

comfort;

3. Consumers see that more and more firms are producing the same kind of goods;
4. They pay less attention to the quality and are buying cheaper goods;
5. They have great demand for the services and etc.

All these problems are based on the facts, that there are not enough consumers to buy goods and it becomes the reason of overstock of the goods. Most modern problems of marketing are connected with ever-changing demands of the consumer. So the aim of the company should be identification of consumers' needs and satisfying their requirements. The company must constantly introduce their goods to society not only in domestic market but also in foreign market.

Companies were trying not to invest money in marketing activities 5 years ago. But if we look at the statistics of IT companies, they become active only last 2-3 years. 18.7% of companies were using marketing activities in 2002. In 2009 their number increased by 32.8%.

For example, Georgian winery companies are not active in marketing activities and they only show commercials in New-Year days. This is a big mistake because consumers must be always informed about the values and advantages of the goods. In 2001 the Georgian winery company has invested 5 million dollars in planning marketing activities in the Russian market. The result was, that the wine occupied 33% of the Russian market. If winery companies will use marketing activities, they will have a chance to satisfy all segments of consumers.

Another important issue is a modern problem of management. Management in the macroeconomic level should consider global processes that are associated with the development of the global economic system. The paradigm shift in macroeconomic management leads to changes in the principles of organization goals. It changes current concepts of management. Following situations describe modern problems of management:

1. Denial of classical management rules. These rules include factors, which claims, that success of the company is based on reducing costs;

2. Using system theory makes it easy to discuss manufacturing as a whole system. It is somehow related to the firm's internal environment. Companies should adapt to the changes of the internal environment for effective functioning of the system;

3. Situational management means that functioning of the firm is stipulated by the reaction from the environment;

4. The new paradigm of management pays great attention to the organization and less attention to the leadership and management styles, qualifications and the people's reaction to changes.

Therefore it is quite difficult to discuss principles of management practically. It requires an overview of business philosophy, to change the psychology of staff including managers and improve their qualifications. All the big companies are trying to avoid the old hierarchical system and to establish a simple relationship with staff and between them.

References:

1. Гуреев А.Ю. *Проблемы современного маркетинга и их решение на основе превентивного подхода*; (2009);
2. Котлер Ф. *Основы маркетинга*; (2007);
3. Whalley A. *Strategic Marketing*; (2010);
4. Ritson N. *Strategic Management*; (2008);
5. <http://live.ge/r-32175>

Michał Ptak
Wrocław University of Economics
Faculty of Economics, Management and Tourism
Jelenia Góra, Poland

THE COST OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY

Climate change (global warming) can be considered as one of the major environmental problems. However, the climate change policy is difficult and expensive. It requires a comparison of the costs and benefits, and a comparison of the costs of action to diminish negative effects of climate change and costs of inaction [1]. The costs and benefits are uncertain. Moreover, they occur in different time periods.

The estimates of costs of mitigation of global warming are controversial. For example, according to the one of the most famous and influential review of the economics of climate change – the Stern Review of 2006 – the cost of long-term actions to avoid worst impacts of climate change and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be approximately 1% of global GDP each year. It is the cost of achieving GHG stabilisation in the range of between 500 and 550 ppm CO₂e. N. Stern estimated also the cost of inaction. According to the report it would be at least 5% of global GDP per year. In other words, we will annually lose one twentieth of our income. The damage cost could be even higher (for example 20% of global GDP) if wider range of risks and impacts is taken into account [2]. As noted in the literature, majority of spending for climate change programs will come from developed countries [3].

W. Nordhaus of Yale University have analysed costs of various trajectories for reducing carbon dioxide emissions over the next years. According to his study, the net present-value global benefit of the optimal climate policy is \$3.4 trillion relative to the baseline (uncontrolled case – no policy to reverse climate change). It is a relatively small amount – it corresponds to only 0.17% of the discounted value of total future income. The reduction targets have to be achieved by carbon tax. According to the study, the optimal tax rate per tonne of carbon (that is carbon price) should be \$95 in 2050 and \$207 in 2100 [4]. It corresponds to respectively \$26 and \$56 per tonne of carbon dioxide.

Carbon taxes (carbon charges) are climate change policy instruments which can provide a cost-effective distribution of mitigation efforts across different countries [5]. However, this would require an introduction of international uniform carbon tax which minimizes the total abatement cost. Currently, such taxes on carbon content of fuels or on carbon dioxide emissions are applied only in some European and non European countries. There are large differences in tax rates: for example in Poland the rate of the CO₂ charge is lower than 0,10 euro per tonne. The tax rate in Sweden is more than 100 euro per tonne of carbon dioxide.

Harmonised carbon taxes could be levied and collected by national governments

[6]. The example of how such taxation harmonisation can be done is the 2004 EU energy tax directive which sets minimum tax rates for energy products [see 7]. Alternatively, such tax could be levied internationally. The tax revenues would be allocated to the special fund for GHG emissions mitigation programmes in selected countries.

The emission reduction targets can be also achieved by quantity instruments, particularly international cap-and-trade scheme. However, it seems that price instruments (international carbon tax) provide greater certainty about the possible costs of tackling climate change and lowering GHG emissions [8].

Literature

1. *World Development Report 2010: Development and Climate Change, The World Bank, Washington 2010.*
2. *Stern N., The economics of climate change, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011.*
3. *Neumayer E., A missed opportunity: The Stern Review on climate change fails to tackle the issue of non-substitutable loss of natural capital, "Global Environmental Change" 2007, Vol. 17.*
4. *Nordhaus W., The challenge of global warming: economic models and environmental policy, 2007 (http://nordhaus.econ.yale.edu/dice_mss_072407_all.pdf).*
5. *The economics of climate change mitigation policies and options for global action beyond 2012, OECD, Paris 2009.*
6. *Hepburn C., Carbon taxes, emissions trading, and hybrid schemes, in: Helm D., Hepburn C. (ed.), The economics and politics of climate change, Oxford University Press, New York 2009.*
7. *Gandhi V., Cuervo J., Carbon taxes – their macroeconomic effects and prospects for global adoption – a survey of the literature, International Monetary Fund, 1998 (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/wp9873.pdf>).*
8. *Climate Change 2001. Mitigation, IPCC, New York 2001.*