

Digital Economy for Sustainable Economic Growth

The Role of the G20 and Global Governance in the Emerging Digital Economy¹

S. Guo, W. Ding, T. Lanshina

Shuyong Guo – Professor, Dean of the School of International Relations and Public Affairs (SIRPA) of Shanghai International Studies University (SISU); 550 Dalian Road (W), Shanghai 200083, China; E-mail: syguo@shisu.edu.cn

Weihang Ding – Ph.D. Candidate at the School of International Relations and Public Affairs (SIRPA) of Shanghai International Studies University (SISU); 550 Dalian Road (W), Shanghai 200083, China.

Tatiana Lanshina – Research Associate, Center for Economic Modeling of Energy and the Environment, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration; Research Associate, Center for Industrial Studies, Institute for US and Canadian Studies; 82 Prospect Vernadskogo bldg. 1, 119571 Moscow, Russian Federation; E-mail: lanshina.ta@gmail.com

Recent decades have seen a rapid digital transformation resulting in important and sometimes even crucial changes in business, society and the global economy. After the global crisis of 2008–2009, digital industries have been among the most dynamic and promising in the global economy. Nevertheless, the world lacks equilibrium between benefits and risks in the digital economy, which explains the need for global governance in this sphere.

This article analyzes the role and characteristics of the G20 in the introduction of global governance in the digital economy. The authors review what's meant by the digital economy and define the key characteristics of this sector, as well as highlight the challenges to international cooperation, analyze the digital strategies of G20 countries, study the G20's participation in the global governance of the digital economy, analyze the potential for the leaders of China and Russia, and make recommendations concerning the participation of the G20 in the global governance of the digital economy.

The authors arrive at the following conclusions. First, society has to govern the digital economy properly in order to eliminate disparities between developed and developing countries, as well as address cyber security and other threats, and promote a higher quality of life for all. Second, the G20 has very limited experience in the governing of the digital economy, but as a leader in terms of soft power, and as an organization with limited membership that includes both countries with a developed digital sector and countries that lag behind, it may play a great role in the digital economy's global governance. Third, the US has historically been a leader in the IT sector and the digital economy. In recent years, China has sufficiently improved its positions, which allows it to aspire to a higher role in global governance. Russia may also play a greater (though not a leading) role, taking into account its experience and potential.

The authors also conclude that the G20 should: (1) pay more attention to cooperation with African countries; (2) promote tools of voluntary cooperation, first and foremost with developing countries; (3) work to improve international cyber security and (4) involve the private sector in the process of global Internet

¹ The editorial board received the article in November 2017.

governance more often. Also, the G20 should position itself properly and actively in the sphere of digital governance, so as to optimize its functions as the hub of global governance.

Key words: digital economy; global governance; G20; BRICS

For citation: Guo S., Ding W., Lanshina T. (2017) Global Governance and the Role of the G20 in the Emerging Digital Economy. *International Organisations Research Journal*, vol. 12, no 4, pp. 169–184 (in Russian and English). DOI: 10.17323/1996-7845-2017-04-169

Introduction

In recent decades, and following the agricultural and industrial revolutions, the world has been undergoing an information revolution, which has brought about essential improvements in productivity, caused critical changes in productive relations and created new activities, products and services. The increasing mobility and thus interdependence between nations has strengthened globalization. Globalization, on the one hand, has enhanced the development of international society, while on the other hand it has proliferated issues of global concern (e.g. cyber security).

Following the sub-prime mortgage crisis in the United States and the European sovereign debt crisis, the world economy entered a post-crisis era of stagnation and adjustment. Every country in the world is exploring approaches for economic revitalization, but tends to confront enormous difficulties. Apart from many other industries, the Internet and broader ICT sector have been quite resilient during the recent turbulent times since more and more individuals, companies and countries have been shifting their focus to the digital economy due to its benefits (e.g. high speed of transactions, low costs, international coverage, etc.). In terms of new businesses creation, survival rates and share appreciation, high- and medium-growth firms have outperformed other sectors of the economy [OECD, 2014]. The share of the digital economy involving digital skills and digital capital now accounts for about 22.5% of the world economy, and it still has a huge potential to further intertwine with the traditional economy and expand. By applying digital skills and technology, the world economy is expected to generate \$2 trillion of additional economic output by the year 2020 [Knickrehm, Berthon, Daugherty, 2016].

So far, researchers have paid attention to the global decline of the labor share due to the advances in information technology and the computer age [Karabarounis, Neiman, 2013], to e-fraud, digital piracy and other forms of digital shadow consumption [Gaspareniene et al., 2016], etc. The concept of global governance in the digital economy and the role of the G20 in the digital transformation of the economy and society have hardly been analyzed. Meanwhile, the advantages of international cooperation in the digital sphere and necessity to build an inclusive global digital economy are becoming more and more obvious.

The aim of this article is to research the expanding role of the G20 in the global governance of the digital economy and formulate major advantages, as well as to find the potential role of China and Russia in digital G20 cooperation. To achieve this task, the authors use qualitative research methods, including the content analysis of G20 documents and empirical generalization.

The G20 in global governance

Global governance is usually defined as the cooperation of transnational actors aimed at finding solutions to common problems that go beyond the scope of individual states. Transnational actors may include agreements, organizations, networks, etc. [Ozkan, 2011]. In other words, global governance is the management of global processes in the absence of global government. In the post-1945 world order, global governance was long understood to mean intergovernmental relationships. Modern global governance is a complex system of formal and informal institutions, both governmental and non-governmental, and relationships that coordinate policies in some specific spheres with mixed results [Aras, Crowther, 2016]. Thus, as noted in [Florini, Sovacool, 2009], it is not only governments that can achieve governance in the modern world.

The G20 emerged after the 1997–1998 financial crisis, but remained in the shadows until another global economic crisis, which unfolded in 2008–2009. The first G20 summit of leaders was held in 2008 in Washington, and was an attempt to bring together the largest global economies, including emerging powers, to find solutions to the global crisis [Lanshina, Barinova, 2017]. According to many authors, the G20 was quite effective in finding emergency policy responses [Narlikar, 2014], since it stabilized financial markets and started a global economic stimulus program which prevented depressions.

After the crisis, it became evident that different countries in the G20 have different policy preferences (e.g. Anglo-Saxon, other European countries and developing countries), and the G20, although comprising 4/5 of the world's economy and trade, still lacks representativeness and inclusiveness. After the crisis abated, the G20 attempted to redefine itself, its agenda has sufficiently expanded and included energy, corruption, taxation, etc. Thus the G20 has made efforts to transform from an anti-crisis forum to an economic development forum. However, some authors think that the G20 is unable to deal with a multitude of everyday problems [Narlikar, 2014]. In the last several years, the G20 has begun to engage in the global governance of the digital economy, yet this process hasn't been fully understood and analyzed.

Defining the digital economy and its characteristics

There are two main opinions regarding the origin of the term “digital economy.” According to one of them, this term appeared in the 1990s [Tapscott, 1995]. According to the other, the concept of the electronic or digital economy arose from ideas that had

been developing in world economic literature since the 1960s, and reflected Daniel Bell's concept of an "information economy" [Bell, 1974].

The digital economy is essentially spoken of in terms of the integration of technology and an ability to eliminate boundaries between physical, digital and biological systems [Yudina, 2016]. It is generally regarded as a type of economy based on digital information. To be more specific, a digital economy promotes the circulation of commodities and the development of the service industry by means of the exchange of digital information and online trade [Liu, 2001]. In the digital economy, the ICT facilities provide a globalized platform for individuals and organizations around the world, facilitating intercommunication and cooperation between different actors.

Mesenbourg [2001] identified three main components of the digital economy: e-business infrastructure, e-business itself (processes that are conducted through computer networks) and e-commerce (online sales). However, it should be noted that nowadays, the boundaries between the digital and non-digital sectors have become less and less clear. Moreover, the digital economy is being broadly applied to other economic sectors [G20, 2016]. It is even extending beyond economic sectors and businesses to comprise individuals, communities and societies through social media and through other means [OECD, 2014].

At the 2016 G20 Hangzhou Summit, the "G20 Digital Economy Development and Cooperation Initiative" was proposed, in which the digital economy is characterized as "a broad range of economic activities that include using digitized information and knowledge as the key factor of production, modern information networks as an important activity space, and the effective use of information and communication technology (ICT) as an important driver of productivity growth and economic structural optimization" [G20, 2016].

By integrating approaches to the notions of the digital economy and its aforementioned characteristics, the authors defined the *digital economy as a series of economic or social behaviors based on information and communication technology (ICT) and realized via the Internet*. In some sense, the "Internet Plus" is digital economy.

According to Accenture Strategy estimates, the United States is the world's largest digital economy. Its digital investment currently accounts for about 33% of the nation's GDP; 43% of the US workforce and 26% of its cumulative capital support digital related activities. More than one fifth of the global GDP (22%) is closely related to the digital economy, which encompasses skill and capital [Knickrehm et al., 2016].

Traditional industries have established digital content for entertainment, communications networks, the media and the cultural sphere using new types of digital technology, and through active product innovation, business integration and industrial restructuring. Nowadays, a number of digital content industries are becoming or have already become new sources of economic growth in some areas. They include digital finance, digital communications, digital entertainment and digital media art. Additionally, digital technology has already been incorporated into fields like industrial

manufacturing, which has improved the economic efficiency of the whole industrial sector and promoted wider, deeper, larger-scale industrial integration.

The digital economy exposes workers from some industries (especially traditional ones) to the risk of unemployment [OECD, 2016a]. OECD has calculated that less than 10 percent of workers in OECD area may lose their jobs due to automation. Up to 70 percent of tasks in 25 percent of jobs may be automated [OECD, 2016b]. On the other hand, the digital economy can also bring about employment opportunities, directly or indirectly. According to estimates, if all European countries develop their digital sectors to the level of the best performers in the EU, Europe would have 1.5 million new jobs [Muylle, Vijverman, 2013].

Internet penetration rates vary across countries. For example, there is a huge gap between the EU member states of northern and southern Europe. Statistics show that currently, more than 3/4 of European residents use the Internet frequently, while half of residents in Bulgaria and Romania do not. Network coverage in Belgium approaches 99%, while in Italy this figure is only 55%, far behind that of other European countries [He, 2013]. The differences between developed and developing countries are even more significant.

In recent years, there has been an increasing convergence between foreign policy and internet governance, especially after the Snowden revelations of 2013. The US preeminence in the Internet, which can largely be explained by its pioneering role, often comes under suspicion. Moreover, there are serious contradictions between states regarding the model of global internet governance. Many G20 countries, including China and Russia, have supported a multilateral model of global internet governance, which allows all states to participate in the process of governance on an equal basis, but limits the participation of non-government actors, such as the private sector and civil society. Some other G20 countries, first and foremost the US, have been proponents of the so-called multi-stakeholder approach, allowing all government and non-government stakeholders to equally participate in global internet governance [Trinkunas, Wallace, 2015].

Digital economy strategies of the G20 countries

In recent years, many (but not all, as it follows from Table 1) G20 members have mapped out their strategies of digital economy development in the medium- or long-term period. This multitude of strategies was initiated by the United States' Information Super Highway program in 1993 and continued via a three-step digital strategy in Japan. All these strategies aim to develop the digital economy, since in the coming years, it will be the vital driving force of the world economy.

The major differences lie in the following aspects: (a) The extent of maturity varies due to how long the countries have been implementing the strategy. The United States, for example, started commercializing its digital information network in March 1991, while other countries, particularly the developing ones, only began recently. As a

Table 1. Digital strategies of G20 countries

| Actor | Strategies | Focuses |
|-------------|--|--|
| US | • Information Super Highway (1993) | · Digital communication system · Information telecommunications network |
| | • National Broadband Plan (2010) | · Boosting high-speed broadband internet access |
| Japan | • e-Japan (2001) | · Information infrastructure and technology research and development |
| | • u-Japan (2004) | · Ubiquity in industries and services, diversification in application |
| | • i-Japan (2009) | · Focus on public administration – government, hospitals and schools |
| EU | • i-2010 (2005) | · Open and competitive digital economy · Information Communication Technology |
| | • Digital Agenda/Europe 2020 strategy | · Develop a digital single market |
| UK | • Digital Britain (2009) | · The country at the leading edge of the global digital economy |
| | • “Digital Economy Act 2010” (2010) | · Media policy issues related to digital media - copyright infringement, Internet domain names, Channel 4 media content, local radio and video games |
| | • “Digital Economy Strategy 2015-2018” (2015) | · Encouraging digital innovators; focusing on the user; equipping the digital innovator; growing infrastructure, platforms and ecosystems; ensuring sustainability |
| France | • Digital France 2020 (2011) | · Develop fixed and mobile broadband · Popularize digital applications and services, especially e-government or e-commerce |
| Australia | • National Digital Economy Strategy (2011) | · e-health, e-education, smart grids, e-government, digital economy, digital media, etc. |
| Germany | • Industry 4.0 (2013) | · Cyber-physical systems · Internet of things · Cloud-computing |
| | • Digital strategy 2025 (2016) | · Digital sovereignty · Digital infrastructure · Data security |
| Russia | • National Technology Plan (2014) | · EnergyNet, FoodNet, SafeNet, HealthNet, AeroNet, MariNet, AutoNet, FinNet, and NeuroNet |
| South Korea | • Manufacture innovation 3.0 (2014) • Scheme of Manufacture innovation 3.0 (2015) | · Information technology + Manufacturing |
| India | • Digital India (2015) | · The creation of digital infrastructure · Delivery of services digitally · Digital literacy |
| China | • Internet Plus (2015) | · Information Communication Technology (ICT) · Integration of internet and other traditional industries |

Note: The order of nations is arranged according to the chronological appearance of the respective digital strategy.

Source: authors.

consequence, the US is more experienced in its ICT infrastructure² [Shen, 2016]; (b) There are different priorities in the digital economy strategies of different countries due to the varieties of their traditional industries. Countries tend to focus their strategies on their competitive industries. Germany stresses the dynamic combination of the internet industry and manufacturing. The UK focuses on cultural industries like music, games and media. Australia, however, exerts more effort in industries such as digital ad sales and services, while Japan places its priority on public administration.

Diversified as they are, the digital strategies of the aforementioned nations all share the following characteristics: (a) They value construction and investment in broadband infrastructure; (b) They aim to improve the internet penetration rate; (c) They place an emphasis on the internet industry dovetailing with other industries.

By comparing the digital economy strategies of different countries, we find that a number of them still restrict the definition to information and communication technology (ICT), including technological fields such as the internet, broadband and e-commerce, and fail to integrate it with most traditional fields. In order to build up smart homes, cities, countries and societies, the development of digital economy should involve not only digitalized entertainment and publishing industries, but also industrial fields that are expected to be digitalized, such as medical equipment, transportation and military equipment.

The G20 in the digital economy's governance

As already mentioned, the digital economy is a rather new topic for the G20. It is also a rather new topic for all global governance policymakers. Previously, digital governance had been discussed in the United Nations, at the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), at the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), etc. However, these discussions and follow-up activity were largely limited to internet governance specifically.

Digital economy issues were first on the G20's agenda at the 2015 Antalya Summit. At that summit, the G20 leaders all realized that we are in the age of the Internet economy, which brings about both opportunities and challenges to global growth. They also realized that ICT and its usage can possibly pose a threat to national security. At the 2016 G20 Hangzhou Summit, the member states discussed the roles the digital economy played in economic growth and innovation. This Summit issued the "Digital Economy Development and Cooperation Initiative," the first of its kind in the world, forming a strategy that accelerates the digital economy and inclusive growth [G20, 2016]. The digital economy was a very important topic during the German G20 presidency in 2016–2017 as well. In April 2017, the G20 held its first digital ministers meeting, resulting in the "G20 Digital Economy Ministerial Declaration." At the 2017

² Germany's average internet speed was 10.7 Mbps in the second quarter of 2015, and only 15% of its internet speeds exceeded 15 Mbps, whereas in America, 21% of internet speeds surpass 15 Mbps, and Japan 38%. Only 7% of German families have fiber-optic connections, whereas in America, the figure is 9% and in Japan – 73% [Shen, 2016].

G20 Hamburg Summit, the leaders promised to ensure that all their citizens would be digitally connected by 2025. They also promised to constructively engage in WTO discussions on e-commerce [G20, 2017b].

The Hangzhou Summit pointed out that the idea of innovative growth includes actions that support innovation, the “new industrial revolution” and the digital economy. In accordance with to the aforementioned Initiative, G20 members agree to the following principles for the stimulation of digital economic growth: (a) Innovation. ICT innovation and the accompanying innovation in economic activities are crucial to inclusive economic growth; (b) Partnership. G20 members make a concerted and work flexible efforts in the choice of issues concerning the digital economy. A closer partnership between G20 members is conducive to sharing knowledge and experience for further cooperation; (c) Inclusiveness. An inclusive and open business environment will facilitate economic growth, build up mutual trust and safeguard the flow of information [G20, 2016].

In the “G20 Digital Economy Ministerial Declaration”, the G20 Ministers responsible for the digital economy noted that the digital economy has become an increasingly important factor in promoting inclusive global growth and reaffirmed their commitment to create “a people-centered, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society,” enabling people to achieve sustainable development and improve the quality of their lives. The ministers also noted that the role of digital technology in the global economy remains largely unknown, and it may create challenges to inclusiveness, employment, etc. According to the document, special attention should be paid to the underrepresented and disadvantaged groups that still lack access to the Internet [G20, 2017a].

It should be noted that the significance of the digital economy within the G20 agenda has been increasing. In the Antalya 2015 G20 Leaders’ Communique, the word “digital” was used 2 times in one paragraph devoted to the Internet economy [G20, 2015]. In the Hangzhou 2016 G20 Leaders’ Communique, however, the word “digital” was used 12 times in several paragraphs of the document [G20, 2016]. The Hamburg 2017 G20 Leaders’ Declaration contained a section, “Harnessing Digitalization,” where the word “digital” was used 18 times [G20, 2017b]. This suggests that global governance with respect to the digital economy may become one of the priorities of the G20.

Thus, the G20 aims towards an inclusive, large and successful digital economy that contributes to sustainable development. Still, it should pay more attention to cooperation between technologically advanced countries and countries that lag behind, especially in Africa. Within the last three G20 summit outcome documents, while the word “digital” has been used increasingly often, digital issues were mentioned in the African context only once – in the Hamburg 2017 G20 Leaders’ Declaration, which launched the G20 Africa Partnership alongside related initiatives, such as #eSkills4Girls. This initiative is aimed at tackling gender digital divide and involving women in the digital economy [G20, 2017b].

The authors also recommend promoting voluntary options aimed at bringing about an inclusive and sustainable digital transformation. This recommendation may be realized in form of an action plan or a long-term voluntary cooperation framework that would complement the general principles of cooperation set in the “Digital Economy Development and Cooperation Initiative” and focus on developing countries that lag behind in the digital revolution. Also, special initiatives in the sphere of cyber security are needed, especially taking into account that cyberwarfare has been present at the G20 meetings. One more important issue is related to the model of global internet governance. The G20 should support greater participation among non-government actors, namely private actors and civil society.

The governance problems of the digital and internet economy have been brought up by many international organizations, such as the OECD, UN, World Bank, WTO and IMF. As mentioned at the beginning of this section, the G20, as a forum, is still not very experienced with them. However, it has several unique strengths which could allow it to become one of the leading forces in the governance of the global digital economy. Since the G20 Hangzhou Summit, the G20 has been at the center of global governance initiatives. It has the advantage of being a major, comprehensive governance platform, facilitating international, multilateral cooperation on the global level. It has become a leader in the production of soft law and in the generation and promotion of voluntary and informal instruments of global action, allowing it to contribute more and more to global governance.

In terms of developing the digital economy and fostering cooperation, the G20 has the following strong points. Firstly, the number of G20 member states is comparatively limited, enabling higher efficiency in decision-making. Secondly, the major G20 members, such as the United States, Japan, Germany and China, have achieved considerable success in developing a digital economy. Such success could facilitate international cooperation and build a foundation for international trust. The joint participation of developed and developing countries in the G20 promises to include digital economy development and cooperation in the organization’s agenda and helps to foster North-South cooperation to reduce imbalances in the digital economy. Moreover, the G20 is able to keep close contact with other international organizations, especially the United Nations.

Optimizing the Leadership?

The US as a Digital Superpower

The United States used to be the leading country in developing the digital economy. The digital information network was created in the United States. Between 1995 and 2000, the American Internet industry grew by a factor of 1.79x annually. Its sales revenues increased from \$301.4 billion in 1998 to \$523.9 billion in 1999, which, for the

first time in the history of the American economy, overtook the car industry and other traditional industries.

In 1992, the United States put forward the initiation of a “national information infrastructure plan”. One year later, the “information super-highway plan” was officially developed and implemented. From a macro perspective, they framed the digital information network technologies development. Afterwards, the Congress passed the “Telecommunications Act of 1996”, and the then President Clinton signed the “global e-commerce framework” in the following year. At the beginning of the new millennium, Clinton signed the “Electronic Signatures Act” with an electronic signature. This act ensures the Internet-based contracts and has the same legal effects as common on-paper signatures. This series of regulations and policies have created a highly favorable macro-economic environment for the Digital Economy. In 2000, Albert Gore, the former US Vice President, and William Daley, the former Secretary of Commerce, jointly declared the advent of an era of digital economy.

In the face of the gap between the US and other countries in Europe and Asia in the post-financial crisis era, the US should make its efforts to find proper ways to shoulder the international responsibility to help these countries by offering technical assistance, rather than turning a blind eye to the broadening gap. From the perspective of the US and other countries, G20 is a good way to lead the global economic governance in the new era which falls in line with the United States’ economic interest. As a new platform for global economic governance, G20 has a huge potential for development through continuous reform and improvement. Through the economic rise of G20 countries, the United States can put an end to the old international economic order, maintain the dollar hegemony, back up the liberalization of multilateral trade, and even boost its own political potency.

The roles of China and Russia

With its increasingly active involvement in the international arena, China is becoming the potential leader of the digital economy. Moreover, the share of the digital sector in the Chinese economy is comparable to that of the US. [Aptekman et al., 2017] The Chinese government has been intensifying its efforts towards international cooperation in digital economy policy. The G20 Hangzhou Summit in 2016 placed the issue of the digital economy high on his agenda, proposing “The G20 Digital Economy Development and Cooperation Initiative.”

To create conditions that are more favorable to the digital economy’s governance, China is realizing a series of ideas and policies, such as “Made in China 2025,” “Internet Plus,” “National IT Development Strategy,” “Big Data Strategy” and “Strategy of Internet Power.” These strategies aim to promote China’s digital development, informatization, as well as the integration of the digital economy and the real economy. As a result, it will bring about fundamental changes in core technology, enabling the digital and manufacturing industries to excel at the international level. In October 2016,

Chinese President Xi Jinping stressed the need to focus on the internet as an area for economic development, to focus on technology innovation, and to find competitive advantages related to the internet as a strategic policy initiative. In particular, there is the need, according to President Xi, to increase investment and strengthen the infrastructure of information technology so as to promote the integration of the digital and real economy. He also underlined the necessity of accelerating the digitalization of traditional industry, developing a smarter and stronger digital economy, and generating a new space for economic development.

Since the G20 Antalya Summit in 2015, China has sought to promote cooperation between countries around the globe in developing the digital economy. It has further called for cooperation to establish an international Internet strategy among different stakeholders at both the regional and global levels, and seek greater consensus to advance a digital economy based on ICT. Thus China already plays an important role in the development of the digital economy and has great potential to strengthen its positions in the nearest future.

In terms of comparative development, Russia is not a digital economy leader. The share of the digital economy in Russia's GDP is about 3.9 percent, which is 1/3 or 1/2 that of the leaders. Nonetheless, Russia's digital sector is burgeoning: in 2011–2015, it accounted for about 24 percent of total national GDP growth [Aptekman et al., 2017]. Russia has started to supply its population and businesses with digital services, it has established large digital companies and has begun a project to eliminate digital inequalities. Many national strategic documents prioritize digital economy development, including “The Concept of the Long-Term Social and Economic Development of Russia up to 2020,” “The Strategy of the Scientific and Technological Development,” the roadmaps of the National Technological Initiative, etc. Recently Russia has been working on the program “Digital Economy of Russia,” which will sufficiently improve the quality of life by 2025. Thus, Russia has a good starting platform and still has high potential to develop its digital economy; therefore its contribution to the global internet and digital economy governance will be of increasingly high importance.

Conclusion

It is widely acknowledged that we are now entering an age where the digital economy will be formalized through global governance. As a new driving force of economic globalization, the development of the digital economy poses both opportunities and challenges in pursuing future development. If the world fails to take proper measures, the digital gap between developed and developing countries will only become broader, and cyber-threats will pose greater and greater risks to the resilience of the global economy. The ensuing uncertainties and disorder will escalate the tensions of uneven development and ultimately lead to economic stagnation.

The G20, as a venue for top-level international dialogue and the co-ordination of policy-making, lacks experience addressing global Internet issues and digital economy-

related governance. Nevertheless, it has a number of advantages and opportunities that could allow it to take the lead in this sphere. It has a limited number of members and at the same time represents most of the global economy. It is a leader in terms of soft power in global governance. Some of the G20 members, like the US, Germany and Japan, have already distinguished themselves through their tremendous achievements in the digital economy. The active participation of these countries in global cooperation could contribute to the progress of less experienced countries and enhance North-South cooperation. The G20 has recently started to realize its potential and has embarked on addressing the digital transformation issues.

In order to avoid the risks associated with uneven development and broaden the gap between developed and developing countries, the G20 should position itself properly and actively; in particular, it must let members coordinate their digital economy strategies, so as to optimize its functions as a hub of global governance. The authors conclude that the G20 should do more to cooperate with Africa and other technologically poor countries in the digital context. It should also promote voluntary cooperation principles with a focus on developing countries. Another recommendation is to launch initiatives in the sphere of cyber security. Finally, the G20 should emphasize a stronger involvement of the non-government sector (private actors and civil society) in global Internet governance.

References

- Aptekman A., Kalabin V., Klintsov V., Kusnetsova E., Kulagin V., Yasenovits I. (2017) *Digital Russia: a New Reality*, McKinsey. Available at: <http://www.mckinsey.com/~media/McKinsey/Locations/Europe%20and%20Middle%20East/Russia/Our%20Insights/Digital%20Russia/Digital-Russia-report.ashx> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- Aras G., Crowther D. (2016) *Global Perspectives on Corporate Governance and CSR*. Routledge.
- Bell D. (1974) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. London: Heinemann; Originally Published, New York: Basic Books.
- Florini A., Sovacool B. (2009) Who Governs Energy? The Challenges Facing Global Energy Governance. *Energy Policy*, vol. 37, pp. 5239–5248.
- G20 (2015) G20 Leaders' Communiqué: Antalya Summit: University of Toronto. Available at: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2015/151116-communicue.html> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- G20 (2016) G20 Digital Economy Development and Cooperation Initiative. Available at: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000185874.pdf> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- G20 (2016) G20 Leaders' Communiqué: Hangzhou Summit: University of Toronto. Available at: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2016/160905-communicue.html> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- G20 (2017a) G20 Digital Economy Ministerial Conference, 6–7 April 2017. Available at: http://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Downloads/G/g20-digital-economy-ministerial-declaration-english-version.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=1 (accessed 23 July 2017).
- G20 (2017b) G20 Leaders' Declaration: Shaping an Interconnected World: University of Toronto. Available at: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2017/2017-G20-leaders-declaration.html> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- Gaspareniene L., Remeikiene R., Navickas V. (2016) The Concept of Digital Shadow Economy: Consumer's Attitude. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, no 39, pp. 502–509.

- He X. (2013) Shuzi Jingji Fazhan Qushiji Woguo de Zhanlve Xuanze [The Development Trend of Digital Economy and the Strategic Choice of China]. *Zhong Wai Qiye*, pp. 41–42. (In Chinese.)
- Karabarbounis L., Neiman B. (2013) *The Global Decline of the Labor Share*. NBER Working Paper, no 19136. Available at: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w19136> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- Knickrehm M., Berthon B., Daugherty P. (2016) *Digital Disruption: The Growth Multiplier*, Accenture. Available at: https://www.accenture.com/_acnmedia/PDF-4/Accenture-Strategy-Digital-Disruption-Growth-Multiplier.pdf (accessed 23 July 2017).
- Lanshina T., Barinova V. (2017) The Global Governance of Renewable Energy: International Trends and Russia. *International Organizations Research Journal*, vol. 12, no 1, pp. 110–126. DOI: 10.17323/1996-7845-2017-01-110.
- Liu Z. (2001) Meiguo Shuzi Jingji Fazhan de Dongyinji Qishi [The Motive and Inspiration of Digital Economy Development of United States]. *Keji Qingbao Kaifayu Jingji*. (In Chinese.)
- Mesenbourg T.L. (2001) *Measuring the Digital Economy*. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Available at: <http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2001/econ/digitalecon.pdf> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- Muylle S., Vijverman E. (2013) Online Jobs Boosting Europe’s Competitiveness. Available at: https://www.iabeurope.eu/files/6713/6990/7349/IAB_Europe_study_-_Online_Jobs_Boosting_Europe_s_Competitiveness_-_Vlerick_Business_School.pdf (accessed 23 July 2017).
- Narlikar A. (2014) Unintended Consequences: The G20 and Global Governance. *Caribbean Journal of International Relations & Diplomacy*, vol. 2, no 3, pp. 61–71.
- OECD (2014) *Measuring the Digital Economy. A New Perspective*. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/341889/725159/OECD+Manual+Measuring+the+Digital+Economy/6418c566-4074-4461-9186-9ad509bc4a4d> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- OECD (2016a) *New Markets and New Jobs in the Digital Economy*. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/inter-net/ministerial/meeting/New-Markets-and-New-Jobs-discussion-paper.pdf> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- OECD (2016b) *Skills for a Digital World*. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/els/emp/Skills-for-a-Digital-World.pdf> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- Ozkan G. (2011) The Global Governance Reform and the Role of the G-20 in Recovery from the Global Crisis. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 24, pp. 159–166.
- Remmin (2015) The Internet Attaches New Meanings to ‘The Belt and Road Initiative’, 08 December. Available at: http://intl.ce.cn/sjjj/qy/201512/18/t20151218_7652067.shtml (accessed 23 July 2017). (In Chinese.)
- Shen Z. (2016) Deguo Chuzhaowei Shuzi Jingji ‘Tisu’ [Measures proposed by Germany to speed up Digital Economy]. *Jingji Cankao Bao*. (In Chinese.)
- Tapscott D. (1997) *The Digital Economy: Promise and Peril In The Age of Networked Intelligence*. McGraw Hill.
- Trinkunas H., Wallace I. (2015) Converging on the Future of Global Internet Governance. The United States and Brazil, Foreign Policy at Brookings. Available at: <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/USBrazil-Global-Internet-Governance-web-final.pdf> (accessed 23 July 2017).
- Yudina T.N. (2016) Cong Shuzi Jingji Shijiao Jiedu Ouya Jingji Lianmengyu ‘Yidai Yilu’ Duijie [Understanding the connectivity of Eurasian Economic Union and ‘One Belt One Road’]. *Dongbeiyi Xuekan*, no 5, pp. 20–24. (In Chinese.)

Роль «Группы двадцати» в глобальном управлении цифровой экономикой¹

Ш. Го, В. Дин, Т. Ланьшина

Го Шуюн – профессор, декан факультета международных отношений и связей с общественностью (SIRPA) Шанхайского университета иностранных языков (SISU); 550 Dalian Road (W), Shanghai 200083, China; E-mail: syguo@shisu.edu.cn

Дин Вэйхан – аспирант факультета международных отношений и связей с общественностью (SIRPA) Шанхайского университета иностранных языков (SISU); 550 Dalian Road (W), Shanghai 200083, China; E-mail: dwh1010@foxmail.com

Ланьшина Татьяна – научный сотрудник Центра экономического моделирования энергетики и экологии ИПЭИ РАНХиГС; научный сотрудник Центра отраслевых исследований ИСКРАН; Российская Федерация, 119571, Москва, просп. Вернадского, д. 82, стр. 1; E-mail: lanshina@ganepa.ru

В последние десятилетия в мире наблюдалась стремительная цифровизация, которая привела к важным, а иногда и решающим изменениям в бизнесе, обществе и экономике. После глобального финансово-экономического кризиса 2008–2009 гг. информационные технологии и прочие близкие к ним отрасли были наиболее динамичными и перспективными в мировой экономике. Тем не менее миру по-прежнему не хватает равновесия между преимуществами и рисками цифровизации, что объясняет необходимость развития инструментов глобального управления в этой сфере.

В статье анализируется роль и возможности «Группы двадцати» в сфере глобального управления цифровой экономикой. Авторы рассматривают определения цифровой экономики и ключевые характеристики этого сектора, освещают проблемы международного сотрудничества, анализируют цифровые стратегии стран и участие «Группы двадцати» в управлении глобальной цифровой экономикой, потенциал Китая и России в этой сфере и дают рекомендации, касающиеся участия «Группы двадцати» в глобальном управлении цифровой экономикой.

Авторы приходят к следующим выводам. Во-первых, международному сообществу следует стремиться к устранению диспропорций между развитыми и развивающимися странами в цифровом секторе, к укреплению кибербезопасности и отражению прочих угроз. Во-вторых, «Группа двадцати» имеет очень ограниченный опыт в области управления цифровой экономикой, но как лидер «мягкой силы» и как организация с ограниченным членством, которая включает и страны с развитым цифровым сектором, и страны, которые отстают, она может играть большую роль в глобальном управлении цифровой экономикой. В-третьих, США исторически лидируют в секторе информационных технологий и в сфере цифровой экономики. В последние годы Китай значительно улучшил свои позиции, что позволяет ему претендовать на более высокую роль в глобальном управлении. Россия может также играть большую (хотя и не ведущую) роль, учитывая ее опыт и потенциал.

Авторы делают вывод о том, что «Группа двадцати» должна: (1) уделять больше внимания сотрудничеству со странами Африки; (2) продвигать инструменты добровольного сотрудничества, прежде всего с развивающимися странами; (3) работать над улучшением международной кибербезопасности и (4) чаще привлекать негосударственный сектор к процессу управления Интернетом. Кроме того, «Группа двадцати» должна позиционировать себя должным образом и проявлять активность, чтобы оптимизировать свои функции в качестве центра глобального управления цифровой экономикой.

Ключевые слова: цифровая экономика; глобальное управление; «Группа двадцати»; БРИКС

Для цитирования: Го Ш., Дин В., Ланьшина Т. Роль «Группы двадцати» в глобальном управлении цифровой экономикой // Вестник международных организаций. 2017. Т. 12. № 4. С. 169–184. DOI: 10.17323/1996-7845-2017-04-169

¹ Статья поступила в редакцию в ноябре 2016 г.

Источники

- Aptekman A., Kalabin V., Klintsov, V. Kusnetsova E., Kulagin V., Yasenovits I. (2017) Digital Russia: a New Reality, McKinsey. Режим доступа: <http://www.mckinsey.com/~media/McKinsey/Locations/Europe%20and%20Middle%20East/Russia/Our%20Insights/Digital%20Russia/Digital-Russia-report.ashx> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- Aras G., Crowther D. (2016) *Global Perspectives on Corporate Governance and CSR*. Routledge.
- Bell D. (1974) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. L.: Heinemann; Originally Published, New York: Basic Books.
- Florini A., Sovacool B. (2009) Who Governs Energy? The Challenges Facing Global Energy Governance // *Energy Policy*. Vol. 37. P. 5239–5248.
- G20 (2015) G20 Leaders' Communiqué: Antalya Summit: University of Toronto. Режим доступа: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2015/151116-communicue.html> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- G20 (2016) G20 Digital Economy Development and Cooperation Initiative. Режим доступа: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000185874.pdf> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- G20 (2016) G20 Leaders' Communiqué: Hangzhou Summit: University of Toronto. Режим доступа: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2016/160905-communicue.html> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- G20 (2017a) G20 Digital Economy Ministerial Conference, 6–7 April 2017. Режим доступа: http://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Downloads/G/g20-digital-economy-ministerial-declaration-english-version.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=1 (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- G20 (2017b) G20 Leaders' Declaration: Shaping an Interconnected World: University of Toronto. Режим доступа: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2017/2017-G20-leaders-declaration.html> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- Gaspareniene L., Remeikiene R., Navickas V. (2016) The Concept of Digital Shadow Economy: Consumer's Attitude // *Procedia Economics and Finance*. No. 39. P. 502–509.
- He X. (2013) Shuzi Jingji Fazhan Qushiji Woguo de Zhanlve Xuanze [The Development Trend of Digital Economy and the Strategic Choice of China] // *Zhong Wai Qiye*. P. 41–42. (In Chinese.)
- Karabarounis L., Neiman B. (2013) The Global Decline of the Labor Share: NBER Working Paper No. 19136. Режим доступа: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w19136> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- Knickrehm M., Berthon B., Daugherty P. (2016) Digital Disruption: The Growth Multiplier, Accenture. Режим доступа: https://www.accenture.com/_acnmedia/PDF-4/Accenture-Strategy-Digital-Disruption-Growth-Multiplier.pdf (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- Lanshina T., Barinova V. (2017) The Global Governance of Renewable Energy: International Trends and Russia // *International Organizations Research Journal*. Vol. 12. No. 1. P. 110–126. DOI: 10.17323/1996-7845-2017-01-110.
- Liu Z. (2001) Meiguo Shuzi Jingji Fazhan de Dongyinjhi Qishi [The Motive and Inspiration of Digital Economy Development of United States]. *Keji Qingbao Kaifayu Jingji*. (In Chinese.)
- Mesenbourg T.L. (2001) Measuring the Digital Economy. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Режим доступа: <http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2001/econ/digitalecon.pdf> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- Muyll S., Vijverman E. (2013) Online Jobs Boosting Europe's Competitiveness. Режим доступа: https://www.iabeurope.eu/files/6713/6990/7349/IAB_Europe_study_-_Online_Jobs_Boosting_Europe_s_Competitiveness_-_Vlerick_Business_School.pdf (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- Narlikar A. (2014) Unintended Consequences: The G20 and Global Governance // *Caribbean Journal of International Relations & Diplomacy*. Vol. 2. No. 3. P. 61–71.
- OECD (2014) Measuring the Digital Economy. A New Perspective. Режим доступа: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/341889/725159/OECD+Manual+Measuring+the+Digital+Economy/6418c566-4074-4461-9186-9ad509bc4a4d> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).

- OECD (2016a) *New Markets and New Jobs in the Digital Economy*. Режим доступа: <https://www.oecd.org/internet/ministerial/meeting/New-Markets-and-New-Jobs-discussion-paper.pdf> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- OECD (2016b) *Skills for a Digital World*. Режим доступа: <https://www.oecd.org/els/emp/Skills-for-a-Digital-World.pdf> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- Ozkan G. (2011) *The Global Governance Reform and the Role of the G-20 in Recovery from the Global Crisis* // *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 24. P. 159–166.
- Remmin (2015) *The Internet Attaches New Meanings to ‘The Belt and Road Initiative’*, 08 December. Режим доступа: http://intl.ce.cn/sjij/qy/201512/18/t20151218_7652067.shtml (дата обращения: 23.07.2017). (In Chinese.)
- Shen Z. (2016) *Deguo Chuzhaowei Shuzi Jingji ‘Tisu’* [Measures proposed by Germany to speed up Digital Economy]. *Jingji Cankao Bao*. (In Chinese.)
- Tapscott D. (1997) *The Digital Economy: Promise and Peril In The Age of Networked Intelligence*. McGraw Hill.
- Trinkunas H., Wallace I. (2015) *Converging on the Future of Global Internet Governance. The United States and Brazil*, Foreign Policy at Brookings. Режим доступа: <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/USBrazil-Global-Internet-Governance-web-final.pdf> (дата обращения: 23.07.2017).
- Yudina T.N. (2016) *Cong Shuzi Jingji Shijiao Jiedu Ouya Jingji Lianmengyu ‘YidaiYilu’ Duijie* [Understanding the connectivity of Eurasian Economic Union and ‘One Belt One Road’]. *Dongbeiya Xuekan*. No. 5. P. 20–24. (In Chinese.)