monitoring health for the SDGs, sustainable development goals. Geneva: Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

1. *Balabanova L.V., Sardak O.V.* Personnel management. URL: https://pidru4niki.com/12560607/menedzhment/planuvannya_pidgotovka_kadrovogo_rezervu (access date: 09/30/2022).; 2. *Volosovets O.P., Zabolotko V.M., Volosovets A.O.* Staffing of the health care industry in Ukraine and the world: modern challenges. URL: http://ir.librarynmu.com/bitstream/123456789/2284/1/1RET.pdf (access date: 09/30/2022); 3. Directory of universities. URL: https://osvita.ua/vnz/guide/search-17-0-0-52-75.html (access date: 09/30/2022); 4. *Korolenko V.V., Yurochko T.P.* Personnel policy in the sphere of health care of Ukraine in the context of European integration. K. 2018. 96 p.; 5. The best medical institutions of higher education in Ukraine. URL: https://osvita.ua/vnz/rating/42226/ (date of application: 09/30/2022); 6. On the approval of the Concept of the development of the public health system: order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated November 30, 2016 No. 1002. URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1002-2016-%D1%80#Text (date of application: 01.10.2022); 7. Draft National Strategy for Reforming the Health Care System of Ukraine for the period 2020–2025. URL: https://ips.ligazakon.net/document/NT1138 (access date: 10/01/2022); 8. *Slabkyi G. O., Pohorilyak R. Yu.* Modern system of training managers in the sphere of health care of Ukraine. Guidelines. Kyiv, 2019. 46 p.; 9. *Soria M, Guerra M, Gimenez I, Escaenro JF.* The decision to study medicine: characteristics. Educaciyn Medica. 2006;9(2):91-97. URL: http://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/edu/v9n2/original4.pdf. (date of application: 02.10.2022); 10. *Van Zanten M, Norcini JJ, Boulet JR, Simon F.* Overview of accreditation of undergraduate medical education programs worldwide Med Educ. 2008 Sep;42(9):930-7; 11. World Health Organization (2020) World health statistics 2020: monitoring health for the SDGs, sustainable development goals. Geneva: License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

УДК:
DOI: 10.36919/2312-7812.1.2022.65

I. Gudz

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCE PROVISION OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES OF AGRIBUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Стаття присвячена актуальним питанням ресурсного забезпечення як головного чинника ефективності роботи підприємства агробізнесу. Наголошено на важливості своєчасності забезпечення підприємства агробізнесу необхідними ресурсами сільськогосподарського виробництва в необхідному асортименті та якості. Систематизовано головні завдання, функції, цілі та принципи ресурсного забезпечення підприємств агробізнесу. Доведено, що своєчасність виявлення проблем з ресурсами підприємств, їх аналізом та контролем забезпечить формування конкурентоспроможності господарюючого суб'єкта агробізнесу та відповідність цілям внутрішніх бізнес-процесів і може бути глибоко інтегрованими з кожним із них. Зосереджено увагу на економічному значенні ресурсного забезпечення як основи розвитку підприємства агробізнесу. Наголошено на важливості раціональної організації ресурсного забезпечення підприємства агробізнесу, що є ключовим фактором збільшення прибутку і рентабельності господарюючого суб'єкта. Розглянуто теоретичні та практичні положення ресурсного забезпечення діяльності підприємства агробізнесу. Визначено, що досягнення бажаних фінансових результатів

підприємства агробізнесу неможливо досягти без формування механізму управління ресурсним забезпеченням діяльності суб'єкта господарювання.

Доведено, що при формуванні складників ресурсного забезпечення підприємств агробізнесу необхідно звернути увагу на те, що ці вибрані фактори повинні відповідати відповідній стратегії фірми. Взаємозалежне формування матеріальних ресурсів підприємств агробізнесу разом з інноваційним потенціалом створить додаткові економічні переваги, якими є ефективніше використання сукупного ресурсного потенціалу.

The article is devoted to topical issues of resource provision as the main factor in the efficiency of the agribusiness enterprise. The importance of timely provision of the agribusiness enterprise with the necessary resources of agricultural production in the necessary assortment and quality was emphasized. The main tasks, functions, goals and principles of resource provision of agribusiness enterprises are systematized.

It has been proven that the timeliness of identifying problems with the resources of enterprises, their analysis and control will ensure the formation of the competitiveness of the managing entity of agribusiness and compliance with the goals of internal business processes and can be deeply integrated with each of them. Attention is focused on the economic importance of resource provision as a basis for the development of an agribusiness enterprise.

The importance of the rational organization of resource provision of the agribusiness enterprise is emphasized, which is a key factor in increasing the profit and profitability of the business entity. The theoretical and practical provisions of the resource provision of the agribusiness enterprise are considered. It was determined that achieving the desired financial results of an agribusiness enterprise cannot be achieved without the formation of a management mechanism for resource provision of the business entity.

It is proven that when forming the components of resource provision of agribusiness enterprises, it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that these selected factors must correspond to the corresponding strategy of the firm. Interdependent formation of material resources of agribusiness enterprises together with innovative potential will create additional economic advantages, which are more effective use of the aggregate resource potential.

Ключові слова: підприємство агробізнесу, ресурсне забезпечення, ефективність діяльності, управління ресурсним забезпеченням.

Keywords: agribusiness enterprise, resource provision, efficiency of activity, management of resource provision.

Formulation of the problem. The efficiency of an agribusiness enterprise depends on many factors, one of the main of which is resource provision in terms of its qualitative and quantitative parameters. In conditions of limited resources, it is important to maximize the use of internal reserves of an agribusiness enterprise on the basis of identifying and eliminating problems of resource provision of its activity.

Modern conditions of development require a change in the concept of assessing the efficiency of the use of resources of an agribusiness enterprise. The value of all types of resources should be determined by their compliance with the strategic priorities of the development of an agribusiness enterprise, and not by the amount of money spent on them. If the resources correspond to the established management strategies at the agribusiness enterprise, then the value of these resources increases significantly compared to those resources that do not correspond to the set strategies.

Successful management of resource provision of an agribusiness enterprise makes it possible to implement modern production technologies at agricultural enterprises,

implement investment projects, develop new mathematical models for assessing resource provision, form and process information for making management decisions in order to prevent crisis phenomena at the enterprise, thereby ensuring the development of agribusiness.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The problems of resource provision as the main condition for the effective operation of the enterprise are considered in the works of domestic and foreign scientists. Many scientists have studied the problem of resource provision of enterprise activity, in particular: V. Andriychuk, S. Paik, Y. Ruus, L. Fernstrцm, and others. Despite the large number of studies, the issue of enterprise resource management in modern conditions is debatable and requires further research.

In the scientific literature, there is no consensus on the components of resource provision for development, since the operating conditions of a modern enterprise are characterized by the dynamism and uncertainty of the environment in which it functions. Adaptation of the enterprise to changes in the external environment is possible under the conditions of continuous development of the enterprise. For effective development, one of the necessary conditions is the availability of resources that are involved in the enterprise's activity. Resources are a factor of internal reserves, the effective use of which makes it possible to provide both the needs of the enterprise in particular and the needs of society in general.

The value and influence of resources on the efficiency of the enterprise is determined by the role played by the resource in achieving the enterprise's goals, the possibilities of its replacement, the level of influence of the price on individual resources and is evaluated by a system of indicators that characterize the efficiency of the use of enterprise resources and determine their impact on the final performance results.

The purpose of the article: research of the essence and structure of resource provision of agribusiness enterprises, substantiation of the basic principles and structure of resource provision, determination of the degree of provision and use of factors included in the resource model by economic entities.

Research results. Every agribusiness enterprise must have the necessary resources to realize the goals of entrepreneurship. Enterprise resource provision is a complex of measures to provide an agribusiness enterprise with resources of the appropriate type and composition, which includes mechanisms for searching, obtaining, storing, accumulating, planning, accounting, using and spending.

Resource provision is the basis of successful activity of any agribusiness enterprise. However, for agribusiness production enterprises, this factor sometimes plays a decisive role, as it is related to the degree of satisfaction of the needs of the population. Material, production, personnel and financial resources are most often distinguished as part of the resource support of agribusiness enterprises.

V. Wernerfelt interprets resources as tangible and intangible assets that are associated with this company on a relatively permanent basis [1]. M. Peteraf considers resources as assets (tangible or intangible) that the enterprise directly owns, controls and has access to on a relatively permanent basis [2]. In another work, the author interprets the definition of «resource provision structure» as a set of types of resources, which are specific ways of their interconnection and interaction aimed at achieving the set goals of the enterprise [3, p. 93].

For the effective development of the firm, one of the necessary conditions is the availability of resources that are involved in the process of activity of agribusiness enterprises. Resources are a factor of the company's internal reserves, the effective use of which makes it possible to meet both the needs of agribusiness enterprises in particular and the needs of society in general.

The value and influence of resources on the efficiency of agribusiness enterprises is determined by the role played by the resource in achieving the goals of the enterprise, the possibilities of its replacement, the level of influence of the price on individual resources and is evaluated by a system of indicators that characterize the efficiency of the use of resources of agribusiness enterprises and determine their impact on the final results of activity .

Resource provision plays an important role both at the operational level of business processes and at the strategic level, where the main strategic tasks of the enterprise are developed. Enterprise development strategies can be radically different - from a strategy of expansion or gradual development to a defensive or stabilization and even an anti-crisis strategy. Therefore, the task and, at the same time, the feature of resource provision of the company's activities at the strategic level is the development of a program of preliminary and timely response to the resource needs of business processes within the chosen strategy in accordance with its general goal [4, c. 118].

As the concept of «resources» is defined in the source[5] as «resources are everything that is used by the subjects of entrepreneurial activity to achieve the set goals and objectives in order to satisfy their own and public needs.»

No less important for the effective functioning of agribusiness enterprises is the formation and rational use of resources for each area of its management activity, in the conditions of dynamic changes, which is characteristic of modern enterprises. On the basis of the conducted studies, it was established that there are many classifications of resource types in the structure of resource provision.

From an economic point of view, «resources» are tools that directly or indirectly participate in the process of production or provision of services. The interpretation of the term «resources» is interpreted as a set of tangible and intangible elements of the production potential, which can be disposed of by the enterprise and which are used to achieve certain goals of economic development [6,7].

The study of the works of foreign scientists on the problems of strategic management of resources showed that strategic management appeared on the basis of the results of the identification and interaction of factors of the external and internal environment, such as uncertainty and unpredictability of processes; the appearance of new functions, the solution of which depends on the preservation, stability and development of the system; the complexity of solving dependent tasks, the level of provision of resources, the availability of strategic resources, etc. [8, c. 118].

Let us consider in more detail the types of resources: material resources, innovation and investment resources, fixed funds and assets of the enterprise, technological resources, available technologies and peculiarities of the organization of the production process at the enterprise, the presence of competitive advantages, ideas and scientific inventions, personnel resources, financial resources, - material and intangible resources

used by the investor in the process of their investment in investment objects with the aim of further obtaining profit [9, p. 75];

As we can see from the analysis of scientific sources, the essence of resource provision is considered through such meaningful characteristics as: a set of certain types of resources that take a direct part in the development processes of the enterprise; the ability of the enterprise to provide its activities with the necessary amount and set of resources to achieve a positive economic effect at a certain point in time; the process of finding, attracting and using various types of resources; a system of state measures aimed at creating material, legal, and institutional conditions for the transformation of elements of the resource space into means of achieving goals [10, p. 52].

Effective resource provision of agribusiness enterprises in conditions of dynamic changes depends on the action of many factors. First of all, from the rational and economically justified use of enterprise resources, the introduction of advanced achievements and new technologies. Secondly, the innovative activity of agribusiness enterprises and the structural ratio of resources necessary for the development of enterprises.

The majority of scientists define the resource provision of enterprises as a set of certain types of personnel, material, financial, informational, intellectual investment resources and sources of their formation, which take a direct part in the development processes of the enterprise or can be mobilized in order to ensure the large-scale use of its potential opportunities and the transition to qualitatively new condition.

This is interpreted as the process of finding, attracting and using various types of resources. The resource system of the enterprise includes a set of consecutive, interconnected stages, systematized for these tasks, methods, models that make it possible to substantiate, choose a method of resource provision and evaluate the effectiveness of the chosen method.

Among such directions, one of the important ones is the determination of the degree of security and the use by economic entities of the factors included in the model. This direction involves the determination of the theoretical values of the performance characteristic Ri according to the model in accordance with the actual values of the factor indicators of each observation, followed by the use of the obtained results for the analysis and evaluation of activities and enterprises in two directions:

1) determination of the degree of security of the enterprise with the factors included in the model, compared to the average level of such security in the aggregate;

2) determination of the degree of rationality of the enterprises' use of the specified factors under the economic conditions prevailing in the analyzed time period.

The practical implementation of the first direction involves determining the difference between the theoretical value of the performance characteristic for each business entity and the average actual value of this characteristic as a whole for the population. Such a sacristy can acquire three meanings:

$$F_{ti} - R_F = 0 \quad (1);$$

$$\tilde{R}_i - \overline{R}(\overline{\tilde{R}}) = \Delta R_i \quad (2);$$

$$\tilde{R}_i - \overline{R}(\overline{\tilde{R}}) = -\Delta \tilde{R}_i \quad (3).$$

The difference is caused by objective short-term business conditions that developed at the enterprise in the analyzed time period. The assessment of such a difference depends on what the resulting feature of the model represents.

Якщо підприємство агробізнесу економічно зацікавлене, щоб такий показник зростав наприклад, грошова виручка, урожайність, продуктивність ресурсів, прибуток, рентабельність, то нульова різниця означитиме, що підприємство забезпечене факторами, які включені в модель, на такому ж рівні, який склався в середньому по сукупності підприємств; якщо різниця дорівнює $\Delta\tilde{R}_i$, то підприємство ліпше забезпечене факторами, а отже, має ліпші об'єктивні умови для одержання більшого значення результативного показника.

If an agribusiness enterprise is economically interested in increasing such an indicator, for example, monetary revenue, yield, productivity of resources, profit, profitability, then a zero difference will mean that the enterprise is provided with the factors included in the model at the same level as the average for the population enterprises; if the difference is equal to $\Delta\tilde{R}_i$, then the enterprise is better equipped with factors, and therefore has better objective conditions for obtaining a higher value of the performance indicator.

І навпаки, в разі, коли ризниця дорівнює $\Delta\tilde{R}_i$ – підприємство має гірші об'єктивні умови господарювання за досліджуваним напрямом.

А тепер розглянемо випадок, коли підприємство агробізнесу зацікавлене в тому, щоб досліджувана результативна ознака була якомога меншою, наприклад собівартість одиниці продукції, матеріаломісткість і трудомісткість виробництва. В такому разі різниці$\Delta\tilde{R}_i$ та $\Delta\tilde{R}_i$, оцінюються протилежно: якщо для підприємства така різниця набула значення $\Delta\tilde{R}_i$,то воно має ліпші умови для зниження досліджуваного результативного показника, а отже, і одержання певної економічної вигоди. І навпаки, за $\Delta\tilde{R}_i$ воно має гірші умови.

And vice versa, in the case when the sacristy is equal to$\Delta\tilde{R}_i$, the enterprise has worse objective conditions of management in the studied direction.

And now let's consider the case when an agribusiness enterprise is interested in the fact that the researched performance characteristic is as small as possible, for example, the unit cost of production, material intensity and labor intensity of production. In this case, the differences$\Delta\tilde{R}_i$ and$\Delta\tilde{R}_i$, are evaluated in the opposite way: if such a difference has acquired the value$\Delta\tilde{R}_i$ for the enterprise, then it has better conditions for reducing the studied performance indicator, and therefore, obtaining a certain economic benefit. Conversely, according to$\Delta\tilde{R}_i$– it has worse conditions.

The degree of provision of the enterprise with the factors of the model (F_3) can be determined from the expression:

$$F_3 = \frac{R_{ti}}{R_t} \tag{4}$$

If it is desired that the resulting characteristic increases and the difference between $\tilde{R}_t$ and $\overline{R}(\tilde{R})$ is $\Delta\tilde{R}_i$, then the coefficient F_3 will be greater than one, and vice versa. In the second case, when it is desirable to reduce the performance characteristic, then for$\Delta\tilde{R}_i$ the coefficient F_3 will be less than one and this is considered as a positive fact of the activity of the agribusiness enterprise.

The practical implementation of the second direction of analysis and evaluation of the activity of an agribusiness enterprise involves determining the difference between the actual value of the resulting characteristic Rfact and its theoretical calculated value $\tilde{R}_t$

As in the first case, such a difference can take on three meanings:

$$R_{if} - R_{ti} = 0 \quad (5),$$

$$R_{iF} - R_{ti} = \Delta R_{iF} \quad (6),$$

$$R_{iF} - R_{ti} = -\Delta R_{iF} \quad (7).$$

This difference is caused by subjective reasons and makes it possible to determine the degree of rationality of using model factors, and ultimately, the efficiency of management in a certain segment of activity. The degree of rationality of the use of factors F_p is determined from the expression:

$$F_p = R_{i\phi} / R_i \gtreqless 1 \quad (8)$$

Therefore, the excess of the actual value of the effective characteristic $R_{i\phi}$ or its decrease compared to the theoretical value of this characteristic $\tilde{R}_t$ can be attributed to or blamed on the enterprise. Such a conclusion is also made taking into account the substantive nature of the resulting feature. If the enterprise is interested in its growth, then if the difference is positive $\Delta R_{i\phi}$, it means that it uses the model factors better compared to the average level of their use in the set of observations.

In this case, the coefficient F_p will be greater than one, and the higher its level, the more efficiently the company uses the specified factors. For a negative value of the difference, the coefficient F_p will be less than one, which will indicate the irrational use by the business entity of its capabilities in the studied segment of activity.

The evaluation approach changes in the opposite way, if the effective feature of the model is an economic indicator that the enterprise is interested in reducing. With the rational use of factors, the difference between $F_{i\phi}$ and $\tilde{R}_t$ acquires a negative value, and the coefficient F_p will equal less than one. In the case when such a difference is zero, it means that the degree of rationality of the enterprise's use of factors is the same as the average for the totality of enterprises.

The conclusions reached regarding the assessment of the degree of rationality of the use of model factors by enterprises gain deeper validity, provided that the standard error of the model is taken into account during such an assessment. If the deviation of the resulting characteristic $\pm\Delta R_{i\phi}$ does not exceed the standard error, then it is considered that such an enterprise uses factors within the non-critical range for undesirable deviation of this characteristic, and within the stable normal range for its positive (desired) deviation.

But those business entities in which $\pm\Delta R_{i\phi}$ exceeds the standard error deserve special attention. If such a deviation is desirable for an agribusiness enterprise, it means that it functions effectively and can become an object for studying its experience. In other cases of undesirable deviation, it is advisable for the agribusiness enterprise to take the necessary measures in order to significantly improve the use of model factors.

We will give an example of determining the degree of availability of resources and the degree of efficiency of their use for two real agribusiness enterprises, which differ significantly in terms of these indicators (table 1).

Table 1

Source information on agribusiness enterprises to determine indicators and

Indicator of economic activity	TAK-AGRO LLC	«INTERAGROINVEST» LLC
The actual amount of net income in the calculation of 1 hectare of agricultural land, UAH Ri	22 121	41 595,4
The theoretical calculated value of the volume of production of net income, hryvnias/ha	25 746,6	35 571,8
Based on 1 ha of agricultural land, UAH: fixed assets	13 019,6	11 969,1
Current assets of the sphere of production	6053,3	9757
SALARY EXPENSES	835,56	556,38

As we already know, the theoretical value of the effective characteristic on average for the population is UAH 33,462.06/ha.

Let's determine the degree of provision of agricultural enterprises with resources included in the model:

$$R_{ti} - R_F = 25746,6 - 33462,06 = -7715,46\,\text{грн};\ F_{31} = \frac{R_{ti}}{R_F} = \frac{25746,6}{33462,06} = 0,769$$

$$R_{t2} - R_F = 35571,8 - 33462,06 = 2109,74\,\text{грн};\ F_{32} = \frac{R_{t2}}{R_F} = \frac{35571,8}{33462,06} = 1,06$$

As you can see, the potential production capabilities of the agricultural enterprise «TAK-AGRO» LLC are significantly below the overall average level of resource availability, in particular by 24.64% (1- 0.769) * 100. For this reason, this agricultural enterprise potentially loses 7414 UAH per 1 ha agricultural land, provided that it ensures the average overall level of efficiency of the use of resources included in the model. In contrast to the first, the second agricultural enterprise «INTERAGROINVEST» LLC is better equipped with aggregate resources due to working capital of the production sphere - the factor with the greatest impact.

The degree of provision of resources is 1.06 or 6% higher than the average for the aggregate level of their provision. Thanks to this, the agricultural enterprise «INTERAGROINVEST» LLC is objectively able to receive UAH 2,411.2 more net income per 1 ha of agricultural land than the overall average.

Now let's calculate the degree of rationality of the efficiency of the use of resources by these enterprises, as factors included in the model:

$$R_{f1} - R_{ti} = 22121 - 25746{,}6 = -3625{,}6\,\text{грн};\ F_{p1} = \frac{22121}{25746{,}6} = 0{,}859;$$

$$R_{f1} - R_{ti} = 41595{,}4 - 35571{,}8 = 6023{,}6\,\text{грн};\ F_{p2} = \frac{41595{,}4}{35571{,}8} = 1{,}169$$

So, there are reasons to believe that the first agricultural enterprise LLC «TAK-AGRO» uses its production resources irrationally due to miscalculations of the management, thereby causing it to underachieve 3,625.6 UAH in net income from each hectare of land.

This is 14.1 .1% less than the amount that the agricultural enterprise LLC TAK-AGRO could receive for its total use of these resources (1 - 0.859) * 100. At that time, the second agricultural enterprise LLC INTERAGROINVEST «, thanks to effective management, received 6,023.6 UAH more cash income from 1 ha of land compared to the amount that would have been produced at an average level of use of the factors-resources included in the model.

The indicator of the degree of rationality of the use of factors included in the model is, in fact, an indicator of the quality of management of enterprises in a certain segment of their activity, for which segment of activity such factors are directly related. if, say, the factors are basic and thus significantly affect the economic condition of enterprises as business entities, then those of them that achieve a higher degree of rationality in the use of such factors simultaneously achieve higher generalized indicators of economic activity (table 2).

Table 2

Dependence of net income and profit per unit of land area on the degree of rationality of the use of resource model factors

Groups of enterprises according to the Fp indicator	Number of enterprises in the group	The average value for groups of the indicator Fp	Net income (revenue) per 1 ha s.y. land, UAH	Operating profit per 1 ha s.y. land, UAH
I – до 0,700	8	0,6281	21 348,8	451
II – 0,700-1,00	16	0,8998	27 721,1	3 813,7
III – 1.00 or more	21	1,4949	39 143,5	6 953,
Together	45	1,133	33 160,6	4 737,7

**Compiled on the basis of statistical data of agricultural firms of the Kyiv region for 2 021*

Therefore, it becomes obvious that the state of the economy of the enterprise in general or the efficiency of a separate segment of its activity depends not only on the level of supply of production factors, but also to a large extent on the quality of their management. to make sure of this, we grouped the studied enterprises according to the Fp indicator.

As we can see from the data in the table, there is a significant differentiation between agribusiness enterprises in terms of the degree of rationality of the use of model factors,

which is directly reflected in the indicators important for the economy of business entities: monetary revenue and operating profit per unit of land area.

For example, in the third group of agribusiness enterprises, compared to the first, the net income was 1.8 times higher, and the profit was 6.9 times higher. It must be said that the agribusiness enterprises of the third group do not have particularly noticeable advantages and provision of resources in comparison with the enterprises of other groups. This confirms the proposed thesis: the state of the economy of agribusiness enterprises depends not only on the availability of resources, but also on the quality of their management.

B models can be used to forecast the researched performance indicators of agribusiness enterprises. To do this, instead of the actual values, it is not necessary to substitute their values in the forecast into the correlation model and then make the necessary calculations.

Undoubtedly, the quality of the forecast depends not only on the validity of the factors (resources) included in the model, but also on how economically correct the expected value of the factors, i.e. resources, will be determined.

In order to carry out forecasting with the help of linear models, there is a need to determine technical and economic standards for individual factors (resources), on the basis of which the need for certain factors (resources) to achieve the planned desired level of the performance indicator is substantiated

The essence of the technical and economic standards is that they indicate how many units of their measurement the factor will improve in order to have an effective measurement indicator. If the increase in the measurement of the x_(i) factor is reduced by x, which is necessary for the increase in the unit of measurement of the results of a certain indicator Δy, then Δx can be determined by the formula

$$\Delta_{xi} = \frac{1}{a_i} * \Delta y \qquad (9).$$

The validity of the given methodology for determining technical and economic standards is proved mathematically. In our example, according to the resource linear model of net income (revenue), the values of technical and economic standards are as follows:

for resource x_1 = 1.267,

resource x_2 =0.380,

resource x_3=0.534.

Thus, it was established that in order to increase the net income (revenue) per one hectare of agricultural land by UAH 1, the fixed assets per this area should increase by UAH 1.267 (1 : 0.789), the working capital of the production sphere - by 0.380 hryvnias and salary expenses for 0.534 hryvnias.

Now the task is to find out by how much the company is able to increase this or that factor for the forecast period. If we are talking about fixed assets, then it is necessary to resolve the issue of the possibility of purchasing the necessary equipment, other fixed assets in the corresponding value equivalent; if about current assets - about the possibility of purchasing more material resources.

If these funds are presented in cost form, there is a need to adjust material costs for the factor of inflation - an increase in the prices of input resources. We see that a dual approach is necessary for each factor, and the art of an agribusiness specialist is manifested in the ability to find one of them that most closely matches the characteristics of this factor and the company's capabilities for its qualitative and quantitative change.

For reasonable forecasting of performance characteristics on the basis of correlation models, it is necessary to determine forecast errors, evaluate them and draw a conclusion about the predicted capabilities of such models. In our example, to solve this issue, we will use information on four typical enterprises, in two of which the actual value of net income exceeds its normative value, and in two - the opposite.

At the first step, it is necessary to determine the theoretical value of the performance characteristic for these enterprises. For two enterprises, we will perform the necessary calculation of this indicator in accordance with the availability of resources. As a result, we get, hryvnias/ha:

$$\gamma_1 = 23\ 406,$$
$$\gamma_2 = 32\ 338,$$
$$\gamma_3 = 20\ 144,$$
$$\gamma_4 = 12\ 879.$$

In the second step, we will determine the deviation between the actual amount of net income per 1 ha and its estimated (theoretical) value, UAH:

$$22\ 121\ 25\ 745,5 = 3625,6$$
$$52\ 939,635\ 571,8 = 17\ 367,8$$
$$24\ 184,622\ 158,4 = 2026,2$$
$$12\ 01218\ 030,6 = -\ 6\ 018,6$$

The resource provision structure for each agribusiness enterprise is individual, based on the specifics of the industry in which it operates, the level of economic development, the state of development potential, and the chosen strategy for further development. Implementation of resource provision of an agribusiness enterprise should be based on the following principles:

1. Flexibility – responsiveness of agribusiness enterprises to changes and the influence of external and internal environmental factors.

2. Continuity – ensuring rhythmic production of agribusiness enterprises and reducing downtime.

3. Compliance - the available resources of agribusiness enterprises must ensure the fulfillment of the set goals and objectives.

4. Autonomy - the ability to fully provide the resources of agribusiness enterprises or reduce dependence on suppliers to a minimum.

5. Resource conservation – frugal use of non-renewable resources of agribusiness enterprises, use of energy-saving technologies

6. Purposefulness - the resources of agribusiness enterprises should be used only for the achievement of the set tasks and the fulfillment of the set goals and tasks of functioning.

7. Planning - should be carried out taking into account a certain complex development of agribusiness enterprises.

Therefore, the developed scientific-methodical approach will make it possible to optimally plan the production and economic activities of agribusinesses in a timely manner, taking into account the level of resource provision, and to adopt effective strategies for minimizing possible negative events and reducing the level of uncertainty of the external and, especially, the internal environment of the agribusiness enterprise.

Scientific-methodical regulations on assessment and recommendations on regulation of resource provision of agribusiness enterprises can be applied in practice to form a strategy for the development of an agribusiness. Proposed evaluation measures and recommendations for regulating the resource provision of agricultural firms, adapting the recommendations to the specifics of their activities.

Conclusions. The theoretical and practical provisions of the resource provision of the agribusiness enterprise are considered. It was determined that achieving the desired financial results of an agribusiness enterprise cannot be achieved without the formation of a management mechanism for resource provision of the business entity.

When forming the components of resource provision of agribusiness enterprises, it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that these components must correspond to the corresponding strategy of the agribusiness firm. The interdependent formation of material resources of agribusiness enterprises together with innovative potential is important, which will create additional economic advantages, which are more effective use of the aggregate resource potential.

1. *Wernerfelt B.A.* (1984) Resource-Based View of the Firm. Strategic Management Journal, vol. 5, pp. 173; 2. *Helfat C., Peteraf M.* (2003) The dynamic resource-based view: capability life cycles. Strategic Management Journa, vol. 24, pp. 997; 3. *Chorna A.* (2009) The structure of the resource security of economic security of the enterprise. Bulletin of the Khmelnitsky National University, vol. 4 no. 1, pp. 93 [in Ukrainian]; 4. *Khristenko L.M.* (2015) Features of resource support of activity of the enterprise. Economy and region. vol. 6, no. 55, pp. 115-119 [in Ukrainian]; 5. *Hoffman, D. G.* (2002). Managing operational risk: 20 firmwide best practice strategies (pp.

34–39). New York: John Wiley & Sons; 6. *Feyer O.V., Drozd M.V.* (2016) Theoretical bases of enterprise resource support. Economy and society, vol. 6, pp. 220-224 [in Ukrainian]; 7. *Ruus J.* (2010) Intellectual capital. Management Practice, pp. 236; 8. *Davies, E.* (2006). The Advanced Measurement approach to operational risk. London: Risk Books. 436 p.; 9. *Kvasnytska P.C.* (2014) Modern approaches to defining the nature and components of investment resources. Economic Journal-XXI, vol. 7-8, no. 1, pp. 7555 [in Ukrainian]; 10. *Oivchar O.I., Gaida N.V.* (2018) Conceptual bases of economic management of resources at enterprises: the security dimension. Scientific Bulletin of Uzhgorod National University, vol. 19, Part 1, pp. 51-55 [in Ukrainian].