

УДК:502.11(1-751.3) (045)

JEL: O130; Q 000.

ХУМАРОВА Н.І.

старший науковий співробітник, д.е.н.

Інститут проблем ринку та економіко-екологічних досліджень НАНУ

Французький бульвар, 29, м. Одеса, Україна, 65044

E-mail: khumarova@nas.gov.ua

ORCID: 0000-0001-5255-8004

ВЕРНІГОРОВА Н.В.

інженер першої категорії

відділу економічного регулювання природокористування

Інститут проблем ринку та економіко-екологічних досліджень НАНУ

Французький бульвар, 29, м. Одеса, Україна, 65044

E-mail: natalivern93@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-5968-4211

ІНКЛЮЗИВНІСТЬ В ПРИРОДОКОРИСТУВАННІ СКРІЗЬ ПРИЗМУ ЗАПОВІДНОЇ СПРАВИ

Актуальність. Разом із всеохоплюючою урбанізацією і втручанням господарських процесів в природні екосистеми стає все важче відмежувати природні заповідні території від людської діяльності. Прискорений ріст населення планети збільшує попит як на вичерпні природні ресурси, так і на невичерпні, що поглиблює її негативну екологічну ситуацію. Заповідні території, як еталонні природні резервати, можуть найкраще показати всю цінність недоторканої природи, і водночас її вразливість. Вони мають бути джерелом природоохоронних ініціатив та «школою» поєднання екологічних та економічних інтересів суспільства, на базі яких формується екологічна свідомість. Для цього необхідно розвивати відповідні передумови розвитку природно заповідного фонду, за яких його функціонування стає невід'ємною частиною соціально-економічного розвитку суспільства, більш доступною, а отже інклюзивною.

Мета та завдання. Метою статті є визначення організаційно-економічних основ розвитку інклюзивності у природоохоронній діяльності з урахуванням міжнародного досвіду, джерел їх фінансування і структури, встановлення факторів, що сприяють включенню цих територій в економічну систему країн; визначення недоліків що притаманні організації діяльності природно-заповідного фонду в Україні; узагальнити інформацію щодо інклюзивності в природокористуванні.

Результати. В статті на основі досвіду розвинутих країн в галузі створення і організації природно-заповідного фонду (ПЗФ) визначено основні переваги поєднання їх соціально-екологічної значущості із економічним розвитком як самих територій так і економіки країни в цілому. Розглянуто тенденції щодо форм власності на природні заповідні території в країнах світу і в Україні, розміри їх фінансування і прибуток держав від діяльності Національних природних парків (НПП). Виявлено проблемні питання розвитку галузі заповідання в Україні, зокрема соціальної складової, а саме необізнаність населення з проблем ПЗФ і його ролі в забезпеченні добробуту суспільства. Проблема розглянуто з позиції доступності об'єктів ПЗФ для населення у поєднанні із дотриманням всіх природоохоронних нормативів. Надано авторське визначення поняття інклюзивності в природоохоронній діяльності. На основі порівняння і аналізу структури НПП інших країн надано рекомендації щодо запровадження стимулювання щодо відтворення природних територій в Україні.

Висновки. Досліджено, що провідну роль в галузі збереження природних територій і створення ПЗФ відіграє інклюзивний економічний розвиток, екологічна інформованість та освіта населення на всіх рівнях соціалізації індивіда в суспільстві. Вагомий внесок з цього питання надає індивідуальний досвід людини щодо інклюзивного природокористування та позитивних вражень. Розв'язання зазначених проблем сприятиме подальшому розвитку у таких сферах як освіта, туризм, засоби масової інформації, психологічна реабілітація тощо. Встановлено що природно-заповідний фонд (ПЗФ) при дотриманні відповідного організаційно-економічного забезпечення може приносити значний прибуток у ВВП країни, при цьому не створюючи рекреаційного перевантаження на природні системи

Ключові слова: природно-заповідний фонд, заповідання, національні природні парки, інклюзивність, ВВП, природоохоронні території, інвестиційний механізм, організаційно-економічне забезпечення.

HUMAROVA N.I.

Dr.Sc. (Economics).

Institute Of Market Problems And Economic&Ecological Research of the

National Academy Of Sciences Of Ukraine

Frantsuzskiy Boulevard, 29, Odessa, Ukraine

E-mail: khumarova@nas.gov.ua

ORCID: 0000-0001-5255-8004

VERNIHOROVA N. V.
Engineer of I category
Institute Of Market Problems And Economic&Ecological Research of the
National Academy Of Sciences Of Ukraine
Frantsuzskiy Boulevard, 29, Odessa, Ukraine
E-mail: natalivern93@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-5968-4211

INCLUSIVENESS IN NATURAL USE IN CASE OF THE RESERVED FUND

Topicality. Together with the comprehensive urbanization and interference of economic processes in natural ecosystems, it is more difficult to separate natural protected areas from human activities. The accelerated growth of the planet's population increases the demand for both exhausting natural resources and inexhaustible ones, which deepens its negative environmental situation. Protected areas, as standard natural reserves, can best show the full value of untouched nature, and at the same time its vulnerability. It should be the source of environmental initiatives and the "school" of combination the ecological and economic interests of society. On it's basis the ecological consciousness is formed. So, it is necessary to develop the appropriate preconditions for the development of a natural reserve fund, in which its functioning becomes an integral part of socio-economic development of society, more accessible, and therefore inclusive.

Aim and tasks. The aim of the article is to determine the organizational and economic basis for the development of inclusiveness in environmental activities, taking into account international experience, sources of funding and structure, identifying factors contributing to the inclusion of these territories in the economic system of countries; definition of deficiencies inherent in the organization of the activity of the nature reserve fund in Ukraine; generalize information on inclusiveness in nature management.

Research results. The article, based on the experience of developed countries in the field of creation and organization of the nature reserve fund (NRF), identifies the main advantages of combining their socio-ecological significance with the economic development of both the territories themselves and the economy of the country as a whole. There are considered: trends of ownership patterns on natural reserve areas in the countries of the world and Ukraine, size of their financing, and the income of the states from the activities of the National Natural Parks (NPP). There were identified problem issues of the field of bequest in Ukraine, in particular the social component, namely, the lack of awareness of the population about the problems of the NRF and its role in ensuring the welfare of society. The problem is considered from the point of view of the availability of NRF facilities for the population, in conjunction with compliance with all environmental standards. Is given an author's definition of the concept of inclusiveness in nature conservation activity. On the basis of comparison and analysis of the structure of the NNP of other countries, recommendations were given regarding the introduction of incentives for the reproduction of natural territories in Ukraine.

Conclusion. It is explored that inclusive economic development, ecological awareness and education of the population at all levels of socialization of an individual in a society plays a leading role in the field of preservation of natural territories and the creation of NRF. An important contribution to this issue is the individual experience of the person with regard to inclusive nature and positive impressions. The solution of these problems will contribute to further development in such areas as education, tourism, mass media, psychological rehabilitation, etc. It has been established that the nature reserve fund (NRF), subject to appropriate organizational and economic support, can bring significant profits in the country's GDP, while not creating recreational overload on natural systems

Keywords: natural reserve fund, heritage, national natural parks, inclusiveness, GDP, protected areas, investment mechanism, organizational and economic support.

Problem statement and its connection with important scientific and practical tasks. According to the UN, at the turn of the 20th and 21 century, the population of the Earth has sharply increased to 6 billion, half of which - urban population [1].

One can say that this is exactly the number of people who are in deficit with nature. In the territory of large cities, the effect of the natural component on a person is weakening, and the negative impact of man-made components (noise, poor quality of the environment), accumulation of people and stress factor increases. The only way to restore a person is to have a rest in nature. The increase of cities, the emergence of new ones, and the attraction of the population to urban life are due to economic factors, as well as the growth of opportunities for self-realization and development. In particular, the higher the country's development, the greater the degree of urbanization, in developed countries, it is 60-70%, and in developing countries - about 30%. Today, the proportion of urban population in Europe is 69%, in Asia - 38%, in Africa - 20%, in North America - 75%, Latin America - 65%, Australia and Oceania - 76%. Especially large share of urban population in developed countries: in the USA - about 73%, in France - 78%, in Germany - about

85%, in the UK - 91% [2]. In the case of protected areas, these countries adhere to generally accepted environmental standards, which is more than 15% of the country's territory.

In Ukraine, by 2017, the level of urbanization is 69.2% [3], the percentage of protected natural areas is 6.6%. Such a small proportion of the reserved nature makes it impossible for people to become inclusive (accessible) to nature areas for recreation, and is primarily aimed at preserving nature.

Therefore, the concept of inclusive development is the new theoretical and methodological approach to the study of economic and environmental problems. To date, the positive impact on the economy of harmonious coexistence of man and nature is beyond doubt, which is evidence of the experience of individual countries. But unfortunately in Ukraine there is no such practice, moreover, even the needs of the population in greening the residential area are often ignored. The population has a shortage in communicating with nature, and the lack of proper infrastructure on existing natural areas significantly reduces public access to natural goods, which significantly affects the quality of the impressions received.

According to researchers, in the global perspective, an increase in the network of national parks, nature reserves and reserves will lead not only to increased biodiversity, the conservation of rare species of plants and animals, but also to the development of the green tourism infrastructure in the surrounding rural areas, with all subsequent economic and financial consequences, the level employment, development of the food industry, crafts and replenishment of the national budget at the expense of foreign tourists. By the way, it was the expansion of the nature reserve network that was one of the impetus to support the US economy in the depressed 1930s, as well as the unification of Germany in the early 1990s [4]. That is why, in the conditions of globalization, the development of new economic-ecological systems, the question of finding ways to support and mechanisms for the development of protected areas and the organization of ecological and economic tools for ensuring inclusiveness is of vital importance.

Analysis of recent publications on the problem. The system of the internal structure of protected areas and the formation of a program for their accessibility to the population is considered in the work of Leyla Babayeva [5]. A new approach to being possessing an inclusive modus was proposed by Yakovlev O. L. [6]. The main stimuli of inclusive growth on the example of Norway are given in the work of Anzimov P. [7]. The role of ecological consciousness and emotions in the development of valuable inclusive landmarks was considered by Philipenko V. Yu [8].

The concept of inclusive growth in the economy is defined in the work of Sapun K.V. and Seleznev R.V. [9]; In the work of Mamedov O., the main criteria of inclusive civilization of society are determined [10].

Features and the role of inclusive innovations in ensuring social and economic development are defined in the work of Fedulova L.I. [11].

Allocation of previously unsolved parts of the general problem. In the modern economy, inclusiveness is seen as a comprehensive public access to the benefits of civilization of the most vulnerable and the poorest layer of the population. In this context, it is not determined that the primary source of all the benefits of civilization is the natural environment, and secondly, communication with nature is also an intrinsic good that we often do not realize, but clearly understand it being found in a wild, untouched natural locality. Consequently, the concept of inclusiveness regarding the nature reserve fund remains inadequate, as well as the place and its role in the socio-economic development of society.

Formulation of research objectives (problem statement). The aim of the article is to determine the organizational and economic basis for the development of inclusiveness in environmental protection activities, for this purpose the following tasks have been set and solved.

- to summarize the international experience of formation and development of NRF of different forms of ownership;
- to investigate the sources and forms of financing of the NRF;
- determine the factors contributing to the involvement of these territories in the country's economic system;
- to substantiate the peculiarities of the organization of the activity of the nature reserve fund in Ukraine;
- generalize information on achieving inclusiveness in nature management.

An outline of the main results and their justification. According to the World Watch Institute, in order to maintain the normal state of the ecosystem, the area of the NRF is 10-12% of the region's area, and for the positive impact on the health of the population - 20% of the total territory [12]. Many countries are already going through the preservation of natural areas, while it is important that states with the most developed economies are leaders in the presence of areas of the natural reserve fund. Thus, one of the richest

nations in the world, in terms of GDP, is US \$ 80,189.70, and the leader in household waste production in the amount of 700 kg per capita per year has the cleanest environment in the world [13]. In Switzerland, forests cover almost 30% of the territory, for comparison - agricultural land occupies about 42.5% (of which arable land - 10%, pasture and hayfields - 32.5%), there are many reserves in the country. National natural parks occupy about 15% of its territory, forming a network of "Swiss parks" [5]. The institutions that make up this network are collaborating and developing mobile applications for tourists, through which the latter can learn about new promotions, offers, discounts and routes. So we can say that the country has a successful combination of preserving nature, and at the same time the availability of communication with it for the whole population. For example, in the territory of the park, Dimitgtal (Switzerland), there are about 2,000 people. The Dieming Valley is the most important alpine agricultural part of the country, which has 6,000 heads of cattle and 60 farms producing cheese. Within the park, excursions for schoolchildren who master the importance of water resources management, receive information about different types of flora and fauna. According to tourists, the landscapes and the nature of these places give a sense of harmony and security [5].

Interesting to explore the range of services that accompany the activities of nature conservation institutions is the experience of one of the largest natural parks in Switzerland, Adula, with about 14 thousand people living in its territory and 17 villages. At the same time, the central area of Adula - about 200 square kilometers - is a reserve, here are natural processes, which became the subject of valuable scientific research. In the park you can see glaciers, alpine valleys, pastures and steep mountain slopes. The rich vegetation composition varies depending on the altitude, here, thanks to the warm climate, a lot of chestnut groves.

The experience of Switzerland suggests that the growth of the number of natural parks, the increase of attention to their condition and the development of tourism has a beneficial effect on the life of the local population. If in the 20th century it gradually shrunk as young people left for work in big cities, nowadays, thanks to new attractive workplaces in parks, many young people have an incentive to stay in their native villages or return from cities. Parks themselves, thanks to a well-thought-out natural wealth management system, have become a symbol of national pride [5]. Today, the country's natural parks are the center of tourism, bringing about \$ 14.4 billion each year to the state budget. Exploring the rich experience of the development of protected areas in different countries of the world we have erected separate economic indicators of their activities (Table 1):

Table 1

Indicators of the state and financing of the NRF countries of the world

<i>Nº</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Nature Reserve Fund, km² or %</i>	<i>Structural and organizational forms</i>	<i>Costs and funding sources</i>	<i>Profit from NRF</i>
1	Ukraine	40000,01 km ² , which is 6,6% of the country's territory	Subordinated: Ministry of Environment, State Forestry Agency, National Academy of Sciences, State Administration of Affairs, Ministry of Education and Science, Institute of T. Shevchenko, Ministry of Regional Construction. Total more than 8000 objects	Costs for NRF maintenance (2018 p.) – 459 205 874,57 mln.grn., or 0,6 % GDP	No information available
2	Switzerland	5720 km ² , which is 14 % of the country's territory	Subordinate to 26 cantons of the Department of the Interior	No data available	\$14,4 billion
3	Finland	15000 km ² (4,4% of the country's territory)	Subordinated to the Main Forestry Office of Finland	1,1% GDP	\$3,15 billion
4	Austria	28,2 % of the country's territory	Subordinated the Austrian Federal Forest Service, 10% 90% privately owned	1,9 % GDP	\$21,8 billion

5	Czech Republic	11000 km ² (29,7 % of the country's territory)	Subordinate to Agency for the Protection of Nature of the Czech Republic	1,9 % GDP	\$7,7 billion
6	Australia	29,7% of the country's territory	Subordinate to the Australian State and Territory Agency	\$ 60 million AUD	\$2,5 billion
7	Costa Rica	13286 km ² (26,3 % of the country's territory)	State regulation the development of the NRF, almost 100% private property	\$12 million	\$2,8 billion
8	USA	1 294 476 km ² (14% of the country's territory)	Subordinated to the Federal Service of National Parks - 85%; 15% privately owned	1,5% GDP, on 90% of the state budget	\$110,0 billion
19	Canada	6,5% of the country's territory	Subordinate to the Ministry of the Environment and provincial ministries	2 % GDP; on 70% funded by Parks Canada, 30% - provincial authorities	\$24,0 billion
10	Italia	13,4 % of the country's territory	25-40% privately owned; 15 - 20% in the possession of public organizations; 40-60% - state-owned	0,8 % GDP	\$45,7 billion

Summarized by the author on the basis of sources[14, 15, 16, 17]

Another country with a high conservation status is Finland. Finland ranked fourth in the ranking of countries in terms of the index of environmental efficiency in 2018, ahead of the Netherlands and Japan. According to environmental indicators, Finland leads the European countries for the purity of air and water. About 70% of its territory is covered with forests and lakes, in the country there are 39 nature reserves. There are many routes available in the country in the bosom of nature, for different categories of the population, as well as for people with disabilities, which is evidence of the direction of nature use to inclusiveness. Back in the 1960s, the country concentrated its efforts on creating modern infrastructure and preserving ecosystems. An excellent example of such a policy is the city of Tapiola - residential buildings here are organically surrounded by forest, courtyards and streets are buried in greenery, and therefore Tapiola is known as the "garden city" [18]. Here, as in many other countries, the educational played an important role of the Government in preserving nature, and the strengthening of legislation from the point of view of ecology. Another example of a country with a high conservation status is Costa Rica. Its only difference from the countries listed in Table 1 is the small deposits of mineral resources and the richness of flora and fauna. Here, six percent of the world's biodiversity is concentrated. In the country, 26 percent of the territory is recognized as a protected area - one of the highest in the world. In addition, Costa Rica has endorsed the constitution "the right to a healthy and environmentally balanced environment" [19].

Today, almost 99 percent of the country's electricity is produced from renewable sources, and "clean life" has become one of the important criteria for the planners of the Happy Planet Index, which will be named "the happiest country on the planet" in 2015. In 2018, she found herself in 13th place (the index is 7,062), but not much inferior to such countries as: Finland (1st place - 7,632), Norway (2nd place - 7,594), etc. For comparison, Ukraine under this criterion occupies 138th place with index 4.103. Kyiv is the greenest city, with a NDVI index of 0.389. For comparison, Berlin has an index of 0.246, Rome - 0.17 [20].

Preservation of nature has become not only a useful conservation measure, but a factor in the country's significant GDP profits - so in 2017 year \$2.9 million foreign travelers visited the country, which replenished the country's treasury by \$3.8 billion: tourism became the main source of wealth of Costa Rica, it brings 12.9% of national income, three times more than banana exports, and ten times more than coffee exports [19].

As we can see from Table 1, countries with a developed natural reserve fund and significant GDP expenditures in this sector receive significant revenues from national parks as tourism objects, in addition to the same profits as expenditures. In the parks areas is developed a convenient tourist infrastructure, and a positive impression of nature is backed by cautious attitude of the population to nature, which embodies the visitors of the country a sense of value, uniqueness of the area.

As practice shows, the net income of nature reserves and protected areas in the world, related only to environmental tourism, is more than \$ 40 per hectare per year, if the same area of the park is used for agricultural purposes, even with the most recent technologies the management of its income will be only \$ 0.8 per hectare [21]. So, if you look only in terms of economic benefits, it makes sense to give preference to the development of parks and protected areas.

According to the Institute of Industrial Economics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, in Ukraine the area of land suitable for recreational use ranges from 8.0 million hectares to almost 20 million hectares, or from 13% to almost one third of the country's territory. There are no reliable data on the income from national parks in Ukraine. But according to experts, the use of nature-recreational landscapes could bring to the national natural parks of Ukraine annually from 300 to 800 million dollars of net income [21]. The coverage of protected areas per capita in Ukraine is only 570 m², compared with 2220 m² in Europe, the European norm is 15% of the natural reserve fund of the country's land [22].

As you can see, from table 1, the protected areas of Ukraine make up only 6.6%, which is, of course, very small for the largest country in Europe, in addition, funding of 0.2% of GDP does not allow for the development of this industry. Unfortunately, the main funds managers, the owners of the objects of the NRF, plan their costs by the residual principle [23]. Foreign experience suggests the introduction of economic incentive mechanisms for environmental activities, for example, in Switzerland communes who create and organize parks with the status of "Candidate in National Parks" may receive state subsidies. In addition, this title is a sign of quality, and attracts tourists to these areas, in 2008 and 2009, 14 projects received the status of Candidates, which together received 5.6 million francs, appointed by OFEV "at the stage of organization" [24].

Given the limited state resources in Ukraine, it makes sense to increase investments in support of the reserve fund by funding international donor agencies such as: the World Bank, the Global Environment Facility, the United States Agency for International Development, the German Technical Cooperation Agency, the European Union, the government agencies the assistance of Denmark and Norway, the Department for International Development of Great Britain, as well as the United Nations Development Program, today they are the main source of subsidies for nature conservation and protected areas in developing countries [22]. As of 01.06.2019, according to the data of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine, there are 9 international investment projects registered with the main purpose of environmental protection, in particular: "INTENSE: Integrated doctoral program on environmental policy, management of natural resources management and technical ecology" (by October 2020), the project budget (PB) is EUR 204 397; "Creation of an innovative cross-border monitoring system for the transformation of Black Sea river ecosystems under the influence of hydropower development and climate change (BSB HydroEcoNex 165)" (until March 20, 2021), PB - EUR 187 666; "Joint protection of people and the environment through the creation of the Ukrainian-Polish system of warning and response to the disaster in the Carpathian region" (by October 2020), PB is EUR 1 453 550; EU Instruments, Policies and Best Practices for Environmental Protection (by August 2019 PB is EUR 39,872; "Improvement of the system of cross-border environmental protection in the city administration of Ksenjopol in Poland and in Chervonograd in Ukraine - through the development of sewage infrastructure" (by January 2021), PB - EUR 600 217; "Nature without borders - preservation of the common natural heritage in the communities of Dobromil (Ukraine) and Zagozh (Poland)" (by March 2021), PB is EUR 770,133; "Improvement of the ecological situation in Shatsk National Nature Park through the drainage of settlements around Lake Svityaz" (by March 2021), PB is EUR 6 418 423; "Protection of waters of the Solinsky lake and the treatment waters of the resort Skhidnytsya - a joint challenge and a chance to preserve and use the potential of the natural heritage" (by June 2020), PB - EUR 859 187; "Support for protected areas in Ukraine" (by May 2022), PB is EUR 14 million. Of these, only three are concerned with the conservation of specially protected and protected areas [25].

Another available investment in support of protected areas used abroad is the exchange of "environmental debts", this opportunity is provided by low-income countries. Due to this exchange it is possible to write off a large sum of international debt. This mechanism in the period 1995 - 1999 used by Costa Rica, which paid off \$ 24 580 594 from \$ 35 922 302; now the reserve fund in this country is a major factor in tourist revenues; In 1995, Bulgaria thus abolished its debt [26].

It should be noted that the size of revenues to the budgets of national parks depends on the level of economic development of the country. The average income of a European or American national park exceeds a similar figure in Africa and Latin America more than 200 times [27]. On the other hand, the creation and development of NRF objects should not be dictated only by economic interests. According to

foreign experience, sufficient availability of the natural environment for the population does not interfere with the high level of conservation of protected areas (Table 2).

Table 2.

Territories of strict heritage in different countries of the world and in Ukraine [28].

№	Country	Number of Reserves	% of protected areas in national natural parks (NNPs) / in the country
1	Swiden	3121	4% from the entire forest area
2	Czech Republic	1350	50% from NNP
3	Austria	25	75% from NNP
4	Germany	16	75% from NNP
5	Canada	46	75 - 90% from NNP
6	USA	2	75 – 90% from NNP
7	Finland	39	5,2% from the entire forest area
8	Romania	55	More 50% from NNP
9	Ukraine	23	10 – 20% from NNP, or 0,88% of the country's territory

It is made on the basis of 28

At one time, the US National Parks Service conducted a study that highlighted two main driving forces that motivate the public to support national parks in the United States: firstly, it is a desire to enjoy the scenery of parks, and secondly, to preserve wildlife the authentic nature of their country as a symbol of national pride. At the first stages of the creation of the objects of the NRF, the main task of the environmental protection workers was the environmental education work among the population. A tangible result of such work gave its results only after 30 years, but today in the US, no one will think of reducing the protected areas. Natural locality is proud of Americans, and compliance with the rules of staying in parks is very strict. As we can see from Table 2, US national parks perform such a high conservation function that it makes no sense to create a reserve, so they are only 2 units.

If to follow the formation of nature reserves in the example of such countries as the USA, Canada, Finland, etc. States with a high degree of bequest, it should be noted that the high percentage of NRF (Table 1), and in particular the strict protection of the NNP (Table 2) is a consequence of the formation of the ecological consciousness of society, and not vice versa. Once located on the territory of protected natural areas, visitors comply with all the rules of conduct prescribed for these territories without third-party supervision of workers, even if it is associated with some discomfort.

As far as Ukraine is concerned, all national parks have a protected area, but often it occupies a very small area from the park's territory (Podilsky Tovtry - 0.87%, Bug Guard - 5%, Dzharylgatskaya - 3%, Holy Mountain - 6.5 %, "Hutsulshchyna" - 7.7%, Nizhneshl'skij - 7.9%). However, according to the Program of the Chronicle of Nature, approved by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in 2002, the protected zone of the strict regime of protection of the national park should occupy more than 20-30% of the park's territory, and more than 30-50% of the territory of the biosphere reserve [29].

The adjustment of the local population to the protected area in Ukraine varies widely. Many parks and reserves are kept and continue to develop, despite the lack of funding, but there are situations where the interests of local residents go against the rules of the bequest. In some cases, the expansion of the NRF due to potential arable land or forest does not find support in local communities and is met with active opposition. Thus, the advantage of commercial interests over the development of the reserve fund in due time stopped the creation of a biosphere reserve in the Donbass. Similarly, the creation of the national park "Hutsulshchyna" was suspended, and its protected status may lose the famous "Gard" too [4].

Currently, in Ukraine, 30% of the eroded lands, in essence, they will not bring a large harvest, and further exploitation will lead to their irreversible loss. Therefore, we can propose to withdraw them from agricultural use and re-profile them in the meadows of nature conservation purposes. For example, the national park of Switzerland "Engadin" was created on the land of intensive human development. Now this biosphere reserve is included in the UNESCO list [30].

At the same time, it should be emphasized that positive communication with nature should be accessible to all segments of the population regardless of the state of health and social status, the natural environment acquires values in society when they become part of his life. As an example, you can find a

network of trails in national parks in Switzerland of different levels of complexity and topics, and in particular, in the Botanical Garden of San Graco. There are five types of paths in the garden that can meet the needs of communicating with nature for people with disabilities and individual interest groups. Therefore, such an organization of the nature reserve fund can perform a useful social function of integration - to unite people with different interests and needs [31]. Such diversity adds to the contemplation of nature a greater number of people, and therefore encourages the development of ecological consciousness.

Inclusiveness in nature management can be defined as social accessibility and attraction of nature-resource potential of territories in socio-economic activity, with preservation of all environmental and environmental standards, in order to form the ecological consciousness of society and direct the economic processes to sustainable development. We consider it expedient to highlight the following main directions to the formation of inclusiveness in the nature reserve fund (Table 3):

Table 3

Directions of development of quality and character inclusive nature management in NRF

Requirements to ensure the integrity of the NRF	Mechanisms of quality assurance	
	Institutional	Administrative
1. Focus on nature conservation	Changes in regulatory legal acts of Ukraine (first of all, those directly related to the NRF)	Supervision of the preservation of all conditions of strict bequest and norms of stay on the territory of the NRF
2. Harmonization of strict reserved with openness and accessibility to communication with nature	Development of regulatory legal mechanism for counteracting excessive inclusion	- Informing the population about the vulnerability of ecosystems and their role in supporting life on the planet; - The ability of managers to motivate visitors to a responsible attitude towards nature; - Direct incentives from the administration to participate in environmental events
3. Target on the maximum possible economic and social effects at rational use of resources	Optimization of educational and recreational and tourist programs on the territory of the NRF with the choice of the most environmentally balanced option.	Cooperation with the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry of Economic Development and the other interested organizations on the formation of a contingent of persons with the definition of norms and limits for participation in educational and recreational and tourist programs on the territory of the NRF.
4. Resource provision of the NRF and infrastructure	Determination of the prospective for use of the natural resource potential of the NRF and the forms of infrastructure provision in accordance with the norms of the NRF	Monitoring of the load on the resources of the NRF and the coordination of infrastructure provision
5. Integrated and balanced management of the NRF	The only management of the objects of the NRF is the complete connection between the individual elements of its activities	
6. Realistic, matching the needs of the existing possibilities of natural objects	Ensuring sustainable development of inclusiveness in NRF facilities	Taking into account all possibilities of realization of social and economic aspects of activity in combination with ecological norms of the bequest
7. Integrating, consolidating function of activities in the NRF, in particular vulnerable populations	Development of state and regional target programs for the development of man and nature, and preservation of the state and quality of the environment NRF	Involvement of NRF staff and other stakeholders in the development of inclusive target programs.

Source: compiled by the author

Thus, the directions of formation of inclusiveness determined by us on the nature reserves presuppose that the inclusiveness of these territories can't be absolute unlike economic (which is endlessly directed towards increasing the public good from the use of natural resources).

Conclusions and perspectives of further observations.

International experience in the conservation of protected areas testifies to the possibility of effective socio-economic and ecological functioning of FPF facilities, in particular

- The management of the NRF has different structural and organizational forms and ownership rights to environmental objects from full control and retention by the state, to a significant degree of private ownership;

- for the maintenance of NRF facilities in different countries of the world, considerable sums of money are spent up to 2% of GDP, while in Ukraine about 0.2% of GDP;

- rational use of economic and environmental potential of the NRF provides a significant contribution to the national and regional economy through the development of ecologically safe and supporting conservation activities of the types of farming, in particular: recreational, tourism, educational, scientific, artistic, etc. ;

- the development of NRF objects stimulates the attraction of foreign and domestic investments, which is confirmed by international projects registered with the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade;

- There are examples of the use of attracted investments in support of protected areas, such as the exchange of "environmental debt", which is provided by low-income countries. Due to this exchange, large amounts of international debt were written off in countries such as Costa Rica, Bulgaria, etc.;

- Compared to other countries, in national natural parks (NPP), % of territories of severe heritage is very low.

It is substantiated that the issues of the development of protected areas and their rational use should be solved in the light of adherence to the principles of inclusiveness in economic growth, covering all segments of the population regardless of the state of affairs and social status.

The concept of inclusiveness in nature management, which is defined as social accessibility and attraction of the nature-resource potential of territories in the socio-economic activity with the preservation of all environmental and environmental standards that forms the ecological consciousness of society and directs economic processes to sustainable development, is proposed. The inclusiveness of nature-protected areas can't be absolute, unlike the economic, which is endlessly directed towards increasing the public good from the use of natural resources.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Історія та перспективи розвитку урбанізації. [Електронний ресурс] - Режим доступу <https://studfiles.net/preview/5726026/page:2/>

2. Проблеми урбанізованого розселення [Електронний ресурс] - Режим доступу <http://www.geograf.com.ua/geoinfocentre/20-human-geography-ukraine-world/276-ref19951103>

3. Статистичний щорічник України за 2016 рік За редакцією І. Є. Вернера Київ 2017

4. Чижов А.. Расширение заповедников: выполнима ли миссия? [Электронный ресурс] / Чижов А. // ЗЕРКАЛО НЕДЕЛИ Украина – 2010. - Выпуск №18, 14 мая-21 мая. – Режим доступа : https://zn.ua/ENVIRONMENT/rashshirenje_zapovednikov_vypolnima_li_missiya.html

5. Бабаева Л. Швейцарські парки – серед кращих в світі. [Електронний ресурс] / Бабаева Л. // Наша Газета 22. 01. 2016. Берн/Бьяска Режим доступу <http://nashagazeta.ch/news/masuisse/shveycarskie-parki-sredi-luchshih-v-mire>

6. Яковлева О. Л. К проблеме ценностного обоснования инклюзивного подхода к бытию / Карельский научный журнал №3, 2014 с. 32 – 36.

7. Ансімов П. Аналіз екологічних проблем Норвегії [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: http://norge.ru/anisimov_miljoeoproblemer/

8. Філіпенко В. Ю. Екологічна свідомість: антропоцентризм і екоцентризм. [Електронний ресурс] / В. Ю. Філіпенко // Молодий вчений. - 2016. - №11.- С. 1818-1822. – Режим доступу: <https://moluch.ru/archive/115/30689/>

9. Сапун К. В. Концепція інклюзивного зростання в економіці / К. В. Сапун, Р. В. Селезньова // Вісник студентського наукового товариства Донецького національного університету імені Василя Стуса. Том 1–2018. С 177 – 181

10. Мамедов О. Экономика инклюзивной цивилизации / Мамедов О. // TERRA ECONOMICUS 2017, Том 15, № 3. С 6 – 18.
11. Федулова Л.І. Інклюзивні інновації в системі соціально-економічного розвитку / ЕКОНОМІКА: реалії часу №3 (25), 2016; с. 56 – 65.
12. Якимчук А. Ю. Экономика и организация природно-заповедного фонда: монография / А. Ю. Якимчук. - Ровно, 2007. – 208 с.
13. 10 самих екологічно чистих країн світу. [Електронний ресурс] - Режим доступу: <http://lifeglobe.net/blogs/details?id=674>
14. Якимчук А.Ю. Аналіз фінансування природно –заповідних установ як суб'єктів регіональної економіки (на прикладі Північного регіону України) / А.Ю. Якимчук // Матеріали IV міжнародної науково-практичної конференції "Динаміка наукових досліджень 2005". – Дніпропетровськ , 2005. – С. 60-65.
15. Phillips A. Economic Values of Protected Areas: Guidelines for Protected Areas anagers. – 1998. JUCN. – 72 p.
16. Yakymchuk A.Y. The economic stimulation of the nature-protection fund's development in the world ecological constitution conception //Проблеми створення Екологічної Конституції Землі Науковий Вісник, 2006, вип. 16.8
17. Націщнальна стратегія зміцнення фінансової стійкості природоохоронних територій України / Проект Міністерства охорони навколишнього природного середовища України, Київ 2009
18. Екологія по-фінськи. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://e-finland.ru/travel/general/ekologiya-po-finski.html>
19. Коста-Ріка: Курс на екологію. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу : <http://www.geo.ru/putesestvia/230441-strana-gde-zizn-zelenee>
20. Киев занял перовое место в списке самых «зеленых» мегаполисов Европы. [Электронный ресурс] – Режим доступа: <https://www.segodnya.ua/kyev/kpeople/kyev-zanyal-pervoe-mesto-v-spiske-samyh-zelenyh-megapolisov-evropy-1093092.html>
21. Гетьман В. О правовых принципах рекреационной деятельности в национальных природных парках Украины. [Электронный ресурс] / В. Гетьман // Зеркало недели Украина 2018– № 15. – Режим доступа: https://zn.ua/ecology/rekreaciya-otdyhaet-281847_.html
22. Калина Т.Є. Фінансове забезпечення розвитку природоохоронних територій. / Т.Є. Калина , О.В. Константинова // «Актуальні проблеми інноваційної економіки» по4/2017 всеукраїнський науковий журнал
23. Дребот О.І. Система державного управління природно-заповідним фондом України та її регіонів / О.І. Дребот // ISSN 1562-0905 Регіональна економіка 2011, №4
24. Географія туризму. Центральна Європа: учбовий посібник / Кужель Ю., Граве О., Полинова Л., Крючков О. під науковою редакцією Кужеля
25. Перелік проектів міжнародної технічної допомоги за підтримки країн-донорів, що реалізуються в Україні та пройшли державну реєстрацію (перереєстрацію) у Мінекономрозвитку URL: <https://data.gov.ua/dataset/04fa817d-5c92-4e0d-b1b5-2dcf720adc36/resource/f00b8124-7ea6-4d8d-ad9b-6089c911ff0a>
26. Обмін «борги на навколишнє середовище» в країнах з перехідною економікою: основні висновки і рекомендації/ Організація Економічної співпраці і розвитку, OECD 2007
27. Мосейкін В. Особливості національних парків світу за формами власності і організаційній структурі. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://valery-moseykin.livejournal.com/5693.html>
28. Борейко В.Є. Європа прямує шляхом заповідності. Короткий огляд заповідної справи в європейських країнах. [Електронний ресурс] / Борейко // Режим доступу : <https://www.lisportal.pp.ua/87607/>
29. Борейко В.Є. Розповсюдження концепції заповідності на інші об'єкти природно-заповідного фонду. [Електронний ресурс] / Борейко // Режим доступу: http://lesovod.blogspot.com/2017/01/blog-post_729.htm
30. Національні парки і заповідники в Швейцарії. [Електронний ресурс] - Режим доступу: <http://guide.travel.ru/switzerland/geo/nature/nationalparks/>
31. Парк Сан-Грато. [Електронний ресурс] - Режим доступу: <https://www.myswitzerland.com/ru/city-parks/parco-san-grato.html>

REFERENCES

1. Istoriya ta perspektyvy rozvytku urbanizatsiyi [History and prospects for the development of urbanization]. Retrieved from <https://studfiles.net/preview/5726026/page/2/> [in Ukrainian]
2. Problemy urbanizovanoho rozselennya [Problems of Urban Resettlement]. Retrieved from <http://www.geograf.com.ua/geoinfocentre/20-human-geography-ukraine-world/276-ref19951103> [in Ukrainian]
3. I.E. Verner (2017) Statystychnyy shchorichnyk Ukrayiny za 2016 rik [Statistical Yearbook of Ukraine for 2016]. Kuiv. [in Ukrainian]
- 4.A. Chizhov. (2010). Rasshireniye zapovednikov: vypolnima li missiya? [Expansion of reserves: is the mission feasible?]. *Zerkalo nedeli Ukraina – mirror of the week Ukraine*, Issue No. 18, Retrieved from https://zn.ua/ENVIRONMENT/rasshirenie_zapovednikov_vypolnima_li_missiya.html [in Russian]
5. Babaeva L. (2016). Shveysarski parky – sered krashchykh v sviti. [Swiss parks are among the best in the world]. *Nasha Hazeta - Our Newspaper*. Berne / Biaska. Retrieved from <http://nashagazeta.ch/news/ma-suisse/shveycarskie-parki-sredi-luchshih-v-mire> [in Ukrainian]
6. Yakovleva O. L (2014). K probleme tsennostnogo obosnovaniya inklyuzivnogo podkhoda k bytiyu [To the problem of value justification of an inclusive approach to being]. *Karel'skiy nauchnyy zhurnal - Karelian scientific journal* №3, p. 32 – 36. [in Russian]
7. Ansimov P. Analiz ekolohichnykh problem Norvehiyi [Analysis of environmental problems in Norway]. Retrieved from http://norge.ru/anisimov_miljoeproblemer/ [in Ukrainian]
8. Filipenko V. Y. (2016). Ekolohichna svidomist: antropotsentryzm i ekotsentryzm. [Ecological consciousness: anthropocentrism and ecocentrism]. *Molodyy vchenyy. - Young scientist*. - No. 11. - P. 1818-1822. - Retrieved from <https://moluch.ru/archive/115/30689/> [in Ukrainian]
9. Sapun K. V., & Seleznova R. V. (2018). Kontseptsiya inklyuzyvnoho zrostannya v ekonomitsi [concept of inclusive growth in economics]. *Visnyk student-skoho naukovohto tovarystva Donetskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Vasylya Stusa. - Bulletin of Student Scientific Society of Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University*. 1, 177 – 181. [in Ukrainian]
10. Mamedov O. (2017). ekonomika inklyuzivnoy tsivilizatsii [economy of inclusive civilization]. *terra economicus*, 15, No. 3., 6 - 18. [in Russian]
11. Fedulova L.I. (2016). inklyuzyvni innovatsiyi v systemi sotsialno-ekonomichnoho rozvytku [inclusive innovations in the system of socio-economic development] *ekonomika: realiyi chasu - ECONOMY: Realities of Time* № 3 (25); p. 56 - 65. [in Ukrainian]
12. Yakimchuk A. Y. (2007). Ekonomika i organizatsiya prirodno-zapovednogo fonda: monografiya [Economics and organization of the natural reserve fund: monograph] p 208. [in Russian]
13. 10 samykh ekolohichno chystykh krayin svitu [10 most environmentally friendly countries in the world]. - Retrieved from <http://lifeglobe.net/blogs/details?id=674> [in Ukrainian]
14. Yakymchuk A.Y. (2005) Analiz finansuvannya pryrodno –zapovidnykh ustanov yak sub'yektiv rehionalnoyi ekonomiky (na prykladi Pivnichnoho rehionu Ukrayiny) [Analysis of financing of natural reserve institutions as subjects of regional economy (for example, Northern region of Ukraine)] *Materialy IV mizhnarodnoyi naukovo-praktychnoyi konferentsiyi" Dynamika naukovykh doslidzhen 2005 - Materials of the IV International Scientific and Practical Conference "Dynamics of Scientific Research 2005"*- P. 60-65. [in Ukrainian]
15. Phillips A. (1998). Economic Values of Protected Areas: Guidelines for Protected Areas anagers. – JUCN. – 72 p. [in English]
16. Yakymchuk A.Y. (2006). The economic stimulation of the nature-protection fund's development in the world ecological constitution conception. *Problemy stvorennya Ekolohichnoyi Konstytutsiyi Zemli Naukovyy Visnyk - Problems of creating the Ecological Constitution of the Earth Scientific Herald*, 2006, no. 16.8 [in English]
17. Natsionalna stratehiya zmitsnennya finansovoyi stiukosti pryrodookhoronnykh treytoriy Ukrainy [National strategy for strengthening financial stability of environmental protections of ukraine]. *Proekt Ministerstva okhorony navkolyshnoho pryrodnoho seredovyscha Ukrayiny - Draft Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine*, Kyiv 2009 [in Ukrainian]
18. Ekolohiya po-finsky [Ecology in Finnish] - Retrieved from <http://e-finland.ru/travel/general/ekologiya-po-finski.html> [in Russian]
19. Kosta-Rika: Kurs na ekolohiyu [Costa Rica: A Course on Ecology] - Retrieved from <http://www.geor.ru/putesestvia/230441-strana-gde-zizn-zelenee>

20. Kiyev zanyal pervoye mesto v spiske samykh «zelenykh» megapolisov Yevropy [Kiyev zanyal pervoye mesto v spiske samykh «zelenykh» megapolisov Yevropy]. Retrieved from <https://www.segodnya.ua/kiiev/kpeople/kiiev-zanyal-pervoe-mesto-v-spiske-samyh-zelenyh-megapolisov-evropy-1093092.html>
21. Get'man V. (2018). O pravovykh printsipakh rekreatsionnoy deyatelnosti v natsional'nykh prirodnykh parkakh Ukrainy [On the legal principles of recreational activities in the national natural parks of Ukraine]. *Zerkalo nedeli Ukraina – mirror of the week Ukraine* - No. 15. - Retrieved from https://zn.ua/ECOLOGY/rekreaciya-otdyhaet-281847_.html [in Russian]
22. Kalyna T.Y., & Konstantinova O.V. (2017). Finansove zabezpechennya rozvytku pryrodookhoronnykh terytoriy [Financial support for the development of protected areas]. *Aktualni problemy innovatsiyanoi ekonomiky* - "topical problems of innovational economy" No.4 [in Ukrainian]
23. Drebot O.I. (2011). Systema derzhavnoho upravlinnya pryrodno-zapovidnym fondom Ukrayiny ta yiyi rehioniv [The system of public administration of the nature reserve fund of Ukraine and its regions]. *ISSN 1562-0905 Rehionalna ekonomika - ISSN 1562-0905 Regional economy* 2011, No4 [in Ukrainian]
24. Kuzhel Y., Hrave O., Polynova L., & Kryuchkov O. *Heohrafiya turyzmu. Tsentralna Yevropa [Geography of tourism. Central Europe]* [in Ukrainian]
25. Perelik proektiv mizhnarodnoyi tekhnichnoyi dopomohy za pidtrymky krayin-donoriv, shcho realizuyut'sya v Ukrayini ta proyshly derzhavnu reyestratsiyu (perereyestratsiyu) u Minekonomrozvytku [List of projects of international technical assistance with the support of donor countries, which are being implemented in Ukraine and have undergone state registration (re-registration) in the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade]. Retrieved from <https://data.gov.ua/dataset/04fa817d-5c92-4e0d-b1b5-2dcf720adc36/resource/f00b8124-7ea6-4d8d-ad9b-6089c911ff0a>
26. Obmin «borhy na navkolyshnye seredovyshe» v krayinakh z perekhidnoyu ekonomikoyu: osnovni vysnovky i rekomendatsiyi [Exchange of "Environmental Debt" in Transition Economies: Key Findings and Recommendations]. *Orhanizatsiya Ekonomichnoyi spivpratsi i rozvytku - Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD* 2007 [in Ukrainian]
27. Moseykin V. Osoblyvosti natsionalnykh parkiv svitu za formamy vlasnosti i orhanizatsiyniy strukturi [Features of the national parks of the world by the forms of ownership and organizational structure]- Retrieved from <https://valery-moseykin.livejournal.com/5693.html> [in Ukrainian]
28. Boreyko V.E. Yevropa pryamuye shlyakhom zapovidnosti. Korotkyy ohlyad zapovidnoyi spravy v yevropeyskykh krayinakh [Europe is walking along the path of nature. A brief overview of the conservation work in European countries]. - Retrieved from <https://www.lisportal.pp.ua/87607/> [in Ukrainian]
29. Boreyko V/ E. Rozpovsyudzhennya kontseptsiyi zapovidnosti na inshi obyekty pryrodno-zapovidnoho fondu [Distribution of the concept of reserve to other objects of the nature reserve fund] - Retrieved from http://lesovod.blogspot.com/2017/01/blog-post_729.htm [in Ukrainian]
30. Natsionalni parky i zapovidnyky v Shveysariyi [National Parks and Reserves in Switzerland]. - Retrieved from <http://guide.travel.ru/switzerland/geo/nature/nationalparks/> [in Ukrainian]
31. Park San-Hrato [San Gretto Park]. - Retrieved from <https://www.myswitzerland.com/ru/city-parks/parco-san-grato.html>