

**Paper/Speech Details**  
**for the 27th NISPAcee Annual Conference**

---

**WG6: Evidence-Based Public Policy Making**

---

---

Author(s) **Olga Lvova**

Lomonosov Moscow State University  
Moscow Russian Federation

Bobyleva Alla,

Title **Comparative Analysis of Public Crisis Management Programmes in Russia**

---

**Abstract** Crisis management strategy of the Government can be illustrated through the analysis of certain Programs and Plans and their contribution to improving sustainability of Russian national economy. It should be evaluated which measures can be considered as effective in long-term perspective to improve sustainability, which are reactive and give quick results, which should still be applied or rejected. The development of approaches to public crisis management Programs and Plans can be monitored by their changes in 2009-2010, 2015-2016.

The comparison of formal attributes and technical differences shows that the Program-2009 was developed in more details than later documents: the number of its pages twice exceeds the Plan-2016 and is three times more than the Plan-2015. However, the number of measures in Program-2009 and Plan-2016 is almost the same (120 and 123 consequently). It can signify that measures of Plan-2016 are named but defined less thoroughly than in Program-2009. Program-2010 generally continues the previous one of 2009, includes similar measures, but seems declarative: concrete mechanisms, responsible authorities, time periods for implementation and required financing are not specified.

A positive distinguishing feature of the Plans-2015 and 2016 is the setting of strategic goals: "sustainable development" (2015) and "stable social economic development" (2016), while the Program-2009 was aimed at reactive "crisis" response.

The main differences between all documents are the volume of funding and chosen priorities for financing. The largest investments were provided for Program-2009 and Plan-2015 (more than 2.2 bln rubles each) as they were adopted in the critical periods of crises. Nevertheless, in real terms the sum of financing in 2009 was the largest (approximately 50% more than in 2015) taking into account the average inflation rate and drop of purchasing capacity of Russian currency during 2009-2016.

Comparison of blocks of measures illustrates that the main priorities

in public crisis regulation in Russia were changing during this period while “social stability maintenance” was common for all the documents. In the Program-2009 social support of the population, performance of social commitments and human capital development are announced as the main priorities with maximum financing. In 2015 the bank system support was preferred due to devaluation of the national currency. In 2010 the main financing was addressed to the development of military industrial complex, in 2016 – to inter-budgetary lending. Such a change in the priorities of financing can illustrate either erratic escalation of the crisis in certain directions or inconsistency of public policy, absence of strategy and choice of “patching the holes” tactics. Each Program and Plan suggested certain industries for priority support and highlighted concrete beneficiaries of financial support which confirms the presence of both systematic and selective measures.

The absence of systematic reaction to the crisis can be noticed: all the Programs and Plans of were aimed at quick prevention of the most acute crisis consequences by taking a selective, countervailing measures. In Russia stable repetitive crisis measures seem to prevail but they do not improve sustainability – while tactics changes, the strategy remains the same.