistent indicator systems is hampered by insufficient expertise and limited technical capacity at regional and local levels. The lack of criteria makes it difficult to monitor the progress of activities and identify problem areas. It also causes delays and deviations from the implementation of project plans, as well as it reduces the transparency of management processes and complicates public and supervisory control.

In view of the abovementioned, it is important to point out that the main problem of the PTM is the deficient allocation of resources, particularly, the uneven distribution of budgetary funds, which leads to a disproportion in the development of different regions and municipalities. For example, the federal level often focuses on strategic and large-scale projects in the field of defence, health and education. Regional authorities focus on the specific requirements in their territories, including the development of local infrastructure, support for agriculture, industry or tourism. Local authorities bear responsibility for specific urban or rural issues such as housing, public services, local health care and education. Disparate indicators make it complicated to develop common strategies and to coordinate activity between independently operating levels of Government.

As a result, it triggers competition for budgetary funds and resources, so that their unequal distribution undermines stability and efficiency of public administration and leads to widening economic disparities. More developed regions receive more resources for further growth, while others tend to stagnation or even deterioration economically. Investments flow to large cities and areas with modern infrastructure, which increases centralisation of economic activity, however, reduces the potential of small or medium-sized regions.

Differences in funding lead to differences in the scale of provision of social services, education and health care. This contributes to social inequalities between residents of different territories and, as a consequence, to migration to more developed regions. This affects demographic problems in areas with low levels of funding. Such issues require close attention and examination within the framework of achieving the national development goals of the Russian Federation, defined by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation dated 07.05.2024 No. 309 “On the national development goals of the Rus-

sian Federation for the period up to 2030 and in the perspective up to 2036” and “Fundamentals of State policy in the field of strategic planning in the Russian Federation”, approved by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation dated 08.11.2021 No. 633 in connection with the adopted “On approval of the strategy of spatial development of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2020 and in the perspective up to 2036”.³

Thus, the deficient distribution of resources poses a serious problem for effective programme-targeted management due to disconnected priorities and indicators of targeted programmes at the three levels of public authority in Russia. Only an integrated approach will ensure an even and fair distribution of budgeting, which will contribute to a sustainable and balanced development of all regions and municipalities in the country.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The analysis of the practical application of programme-targeted approach in the system of public administration makes it possible to formulate the following generalised list of key problems and shortcomings, which are characteristic of the Russian practice of programme-targeted approach.

1. Ambiguity of goal-setting and performance indicators.

The objectives of most programmes are often too vaguely formulated and do not contain clear measurable indicators. At the same time,

³ The Decree of the President of the Russian Federation dated 07.05. 2024 No. 309. URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/50542>; The Decree of the President of the Russian Federation dated 08.11.2021 No. 633 “On approval of fundamentals of State policy in the field of strategic planning in the Russian Federation”. URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/47244>; Order of the Government of the Russian Federation dated 28.12.2024 No. 4146-R “On approval of the strategy of spatial development of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2020 and in the perspective up to 2036”. URL: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_495567/?ysclid=m669hpy6fh485020258 (accessed on 20.01.2025).

the sophistication of the indicators does not allow to assess adequately both the progress of projects and the efficiency of budget spending.

2. Weak correlation between strategic and sectoral objectives. Hence, federal, regional and sectoral programmes are often not synchronised. Strategic priorities and budget constraints may contradict each other and lead to “misallocation of resources”.

3. Duplication of functions and poorly co-ordinated actions occurs due to the fact, that different agencies and administrative bodies may launch similar projects or activities without coordinating them among themselves. The lack of a unified approach to planning and monitoring leads to twinning or contradictory projects.

4. Formal planning and lack of realistic plans. Programmes and government assignments are

often accomplished in a formal way without taking into account realistic timeframes, risks and opportunities. Plans become overly optimistic in terms of implementation deadlines, costs or expected results.

5. Lack of transparency and accountability. Monitoring and publicly reporting mechanisms on programme implementation are often poorly developed. Limited access to data does not allow public to assess results objectively.

5. Not yet fully developed monitoring and evaluation system. Effective mechanisms for measuring results (both intermediate and final) are often lacking. Gaps between planned and actual indicators are not properly analysed which prevents timely adjustments.

6. Lack of inter-agency collaboration. Despite numerous proposals, there is still no single

Table 2

Structure of the Standard of program-targeted management for State programs

No.	Chapter	Content
1.	General provisions	
1.1.	Aim and purpose	Definition of a unified approach to the programme-targeted management of government programmes
1.2.	Scope of management	Level of government: federal, regional and local level
1.3.	Legal and regulatory framework	List of laws and regulations applicable to the programme-targeted management
1.4.	The basic principles of programme-targeted management	Efficiency, transparency, risk assessment, targeting, comprehensiveness, unification of methodologies
2.	Structure and elements of programme-targeted management	
2.1.	Components of the State programme	Programme objective Programme tasks Target indicators and indicative values. Expected results Main activities Sources and volume of financing List of responsible staff/entities for the implementation of the programme

Table 2 (continued)

No.	Chapter	Content
2.2.	Classification of public programmes	Sectoral (by policy directions) Intersectoral (cross-sectoral programmes) Territorial (regional and local) Integrated (long-term strategies)
2.3.	Life cycle of the State programme	Initiation (general idea) Planning (design and budgeting) Implementation (carrying out activities) Monitoring and control (assessing performance) Adjustment (changing parameters if necessary) Closing (assessing effectiveness, summary of results)
3.	Planning and budgeting	
3.1.	Methodology and instruments of planning	Targeted planning Programme-strategic planning Indicative planning
3.2.	Sources of financial support for the programmes	Programme budget (performance budgeting) Mechanisms of co-financing Public-and-private partnership
3.3.	Programme resources	Material and technical resources Human resources Information resources
4.	Implementation of programmes	
4.1.	Mechanisms to fulfill implementation	Project management Risk management Interaction of staff/entities responsible for the project
4.2.	State control and audit	Internal control External audit (audit chambers, independent experts) Qualitative evaluation of activities implemented
4.3.	Programme adjustments	Conditions for introducing changes Procedure to revise target indicators and budgets Deadlines postponement, reallocation of resources
5.	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting	
5.1.	Programme monitoring system	Current monitoring (quarterly, annual) Evaluation of intermediate results Deviation control
5.2.	Key performance indicators (KPI)	Performance indicators Socio-economic effects Return on investment ratios
5.3.	Reporting tools	Digital monitoring platforms Reporting regulations Automated control systems

Table 2 (continued)

No.	Chapter	Content
6.	Information technologies and digitalization of programme-targeted management	
6.1.	Programme management digital platforms	Government information systems Automated budgeting systems Electronic registers of programmes
6.2.	Big data analysis instruments	AI analytics, predictive modelling Geoinformation systems Business intelligence tools (BI-systems)
6.3.	Information security system	Personal data security Cybersecurity in digital platforms Networking technology for safe communication
7.	Risk management	
7.1.	Risk identification	Political and economic risks Financial risks Social risks Environmental risks
7.2.	Risk management methods	Risk insurance Creation of anti-crisis reserves Alternative scenarios of implementation
7.3.	Monitoring and response to risks	Regular auditing Forecasting of possible threats Rapid response instruments
8.	International and best experience	
8.1.	Global models of programme-targeted management	Examples of effective government programmes from different countries, comparative analysis of approaches, in particular, a guide to project management via ISO 21500
8.2.	Harmonisation with global standards	
9.	Final clauses	
9.1.	Adaptation and development of programme-targeted management	Flexibility of approaches Introduction of innovations Assessing long-term impact
9.2.	Responsibility of participants	Powers of the authorities Roles of responsible teams/entities
9.3.	Procedure of revision and updating of the Standard	Regulations of revision Frequency of updating Interaction with the authorities

Source: compiled by the author.

digital platform and standardised procedures for data exchange between agencies. Each of them originates its own system of indicators and criteria, which leads to fragmentation of the information database.

7. Problems with human resources and competence of personnel keeps affecting the quality of targeted programmes. Specialists capable to operate using targeted management and evaluation methods effectively often spend too much time for additional bureaucratic paperwork. At the same time, inadequate training and a lack of motivation of staff leads to a formal approach to programme implementation.

8. Lack of adaptability and flexibility reduces the PTM value. Changes in legislation or in economic conditions rarely affect project implementation quickly. Complex procedures for approving changes delay decision-making and have a negative impact on final effectiveness.

9. Inadequate financial discipline and monitoring of results affect the quality and success of programmes. Non-compliance with allocated limits and postponement of expenditure to later periods occur during implementation. Besides, financial reports do not always provide a clear assumption about costs and results, it is difficult to truly assess the effectiveness of projects at the accomplishment of the programme.

10. Low involvement of experts and stakeholders at certain stages of the projects. For example, the opinion of independent experts, business and civil society is not sufficiently taken into account in the design and adaptation stages of programmes. As a result, decision-making occurs in a departmental environment, which can lead to a so-called “narrow viewpoint” of objectives and results.

In general, the problems of programme-target management in Russia are mainly related to systemic factors of management and are caused by insufficiently developed mechanisms of coordination, control and assessment of project efficiency. Formal targeting, insufficient coor-

dination of programmes at different levels, lack of modern monitoring tools and inadequately qualified personnel significantly reduce effectiveness.

In order to enhance efficiency, the following measures seem necessary to undertake, as:

- sophistication of the regulatory legal framework;
- strengthening interagency cooperation;
- introducing the evaluation of transparency and monitoring methods;
- upgrading the level of competence of civil servants in the management of State programmes.

At the same time, the process of building a unified public authority requires to develop a Common Standard of Programme-Targeted Management, which provides a unified mechanisms of planning, implementation and monitoring of state programmes at all levels of government (in *Table 2*). Such a postulate should also include clear methodological approaches to formulate goals and objectives, as well as to establish of programme performance indicators, distribution of resources and clear lines of responsibilities between different departments and agencies. Such standard postulate will make it possible to achieve consistency in the activity of all elements involved in the process, minimise the duplication of functions and improve coordination between all federal, regional and local levels involved. The introduction of monitoring and evaluation standards will ensure transparency and accountability in the use of budgetary resources, identify timely deviations from plans and make necessary adjustments in time.

The unified information Standard of programme-targeted management will lay the foundation for data collection, storage and analysis, which will significantly improve the quality of management decisions. It ensures the availability of necessary information to all stakeholders, including the public and independent experts, which will also increase

confidence in government programmes and enhance public control.

An important factor for successful implementation of the Standard is the development of common patterns for training and professional development of personnel involved in the sphere of programme-targeted management. Such professionals, who obtain the corresponding knowledge and skills, will be able to use actively standardised methods and tools, which will contribute to the all-round efficiency of public administration.

The Standard envisages the use of innovative technologies, such as big data and artificial intelligence, which will successfully automate routine processes, improve forecasting and analysis of results, as well as increase the adaptability of programmes to changing external conditions.

Its development and implementation appears to serve an important step towards an efficient, transparent and coherent public administration system. This will not only improve the effectiveness of Government programmes, but also inspire a stronger confidence of citizens in Government institutions and ensure the sustainable socio-economic development of the country.

CONCLUSIONS

Over the past two decades, programme-targeted management in Russia has gone through several stages of development to turn into a mature public administration system, which is results-oriented and integrated with digital technologies. Nevertheless, despite the successes, some of the challenges still remain, particularly, the need to strengthen inter-agency coordination, improve staff qualification and make the programmes more flexible and adaptable to a rapidly changing environment.

Non-stop development of programme-targeted management is an important factor in increasing the efficiency of the public administration and achieving the strategic goals of the Russian Federation. At the same time, the role of programme-targeted management in the Russian public administration system keeps growing, to become a central element in the planning and implementation of strategic priorities. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain a balance between formal regulations and the capability of the State system to respond quickly to current challenges, as well as to enhance transparency, coordination and accountability of all participants in State programmes.

REFERENCES

1. Ekaterinovskaya M. A. Development management: Program-targeted approach. Moscow: Prometei; 2020. 286 p. (In Russ.).
2. Tambovtsev V., Shastitko A. The viability of results-based public expenditure budgeting. *Ekonomicheskaya politika = Economic Policy*. 2006;(3):129–147. (In Russ.).
3. Veselovsky M. Ya., Izmailova M. A., Balynin I. V., Sergienko N. S. Condition and prospects of innovation-driven, scientific and technological development of the regional industry in Russia. *Amazonia Investiga*. 2019;8(20):251–262.
4. Makarova S. N. Targeted budget programs: Theory and practice. Krasnoyarsk: Siberian Federal University; 2015. 188 p. (In Russ.).
5. Schukina T. V. Legal regulation of the software and target approach in the system of public administration under the strategic development of the Russian Federation. *Voprosy ekonomiki i prava = Economic and Law Issues*. 2018;(124):7–11. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.14451/2.124.7
6. Balynin I. V. How to fix key mistakes of preparation and implementation of national projects in the Russian Federation? *Auditorskie vedomosti = Audit Journal*. 2020;(1):117–119. (In Russ.).

7. Balynin I. V. National projects in the Russian Federation: 12 key errors and copyright recommendations for their correction. *Ekonomika i predprinimatel'stvo = Journal of Economy and Entrepreneurship*. 2019;(12):296–299. (In Russ.).
8. Maidanevych Yu. P., Rotanov G. N. Conditions and prerequisites for the implementation of national projects: Theoretical aspect. *Ekonomika i predprinimatel'stvo = Journal of Economy and Entrepreneurship*. 2020;(7):37–43. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.34925/EIP.2020.120.7.004
9. Prokofiev S. E., Panina O. V., Eremin S. G., Galkin A. I., Komov V. J. Improving the efficiency of public authorities. *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*. 2019;10(6):1939–1944.
10. Il'in V. A. et al. National projects of Russia: Features, implementation efficiency. Vologda: Vologda Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences; 2024. 453 p. (In Russ.).
11. Bagratuni K. Yu. Project-based approach in the system of program-targeted financial management of state public and municipal finances. *Ekonomika i predprinimatel'stvo = Journal of Economy and Entrepreneurship*. 2021;(5):550–554. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.34925/EIP.2021.130.5.106
12. Zaveryukha Ya. O., Zaveryukha A. S. The program-targeted approach to managing public finances in Russia: Features and characteristics. *Ekonomika: vchera, segodnya, zavtra = Economics: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. 2019;9(3–1):373–382. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.34670/AR.2019.89.3.040
13. Results-based budgeting: International experience and possibilities of application in Russia. Moscow: Center for Fiscal Policy; 2015. 60 p. (In Russ.).
14. Bryzgalov D. V., Tsyganov A. A. Expansion of the program-target approach to the management of the Compulsory Health Insurance System. *Strakhovoe delo = Insurance Business*. 2020;(1):53–60. (In Russ.).
15. Afanas'ev R. S., Bogdanov L. N. Structure and content of program-targeted planning documents in OECD countries: Traditional approaches and new solutions. *Voprosy ustoychivogo razvitiya obshchestva*. 2020;(7):159–171. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.34755/IROK.2020.94.31.177
16. Kristensen J. K. Overview of results focused management and budgeting in OECD member countries. Paris: OECD; 2002.
17. Maidanevych Yu. P., Sergienko N. S., Gnezdova Yu. V. Government support for the agro-industrial complex: The experience of a programme-oriented approach in Australia. *Upravlenie = Management (Russia)*. 2024;12(3):14–25. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.26425/2309-3633-2024-12-3-14-25
18. Kyarimova A. D. Program-target approach to innovative development: Russian and foreign experience. *Ekonomika i upravlenie = Economics and Management*. 2022;28(3):306–312. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.35854/1998-1627-2022-3-306-312
19. Sergienko N. S. Program-target approach in support of tourism development: Experience of foreign countries. *Vestnik universiteta (Gosudarstvennyi universitet upravleniya)*. 2023;(10):135–143. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.26425/1816-4277-2023-10-135-143
20. Halligan J. New public sector models: Reforms of Australia and New Zealand. In: Lane J.-E., ed. *Public sector reform: Rationale, trends and problems*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd; 1997:17–46.
21. Ekaterinovskaya M. A., Orusova O. V., Shvets I. Yu., Shvets Yu. Yu., Khaustova K. V. Transformation of public administration in the digital economy. In: Bogoviz A. V., ed. *Big Data in information society and digital economy*. Cham: Springer-Verlag; 2023:27–32. (Studies in Big Data. Vol 124). DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-29489-1_4

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Natalia S. Sergienko — Cand. Sci (Econ.), Assoc. Prof. of the Department of State and Municipal Management, Financial University, Moscow, Russia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9042-8454>
nssergienko@mail.ru

Conflicts of Interest Statement: The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

The article was submitted on 21.01.2025; revised on 04.02.2025 and accepted for publication on 20.02.2025.

The author read and approved the final version of the manuscript.