PROTOTYPES FOR TRANSBORDER STATISTICS

Vasiliy M. Simchera[1], Sergey Nesterov[2]

ABSTRACT

Prototypes of statistics of transborder relations are the effective international systems of the integrated statistics, in particular statistical systems of the effective economic and custom unions, the first among others is the Eurostat – the integrated statistical system. In what degree experience and practice of functioning of the systems mentioned above are suitable and fit to use and in what degree they are not suitable and not to be fit for forming modern statistics of transborder relations? We present an example based on the Euroasian statistics formation in attempt to provide credible answer to the questions above.

Why is the solution for problems of border statistics now the most important for the evolution of the Eurasian statistics? Firstly, because the cross-border ties in these countries are characterized by the most intensive and large-scale development in the modern world.

Secondly, because the Eurasian statistics, which today is the youngest international structure, the platform of statistics that can be created without any preconditions and in an inexpensive way, can be organically converted into a common platform for statistical applications in these countries.

Thirdly, because the differences between the Eurasian and Eurasian estimates of the same phenomena, especially foreign economic phenomena, differ in magnitudes of order and increasing; these differences are strengthening rather than weakening the divergence of views on a similar solution for international financial, social or political problems.

Why the focus of the attention should be holistic improvement of the entire statistics of these countries? Because solving individual problems without solutions to the general problems is impossible and pointless.

Hence the work on formation of cross-border ties (relations) statistics cannot be considered in isolation as a standalone statistical project. What is important in planning and implementation of such a complex project is a correct identification

[1] E-mail: vms3000&yandex.ru.
[2] E-mail: nnesterov&tpg.com.au.

of the complete set of differences that exist in modern Eurasian statistics, assess extent and consequences, and on this foundation in the form of a single universal international standard, to develop coordinated proposals and recommendations to overcome differences.

Here are the list and the metric of the most significant differences, which require in priority development and acceptance of a single international standard for differences accounting and adjustment in time of the formation and comparison of the integrated system of statistical indicators of the Eurasian Foreign Economic Relations of the Republic of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia as the original founders of the EAEC (**Table 1** shows a list of differences).

Table 1. Differences in the comparative assessment of the key indicators of foreign Eurasian EAEC member countries 2014

#	Indicators	WTO Bn USD	E*A*EC Bn USD	Difference Bn USD
1	The total volume of imports	694.0	346.2	-347.8
2	The total volume of exports	1172.5	585.1	-587.4
3	Import taxes	138.8	69.2	-69.6
4	Export taxes	234.5	117.0	-117.5
5	Fictitious import and export operations, unpaid taxes	187.1	0.0	-187.1
6	Fictitious capital outflow	69.6	0.0	-69.6
7	Fictitious operations for VAT refunds	58.7	0.0	-58.7
8	Volume of export-import operations:	-	-	-
9	According to statistics, the balance of payments	980.8	953.2	-27.6
10	According to customs statistics	1866.5	953.2	-913,3
11	Repeated account of foreign trade turnover	280.0	139.7	140.3
12	Share of cross-border trade in total foreign turnover	12.3%	7.0%	-5.3%

Of course, having comparative analysis of data relevant national services of the Member States EAEC with the data of the WTO and other international organizations, considering the observed discrepancies and serious factual errors in the estimates should be adjusted and many other indicators. In particular, the dynamics cost and physical volume indicators of foreign economic relations factually in these countries differ by 20-25%, assessment of the whole value indicators at the current exchange parity rate and the forex exchange rate produces the difference within the same 20%-25%.

Finally, the adjustment shall be subjected to the entire set of national statistics in these countries, taking into account differences in the applicable tax and credit rates, incentives and subsidies, and discounted rent payments, shopping discounts and capes, transport, invoices and other transaction costs, which regulations are often different on multiple times from the current international standards.

What has been done here in the past five years, since the establishment of the Customs Union of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia, and laying the foundation stone of the now formed Eurasian Economic Union (EAEC) (the countries of the former Soviet Union) which aims to overcome these differences? Apart from the extremely negative Russian reaction on the Magnitsky Law, approved in 2008 (but not implemented so far) which proposes adjusting the international assessment of Russian foreign trade in the direction of reducing by 56%, what was done - almost nothing.

Can we ignore the existing differences without serious mistakes and losses, take and guarantee the implementation of the decisions taken in these countries? In particular, the total evasion of taxes and customs duties on a scale exceeding the actual volume of budgetary payments in these countries, in such circumstances can we guarantee the fulfilment of state obligations towards the population? Or at order scales of undervaluation of imports receive in full the budget and not as a multiple of the amount of the reduced import duties, and at similar scale of undervalued exports - scale which understated revenues of export duties, the aggregate amount which surpasses 100 billions of USD per year. Under the facade of fictitious imports in these countries annually 50 billions of USD were laundered and illegally exported, and under the cover of fictitious exports billions of dollars in fraudulent transactions return of a fictitious VAT.

And what is a result apart from the general talks about the former friendship and obvious advantages of integration in comparison with disintegration? What did tangible benefits get people from these countries received? Why, for a number of years at the existing Eurasian space situation have not improved, and integration relations are getting worse, levels of specialization, cooperation did not raise, and fallen down. However, smuggling, dumping, fictitious import declarations, evasion of taxes and customs fees, money laundering gained a new steam. Expenses increased and physical volumes and overall effectiveness of foreign trade between these countries went down at scales were not known in the former practice. Why did the Euroasian integration from the very beginning start to slip and deviate from the World trends?

Is today the EAEU and its existing prototypes – the Euroasian Economic Space (EES) and the Customs Union (CU) – the revived reality of really deep and effective former relations of the former USSR republics, more widely - the former

Commonwealth of the Socialistic Countries or it is an adventurous fiction, a peculiar Post-Soviet offshore harbour, which hidden agenda is a creation on an uncompetitive basis of one more legalized corruption centre of ethnocratic business?

Is it the prime cause of the negative attitude and the growing discontent of expert community and the people of these countries with actions for formation of EAES, the falling rating of trust to the Euroasian integration based on the ethnocratic principles, which are not compatible to the truthfully declared principles of equality, justice and mutual benefit, which guarantee a transparent exchange of goods and services and free movement of the population, labour, capitals and all other productive resources of the integrating countries?

As a result, today on newly formatted Euroasian space instead of the expected processes of intensively going deep integration we observe literally atomistic disintegration of the former fully complementary and effectively interacting large systems and agents of the integrated production on an uncountable pieces, separated small and, as a rule, chaotically counteracting ethnic formations, which undermined not only any essential signs for integration development, but also elementary survival conditions. Historical experience including experience of the EU which is most advanced in the world, shows that prospect of such processes evolution and formations is only one: decline. Difference consists only in one factor, it is a decline, which is implanted into EAES matrix from the very beginning.

Plenty of various studies are written and published about an originality of modern Euroasian integration (more widely – globalizations), but in fact, practically all of them were declarative, and did not pass time test. This contributes to low efficiency of modern Euroasian projects, its crisis state and disintegration, manipulative changes of its purposes and forms, disorder and changing minds in integration, finally as a general consequence: side effect creation of reintegration processes and strengthening anti-globalist movements.

A real life shows that the modern inconsistent Euroasian situation characterized by extremely inconsistent and multispeed development with domination the narrow groups benefiting and lack of the uniform public values and goals, generally speaking, is an expected negative result.

It is clear that such inconsistent Eurasian situation with such values cannot last infinitely long. To change the situation existing institutions have to be transformed to new global structures, which compete at scales of technical and economic requirements but not formed on the cut-down initial specifications, which EAES initially does not meet. The guideline is: not EAES parameters have to be defined based on EAES borders, but in opposite, these borders have to be defined

satisfying optimum system parameters, without such approach EAES functioning by definition will always be not effective. It is obvious that in present borders and a present configuration, without China and some other the European and Asian countries, in particular Ukraine and Uzbekistan, EAES looks as obviously insufficient structure, for which there seems to be no future. It is natural that when determining such borders the good will of the integrated countries must be in place as an axiom.

What borders and what parameters, which correspond with the required viable structure of EAES must one have?

The adequate answer to this question, question which is in fact necessary to be asked in studies on formation of EAES, requires access to the relevant reliable statistical information which in the modern Euroasian reality practically is absent, or is substituted by unacceptable imitations and surrogates.

How, with help of Euroasian institutes, to provide development and navigation of such globally transparent and reliable information in the up to date or advancing mode and on a regular basis? How to integrate information into universal worldwide process and on this basis from the very beginning to provide effective creation of EAES? What sort of criteria the required information has to poses and satisfy?

It is an axiom that euroasian information must meet the standards of modern international statistics, and the living modern embodiment is the Eurostat. Eurostat is the most developed organization of modern international integrated statistics, thanks to the classic work and the publication which were the foundation for successful formation and effective functioning of European Union (EU) for more than 30 years.

How and with what resources and when the Eurasian statistics can expect to achieve the highest standards, which are now, despite all the current bifurcation belong to European statistics? And given the current realities whether to pursue development of these standards? What alternative standards should focus Eurasian Statistics on that it was able to perform the powerful cognitive and transformative role that it is given in the form of modern institutions EAEC entity, which is accounted for almost a quarter of all the assets in today's world?

If having such formulation of the question what can and should be taken from the brief experience gained in the past by Eurasian statistics, in particular experience of the Interstate Statistical Committee (CSC) and the Customs Union Commission (CUC) of the Republics of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia as the most significant countries.

Secondly, in its full volume the experience and documents of the Secretariat of the Customs Union Commission (CUC) in the development of the Eurasian

statistics should be used, in particular internationally recognized standards and documents:

- A unified methodology of customs statistics of foreign trade and statistics of mutual trade of member countries of the Customs Union

- A unified classifier reference standard systems, algorithms, modes, procedures, forms of documentary records and monitoring flows of mutual trade of member countries of the Customs Union (47 classifications).

- Forms of statistical monitoring and notification of customs declaration of goods in mutual trade Countries of Custom Union (CCU) (without requiring the completion and submission of customs declarations)

- The forms of statistical monitoring and reporting of import customs duties (penalties, interest, compensation payments, etc.) CCU

- The system of indexing and monitoring of cross-border trade CCU.

- The technique and performed questionnaire survey efficiency of automated information systems for monitoring mutual trade CCU.

Thirdly, many discrepancies and gaps in the calculation and publication of statistics must be removed, while keeping them untouched, making conditions for creating and illustrating the performance of the EAEC as not only inappropriate, but also immoral. In particular, differences in the estimates of totals of mutual trade between the countries of the Customs Union should be eliminated, differences which today are in magnitude over a 15-20% (in 2015). These differences were in the magnitude of 45%-50% in 2011.

An even more striking example of such differences is the difference in accounting of the same information. In 2011 after Rosstat refused to form statistics of mutual trade using the so-called mirrored data from Belarusian and Kazakh sides and transfer to the own database; based on their own form of federal statistical observation (form №1-TC), the level of discrepancy between the accounted information increased to unacceptable levels (see. Table 2), reaching for example, assessments of mutual supplies of oil and petroleum products from Russia to Belarus breaks 200%, ferrous metals and products from them – 230%, cars-310% and so on. Discrepancies, whose price in real terms means 1.1 mil tons of oil unaccounted in Russia, 69.0 thousand tons of ferrous metals, 23.8 mil tons (or 16 thousand pieces of cars), 32.9 thousand tons of dairy products, etc.

These differences in the accounting and reporting - a breeding ground for negative activities of illegal fictitious import and other negative phenomena in mutual trade of the EAEC, which in one year 2012 exceeded 50 bn USD, including 15 bn USD in trade between Belarus and Russia.

Table 2. Differences in estimations of the same volumes of mutual trade between the States of the Custom Union

	Estimation RF (1) (Export volume)			Estimations BR (2) - Export volume			Differences (1)-(2)			Differences in %	
	thousands tons	$ mil.	Price RF ($/ton)	thousands tons	$ mil.	Price RF ($/ton)	thousands tons	$ mil.	Price RF ($/ton)	Group Data RF	In total volume difference RF
(27) Mineral fuels, mineral oils and products of their distillation; bituminous substances; mineral waxes	1 792,1	692,1	386,2	2 935,8	1 263,0	430,2	-1 143,7	-571,0	-44,0	-82,4	-29,0
(72) Ferrous metals	212,1	686,0	3 234,5	281,1	166,0	590,5	-69,0	520,0	2 644,0	32,5	34,8
(73) Metals and ferrous metal products	22,1	96,9	4 389,0	20,3	37,5	1 846,7	1,8	59,4	2 542,3	61,3	4,9
(39) Plastics and articles thereof	37,4	98,5	2 632,7	19,4	52,8	2 716,0	18,0	45,7	-83,2	46,0	5,0
(40) Rubber and articles thereof	8,4	35,3	4 182,8	4,4	21,2	4 876,8	4,1	14,0	-694,0	40,0	1,8
Total-1 Episode-1 (90 positions)	7843,1	1968,8	251,0	3484,4	1943,2	557,7	4 358,7	25,6	306,7	1,5	1,3
(87) Vehicles other than railway or tram rolling stock, and parts and accessories thereof	10,6	62,2	5 845,3	34,4	222,5	6 460,5	-23,8	-160,3	-615,1	-257,7	-13,7
(04) Dairy products; birds' eggs; natural honey; edible products of animal origin, not elsewhere specified or included	22,4	76,8	3 426,9	55,3	137,4	2 485,1	-32,9	-60,6	941,9	-78,9	-5,2
Total-2 Episode-2 (60 positions)	296,6	717,5	2 418,9	866,8	1 167,5	1 347,0	-570,0	-450,0	1 071,9	-62,7	38,5

Clearly, these and numerous other differences in the application of a united methodology and differences in the estimates of the same indicators of mutual trade in the formation and creation of the effective institutions on the foundation of EAEC, unconditionally and fully have to be overcome. Without these actions, of course, to formulate and solve the issue of creating an integrated Eurasian statistics on the same level as modern European statistical standards is not realistically impossible.

The assessment of levels, rates and proportions of specialization, cooperation and integration of production, identification of competitive clusters, building a production function, application factor analysis, identification and demonstration

of real effects of the Eurasian integration on the basis of truncated data of these services without additional development data, based on the use of modern information technology, are impossible.

In particular, in such a truncated and conventionally not settled data, the statistical estimation of the Eurasian integration processes, ignoring the need to identify objectively determined total cost, is also impossible. For example, it is impossible to find that the Russian side allegedly receives benefits of the mutual trade but actually carries an annual multibillion-dollar losses in excess of its physical volume of revenues generated from the sale of Russian oil and gas volumes combined. Calculations show that Eurasian economic integration, despite optimistic political statements at current non-equivalent evaluation of Russia assets in real terms is still not very effective, requires reformulation of baselines and equivalent assessment of equity resources, which, unlike the current conditions, should be equally beneficial and fair to all countries.

Finally, in 2013-2015 in order to develop plans of the Eurasian statistics in the ECC, the following should be provided:

- Expansion of applied macroeconomic indicators covering, as shown by the data presented in Table 2, only 130 observable, 120 observed partially observed up to 450 unobservable indicators, and to ensure the approximation of their sets to the leading international set covered by the current 1300 observable indicators;

- Development of new performance indicators and new metrics to measure their quality characteristics as the effective tools needed to develop and ensure the successful implementation of multi-dimensional strategic projects of international economic integration;

- Formation of a set of anti-crisis indicators for decision-making under uncertainty and increased risks, which should be considered as conditions of the forthcoming development of institutions of international economic integration.

It is expected that with the new indicators created by the EAEU institution from the beginning of their work it will be able to solve fundamentally new classes of integration tasks and problems with the ability to bring to these decisions the evidence of feasibility studies.

Table 3. The ratio of sets of observable and unobservable indicators characterizing levels, rates, proportions integration of key clusters of economic and social development (the numerator - numeric set in the denominator of their share in the identical set of global indicators)

N	Set of clusters characterising:	Set of integration indicators			
		Observable set	Partly observable Set	Unobservable set	Limiting world set
1	Geographical geopolitical position of integrated countries	7/28,0	4/16,0	14/56,0	25
2	Integrable economy and finances	15/8,6	9/5,1	78/44,6	175
3	Population and social conditions	29/12,1	17/7,1	66/27,5	240
4	Industrial production	10/6,1	12/7,2	36/21,8	165
5	Agriculture	14/10,0	15/10,7	27/19,3	140
6	Investment and capital construction	12/7,5	8/5,0	60/37,5	160
7	Transport and Communications	11/8,7	12/9,5	47/37,3	126
8	Commerce and Services	10/7,4	11/8,1	39/28,9	135
9	Foreign economic relations	7/6,7	12/11,4	53/50,5	105
10	Science, Technology, Education	4/10,5	9/23,7	14/36,8	38
11	Environment	11/16,7	12/18,2	15/22,7	66

Creation of the EAEC will be successful if concrete tasks will be solved in a matter of priority on the conceptual level; the following are three groups of strategic tasks:

- Determination and support of optimal boundaries of Eurasian integration, in which at a minimum of overheads and physical distances can provide effective interaction of economies and thereby improve its stability and resilience to external shocks, including the negative effects of crisis;

- Overcoming existing and eliminate possible ruptures in the growth conditions of the forthcoming economic development, in particular, gaps in wages, in prices, taxes, credit rates, exchange rates, etc., which may increase occurring undo all made by CCU efforts on the full implementation of the declared principles of free movement of goods, services, capital and labor, representing the very foundation of the success of the EAEU in the institutions;

- Identification of problems and involvement in the economic cycle using indicators developed lurking in the CCU, with unused or under-utilized resources and hidden reserves, representing supposedly an expert, the most

powerful factor of further strengthening their economic potential and accelerate the transition to a higher level of economic integration.

To fully perform their functions the new Eurasian statistics, using all the power of evidence, should prevent domination of the degenerate present situation, where the work items, goods and services and the derivative nature of secondary importance (such as cinematography, show-business, mobile communications or brokering) are valued and paid unfair and provocatively higher than similar basic engineering, educational or healthcare services and traditional services, causing tension in the society.

In a special manner, the development of an independent feasibility technical and economic study of the problem must be addressed to improve the quality of the Eurasian statistical information required not just for the formation, but also to ensure that the subsequent successful operation of the EAEU starts in 2015. In order to guarantee solutions for these tasks, we believe it needs to consider and develop a project for creation of the EAEC Research Institute Eurasian Statistics (RI EAU) and a program of work for 2013-2015, which provides the solutions for the following urgent tasks:

- Definition of optimal borders by consensus and the development on this very extended base of full-scale strategy for socio-economic development of the EAEU, the submission of a feasibility study of conditions and the effects of these programs in 2013-2015 and subsequent period up to 2020;
- Formation of full program specialization, cooperation and integration of national resources and the production and development, on this basis, comprehensive modernization and innovative forecasts of socio-economic development of the EAEU and the impact of their implementation to the period up to 2030;
- Preparation of the feasibility study of costs (overheads) and efficiency of typical organizational structures formation: large transnational companies, scientific and technical EAEU megacities such as Silicon Valley in the US, Skolkovo in Russia or AIRBUS consortium in the EU;
- Situational analysis of economic lows (bottoms) and maximum (upper) ratings for the points of profitability, break-even point of no return, and in key areas of export-import and other economic activities of the member states in EAEU;
- Comparison analysis of the key indicators of the competitiveness of the socio-economic development of EAEC with similar indicators of the European Union, the OECD, the BRICS and other major international economic organizations and unions, and the definition of prospects of improvement and expansion of the EAEU in the past, perhaps the most integrated, and now to the same extent perhaps the most disintegrated world economic space.

A particular special challenge with solutions that are moving from the future to the present, the initiating research institute, might be necessary to start the implementation of a systematic approach in the formation of the EAEC - studying the prospects of its integration with the EU and create a global belt of trans-Eurasian Economic Union (TEAES) with coverage of the BRICS countries, SCO and other countries involved. Union, which has no analogues in the modern world with full coverage not only of trade, transport, customs, but, and this is important, modern payment systems, foreign exchanges, innovation and all other infrastructure systems, which have horizons in the context of the current global integration trend, is unlikely worth to ignore and consider as a pure utopian.

The solution of all of these tasks is assumed to be carried out on the basis of regular cleaning developing Eurasian data and indication of correction coefficients and assessments of statistical errors, which have too be officially published. We believe that the solution of these problems on the basis of cleaned data will guarantee an insurance of transparency of the upcoming work at EAEU and, from the outset to be distinguished from the other international organizations, which perform largely based on non-transparent and, therefore, unreliable data.

It is known that before these problems in the practice of the majority of organizations economic, foreign exchange, customs and other international institutes, including Customs Union of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia, were solved (or are in the process of solving today) selectively, on a contract basis of fragmented set of research organizations and usually not provided (and apparently could not provide) complete and desired results[3].

It is well known that all empirical measurement of the same phenomena, including their own metrics (not only in the science of humanities but also in all the physical sciences) deviate from the norm and are changing in practice within range of certain tolerances to errors. Ideal measurements do not exist in reality. Confidence intervals of these errors, if possible, be determined by using known statistical rules and criteria for accuracy evaluation, and if not possible, determined conventionally, by comparing the convergence of two or more empirical estimates of the same phenomenon, derived from two different sources, or two different methods. Within estimated range of tolerances the observed phenomena to be considered as appropriate and acceptable, outside of range it

---

[3] The exceptions are the European Union (Brussels), OECD (Paris), WTO (World Customs Organization) and BRICS (company Goldman Sachs), where such activities are organized and carried out centrally by the organizations created under these independent research centers.
A good example of such a decentralized organization of the work on the terms of outsourcing is ECE, where they are carried out through tenders or placing orders with the definition of the procedure for selection and financing of priority based on the package developed regulatory documents, in particular the "Regulations on the procedure of the competition at the choice of scientific research "," Regulations on the selection of priority topics for research papers on matters within the competence of the ECE, the "Regulations on the financing of scientific research" and "Regulations on the conduct of scientific research commissioned by the ECE".

considered as non-measurable, not credible and not suitable for practical use. The standards of modern statistics for large samples consider evaluation as non-measurable if errors deviation from the norm is within ± 3%, while the ratio of small samples in the range ± 7%.

In summary, differences in scope, coverage and credibility in the observed indicators, used in the Eurasian statistics, overrun accepted tolerance in the range 15-50% of each other or from the accepted norm, and it can be argued that today it is beyond the permissible level and is not suitable for practical use.

In the context of the above considerations and evaluations of the proposals in the Eurasian statistics, as we understand, as a priority must be to develop a road map for these discrepancies with regard to their assessment work organized by conversion into a set of national indicators of similar comparable international indicators and to be monitored on a regular basis.

Table 4. The indicators characterizing the comparative development of the member countries of the Customs Union, the Eurasian Economic Community and the European Union in 2010.

Indicators and Factors	Custom Union	EAEU	EU	Custom Union % to EU 2010	Expected change in 2020	Number of years to achieve
Year of foundation	2007-2010	2000-2001				
The number of countries united	3	5	27 [2]	11.11%	44.44%	50
Total area sq. m. km	20 030,7	20 373,7	4 324,7	463,2%	570,0	-
The proportion of the world, %	14,6	15,8	3,2	456,3	560,0	-
Population in mil	167,7	180,8	501,1	33,5%	60,0	55
The proportion of the world, %	2,5	2,7	7,4	33,8%		52
Population density (persons / km2)	8,4	8,9	115,9	7,3		52
GDP, mil. at the exchange rate of currency	1 388,5	1 443,1	16 447,0	8,5	16,8	55
GDP, mil. at the equivalent buying power	2 318,8	2 410,0	14 7993,0	15,7	33,0	42
GDP per capita, USD	8280-13827	7982-13330	29729-33052	27,9 – 41,8	45,1-50,0	23

Table 5. The indicators characterizing the comparative development of the member countries of the Customs Union, the Eurasian Economic Community and the European Union in 2010 (cont.)

Indicators and Factors	Custom Union	EAEU	EU	Custom Union % to EU 2010	Expected change in 2020	Number of years to achieve
The share in the world in terms of parity of GDP, %	1,5	1,5	21,0	7,3		
Specific weight in oil production, %	15,1	15,2	2,9	5,2 times		
GDP growth (2001-2010)	167	155	114	147	180	100
Average annual GDP growth	5,2	4,5	1,4	3,7	4,1	-
The percentage of GDP: investment	17,4	17,5	18,4	94,6	100	
The percentage of GDP: services	60,5	58,0	55,4	109,2	100	-
The share of exports of goods %	2,5	2,6	37,9	6,6	18,0	37
GDP growth due to factors external integration, %	4,5-7,5	4,1-7,0	2,7-3,1	166,7-242,0	110,0-120,0	
The refinancing rate, %	8,5	8,1	2,4	354,2	310	38
The budget deficit, %	-10,1	-10,5	0,2	-50 раз	100	53
Inflation rate, %	8,0	8,1	1,5	6,2 раза	340	57
The actual level of unemployment,%	6,4	6,5	9,7	66,0	100	-
The gap in income per capita, thousands USD	2,7 – 5,2	0,3 – 5,2	7 – 78	6,7 – 38,6	4,2 – 4,5	
Number of TNC on the territory of the Union of the 500 largest TNCs in the world	7	7	161	4,4	25,0	60
Number of standardized tables published annually, characterizing socio-economic situation	580	450	1300	42,0	48,0	44

Planned tasks can be considered as solved, and EAES comes to the existence as a result of these tasks solution, with the key developmental parameters of the EAES countries, starting with parameters characterizing levels of specialization and cooperation and competitiveness of the integrated productions and ending with the parameters characterizing the level and quality of life. All the key parameters must match the same parameters achievable nowadays in EU countries. Magnitude of gaps and values distances, which should be resolved, is

presented in **Table 4**. Apparently, the provided data shows that countries of EAES have to make a way of length more than 50 years.

Comparing and analysing the provided data it is necessary to remember that full effects and advantages of integration, as large volume of production, will become reality of the Euroasian life only at the end of this road. It is necessary to remember direct dependence of these effects on production scales: the more scale, according to the law of an large scale efficiency, the lower specific expenses and production efficiency is higher. Trends of modern globalization, as the highest form of the international integration, unambiguously confirm validity of statements discussed above. However, it is not always that these scales effects entirely appear in the automatic mode. To achieve desirable results in full from the Euroasian integration it is ruled to start with increase in scales, but not with current territorial space, which is excessive, and market capacity and efficiency are insufficient.

In order for the EAES to be truly large international organisation by 2015, it needs to have comprehensive solutions of planned restructuring tasks. EEK and its institutes are created to provide solution for these tasks and obviously they do not cope with these tasks. Moreover, the real threat exists related to a low level of transparency of used data and inadequate quality of personal involved. It is likely that these tasks would not be solved and respectively, under the threat existence of EAES.

It is obvious that without availability of necessary data and sufficient volumes of transparent (and credible) information, strengthening of HR departments by professional experts and attraction to work of EEC of all the positive that was collected and left in the STU countries, it would be problematic to see in the near future a convincing progress of the Euroasian integration related to the planned tasks and creation of effective structures of EAES.

Behind groups of mercantile interests and number of other negative factors, weaknesses of modern Euroasian statistics are hidden. Negative factors start from the cover-up of the facts of evasion from payment of the customs duties and taxes, and end with to cover-up of smuggling, dumping, corruption, etc. All these negative factors must be uncovered by relevant statistics or if the Euroasian statistics would not be built in these interests, statistics as powerful tool of knowledge at the same could be a tool for distortion of surrounding reality, to equalize its tasks with fundamental problems of the Euroasian integration, and it would not be necessary to raise a question of the prime solution of these tasks, of course. EAES is starting the formation of conditions and inconsistent baggage of disordered, non-transparent statistical data accompanying this process, do not create the full-sized Euroasian economic union even applying maximum efforts.