

УДК 330.837: 338.58

*Архипцев С. І.  
Arkhiireiev S.*

## СЕКТОР ВНУТРІШНІХ ТА ЗОВНІШНІХ ТРАНСАКЦІЙ ПІД ВПЛИВОМ УГОДИ ПРО АСОЦІАЦІЮ З ЄС

### DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTION SECTOR UNDER THE EFFECT OF EU ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT

*Проаналізований вплив урядової трансакційної політики відносно трансакційного сектора. Введений термін сектор міжнародних трансакцій. Досліджені наслідки, викликані підписанням Угоди про асоціацію між Україною та ЄС, для більшості міжнародних трансакцій і майже для всіх трансакційних процесів в Україні.*

*Ключові слова: внутрішній трансакційний сектор, сектор міжнародних трансакцій, Угода про асоціацію між Україною та ЄС.*

Signing of EU – Ukraine Association Agreement [1] has caused consequences for various international transactions and almost for all transaction processes in Ukraine. Retail turnover has already undergone a change – it has considerably contracted. In first half of 2015, it fell almost 25 percent over the last year. That cannot but affect both general indicators of economic development and the transaction sector structure. Thus, the Agreement is expected to influence the restructuring of transaction sector in whole.

There is one more problem that should be considered apart: the problem of restructuring of financial transactions. Signing of the Agreement has caused changes in the directivity of external transactions. Russia has interrupted the credit Agreement for 15 billion dollars after providing the first three billion, but the loans from the international organizations and some Western countries have been received. In particular, at the end of July 2015 we have learned about EU macro-financial assistance for the total amount of 600 million euros, which can be increased by another 1,2 billion euros, and about second tranche of 1,7 billion dollars of the IMF loan, which total size is 17,5 billion.

Signing of the Agreement has also led to deregulation of carrying out bank transactions and has accordingly changed their structure. Deposit

transactions have been reduced by a third. Since the beginning of 2014, 53 banks have been removed from the market, this being the result of their non-solvency and the attempts taken for the purpose of overcoming illegal transactions. As a result, the deposit guarantee fund has been exhausted. Thus, even the brief preliminary analysis shows that practically all transactional types of economic activity turned out to have come under the influence of the Agreement.

That means modification of the transaction sector internal structure. Changes are also likely to occur in the transaction sector in whole since the Agreement is likely to change a balance of real sector and transaction sector because of the mentioned changes in the sphere of international and domestic transactions.

For the national economy, the transaction sector restructuring is especially important in the case of losing its operating efficiency, which is taking place in Ukraine now. A major way to achieve such restructuring is to carry out the consistent government transaction policy.

The role of state in the economy under market transformation has essentially changed. In particular, it tells on the transaction activities, which is transferred from the hands of the state to the hands of the private sector and essentially changes its size and significance. However, it does not mean that the state completely abandons the transaction sphere. The state continues affecting on the transaction sector, whether voluntary or not.

Of course, it would be better if the state pursued a transaction policy especially worked out rather than taking spontaneous measures in order to regulate transaction activities, i.e. the state control is of paramount importance. The problem of government transaction policy is poorly worked out in economic literature. Following a conscious transaction policy presupposes corresponding characteristics of the transaction sector of economy. However, the problems of evolution of the

transaction sector and its structure under market transformation conditions are insufficiently discussed in the existing investigations.

They must deal with the problem of comprising both the transaction activities volume and transaction sector size as well as and their significance in Ukraine as an EU Associated Country and different EU Member States (either core, or peripheral, or new member) economies in order to obtain the guiding line for Ukrainian government transaction policy.

An objective of the article is determining the influence of the government transaction policy at all and those connected with signing of EU – Ukraine Association Agreement on the transaction activities and interdependence between the development of transaction activities and the transaction sector growth.

The efficient government transaction policy under the Associated Agreement results in the growth of transaction sector. Wallis and North [2] introduced the term “transaction sector” in their well-known study. According to the approach proposed by J. Wallis and D. North, the majority of state functions should be attributed to transaction services. At any rate, the remuneration of workers rendering such services belongs to transaction costs. They estimated the share of transaction costs in US GNP (47-55% in 1970) and the correlation of the public and private transaction sectors on this basis.

The study of the Australian transaction sector has shown its growth up to 60% in 1991 [3]. In Argentina, the transaction sector’s share of GNP changed from 28% only to 35% in 1970-1980, where it remained at least to 1990 [4].

On the contrary, in Germany the transaction sector fell from 48,5% in 1982 to 41,8% in 1993 [5], [6], [7] introduces a comparative approach for comparing the transaction sector of some countries and points out the difficulties of the cross-national comparisons. According to M. Ghertman [7], the transaction sector has reached a level of 63% GNP in France, 62% in USA, 56% in Japan and 52% in Germany in 1990.

In the first decade of the new millennium, transaction sector research has also spread over the countries with transition economy. Thus, the transaction sector development research has been conducted in Poland and Bulgaria. It has covered the major part of the validity period of their Association Agreements with the EU.

As for Poland, the Association Agreement was signed in 1991 and was valid from 1994 to 2004.

In 2004, the country joined the EU based on the 2003 Agreement. The research of Polish transaction sector conducted by A. Sulejewicz, P. Graca [8] covered the essential part of the Association period. They show increasing of the transaction sector of Poland from 49.6% in 1996 to 67.2% of GNP in 2002.

As regards Bulgaria, the Association Agreement was signed in 1993 and was valid within the period of 1995 – 2007. In 2007, the country joined EU based on the 2005 Agreement. The research of Bulgarian transaction sector conducted by G. Chobanov, H. Egbert [9] covered most of the Association period.

They use the method of A. Sulejewicz and P. Graca [8] to display the growth of Bulgarian transaction sector from 37.4% in 1997 to 52.7% of GNP in 2003 and to make a comparison between the two Associated Countries (Poland and Bulgaria).

The research by H. Egbert, M. Ivanova, G. Chobanov [10] has given more information with regard to the Association period. According to the updated information the transaction sector of Bulgaria provided 36,3% of GNP in 1997, however in 2006 this indicator totalled 51,9%.

Thus, in both Poland and Bulgaria the transaction sector was essentially transformed over a period of the Association Agreement. In Poland it has increased by 17%, and in Bulgaria it has increased by 15%. The internal structure of the transaction sector has also been strongly modified in these countries.

All these researchers identified the scope of transaction sector with the total value of transaction costs. The author of the article used a different technique to compare the size of the transaction sector in different countries. It presumes identification of the scope of the institutional transaction sector with the volume of transaction activities.

To begin with, it was proposed to compare the volume of transaction activities by employment [11]. It turned out, that in Ukraine, 19.3% of those employed are engaged in transaction activities. This index is by far less than the one of developed market economies. It makes up 77.8% of the share of the employed in rendering transaction services in Japan, 75.2% for Italy, 64.6% for Germany, 64.2% for Canada, 61.4% for Great Britain, 53.7% for USA. To compare, the share of the employed in private transaction activities accounts for respectively 74.0% for Germany, 61.1% for Italy, 53.4% for Japan and for USA, 50.0% for Great Britain, 48.0% for Canada.

To continue with, it was proposed to compare the volume of transaction activities by a set of different value indexes (Output, Intermediate Consumption, Gross Value Added, Labour Compensation of Employment, Gross Operating Surplus, Net Operating Surplus, Gross Capital Formation, Capital Consumption, Net Capital Formation) [12].

Some years ago, the author has conducted such investigation to compare the transaction sector in Ukraine and Germany by wide-range indexes [13] that can also be used nowadays, under the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement.

All other methods provide the comparison of the share of the transaction sector in GNP only. At the same time, the system of national accounts analyzes the institutional sectors of economy with a different set of indicators.

Therefore, the determination of the size and significance of transaction activities, which include only transaction institutional units, can play an important role. The distinctive characteristics of transaction institutional units include their uniformity of behaviour and autonomy in decision-making in respect to their transaction functions.

Using different numerous indicators is necessary to allow for a wide-ranging analysis of the transaction activities similar to the analysis of the institutional sectors in the system of national accounts.

The need for new transaction policy in the New Associated Countries like Ukraine is more obvious in comparison with the EU Member States. Carrying out an absolute majority of transactions was monopolized by the government sector of the command economy. The transaction policy was strictly prohibitive unlike in the other countries of the World in relation to private transactions. This policy became the starting point of the market economy formation, which is based on free transacting and private transaction activities. However, public transaction activities do not disappear under market transformation conditions but they have undergone considerable changes.

The public sector reserves for itself some specific functions such as determining rules and actions of law-enforcement agencies directed to suppression of crimes committed during carrying out transactions as well as the judicial system activities focused on determining the character of punishment of the guilty. Special public organs also play an important role.

In general, the public sector loses its monopoly of carrying out the transactions and is subject

to substantial reduction under the market transformation. However, it does not lose its role in general which undergoes a modification in accordance with the general principles of the market economy.

The public sector must provide implementation of its main function to be a reliable instrument of carrying out effective transaction policy, while direct transaction functions pass on to the private sector.

It also concerns international transactions carried out by private sector, but under the influence of Government transaction policy. Signing of EU-Ukraine Association Agreement in Ukraine in 2014 has become important element of Government transaction policy for the years.

Association Agreements with the EU have always exerted a severe impact on the signatory countries, restructuring of their transaction sector being one of the effects. International political tensions generated by the Agreement with Ukraine are known to be its special feature. Their implications have a much greater influence on the economy than the Agreement itself. The EU-Ukraine Association Agreement is believed to have had a greater geopolitical impact than any other Association Agreement with the EU, its influence being comparable only to the collapse of the Eastern bloc and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s.

The most important distinctive characteristic of the Agreement is rather broad geographic scope of its impact. Naturally enough the Agreement will have the strongest influence upon Ukraine but it will also affect both EU countries and third countries. Restructuring of EU transactions will be definitely influenced by the sanctions imposed against Russia as well as by the so-called Russia's anti-sanctions (the Russian food embargo). They can affect not only a trade turnover with Russia but also cause other changes with respect to substitution of commodity transactions with Russia. It is natural that among third countries the Agreement should mostly have effect upon Russia. However, the Agreement can indirectly affect other countries. For example, Latin America countries may substitute European products in the market of Russia.

As a result, not only Ukraine but also third countries exert both direct and indirect influence over EU countries including Germany. Seven months statistics have shown that indirect consequences of the Agreement have influenced German-Ukrainian international transactions more

than those between Germany and Russia in relative terms.

Another important feature of the Agreement is the power of its influence. In Ukraine influence of the Agreement has appeared to be broader than one would assume even before its signing. The fact is that its signing has caused changes in the political and economic regime in the country. That means that in general the consequences will be more profound than the direct effect. Thus, the effects of the Agreement should be divided into direct and indirect consequences, the latter being caused not by the Agreement itself but by the changes, which took place because of its signing.

These effects are not likely to appear simultaneously. First, since before the Agreement was signed its indirect consequences had already appeared. The Agreement signing itself appeared to take too much time. Accordingly, the consequences are likely to be modified while it is being implemented. Various stages of the Agreement implementation are certain to be observed since free trade regimes are not introduced simultaneously.

Actually even before the Agreement came into operation, certain changes have taken place with regard to external transactions of Ukraine and other countries being involved. Naturally, they will become more profound from now on. The indirect consequences have already become apparent in the first half of the year. Thus, an important milestone with regard to Ukraine international trade appears to have been passed. In 2013 as well as during previous period of time major portion of foreign trade was being carried on with CIS countries (if compared to EU) but in the first half of 2014 sharp changes took place and major portion of Ukrainian export fell on EU countries by comparison with CIS countries. In 2013 Ukrainian exports to EU was 10% less than to CIS countries, but in 2014 it exceeded by 2% [14]. This has to do with both the political situation and the removal of trade barriers between EU and Ukraine since May 2014. However, Ukraine can use this removal of trade barriers, even by providing quotas, not always fruitfully. Thus, quotas provided to Ukraine for 2015 were used on the average by only 20% for half of the year, compared with 60% use of quotas received by Turkey (Table 1).

Somewhat different and unfortunately unfavorable trend has been observed in the sphere of foreign direct investments. They have been seriously reduced including those coming from the EU countries.

The Agreement influence will not add up only to regional restructuring of external transactions or foreign direct investments. The Agreement will have non-uniform influence on the development of industries, the possible effects having to be analyzed individually for each industry.

Reorientation of the economy of Ukraine from Russia to the European Union is already fundamentally changing the structure of Ukrainian foreign trade and the international transactions in general. In addition, it cannot but have an effect on the sectoral structure of the foreign trade. If Russia used to buy engineering products from Ukraine, in Europe the only Ukrainian industries that could be successful on the European market would be food and light industries.

The analysis that has been carried out allows to conclude that the Agreement is bounded to have the greatest impact on restructuring of the international transactions of a significant number of countries and mostly of Ukraine, where it also caused crucial changes of the domestic transactions. It is possible and necessary to continue investigating the problem of the international and domestic transaction restructuring by different indexes as well, the problem of the competitive international transaction sector and providing appropriate changes formation of it structure under the influence of EU-Ukraine Association Agreement, i.e. the main problem of this article.

The study of transaction sector is still a vital task of Economics and requires a more detailed investigation that would allow finding not only the effective boundaries of transaction sector development but also the parameters of transactions structure maximizing economic efficiency under the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement.

The given task of Economics is of particular urgency, taking into account the possible changes as of 01/01/2016. At this point, the economy of Ukraine can experience a double shock. On the one hand, barriers to export from the EU to Ukraine will be removed. That in itself can shock the Ukrainian economy (national manufacturers might not withstand competition from more developed countries in the market). On the other hand, there is a major risk that Russia will nevertheless close the market for the goods from Ukraine that can make this shock double (we might expect the decline in production because of loss of foreign markets). Therefore, we believe such investigation to be extremely urgent and important since it studies the current state of affairs and estimates the Ukrainian economy prospects taking into account the possibility of double shock.

Table 1. Usage of EU tariff quota imports by Ukraine as of 30.06.2015, 10:20 [15]

Order Number	Description	%
09.3050	Sheep legs, , other cuts with bone in (excluding carcasses and half carcasses, short forequarters and chins and/or best ends), fresh or chilled. Boneless meat of sheep, fresh or chilled. Frozen cuts of sheep, with bone in (excluding carcasses and half-carcasses, and short forequarters). Frozen meat of lamb, boneless. Frozen meat of sheep, boneless	0,0
09.3051	Natural honey	100,0
09.3052	Raw beet sugar not containing added flavouring or colouring matter. Other sugar than raw sugar. Maple sugar in solid form, containing added flavouring or colouring matter. Isoglucose in solid form, containing in the dry state 50% by weight of fructose. Maltodextrine in solid form and maltodextrine syrup, containing in the dry state 50% by weight of fructose. Caramel. Inulin syrup. Other sugars, including invert sugar and other sugar and sugar syrup blends containing in the dry state 50% by weight of fructose	80,6
09.3053	Glucose and glucose syrup, not containing fructose or containing in the dry state less than 50% by weight of fructose, excluding invert sugar. Other fructose and fructose syrup, containing in the dry state more than 50% by weight of fructose, excluding invert sugar	0,9
09.3054	Flavoured or coloured isoglucose syrups. Flavoured or coloured glucose syrup and maltodextrine syrup. Flavoured or coloured sugar syrups (excl. isoglucose, lactose, glucose and maltodextrine syrups)	0,0
09.3055	Barley groats. Groats and meals of cereals (excl. wheat, rye, oats, maize, rice and barley). Cereal pellets (excl. wheat, rye, oats, maize, rice and barley). Rolled or flaked wheat grains. Rolled or flaked maize grains. Rolled barley grains. Flaked barley grains Worked grains (for example, hulled, pearled, sliced or kibbled), other than of oats, of rye or of maize. Germ of cereals, whole, rolled, flaked or ground	100,0
09.3056	Malt, whether or not roasted. Wheat gluten, whether or not dried/	0,9
09.3057	Wheat starch. Maize starch. Potato starch.	4,2
09.3058	Dextrins and other modified starches (excl. starches, esterified or etherified) Glues containing, by weight, 25% or more of starches or dextrans or other modified starches	0,0
09.3059	Bran, sharps and other residues, whether or not in the form of pellets, derived from the sifting, milling or other working of cereals (excl. those of rice). Residues from the manufacture of starch from maize (excluding concentrated steeping liquors), of a protein content, calculated on the dry product exceeding 40% by weight	8,6
09.3060	Mushrooms of the genus <i>Agaricus</i> provisionally preserved (for example, by sulphur dioxide gas, in brine, in sulphur water or in other preservative solutions), but unsuitable in that state for immediate consumption Mushrooms of the genus <i>Agaricus</i> , prepared or preserved otherwise than by vinegar or acetic acid	0,0
09.3061	Mushrooms of the genus <i>Agaricus</i> provisionally preserved (for example, by sulphur dioxide gas, in brine, in sulphur water or in other preservative solutions), but unsuitable in that state for immediate consumption	0,0
09.3062	Tomatoes prepared or preserved otherwise than by vinegar or acetic acid	67,7

Table 1 (continuation)

09.3063	Grape juice (including grape must), of a Brix value not exceeding 30, of a value exceeding 18 EUR per 100 kg net weight. Grape juice (including grape must), of a Brix value exceeding 67, of a value not exceeding 22 EUR per 100 kg net weight. Grape juice (including grape must), of a Brix value exceeding 30 but not exceeding 67, of a value not exceeding 18 EUR per 100 kg net weight. Apple juice	99,8
09.3064	Butter milk, curdled milk and cream, yogurt, kephir and other fermented or acidified milk and cream, concentrated or not, flavoured or containing added fruit, nuts or cocoa	0,0
09.3065	Dairy spreads of a fat content, by weight, of 39% or more but not exceeding 75%	0,0
09.3066	Sweetcorn	0,0
09.3067	Chemically pure fructose. Chemically pure maltose. Other sugar confectionery, not containing cocoa, containing 70% or more by weight of sucrose. Cocoa powder, containing 65% or more by weight of sucrose or isoglucose expressed as sucrose Other preparations in blocks, slabs or bars weighing more than 2 kg or liquid, paste, powder, granular or other bulk in containers or immediate packings, of content exceeding 2 kg, containing less than 18% by weight of cocoa butter and 70% or more by weight sucrose. Other food preparations of flour, groats, meal, starch or malt extract, not containing cocoa or containing less than 40% of cocoa calculated on totally defatted basis, containing 70% or more by weight sucrose. Preparations w/basis of coffee, tea or mate. Mixtures of odoriferous substances and mixtures w/basis of one or more of these substances, of a kind used in drink industries, containing all flavouring agents characterising a beverage, of actual alcoholic strength by volume not exceeding 0,5%	8,3
09.3068	Tapioca and substitutes therefore prepared from starch, in the form of flakes, grains, pearls, siftings or similar forms. Bulgur wheat	0,0
09.3069	Chocolate milk crumb. Other protein concentrates and textured protein substances. Non-alcoholic beverages other than waters, containing 2% or more by weight of fat obtained from the products of headings 0401 to 0404	0,0
09.3070	Other food preparations not elsewhere specified or included	0,1
09.3071	Undenatured ethyl alcohol. Ethyl alcohol and other spirits, denatured, of any strength	0,0
09.3072	Cigars, cheroots and cigarillos, containing tobacco. Cigarettes containing tobacco, not containing cloves	0,0
09.3073	Mannitol. D-glucitol (sorbitol). Sorbitol other than that of subheading 2905 44	0,0
09.3074	Finishing agents, dye carriers to accelerate the dyeing or fixing of dyestuffs and other products and preparations (for example, dressings and mordants), of a kind used in the textile, paper, leather or like industries, not elsewhere specified or included, with a basis of amylaceous substances	0,0
09.3075	Garlic, fresh or chilled	0,0
09.3076	Oats	69,9
	<b>Ukraine, average</b>	<b>20,0</b>
	<b>For comparison: Turkey, average</b>	<b>59,5</b>

1. Association agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and Ukraine, of the other part Official Journal of the European Union, Legislation, Vol. 57, L 161, 29.5.2014.
  2. Wallis, J., North, D. Measuring the transaction sector in the American economy, 1870-1970. In: Long-term factors in American economic growth. Ed. by Engerman S., Gallman R. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986. – pp. 95-148.
  3. Dollery, B.; Leong, W. Measuring the transaction sector in the Australian economy, 1911-1991 // Australian Economic History Review. – 1998. – Vol. 38. – №. 3. – pp. 207-231.
  4. Dagnino-Pastore, J.; Farina, P. Transaction costs in Argentina. Paper presented at ISNIE 1999.
  5. Bischoff, I.; Bohmet, A. Gesamtwirtschaftliche Transaktionskosten und wirtschaftliches Wachstum (Social Transaction Costs and Economic Growth) // Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik, 220(4) – 2000. – pp. 419-437.
  6. O'Malley T. Transactions Sector, Innovation and Competitiveness // Australasian Journal of Regional Studies, 14(3). – 2008. – pp. 335-356.
  7. Gherman, M. Measuring macro-economic transaction costs: A comparative perspective and possible policy implications. Paper presented at ISNIE 1998.
  8. Sulejewicz, A.; Graca, P. Measuring the transaction sector in the Polish economy, 1996-2002. Paper presented at ISNIE, 2005.
  9. Chobanov, G.; Egbert, H. The Rise of the Transaction Sector in the Bulgarian Economy // Comparative Economic Studies, 49. – 2007. – pp. 683-698.
  10. Egbert, H.; Ivanova, M.; Chobanov, G. New data on the Bulgarian transaction sector: 1997 – 2006, In: Policies of Economic and Social Development in Europe. Ed. by Chobanov, G., Plühn, J., Schellhaass, H., Lang: Frankfurt, 2010. – pp. 115-126.
  11. Архієреєв С. І. Трансакційний сектор економіки України. – Х.: ХФ НІСД, 2003. – 56 с.
  12. Архієреєв С. І. Державна трансакційна політика та структурні перетворення економіки України. – Х.: Константа, 2006. – 108 с.
  13. Архієреєв С. І. Порівняльний аналіз розвитку трансакційного сектору України, Німеччини та інших країн ОЕСР // Вісник УБС НБУ, 2008. – № 2 – С.3-9.
  14. Зовнішньоторговельний баланс України. Державна служба статистики України. Експрес-випуск. 16.02.2015 р. № 65/0/08.2вн-15. [Електронний ресурс]: Режим доступу: [www.ukrstat.gov.ua](http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua) (дата звернення 23.07.2015)
  15. CIRCABC Library. Communication and Information Resource Centre for Administrations, Businesses and Citizens. [Електронний ресурс]: Режим доступу: <https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/357eb96f-e51c-4a6a-bc3c-ea7ef147fdec/20150630.xlsx> (Accessed: 11 July 2015).
- The influence of government transaction policy on transaction sector is analyzed. The term international transaction sector is introduced. The consequences have been caused by signing of EU – Ukraine Association Agreement for various international transactions and almost for all transaction processes in Ukraine are investigated.*
- Key words:** domestic transaction sector, international transaction sector, EU – Ukraine Association Agreement

УДК 65.012.34

Ткач О. В., Волощук І. А.

## ПЕРЕДУМОВИ ТА ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ РОЗВИТКУ РЕГІОНАЛЬНИХ ТРАНСПОРТНО-ЛОГІСТИЧНИХ ЦЕНТРІВ

*У статті розглянуто методологічні основи формування і розвитку регіональних транспортно-логістичних центрів, визначено доцільність їх створення. Визначено джерела фінансування для будівництва регіонального логістичного центру. Пропонується створення Концепції Міжнародного транспортно-логістичного центру (МТЛЦ) та особливості його функціонування.*

**Ключові слова:** інфраструктура, логістичний центр, транспортно-логістичний центр, мультимодальні вантажні термінали, міжнародний транспортно-логістичний центр.

**І. Вступ.** Категорія «інфраструктура» є одним з найважливіших об'єктів економічного

аналізу як у вітчизняних дослідженнях, так і в зарубіжних, при чому основним є підхід до неї як до одного з найбільш значущих факторів розвитку і розміщення продуктивних сил регіону [36, с. 254]. Під інфраструктурою розуміється сукупність всіх об'єктів (споруд, підприємств, закладів або галузей), функціонування яких не тільки створює загальні умови розвитку суспільного відтворення й соціальної діяльності, а основне призначення яких задовольнити економічно та соціально обґрунтовані потреби виробництва і будь-якої суспільної діяльності, створити механізм управління та регулювання економікою регіону з мінімізацією витрат. Вагоме місце серед цих об'єктів займає транспортно-логістичні центри. Забезпечення успішної діяльності такого центру потребує