

**МРНТИ 06.71.07**  
**УДК 338.439.6**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55871/2072-9847-2025-67-2-205-212>

**Konyrbekov M.\***

PhD, associate professor  
Turan University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
email: [konyrbekov.m@gmail.com](mailto:konyrbekov.m@gmail.com)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1985-3532>

**Kasymbekova G.R.**

PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Finance  
Turan University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
[g.kasymbekova@turan-edu.kz](mailto:g.kasymbekova@turan-edu.kz)  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5411-1297  
Phone: +7 747 196 90 24

**Beisekova Zh.**

Candidate of Economic Sciences  
Kazakh National Agrarian Research University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
e-mail: [zhanna.beysekova@mail.ru](mailto:zhanna.beysekova@mail.ru)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-7721-5611

## FOREIGN EXPERIENCE IN MODERNIZING THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR TO ENSURE STABLE FOOD SUPPLY FOR THE COUNTRY

**Abstract:** In the context of the modernization of the agro-industrial complex (AIC) of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the study of food security stability is a pressing issue due to several factors. Firstly, the situation remains unstable, with a high dependence on imports in certain product categories, highlighting the urgent need for modernization of the AIC. Secondly, the effective modernization of the sector and the assurance of food security require highly qualified specialists; however, the persistent shortage of specialized personnel complicates both research and implementation of modernization tasks. Thirdly, global climate change has a significant impact on Kazakhstan, potentially affecting agricultural productivity and food production.

The policy of supporting and developing the AIC plays a crucial role in ensuring national security and includes legislative regulation aimed at creating mechanisms to develop effective programs that guarantee the sustainable and balanced development of the sector. The AIC is central to the national food supply system, and its modernization is an integral part of the strategy for establishing a sustainable food system.

This study emphasizes the need to consider the legal and regulatory aspects of AIC modernization and food security, including normative regulation, subsidies, trade policy, and other factors influencing the success of modernization.

The aim of the research is to examine theoretical and methodological approaches and to develop recommendations for Kazakhstan's food security system based on international best practices.

The study employs methods such as comparative analysis, synthesis, and deduction.

**Keywords:** Agro-industrial complex, agro-industrial sector, food security, agriculture, productivity, efficiency.

### INTRODUCTION

In his Address to the People of Kazakhstan titled "The Economic Course of Fair Kazakhstan", President Kassym-Jomart Tokayev emphasized that the health of the nation and the quality of consumed products are top priorities for the state. One of the stated goals is to increase the share of processed products in the agro-industrial complex (AIC) to 70% within three years [1].

The modernization of the agro-industrial complex of the Republic of Kazakhstan is one of the key priorities of national policy. It aims to enhance the competitiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of agricultural production. Therefore, it is important not only to increase the volume of food production, but also to improve the quality of the products and expand processing capacities.

Ensuring food security is a crucial task for any country. The COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated how vulnerable global supply chains can be in the face of widespread infection outbreaks, and highlighted the importance of a resilient and sustainable agricultural sector.

The purpose of this research is to explore theoretical and methodological approaches and to develop recommendations for improving Kazakhstan's food security system based on international best practices.

The study applies methods such as comparative analysis, synthesis, and deduction.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The development of the agro-industrial complex (AIC) has attracted significant interest from both researchers and practitioners, as reflected in numerous works by domestic and international scholars.

Among Kazakhstani authors, the issues of AIC development and food security have been studied by G.A. Bizhanova, A.I. Gizzatova, O.K. Denisova, M.U. Rakhimberdinova, A.A. Kaigorodtsev, G.K. Koshebaeva, N.A. Alpyspayeva, V.V. Biryukov, A.B. Moldashev, G.A. Nikitina, G.N. Nakipova, K.A. Akhmetova, M.Zh. Kamenova, S.S. Daribekov, A.A. Essekeyeva, K. Kirdassinova, G. Zhunisova, Zh.Zh. Yeszhanova, R.V. Bayramov, M.U. Spanov, and others.

Despite growing interest in this issue, many unresolved challenges remain. First and foremost, it is worth noting that the theoretical foundations for the national food supply system and the state-led modernization of the AIC have not yet been fully developed. The economic and institutional aspects of interaction between internal subsystems remain insufficiently studied, and approaches to assessing the sustainability of the food supply system are still highly contradictory. Furthermore, there is no unified approach to designing mechanisms and tools for the economic modernization of the agro-industrial sector.

It should also be noted that although there is a wealth of positive international experience in the field of food supply, research on how to adapt this experience to the development and modernization of Kazakhstan's AIC remains fragmented and insufficiently systematized. Addressing these gaps is essential for the formation of a sustainable food security system.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The main research methods used in this study were based on the core principles of the theory of agricultural and agro-industrial complex (AIC) development.

In the process of writing the article, various methods were applied, including generalization, systematization, induction, comparative analysis, index method, and rating evaluation.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Foreign countries are developing import substitution strategies to strengthen food security and reduce dependence on external suppliers, particularly in relation to key products. These strategies aim to replace imported goods and include the development of sustainable food supply systems by introducing incentive measures for agricultural enterprises, restaurants, shops, and other participants in the food chain.

Developing countries are also formulating priorities for sustainable food supply, as agriculture remains one of the key sectors of their economies.

**Table 1. Foreign programs aimed at the development of agricultural regions**

Country	Name / Statement	Description
Russia	State Program of the Russian Federation "Comprehensive Development of Rural Areas", adopted on May 31, 2019 (as amended on December 22, 2023)	Creating conditions for the provision of affordable and comfortable housing and infrastructure development, targeted enhancement of the economic and social potential of rural areas, and development of the labor market (human capital).
Uzbekistan	State Program on the Effective Implementation of the Objectives of the Agriculture Development Strategy for 2020–2030, adopted on June 7, 2022	Establishment of a favorable agribusiness climate and value-added chains, increasing investment attractiveness, reducing state intervention in rural development, and ensuring efficient use of land and water resources.

Country	Name / Statement	Description
Kyrgyzstan	Program for the Development of Agricultural Cooperation in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2023–2027, adopted on August 23, 2023	Provides directions for the further development of agricultural cooperatives, mechanisms for implementing relevant measures, and performance indicators.
Belarus	State Program “Agrobusiness” for 2021–2025, adopted on February 1, 2021	Aims to create conditions for the sustainable development of the agro-industrial complex.

Note: Compiled based on literature sources [2–9].

Belarus. In the Republic of Belarus, agriculture is considered one of the priority sectors for economic development. The key indicators for agricultural development are profitability, income, and return on investment [10]. The main objectives of Belarusian agriculture include: establishing a stable production base to ensure sustainable economic growth in the sector; enhancing the competitiveness of agricultural products in the global market; fully meeting domestic market demands; reducing production costs; increasing profitability from production activities; and enabling agricultural entities to repay debts owed to the state and private credit institutions.

Kyrgyzstan. In Kyrgyzstan, the country's dependence on imported agricultural commodities — used to assess food security — presents certain challenges. The country is self-sufficient in only three out of nine major product groups [11]. In addition, issues persist in the fields of sanitary, phytosanitary, and veterinary safety.

Similar to Belarus, Kyrgyzstan focuses on short- and medium-term financial support measures for agriculture, which include:

- providing loans to agricultural producers, including for operational costs and equipment;
- exemption from income and profit taxes, as well as VAT;
- voluntary crop insurance, with 50% of the insurance premium covered by the state budget.

Currently, Kyrgyzstan lacks long-term measures of an organizational or institutional nature, as such mechanisms are either under development or have not yet been considered.

Around the world and within international organizations, various models of food security systems have been developed, and they differ in various parameters [12].

Economic measures are directly linked to concepts such as economic growth in the sector and living standards in rural areas. In the countries considered, short- and medium-term measures for the economic support of agricultural producers are widespread. These include direct transfers to agricultural entities, reimbursement of essential expenditure items, partial or full state participation in the repayment of interest and principal on loans, guaranteed demand for certain types of products, and compensation for unforeseen losses related to the specifics of agricultural activity.

However, such economic support measures alone are not sufficient to ensure qualitative changes in agricultural production structures. They are primarily aimed at reducing the economic burden on agricultural producers and mitigating operational risks.

In addition to these measures, there are also trade-related restrictions through applied customs tariffs and budget-related measures regulating tax revenues from agricultural producers.

Since food security is not the sole purpose of state support for agriculture, and given the need to ensure the competitiveness of domestic agricultural products on the global market, a classification of economic support measures has been developed. These measures are grouped into three “boxes”:

1. **The Green Box** includes support measures that have no trade-distorting effect on agricultural production. These are typically subsidies funded from the state budget, not consumer expenditures, and thus do not influence market prices. The most common measures include sub-

sidies for infrastructure development, training of skilled personnel, and similar initiatives. These are long-term measures with minimal influence on internal or external market conditions.

As described earlier, Green Box measures are not yet widely implemented in countries where agriculture constitutes a significant share of GDP and employment. In such cases, the distribution of Green Box measures is considered sufficient if they account for at least one-third of GDP growth in the sector.

**The Blue Box** includes programs related to production-limiting support. Payments from the state budget must be linked to specific measurable units of production or capital—such as the size of cultivated land or the number of livestock. These measures are introduced to regulate prices in domestic markets in order to prevent losses for agricultural producers. The experience of countries described in this study, including Serbia, Turkey, and Greece, demonstrates the widespread use of Blue Box measures.

**The Amber Box** is considered the least favorable category of government support. It includes direct price support, credit subsidies, and compensation payments. Under the WTO framework, the use of such measures is strictly limited, with a gradual phase-out anticipated. As seen in the experiences of various countries, Amber Box measures are the most widely applied. Although they may have a rapid effect, they do not provide qualitative improvements in the sector [13].

One of the main challenges faced by countries where agriculture represents a high share of GDP and employment is the use of economically distorting short-term support measures. Such instruments, although necessary for survival under market conditions, do not lead to the creation of sustainable infrastructure or the implementation of technological, organizational, and marketing innovations that are critical for long-term sectoral development.

**Organizational measures** are primarily associated with state programming of agricultural sector development. These measures help define the general goals and objectives of the sector, prioritize forms of economic support, set specific targets, and monitor progress accordingly. Organizational measures also facilitate the systematization and coordination of other support mechanisms and the evaluation of their effectiveness and relevance.

Currently, nearly all of the countries described above utilize strategic planning practices for agricultural development. A notable example is the European Union's experience with agricultural development planning that occurs beyond the direct purview of the state—especially in countries like Greece, Romania, and Serbia, where agriculture holds high strategic importance. The use of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) framework tailored to each country's specific conditions allows EU member states to implement a unified system for organizing and supporting agricultural development [14].

**Institutional measures** are primarily linked to the rules that govern the functioning of agriculture within a given society. This understanding follows the definition of institutions proposed by American economist Douglass North, who described institutions as the "rules of the game" in a society, or more formally, as the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction.

In society, institutions are typically represented through two components:

- A formal legal framework established by the state;
- Social capital formed through the interaction of various social groups and individuals.

Thus, institutional support measures in agriculture can be divided into two main categories:

**Normative (legal) measures** define the conditions under which all agricultural actors operate at the national level. These include legal instruments that either protect agricultural entities from harmful events or establish fair operational rules—or, conversely, grant them special privileges or operational regimes. An example would be assigning a special status to young farmers, allowing them to be treated as a separate group eligible for specific subsidies (as seen in Greece and Romania). A key recent innovation in normative institutional measures is the introduction of regulations concerning the environmental impact of agricultural activities.

**Social institutional measures** emerge organically from local needs and are often shaped by historical practice and social capital. These measures are typically not enforced by the state but are maintained through informal community norms. The state has limited capacity to directly apply such measures, but it can foster an enabling environment for them to arise. An example of this would be the role of local grassroots groups in Greece, which can regulate agricultural activities without state intervention—through mutual assistance, information-sharing, and the creation of local advisory networks.

**Conclusions.** In general, based on the above, several conclusions can be drawn regarding foreign experience in state support for agriculture in countries where the agricultural sector accounts for a significant share of GDP and employment:

Countries that prioritize agricultural development do not necessarily aim to increase its share in national GDP, but rather stimulate employment in the sector. In most cases, the focus is on intensifying agricultural production and diversifying the economy. A high share of agriculture in GDP should be interpreted as an indicator of insufficient development in other sectors of the economy.

In countries where agriculture occupies a large share of GDP, short- and medium-term economic support measures, classified under the WTO's "Amber Box," are typically predominant. Similar support approaches exist across all countries considered in this study, with Belarus, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan showing the most pronounced reliance on such measures.

Countries applying "Blue Box" and "Green Box" measures tend to show more sustainable and qualitative growth in agriculture. Among the countries analyzed, these measures are most effectively implemented in Greece, Serbia, and Romania.

Strengthening the sustainability of Kazakhstan's food supply system is possible through the development of a national model that synthesizes international best practices while accounting for the country's specific characteristics. In this regard, the most promising state support measures for agriculture include:

- subsidizing infrastructure development and the training of highly qualified specialists;
- subsidizing wage funds to attract skilled professionals to the agricultural sector;
- providing subsidies based on measurable indicators (e.g., livestock numbers or cultivated land area);
- establishing a legally recognized "young farmer" status to facilitate the creation of targeted support programs;
- encouraging local community involvement to help resolve agricultural issues at the grassroots level and ensure continuous communication between agricultural producers and local or national authorities.

Overall, the focus should be on a gradual shift away from "Amber Box" measures toward "Blue Box" and ultimately "Green Box" mechanisms. Given the complexity of this transition, it may be effective to create designated development zones—similar to industrial zones—but specifically tailored for agriculture under new regulatory frameworks.

In the future, it is essential to identify and adapt national food security models suitable for Kazakhstan's conditions. In this context, the country should consider the diverse resources and capacities available to adapt successful foreign experience in agro-industrial development. A useful first step could be diversifying both the markets for agricultural products and the markets for industrial and technological equipment. China's experience in ensuring food security may offer valuable insights, and long-term cooperation in this area could facilitate the effective implementation of necessary measures.

For Kazakhstan, the experiences of both countries with a high share of agriculture in the economy and those where agriculture plays a relatively minor role can be instructive. The former offers lessons on what to avoid, while the latter provides models of success—allowing for a more objective and comprehensive understanding of the issue.



# REFERENCES:

1. Президент Республики Казахстан К.-Ж. Токаев. Экономический курс Справедливого Казахстана: послание народу Казахстана // <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/addresses>. 10.11.2023.
2. Пашкевич О.А., Лёвкина В.О. Зарубежный опыт развития сельских территорий // <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/zarubezhnyy-opyt>. 10.11.2023.
3. Пашкевич О.А. Сельское хозяйство стран Северной Европы: ресурсы, занятость, регулирование // Аграрная экономика. – 2017. – №5. – С. 56-63.
4. Постановление Правительство Российской Федерации. Об утверждении государственной программы Российской Федерации "Комплексное развитие сельских территорий": утв. 31 мая 2019 года, №696 // <https://docs.cntd.ru/document/554801411>. 11.10.2023.
5. Постановление Президента Республики Узбекистан. О дополнительных мерах по эффективной организации исполнения задач, определенных в стратегии развития сельского хозяйства Республики Узбекистан на 2020-2030 годы: утв. 7 июня 2022 года, №ПП-273 // <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/6055545>. 11.11.2023.
6. Постановление кабинета министров Кыргызской Республики. Об утверждении Программы развития сельскохозяйственной кооперации в Кыргызской Республике на 2023-2027 годы: утв. 23 августа 2023 года, №418 // <https://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/kyr220394.pdf>. 11.11.2022.
7. Постановление Совета Министров Республики Беларусь. Государственная программа «Аграрный бизнес» на 2021–2025 годы: утв. 1 февраля 2021 года, №59 // <https://www.mshp.gov.by/ru/programms-ru>. 11.11.2023.
8. Селезнев А.Г. Зарубежный опыт развития фермерских хозяйств и перспективы его применение в России // Журнал международной экономики. – 2019. – Т. 9, №1. – С. 246-257.
9. Касимбекова М.А., Баймагамбетова З.А., Матайбаева Г.Ж. Зарубежный опыт государственного регулирования агропромышленного комплекса // Экономическая серия вестника ЕНУ имени Л.Н. Гумилева. – 2022. – №4. – С. 143-150.
10. Казакевич И. Особенности формирования внутренней поддержки сельского хозяйства Беларуси // Наука и инновации. – 2016. – №10. – С. 8-11.
11. Дооранов А.П., Маниева Ч.А. Система поддержки сельского хозяйства Кыргызстана в условиях ЕАЭС // <http://jurnal.org/articles/2016/ekon41.html>. 10.11.2023.
12. Каменова М. Факторы устойчивого развития аграрного сектора Казахстана // Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Економіка. – 2012. – №142. – С. 23-26.
13. Правила внутренней поддержки сельского хозяйства в рамках ВТО. Справка // <https://ria.ru/20111114/488431764.html>. 10.11.2023.
14. Норт Д. Институты, институциональные изменения и функционирование экономики. – М., 1997. – 190 с.

# REFERENCES:

- 1 Prezident Respubliki Kazahstan K.-Zh. Tokaev. Jekonomicheskij kurs Spravedlivogo Kazahstana: poslanie narodu Kazahstana // <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/addresses>. 10.11.2023.
- 2 Pashkevich, O.A., Ljovkina V.O. Zarubezhnyj opyt razvitija sel'skih territorij // <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/zarubezhnyy-opyt>. 10.11.2023.
- 3 Pashkevich O.A. Sel'skoe hozjajstvo stran Severnoj Evropy: resursy, zanjatost', regulirovanie // Agrarnaja jekonomika. – 2017. – №5. – S. 56-63.
- 4 Postanovlenie Pravitel'stvo Rossijskoj Federacii. Ob utverzhdenii gosudarstvennoj programmy Rossijskoj Federacii "Kompleksnoe razvitie sel'skih territorij": utv. 31 maja 2019 goda, №696 // <https://docs.cntd.ru/document/554801411>. 11.10.2023.
- 5 Postanovlenie Prezidenta Respubliki Uzbekistan. O dopolnitel'nyh merah po jeffektivnoj organizacii ispolnenija zadach, opredelennyh v strategii razvitija sel'skogo hozjajstva Respubliki Uzbekistan na 2020-2030 gody: utv. 7 ijunja 2022 goda, №PP-273 // <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/6055545>. 11.11.2023.
- 6 Postanovlenie kabineta ministrov Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki. Ob utverzhdenii Programmy razvitija sel'skohozjajstvennoj kooperacii v Kyrgyzskoj Respublike na 2023-2027 gody: utv. 23 avgusta 2023 goda, №418 // <https://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/kyr220394.pdf>. 11.11.2022.
- 7 Postanovlenie Soveta Ministrov Respubliki Belarus'. Gosudarstvennaja programma «Agrarnyj biznes» na 2021–2025 gody: utv. 1 fevralja 2021 goda, №59 // <https://www.mshp.gov.by/ru/programms-ru>. 11.11.2023.
- 8 Seleznev A.G. Zarubezhnyj opyt razvitija fermerskih hozjajstv i perspektivy ego primenenie v Rossii // Zhurnal mezhdunarodnoj jekonomiki. – 2019. – T. 9, №1. – S. 246-257.

- 9 Kasimbekova, M.A., Bajmagambetova, Z.A., Matajbaeva, G.Zh. Zarubezhnyj opyt gosudarstvennogo regulirovaniya agropromyshlennogo kompleksa // Jekonomicheskaja serija vestnika ENU imeni L.N. Gumileva. – 2022. – №4. – S. 143-150.
- 10 Kazakevich, I. Osobennosti formirovaniya vnutrennej podderzhki sel'skogo hozjajstva Belarusi // Nauka i innovacii. – 2016. – №10. – S. 8-11.
- 11 Dooranov, A.P., Manieva, Ch.A. Sistema podderzhki sel'skogo hozjajstva Kyrgyzstana v uslovijah EAJeS // <http://jurnal.org/articles/2016/ekon41.html>. 10.11.2023.
- 12 Kamenova, M. Faktory ustojchivogo razvitija agrarnogo sektora Kazahstana // Visnik Kiivskogo nacional'nogo universitetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. Jekonomika. – 2012. – №142. – S. 23-26.
- 13 Pravila vnutrennej podderzhki sel'skogo hozjajstva v ramkah VTO. Spravka // <https://ria.ru/20111114/488431764.html>. 10.11.2023.
- 14 Nort D. Instituty, institucional'nye izmenenija i funkcionirovanie jekonomiki. – M., 1997. – 190 s.

## ЕЛДІ АЗЫҚ-ТҮЛІКПЕН ТҰРАҚТЫ ҚАМТАМАСЫЗ ЕТУ ҮШІН АГРАРЛЫҚ СЕКТОРДЫ ЖАҢҒЫРТУДАҒЫ ШЕТЕЛДІК ТӘЖІРИБЕ

### Konyrbekov M.\*

PhD, associate professor  
Turan University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
email: konyrbekov.m@gmail.com  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1985-3532>

### Kasymbekova G.R.

PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Finance  
Turan University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
g.kasymbekova@turan-edu.kz  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5411-1297  
Phone: +7 747 196 90 24

### Beisekova Zh.

Candidate of Economic Sciences  
Kazakh National Agrarian Research University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
e-mail: zhanna.beyseкова@mail.ru  
ORCID:0000-0002-7721-5611

**Аңдатпа.** Қазақстан Республикасының агроөнеркәсіп кешенін (бұдан әрі – АӨК) модернизациялау жағдайында азық-түлікпен қамтамасыз етудің тұрақтылығын зерделеу мен зерттеу жүргізудің өзекті мәселелері, біріншіден, жағдайдың тұрақсыздығы және кейбір өнім санаттарындағы импортқа жоғары тәуелділік және агроөнеркәсіп кешенін модернизациялау қажеттілігі сияқты бірқатар проблемаларды шешуге негізделген. Сонымен қатар, екіншіден, агроөнеркәсіп кешенін тиімді модернизациялау және азық-түлікпен қамтамасыз етудің тұрақтылығын қамтамасыз ету үшін жоғары білікті мамандар қажет. Алайда, көбінде бейінді мамандардың кадр тапшылығы проблемасы туындап, бұл зерттеу жүргізуді және АӨК модернизациялау бойынша міндеттерді орындауды қиындатуы мүмкін. Үшіншіден, Қазақстанға климаттың жаһандық өзгерістері әсер етеді, бұл ауыл шаруашылығы мен өнімділікке, ауыл шаруашылығы өнімін өндіруге теріс әсер етуі ықтимал.

АӨК-ті қолдау және дамыту саясаты мемлекеттік қауіпсіздікті қамтамасыз етуде маңызды рөл атқарады және агроөнеркәсіп кешенінің тұрақты және теңгерімді дамуын қамтамасыз ететін тиімді бағдарламаларды әзірлеуге ықпал ететін тетіктерді құруға бағытталған заңнамалық реттеуді қамтиды. Бұл кешен мемлекет халқын азық-түлікпен қамтамасыз ету жүйесінде шешуші рөл атқарады және оны модернизациялау тұрақты азық-түлік жүйесін қалыптастыру стратегиясының ажырамас бөлігі. Жүргізілген зерттеуде агроөнеркәсіп кешенін модернизациялау мен азық-түлікпен қамтамасыз етудің тұрақтылығының заңнамалық және реттеуші аспектілерін ескеру қажет. Бұған нормативтік реттеу, субсидия, сауда саясаты мәселелері және АӨК-ті модернизациялаудың табыстылығына әсер етуі мүмкін басқа да аспектілер кіреді.

Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты – теориялық-әдіснамалық тәсілдерді зерделеу, мемлекетті азық-түлікпен қамтамасыз ету жүйесінің шетелдік озық тәжірибелерді зерттеу нәтижесінде ұсыныстар қалыптастыру.

Зерттеу жұмысында салыстырмалы талдау, синтез, дедукция әдістері қолданылды.

**Түйін сөздер:** агроөнеркәсіп кешені, агроөнеркәсіп секторы, азық-түлікпен қамтамасыз ету, ауыл шаруашылығы, өнімділік, тиімділік.

## ЗАРУБЕЖНЫЙ ОПЫТ МОДЕРНИЗАЦИИ АГРАРНОГО СЕКТОРА ДЛЯ ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЯ СТАБИЛЬНОГО ПРОДОВОЛЬСТВЕННОГО СНАБЖЕНИЯ СТРАНЫ

**Konyrbekov M.\***

PhD, associate professor  
Turan University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
email: konyrbekov.m@gmail.com  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1985-3532>

**Kasymbekova G.R.**

PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Finance  
Turan University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
g.kasymbekova@turan-edu.kz  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5411-1297  
Phone: +7 747 196 90 24

**Beisekova Zh.**

Candidate of Economic Sciences  
Kazakh National Agrarian Research University  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
e-mail: zhanna.beysekova@mail.ru  
ORCID:0000-0002-7721-5611

**Аннотация.** Актуальность вопросов изучения и проведения научных исследований по устойчивости продовольственного обеспечения в условиях модернизации агропромышленного комплекса Республики Казахстан (далее – АПК) обусловлена, во-первых, решением ряда проблем, таких как нестабильность ситуации и высокая зависимость от импорта по некоторым товарным категориям, необходимость модернизации АПК. Во-вторых, для эффективной модернизации агропромышленного комплекса и обеспечения стабильности поставок продовольствия необходимы высококвалифицированные специалисты. Однако во многих случаях наблюдается нехватка профильных специалистов, что может осложнить проведение научных исследований и реализацию задач, связанных с модернизацией аграрного сектора. В-третьих, на Казахстан влияет глобальное изменение климата, которое, вероятно, окажет негативное влияние на сельское хозяйство, производительность и сельскохозяйственное производство. Политика поддержки и развития агропромышленного комплекса играет важную роль в обеспечении безопасности государства и включает законодательное регулирование, направленное на создание механизмов, способствующих разработке эффективных программ, обеспечивающих устойчивое и сбалансированное развитие агропромышленного комплекса. Данный комплекс играет ключевую роль в системе продовольственного обеспечения населения страны, а его модернизация является неотъемлемой частью стратегии формирования устойчивой продовольственной системы. Проводимое исследование должно учитывать законодательные и нормативные аспекты модернизации агропромышленного комплекса и устойчивости продовольственного обеспечения. К ним относятся нормативное регулирование, субсидии, вопросы торговой политики и другие аспекты, которые могут повлиять на успех модернизации агробизнеса.

Целью данного исследования является изучение теоретических и методических подходов, разработка рекомендаций на основе изучения зарубежного передового опыта в системе государственного продовольственного обеспечения.

В исследовании использовались методы сравнительного анализа, синтеза и дедукции.

**Ключевые слова:** Агропромышленный комплекс, агропромышленный сектор, продовольственная безопасность, сельское хозяйство, производительность, эффективность.