

State policy for supporting beef cattle farming in the Republic of Kazakhstan: Mechanisms of subsidisation and concessional lending using Abai region as an example

Kuanysh Suleimenov*

Student

Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan
010000, 33-A Abai Ave., Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0211-4823>

Abstract. This study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of state policies supporting beef cattle farming in Kazakhstan by analysing the interaction between subsidies and concessional lending at a regional level. A combination of institutional, comparative and empirical-statistical analysis was employed to interpret the dynamics of production indicators, investment activity and budgetary parameters over time. It was found that the institutional configuration of state support has become multi-level, with a formal division of powers between central and regional authorities. The financing structure in the Abai region was found to be characterised by the predominance of financial instruments (KZT 7.8 billion) over direct forms of support (KZT 4.8 billion), indicating a policy shift towards stimulating investment activity. An empirical analysis of livestock numbers and production structure revealed a preference for an extensive development model, evidenced by the quicker growth in livestock numbers (with cattle numbers rising by 2.4%) compared to output growth (with meat production rising by 2.7%). However, access to credit remains uneven as collateral requirements limit the participation of small producers in financing programmes. This contributes to the strengthening of structural differentiation within the sector: agricultural holdings account for 55% of meat production, while households account for only 15%. Generalising the obtained results showed that state policy effectiveness is determined not only by financing volume, but also by support instrument coherence, institutional integration level, and accessibility to different producer categories. The practical significance of the results lies in their potential use in revising access criteria for small producers in subsidy programmes, including lowering project capacity requirements, and in adjusting budget planning in the agricultural sector by synchronising payments with production cycles

Keywords: budget transfers; deferred obligations; extensive model; investment projects; cluster model; digitalisation of the agricultural sector

Introduction

This study was conducted to assess the effectiveness of state policy in supporting beef cattle farming in the Republic of Kazakhstan, particularly in combining subsidy- and credit-based support mechanisms. Despite increased public expenditure on the agro-industrial complex and financing of subsidy programmes, production performance in the sector remains uneven, and access to financial instruments is characterised by

pronounced regional disparities (Siximbayeva *et al.*, 2025). The Abai region is representative for analysing state policy in the livestock sector as it accounts for around 8% of the national total output of livestock products and the share of livestock farming in the region's gross output exceeds 55%, indicating specialisation and pasture potential (Kazhieva *et al.*, 2024). A. Yesbolova *et al.* (2025) established that small farms have

Suggested Citation: Suleimenov, K. (2026). State policy for supporting beef cattle farming in the Republic of Kazakhstan: Mechanisms of subsidisation and concessional lending using Abai region as an example. *Bulletin of the Kyrgyz National Agrarian University*, 24(2), 74-87 doi: 10.63621/bknau./2.2026.74.

*Corresponding author (KSuleimenov@outlook.com)



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

limited access to credit resources due to their collateral base being so small. Meanwhile, 4.4 million tonnes of milk out of a total of 6.4 million tonnes are produced by private subsidiary farms. The authors also found that large agricultural enterprises received the majority of subsidies and concessional loans, with milk production increasing by 36.8% over five years. This intensified the structural asymmetry of the agricultural sector and uneven regional development. P. Shevchenko *et al.* (2024) demonstrated that using imported breeding lines results in higher productivity, with an average live weight of 518 kg – 19% higher than the breed standard – compared to local genotypes. However, the feasibility of implementing these innovations is contingent upon access to subsidised lending for the purchase of breeding animals and breeding services.

Kazakhstan's production systems remain highly dependent on pasture resources, while intensification is constrained by a shortage of arable land and limited access to financial support instruments, as argued in the work of S. Robinson & M. Petrick (2024). Based on a survey of 250 farms, the authors established that only 32.8% of respondents have access exclusively to rural pastures, 12.4% hold two 49-year state lease agreements, a 1% increase in access to arable land raises the self-production of concentrated feed by 5.2%, and credit-constrained farmers are 43% more likely to use mobile grazing and move their livestock 28 km further. B.R. Hankerson (2025) showed that only about 50% of Kazakhstan's suitable pasture lands are used in the production process, which indicates a reserve for the extensive expansion of the sector. At the same time, the author identified a link between grazing intensity and the degradation of land resources, emphasising the need to integrate environmental criteria into state subsidy mechanisms. The institutional dimension of the issue is examined in a study by J. Yin & J. Guo (2026). It was found that technological backwardness, infrastructural constraints and an unstable regulatory environment all contribute to the ineffectiveness of agricultural policy. Climate risks, together with imperfect financial instruments, increase production instability and limit investment activity. R. Yegemberdiyev *et al.* (2024) found that beef cattle farming competitiveness requires subsidies to be integrated with long-term credit instruments, as imports exceed exports by USD 292.3 million despite production increasing by 57% between 2018 and 2022. The authors emphasised that structural modernisation depends on coherent budgetary support, investment policy and export strategy.

G. Mussina *et al.* (2025) proved, based on a survey of farmers from 2020 to 2024, that entrepreneurial activity is only possible for individuals with a risk-aversion coefficient $rr(w) \leq 2$ in the absence of subsidies. However, subsidies of KZT 30,000 per head of cattle and KZT 4,500 per centner of milk enable farmers with $rr(w)$ up to 4 to participate. At the same time, the region's crop production has a relative economic advantage over

livestock farming. This means that beef cattle farming can only develop through state subsidies. Building on this, S. Wang *et al.* (2026) surveyed 420 farmers and demonstrated that risk-tolerant farmers implement environmentally sustainable practices with a coefficient of 0.101 and $p < 0.01$. Furthermore, multidimensional contextual factors – such as internal attitudes, resource potential and social legitimacy – reinforce the positive impact of risk preferences on the intention to switch to organic production. An analysis of agricultural production in Kazakhstan from 2017 to 2024, conducted by S. Sarbassova *et al.* (2025), confirmed the positive impact of subsidies on production dynamics. KZT 1 billion in subsidies generates an additional KZT 17.49 billion in output ($p = 0.0085$). However, the study also revealed a dependence on climatic factors, with production falling to KZT 7,576.5 billion in 2023 after peaking at KZT 9,481.2 billion. Meanwhile, access to credit resources was found to have a statistically insignificant effect, with a coefficient of -1.06 and $p = 0.6874$. This indicates the need for improved monitoring of state programmes. E. Bukin *et al.* (2025) proved that transferring pastures into private use leads to their intensified use and the degradation of vegetation cover, creating additional risks for producers who rely on subsidy support. The negative effects of privatisation were stronger for individual farmers, with a decline in the normalised difference vegetation index of 1.4-1.9%, than for agricultural enterprises. Spillover effects on neighbouring, non-privatised plots worsened vegetation conditions by a further 1.3-1.8%.

However, existing studies have not examined budget execution and the structure of livestock numbers at the regional level simultaneously. This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of state policy in supporting beef cattle farming in the Republic of Kazakhstan by analysing the interaction between subsidy mechanisms and concessional lending, using the Abai region as a case study. To achieve this, the following objectives were addressed: establishing the institutional structure and functional features of state support instruments, assessing their impact on investment activity and production indicators in the sector, and identifying structural constraints and imbalances affecting the effectiveness of agricultural policy implementation.

Materials and Methods

The study covered the period from 2014 to 2025 to analyse the transformation of state support mechanisms for livestock farming, changes in the institutional architecture of Kazakhstan's agricultural policy and current empirical data and budgetary parameters of medium-term planning for 2026-2028. The spatial focus was limited to the Republic of Kazakhstan, with Abai region being examined in detail as a representative case of the regional implementation of state support instruments. The region was chosen because its pasture farming structure corresponded to national average indicators, subsidy

programmes were available, and investment projects were being implemented in beef livestock farming. The research methodology combined legal and regulatory analysis with elements of institutional modelling, legal systematisation and content analysis of regulatory acts. This approach enabled the identification of subsidy allocation mechanisms, the functional links between state institutions, and the structure of support instruments for the agricultural sector. The material basis consisted of regulatory acts concerning subsidy policy and support for livestock farming: These included the Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 3-2/615 (2014), the Order of the Acting Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 317 (2018), the Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 108 (2019) and the Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 107 (2020). The analysis aimed to assess the mechanisms of investment subsidisation, support for breeding, lending and processing development.

To evaluate the financial stability of the state support system, the method of comparing planned and actual budget execution indicators was employed. The analysis examined the volumes of subsidy financing, the level of budgetary debt and the existence of deferred state obligations to agricultural producers. Data from the Atameken National Chamber of Entrepreneurs (The outstanding subsidy..., 2026) and international analytical materials from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) (2023) were used as sources. A functional and comparative analysis of macro-credit and microcredit programmes was used to study credit instruments. This covered loan terms, interest rates, collateral requirements and interest-rate compensation mechanisms for different producer categories, based on the budget lending programme (Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 322, 2023) and interest-rate subsidy mechanisms for loans and leasing operations (Order of the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan – Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 436, 2018).

Budget policy dynamics were analysed using a macroeconomic approach, incorporating official statistical and forecast indicators from the Kazinform International News Agency (Nurmaganbetova, 2025), Agrosearch (Around 2 trillion..., 2026) and the World Bank (Trading Economics, n.d.). This included total public expenditure, agribusiness allocation volumes, and the proportion of transfers and subsidies within expenditure structures. The analysis period covered 2023-2028, enabling the combination of actual data with medium-term budget planning forecasts. The methodology for analysing regional development programmes was based on a case-study approach, with Abai region serving as the analytical unit. Materials used included official reports on the implementation of development programmes from Baibolsyn.kz (A sheep farming..., 2026) and Kazakhstan's

Agribusiness (50 billion tenge..., 2026). The analysis assessed the sectoral specialisation of the region, the scale of financing, the development of infrastructure facilities, and the integration of production and processing components within agro-industrial chains. The empirical study of livestock development was based on descriptive statistical analysis of secondary data without econometric modelling. Sources included ElDala.kz (Breeding cattle numbers..., 2026), Qazinform (Mergalym, 2026) and FAO (2023). Structural analysis was applied to evaluate changes in livestock numbers and meat production. The study covered cattle, small ruminant and horse numbers, meat production and investment in fixed capital in the agro-industrial complex. Investment activity was analysed through a comparative dynamic comparison, examining the relationship between state support and investment volumes without providing a quantitative assessment of its strength.

A comparative analysis of livestock development models was carried out using typologisation, based on materials from the United States Department of Agriculture Foreign Agricultural Service (2022), the Agrarian Credit Corporation JSC (n.d.), OECD & FAO (2023). The intensive, extensive and cluster-based development models were compared according to the following criteria: productivity; production structure; investment; institutional support; and chain integration. At the same time, constraints relating to personnel, technology, biosecurity and digitalisation were considered as contextual factors that indirectly affect the effectiveness of state support instruments, rather than being evaluated directly in terms of the effectiveness of subsidy and credit policy. The study's limitations are related to the absence of micro-level data on individual farms, the inability to verify budget data at the level of individual payments, and the limited comparability of regional statistical indicators with those of other Kazakhstani regions.

Results

State policy for supporting beef cattle farming in the Republic of Kazakhstan

This policy is implemented through a multi-level governance system. At the national level, the rules for subsidisation, lending and budgetary parameters are defined, and at the regional level, these are put into practice in accordance with territorial specialisation. In the Abai region, this involves adapting support mechanisms to the pasture-based farming model and the structure of livestock production. This division of functions corresponds to the "policy design-policy delivery" model, which is typical of countries with territorially differentiated agricultural production (López-García *et al.*, 2024). In 2025, the total volume of state support for the agricultural sector in the Abai region was KZT 15.1 billion. Of this, KZT 7.8 billion was allocated to financial instruments, KZT 4.8 billion to livestock support and KZT 2.5 billion to crop production (The

agricultural sector..., 2025). Thus, lending mechanisms and interest-rate compensation prevailed in the regional financing structure, corresponding to the general trend of Kazakhstan's agricultural policy shifting towards investment-based support instruments (Gebeyehu & Bedemo, 2024). At the same time, however, signs of budgetary instability were recorded in the region. Subsidy arrears owed to agricultural producers in the region for 2024-2025 reached KZT 2 billion (The outstanding subsidy..., 2026). This indicates a mismatch between the approved volumes of support and the actual capacity of budget financing. In international practice, irregularity in subsidy payments is regarded as a factor that reduces the predictability of investment activity among agricultural producers (FAO, 2023).

One of the support instruments at the national level is Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 322 (2023), which allows local executive bodies to borrow from the budget for up to 10 years at an annual interest rate of 1%. This programme is intended for large-scale investment projects, including dairy farms with a minimum of 400 head of cattle, feedlots with a minimum of 5,000 head of cattle, meat-processing enterprises, greenhouse complexes and irrigation facilities. Meanwhile, Kazakhstan operates the "Auyl Amanaty" microcredit programme, which supports small-scale farming. For livestock farming, the programme provides loans of up to 2,500 monthly calculation index (MCI) for a term of up to seven years at an interest rate of up to 2.5% (Kazakhstan stimulates

agricultural..., 2025). Unlike macro-lending, this programme supports private subsidiary farms, cooperatives and the self-employed. However, access to financial instruments in Kazakhstan remains uneven. Large agricultural enterprises have advantages due to their access to collateral and ability to develop investment projects. In contrast, small producers are hindered by the requirements relating to formalising their activities and joining cooperatives. In the Abai region, this is reflected in the concentration of large investment projects around the regional programme for forming a meat cluster, combining state support with infrastructure and processing development (Implementation of the President's instructions..., 2026).

In 2025, the full volume of state support allocated to the Abai region, amounting to KZT 15.1 billion, was utilised (15.1 billion tenge..., 2025). At the same time, a programme to develop sheep farming in the region from 2026 to 2030 was approved, with KZT 50 billion of financing from the national budget. The programme envisaged the implementation of nine investment projects in the agro-industrial complex, with a total value of KZT 23.1 billion. The expected investment volume in the sector is projected to rise to KZT 78.2 billion (50 billion tenge..., 2026). While these indicators characterise the Abai region specifically, the nationwide trend lies in the expansion of state budgetary participation in Kazakhstan's agricultural sector. In this context, systematising the regulatory legal acts presented in Table 1 makes it possible to identify the main state support mechanisms and record their structural limitations at the regional level.

Table 1. Systematisation of regulatory and legal mechanisms for subsidising Kazakhstan's agro-industrial complex and their institutional characteristics

Regulatory legal act	Functional area	Implementation mechanism	Limitations of application
Order of the Acting Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 317 (2018)	Investment subsidies	Partial reimbursement of capital expenditure on the creation and modernisation of facilities: farms, processing, infrastructure	Forms the long-term investment base of the sector; however, due to requirements concerning the minimum capacity of projects, it is in practice oriented towards large agricultural formations, which limits the participation of small producers
Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 108 (2019)	Breeding livestock farming	Compensation of expenses for the purchase of breeding animals, breeding services, and artificial insemination	Ensures the genetic modernisation of the sector, but under the conditions of Abai region, the low share of breeding stock reduces the multiplier effect of the instrument
Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 3-2/615 (2014)	Processing of agricultural products	Reimbursement of expenses incurred by processing enterprises for the purchase of raw materials	Institutionally aimed at developing added value; however, actual financing of this area in the region remains minimal, indicating a gap in the "production-processing" chain
Order of the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan – Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 436 (2018)	Lending and leasing	Subsidisation of part of the interest rate on loans and leasing operations	The most system-forming mechanism, ensuring the attraction of private capital; in 2025, it accumulated the main share of financial support resources
Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 107 (2020)	Crop production: feed base	Compensation of expenses for seeds, fertilisers, and plant protection products	Has an indirect impact on beef cattle farming through the formation of the feed base, but the volume of financing does not correspond to the needs of intensive development of the sector

Note: Ministry of Agriculture refers to the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Source: compiled by the author

The analysis revealed that the regulatory system is fragmented, with each instrument functioning autonomously and lacking an integrated coordination framework. This makes it difficult to achieve synergy between the stages of agricultural production. In particular, support for primary production, such as livestock farming, is not accompanied by sufficient incentives for processing. This is evident from the low proportion of financing allocated to this area within the regional expenditure structure. A defining feature of the institutional model is the prevalence of compensatory mechanisms. While reimbursement of expenses already incurred reduces the risk of budgetary funds being misused, it creates an entry barrier for small farms that do not have sufficient working capital. This partly explains why access to investment subsidies is concentrated among large agricultural formations. Institutional weakness is reflected in the insufficient integration of the vertical value chain.

Of the analysed documents, four out of five provide for mechanisms of partial reimbursement of expenses. However, only Order of the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan – Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 436 (2018) and signed by the Deputy Prime Minister, focuses on subsidising interest rates on loans and leasing. The main target groups for support are medium and large-scale agricultural enterprises, as Order of the Acting Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 317 (2018) establishes minimum capacity parameters for investment projects to qualify for compensation for capital expenditure. Lending mechanisms, however, require collateral. Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 108 (2019) is aimed at farms engaged in breeding livestock; however, the effectiveness of this instrument in the Abai region is limited by the low proportion of breeding stock in the herd. The analysis also revealed an imbalance in support for production versus processing. For example, Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 3-2/615 (2014) formally provides for the compensation of processing enterprises' expenses for raw material purchases, yet actual financing in this area remains minimal compared to lending programmes and investment subsidies. Meanwhile, Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 107 (2020) has only an indirect impact on beef cattle farming since it aims to support the feed base by compensating for expenses incurred in the purchase of seeds, fertilisers and plant protection products. Overall, it can be concluded that the regulatory system supporting Kazakhstan's agro-industrial complex primarily focuses on stimulating capital investment and lending activity. However, mechanisms for integrating production, processing and sales remain underdeveloped.

The dynamics of state support for the complex in the period 2026-2028 are characterised by an increase in national-level budgetary expenditure. According to

official government forecasts, total public expenditure is expected to rise from KZT 27.7 trillion in 2026 to KZT 29.8 trillion in 2028 (Nurmaganbetova, 2025). Approximately KZT 2 trillion is earmarked for supporting agribusiness within Kazakhstan's agricultural policy for 2026-2028, primarily through concessional lending and financial intermediation mechanisms (Around 2 trillion..., 2026). According to the World Bank, transfers and subsidies accounted for over 69% of public expenditure in 2023, indicating the significant role of budgetary financing in state economic policy (Trading Economics, n.d.). Consequently, there is a clear shift in emphasis at the national level from direct subsidisation towards financial support instruments.

At the national level, the financing structure of Kazakhstan's agro-industrial complex is dominated by credit mechanisms, but the distribution of funds between individual sectors remains uneven. For example, KZT 44 billion was allocated in 2025 to support the processing of agro-industrial products, accounting for just 4.4% of the KZT 1 trillion total state support for the agro-industrial complex (Baiterek National Holding..., 2025). This indicates a concentration of resources in primary production and financial stimulation, with the processing segment receiving a smaller share of financing. The article did not apply correlation or regression models, meaning the presented data can record structural ratios and trends, but cannot prove the direct causal impact of individual support instruments on production outcomes.

The Abai region is characterised by a distinct regional configuration of state support. New and regionally adapted programmes for the development of beef cattle farming are being formed in Abai region in the context of the broader transformation of Kazakhstan's agricultural policy, which is gradually shifting from universal support instruments to territorially differentiated models. This transformation is driven by the need to consider the natural resource specialisation of regions, which is particularly relevant in the east of the country, where pasture resources, livestock farming traditions and the potential for export-oriented production are combined (Tkacheva *et al.*, 2024). In 2025, the region fully utilised the allocated financing volume of KZT 15.1 billion (15.1 billion tenge..., 2025). At the same time, KZT 50 billion in budgetary funds was approved for the development of sheep farming in the region for 2026-2030. In 2025, the implementation of nine investment projects in the agro-industrial complex with a total value of KZT 23.1 billion was planned (50 billion tenge..., 2026).

Unlike national programmes, which have universal support mechanisms, the regional initiatives of the Abai region are sectorally and territorially specialised. The regional "Igilik" programme focuses on developing sheep farming and renewing the genetics of livestock (A sheep farming..., 2026). As part of the sheep farming development programme for 2026-2030, the aim is to

increase the number of sheep from 1.2 million to 2.3 million (50 billion tenge..., 2026). These figures specifically characterise the target parameters of the Abai region's regional programme, rather than the nationwide dynamics of livestock farming in Kazakhstan. Here, state support is combined with the region's territorial specialisation, whereby some agricultural land is used as pasture. Another area of regional policy is the development of processing infrastructure. In the Zhanasemey District, a project for a meat-processing complex with an annual production capacity of 11.4 thousand tonnes and a total investment volume of KZT 7.7 billion is underway (Serdalina, 2025). The project also provides for the formation of feedlots with a capacity of up to 40 thousand head of livestock. These data characterise a local investment project in the Abai region and cannot be extrapolated to the entire Kazakhstani agricultural sector. Nevertheless, they demonstrate that regional policy is oriented towards integrating production and processing within individual territorial clusters.

A comparison of national and regional programmes reveals differences in their functional purpose. At the national level, the main emphasis is on financial stimulation through subsidies and loans, whereas in the Abai region, support is supplemented by specific investment projects and production specialisation. The "Igilik" programme for developing sheep farming, and the construction of the meat-processing complex are mutually complementary, as they cover breeding, increasing livestock numbers and processing products. However, the available data does not provide sufficient evidence to suggest that a fully formed cluster has been established, as no formalised assessment of the effectiveness of intersectoral integration has been conducted. The personnel component remains an additional limitation. Abai region's regional programmes up to 2028 include measures to train specialists and expand employment in the processing sector (A new level..., 2026). This indicates that staffing provision has been incorporated into regional agricultural policy. Nevertheless, the materials presented demonstrate institutional and investment modernisation, although they do not confirm the direct impact of individual programmes on changes in productivity or production efficiency due to the absence of formal statistical modelling.

Empirical assessment of the effectiveness of state support in the Abai region

In Kazakhstan, the structure of livestock farming is linked to natural resource conditions: pastures account for 83.8% of agricultural land, and part of the territory belongs to semi-arid zones where sheep and goats are better adapted to the conditions than cattle (Yerseitova *et al.*, 2018). However, the current system of support for Kazakhstan's agro-industrial complex lacks separate mechanisms exclusively aimed at developing beef cattle farming, thus preserving the advantage of

less capital-intensive farming methods. Nationally, the cattle population in Kazakhstan reached 8.2 million in 2025, while the sheep and goat population stood at 20.6 million, and the horse population at 4.6 million. Meat production reached 1.2 million tonnes (Mergalym, 2026). The ratio of livestock population growth to meat production indicates that the increase in livestock numbers is not accompanied by a proportional increase in output. An economic assessment of the state of livestock farming in Kazakhstan shows that overcoming this imbalance requires the creation of integrated production structures, namely meat hubs, to ensure a link between small producers and processing enterprises (Abdikerimova *et al.*, 2024). The discrepancy between livestock numbers and production clarifies the impact of state policy: an increase in the resource base is not accompanied by a proportional increase in output. This suggests that financial instruments are not aligned with production efficiency requirements. The territorial structure of livestock farming in Kazakhstan remains uneven. Regions with developed pasture farming and access to infrastructure typically have higher indicators of livestock concentration. According to FAO (2023), over half of Kazakhstan's land is used for pasture. Under these conditions, large farms have better access to winter pastures, credit resources and subsidy programmes than small producers, who are involved in the support system to a lesser extent.

The current livestock structure in the Abai region is characterised by the dominance of small ruminants, with a population of over 1.17 million compared to 752,500 cattle and 405,900 horses (Breeding cattle numbers..., 2026). A comparison between investment activity and production indicators is particularly indicative for the region. In 2024, investment in fixed capital in the region's agro-industrial complex exceeded KZT 43.2 billion, and a minimum level of KZT 48 billion was planned for 2025 (Mamyrkhanova, 2024). Meanwhile, the national increase in meat production was 2.7% (Mergalym, 2026). This suggests that subsidisation maintains production volumes, while lending stimulates capital investment and drives structural transformation. Analytically, this distinguishes the functional roles of state support instruments. Subsidies stabilise production in the short term and reduce operational risks, but they do not incentivise technological change. Conversely, lending establishes the investment framework for development, enabling the renewal of fixed assets and expansion of production capacity. Accordingly, credit mechanisms act as the channel through which state policy influences the sector's long-term dynamics. However, the presented indicators cannot be interpreted solely as the result of state policy. The development of livestock farming is also influenced by natural-resource factors and external demand for meat products, including from Central Asian countries and China (OECD & FAO, 2023). Therefore, within this study,

state support is considered as one of the factors in the development of the sector, rather than as the sole cause of changes in production indicators.

The Abai region is characterised by a combination of extensive and partially integrated production models. The target parameters of state policy, particularly the aim to increase the average live weight of cattle from 336 kg to 400 kg (United States Department of Agriculture Foreign Agricultural Service, 2022), indicate a shift towards intensified production. However, the actual indicators suggest that an extensive development model is predominant. In 2025, cattle numbers in Kazakhstan grew by 2.4%, while meat production increased by only 2.7% (Mergalym, 2026). This does not demonstrate an increase in productivity per head. This is further evidenced by the continued high proportion of small farms in the production structure and the prevalence of pasture-based farming, which results in lower average daily weight gains compared to intensive feedlot systems. Under these conditions, the target of

400 kg remains primarily a strategic benchmark, as intensification is limited in practice by producers' uneven access to breeding material, compound feed resources and investment in feedlot infrastructure.

The structure of meat production in Kazakhstan, where agricultural holdings account for approximately 55% of output, individual farms for 30%, and households for 15% (Daribayeva *et al.*, 2025), reflects the partial concentration of production in large economic structures. This indicator was used as an empirical indicator of the formation of cluster elements, as it demonstrates the presence of vertical integration only in part of the production chains. At the same time, the profitability level of agricultural holdings, at 18-22%, indicates the higher efficiency of capitalised structures compared with small-scale forms of farming, which confirms the influence of the investment component of state support. The models of beef cattle development are specified through actual indicators in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparative characteristics of beef livestock development models

Criterion	Intensive elements	Extensive elements	Cluster elements
Productivity	Average live weight of cattle: 336 → 400 kg (target benchmark)	Growth in meat production: 2.7% with higher growth rates in livestock numbers	Profitability of agricultural holdings: 18-22%
Production structure	Share of capitalised farms: ~55%	Share of households: ~15%	Integrated production: agricultural holdings + farmers: ~55% + 30%
Investment	Investment in the agro-industrial complex: over KZT 43.2 billion in 2024	Low capitalisation of small farms	Processing investment projects: KZT 7.7 billion meat-processing plant
Institutional support	Access to loans at 1-2.5%	Limited access to financing	State programmes + infrastructure projects
Chain integration	Partial modernisation	Absence of processing among small farms	Processing capacity: 11.4 thousand tonnes per year

Note: cattle refer to bovine livestock

Source: compiled by the author based on United States Department of Agriculture Foreign Agricultural Service (2022), FAO (2023), Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 322 (2023), M. Mamyrkhanova (2024), A. Daribayeva *et al.* (2025), United Nations Development Programme (2025), O. Sushchenko *et al.* (2026), N. Mergalym (2026), Agrarian Credit Corporation JSC (n.d.)

Analysis of the presented indicators shows that the Abai region has not transitioned to an intensive or cluster-based model. Instead, a combination of different types of development is evident, with extensive characteristics remaining dominant. This is reflected in livestock numbers growing faster than production, which indicates the limited impact of subsidies on productivity. At the same time, credit instruments facilitate the formation of individual cluster elements by financing processing and infrastructure. The impact of these instruments is localised and concentrated in the segment of large farms, which explains the asymmetry in the sector's development. Thus, state support creates a mixed model in which subsidisation maintains the existing production structure while concessional lending creates the conditions for its transformation. However, without systemic integration, these effects are partial.

The effectiveness of state support for beef livestock production in the Abai region is limited by structural

constraints primarily relating to financing, access to credit resources and technological modernisation. At the national level, budgetary support for producers accounted for 4.9% of gross farm receipts in 2021-2023, which is lower than the average for OECD (2024) monitoring countries (9%) and OECD countries (14%). This indicates the limited scale of direct support for Kazakhstan's agricultural sector compared to international practice. At the same time, the predominance of subsidies linked to capital expenditure and resource provision increases producers' dependence on regular budget financing. In cases of delayed payments or incomplete financing, this complicates the implementation of investment projects and reduces the predictability of production planning.

Another limitation is uneven access to financial instruments. Large agricultural enterprises are better able to attract concessional loans due to their access to collateral and their ability to prepare investment

projects, whereas small farms remain outside the system of long-term lending. Consequently, state support is characterised by differential coverage of different categories of producers, exacerbating the structural polarisation of the sector. Technological constraints also directly affect the effectiveness of support instruments. According to sectoral reviews, around 80% of agricultural machinery in Kazakhstan has exceeded its standard service life (International Trade Administration, n.d.). This reduces effectiveness even where access to subsidies or credit resources is available, since some farms operate with outdated materials and technology. Partial subsidisation of machinery renewal does not compensate for the extent of accumulated technological depreciation. Personnel constraints are mainly national in character. It is estimated that there is a shortage of approximately 6.5 thousand agricultural specialists in Kazakhstan, while only around 28% of these specialists have the relevant professional qualifications (Kazakhstan's agricultural sector..., 2025). This restricts the implementation of production and management practices, thereby reducing the effectiveness of modernisation programmes and concessional lending.

The analysis showed that the effectiveness of state support depends on two factors: the volume of financing and the coherence between financial instruments and the production capacities of farms. While subsidy mechanisms primarily support ongoing operations and reduce short-term costs, there was insufficient evidence in this study to demonstrate a direct link with increased productivity or technological modernisation. Conversely, credit instruments in the Abai region are associated with the implementation of investment projects in processing and the expansion of production infrastructure. This is reflected in increased capital investment and the development of individual cluster elements. The results obtained suggest that the model of state support for beef cattle farming in Kazakhstan can be characterised as partially integrated. At the national level, financial, technological and personnel constraints persist, reducing the effectiveness of subsidy policy. In the Abai region, however, concessional lending is mainly used for investment projects and infrastructure development. However, access to these mechanisms remains uneven depending on the size of the farm.

Discussion

The analysis confirmed that state support for beef livestock farming in Kazakhstan varies in effectiveness depending on the instruments used, production structure, and producers' level of integration into the financial system of the sector. The study established that the total volume of state support in the Abai region in 2025 amounted to KZT 15.1 billion. Of this, KZT 7.8 billion was allocated to financial instruments, KZT 4.8 billion to livestock farming and KZT 2.5 billion to crop production. At the same time, subsidy arrears for 2024-2025

totalled KZT 2 billion. This indicates a concentration of support in the financial and credit segment combined with an insufficient stable budgetary provision. Meanwhile, the cattle population in Kazakhstan increased by 2.4% to reach 8.2 million head in 2025, while meat production increased by only 2.7% to reach 1.2 million tonnes. The ratio identified between livestock growth and production growth does not suggest increased sectoral productivity; rather, it reflects the preservation of extensive development. These results are partly consistent with those of D. Matakbayev & S. Shauyenov (2025), who found that genetic improvement of the herd can increase average daily weight gain by 12-18%, depending on breed and feeding system, in their study of Kazakhstani livestock farming. The present study also found that state policy is oriented towards breeding: target parameters envisage an increase in the average live weight of cattle from 336 kg to 400 kg. However, actual results in the Abai region demonstrated slower intensification. Despite the increase in livestock numbers, no faster growth in meat production was recorded. This suggests that breeding programmes largely function in isolation from the modernisation of fattening and processing systems. In addition, the structure of meat production in Kazakhstan remains uneven. According to a recent study, agricultural holdings accounted for around 55% of meat production, while individual farms and households accounted for 30% and 15%, respectively. This level of concentration in production is consistent with the findings of D. Matakbayev & S. Shauyenov (2025), who discovered that large integrated farms exhibit productivity metrics that are 20-25% higher than those of smaller producers, thanks to their use of breeding and technological tools. A similar trend was observed in the Abai region, where large producers had better access to concessional lending and investment programmes.

Comparing the results with those of the study by S.M. Yessengaliyeva *et al.* (2021) revealed the importance of technological modernisation in improving sector efficiency. The authors found that introducing resource-saving technologies could reduce production costs by 15-20% and increase labour productivity by almost a third. The present study found that around 80% of agricultural machinery in Kazakhstan has exceeded its standard service life, limiting the potential for large-scale modernisation. Nevertheless, investment in fixed capital in the Abai region's agro-industrial complex exceeded KZT 43.2 billion in 2024, with plans to reach no less than KZT 48 billion in 2025. While this indicates growth in investment activity, it does not confirm an automatic transition to an intensive production model since technological renewal is concentrated mainly in large farms.

Comparing the results with those of the study by K. Džermeikaitė *et al.* (2023) revealed the technological gap between the potential of precision livestock farming and the current state of the sector. The authors

found that using automated monitoring systems and digital feed control systems could increase herd productivity by 10-15% and reduce feed losses by up to 12%. The present study found that such technologies are only applied fragmentarily in the Abai region, mainly in large agricultural formations. The main limitation was found not to be a technological deficit per se, but rather uneven access to credit resources and the high costs of modernisation for small farms. This clarifies that technological modernisation in Kazakhstan depends not only on producers' innovative activity, but also on the structure of state support.

Comparing the results with those of the study by G. Gongal *et al.* (2022) clarified the functional role of veterinary infrastructure in the state support system for beef livestock farming. These authors emphasise that the effectiveness of veterinary control depends on the system's capacity for an early response and coordination. In an international context, this is associated with reducing economic losses from epizootics by 25-40%. However, the present study found that the development of the veterinary system in Kazakhstan is mainly taking place through institutional and infrastructural strengthening without a clearly traceable link to increased productivity in beef cattle farming in the Abai region. This analysis supports a key analytical conclusion: in the study by G. Gongal *et al.*, veterinary infrastructure is integrated into a risk management model where it contributes to economic efficiency, whereas in Kazakhstan it primarily serves to reduce epizootic risks and ensure basic production stability. Therefore, the difference lies not in the existence of infrastructure, but in the extent to which it is integrated into the sector's production and economic outcomes.

Comparing the results with those of the study by A. Gabriel & M. Gandorfer (2023) revealed different levels of institutional use of digital tools in the agricultural sector. In their work, these authors consider digitalisation to be a factor in improving the efficiency of the production process in the agricultural sectors of EU countries. However, the present study found no evidence to suggest that digitalisation is an independent factor in increasing the productivity of beef cattle farming in Kazakhstan, particularly in the Abai region. The results obtained provide a clear distinction between the functions of digital tools: in European models, they are integrated into production and management processes, whereas in Kazakhstan, their use is mainly limited to administrative and accounting functions related to the provision of public services. Accordingly, in the examined context, digitalisation does not transform the production structure of the sector, but rather plays an auxiliary role in ensuring the functioning of the state regulatory system.

Comparing the results with those of D.R.K. Sainkanth *et al.* (2023) revealed the environmental dimension of the sector's development. The authors found

that the extensive use of pastures without controlling grazing pressure could reduce land productivity by 18-30% in the long term. The present study found that pastures account for 83.8% of Kazakhstan's agricultural land and that the pasture-based production model dominates in the Abai region. While this ensures the sector's adaptation to natural and climatic conditions, it also maintains the extensive nature of development. The increase in livestock numbers outpaced the modernisation of fattening and processing systems, indicating limited production intensity.

A comparative analysis with the study by S. Tokenova *et al.* (2025) confirmed the existence of institutionally determined restrictions on small-scale farming access to state financial support instruments, as evidenced by regulatory and administrative participation requirements for lending and subsidisation programmes. The present study empirically clarified these provisions by identifying structural unevenness in the distribution of support, whereby entities with a higher level of capitalisation and institutional capacity systematically accumulate advantages. Even the existence of specialised microcredit instruments was found to be insufficient to eliminate basic barriers to access, as the requirements for cooperation and formalisation of economic activity act as a selective mechanism for allocating resources. Generalising the results obtained led to the conclusion that state policy for developing beef cattle farming in the Republic of Kazakhstan is only partially effective: while it expands the sector's production and investment potential, it simultaneously reproduces institutional asymmetry in access to support, limiting inclusiveness and reducing the systemic effect of implemented measures.

Conclusions

The study found that the institutional configuration of state support for beef cattle farming in the Republic of Kazakhstan, using the Abai region as an example, is multi-level, with a formal division of functions between the central government and the regional government. The total volume of financing in the Abai region reached KZT 15.1 billion in 2025. The share of financial instruments (KZT 7.8 billion) exceeded that of direct support for livestock farming (KZT 4.8 billion). This demonstrated a shift in policy emphasis from compensatory mechanisms to stimulating investment activity. This resulted in the identification of accumulated deferred subsidy obligations to agricultural producers in the Abai region for 2024-2025, totalling KZT 2 billion as of February 2026. This proved the existence of a gap between budget planning and the state's actual fiscal capacity. Systematising regulatory legal acts revealed the fragmented nature of the regulatory system, where each subsidy instrument operates autonomously without an integration framework. Meanwhile, support for processing remains minimal against the backdrop

of compensation for capital expenditure dominating, which, in practice, favours large agricultural enterprises.

The study found that the number of small ruminants in the Abai region exceeds 1.17 million, while the cattle population amounts to 752,500. It also found that the rate of livestock growth outpaces meat production growth, indicating the persistence of an extensive model and productivity problems. The outcome was the identification of asymmetric effectiveness of instruments: credit mechanisms demonstrated greater transformative capacity than subsidies, but access to them was uneven due to collateral requirements, intensifying the structural polarisation of the sector. The implementation of investment projects such as the construction of a 11.4-thousand-tonne-per-year meat-processing complex in Zhanasemey District with an investment of KZT 7.7 billion indicates the positive impact of credit instruments on investment activity. However, agricultural holdings account for only 55% of meat production, suggesting that this impact is mainly limited to large-scale producers.

The level of budgetary support in the structure of gross farm receipts was only 4.9%, while the wear of agricultural machinery exceeded 80%, which, together with a shortage of 6.5 thousand specialists, forms systemic constraints on the transition to intensive

production. The analysis identified five types of systemic limitations in state policy in Abai region: an investment-production gap, where KZT 43.2 billion in investment generated only a 2.7% increase in meat production; uneven access to financial instruments due to collateral requirements; a personnel deficit, with 6.5 thousand vacancies and only 28% of specialists having relevant professional education; technological ageing, with 80% of machinery exceeding its standard service life; and a disproportion between support for production and support for processing, with only 4.4% of the agro-industrial complex budget allocated to processing while capacity utilisation stands at 37.6%. Prospects for further research lie in developing an adjusted model of inter-budgetary relations that would eliminate the gap between declared support volumes and actual financing at the regional level.

Acknowledgements

None.

Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] 15.1 billion tenge in subsidies have been allocated to support agricultural producers in the Abai region. (2025). Retrieved from <https://ortcom.kz/ru/novosti/1762849116>.
- [2] 50 billion tenge will be allocated over 5 years for the sheep farming development program in the Abai region. (2026). Retrieved from <https://eldala.kz/novosti/zhivotnovodstvo/24202-na-programmu-razvitiya-ovcevodstva-v-oblasti-abay-vydelyat-50-mlrd-tenge>.
- [3] A new level of agricultural development: Transition to a progressive agro-economy launched on the President's instructions. (2026). Retrieved from <https://surli.cc/ajxxbq>.
- [4] A sheep farming development program will be adopted in the Abai region. (2026). Retrieved from <https://baibolsyn.kz/ru/novosti/programmu-razvitiya-ovcevodstva-primut-v-oblasti-abaj/>.
- [5] Abdikerimova, G., Yesbolova, A., Moldabekov, B., Kulanova, D., & Seidakhmetov, M. (2024). Economic assessment of the state of livestock industry in Kazakhstan: Prerequisites for the creation of a meat hub. *Agricultural and Resource Economics: International Scientific E-Journal*, 10(1), 29-45. doi: 10.51599/are.2024.10.01.02.
- [6] Agrarian Credit Corporation JSC. (n.d.). *Annual report 2021*. Retrieved from <https://agroccredit.kz/upload/iblock/48a/tdlgoaitwlgv81tuxfvhyezz0bvq93iv.pdf>.
- [7] Around 2 trillion tenge to be allocated for agribusiness support in Kazakhstan in 2026-2028. (2026). Retrieved from <https://agrosearch.kz/en/news/na-podderzku-agrobiznesa-v-kazaxstane-napravyat-okolo-2-trln-tenge-v-2026-2028-godax>.
- [8] Baiterek National Holding plans to allocate 1 trillion tenge to support farmers. (2025). Retrieved from <https://baiterek.gov.kz/ru/pr/news/1-trln-tenge-planiruet-napravit-ao-nukh-bayterek-na-podderzhku-agrariyev>.
- [9] Breeding cattle numbers are growing in the Abai region. (2026). Retrieved from <https://eldala.kz/novosti/zhivotnovodstvo/24127-pogolove-plemennogo-skota-rastet-v-oblasti-abay>.
- [10] Bukin, E., Robinson, S., & Petrick, M. (2025). The effects of land privatization on pasture productivity in south-eastern Kazakhstan. *Land Use Policy*, 158, article number 107741. doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2025.107741.
- [11] Daribayeva, A., Alina, G., Nurgaliyeva, A., Ukubassova, G., & Tursumbayeva, M. (2025). Kazakhstan's meat market: Analysis of production, consumption, and export. *Scientific Horizons*, 28(5), 90-101. doi: 10.48077/scihor5.2025.90.
- [12] Džermeikaitė, K., Bačėninaitė, D., & Antanaitis, R. (2023). Innovations in cattle farming: Application of innovative technologies and sensors in the diagnosis of diseases. *Animals*, 13(5), article number 780. doi: 10.3390/ani13050780.

- [13] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2023). *Elaboration of the state programme 2022-2026 (Including the concept) of agro-industrial development – TCP/KAZ/3801*. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/cc8533en>.
- [14] Gabriel, A., & Gandorfer, M. (2023). Adoption of digital technologies in agriculture – an inventory in a European small-scale farming region. *Precision Agriculture*, 24, 68-91. doi: 10.1007/s11119-022-09931-1.
- [15] Gebeyehu, L., & Bedemo, A. (2024). How agricultural credit and subsidies impact agricultural productivity in Ethiopia: Empirical evidence using ARDL model. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, 10(1), article number 2329118. doi: 10.1080/23311932.2024.2329118.
- [16] Gongal, G., Rahman, H., Thakuri, K.C., & Vijayalakshmy, K. (2022). An overview of transboundary animal diseases of viral origin in South Asia: What needs to be done? *Veterinary Sciences*, 9(11), article number 586. doi: 10.3390/vetsci9110586.
- [17] Hankerson, B.R. (2025). *Pasture, grazing, and meat production in Kazakhstan – current state and future opportunities*. (Doctoral dissertation, Humboldt University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany). doi: 10.18452/34649.
- [18] Implementation of the President's instructions: Abai region strengthens industrial, agricultural, and transport-logistics potential. (2026). Retrieved from <https://surl.li/mlrpiw>.
- [19] International Trade Administration. (n.d.). *Kazakhstan – agricultural sector*. Retrieved from <https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/kazakhstan-agricultural-sector>.
- [20] Kazakhstan stimulates agricultural cooperation. (2025). Retrieved from <https://surl.li/dxexzb>.
- [21] Kazakhstan's agricultural sector faces acute shortage of specialists. (2025). Retrieved from <https://dairynews.today/news/v-kazakhstan-egrarnyy-sektor-ispytyvaet-ostroyu-nekhvatku-spetsialistov.html>.
- [22] Kazhieva, Zh., Barchak, M., & Zamanbekova, A. (2024). Small and medium-sized entities in livestock sector of the Republic of Kazakhstan: Factors of increasing production volumes. *Problems of AgriMarket*, 2, 137-148. doi: 10.46666/2024-2.2708-9991.11.
- [23] López-García, D., Cruz-Maceín, J.L., & DiPaula, M. (2024). Agri vs. food? Perceptions of local policymakers on agri-food policies from a multilevel approach. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 8, article number 1399746. doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2024.1399746.
- [24] Mamyrkhanova, M. (2024). *Criminalization of assault, eviction of the aggressor: A deputy spoke about new amendments prepared by the Majilis*. Retrieved from <https://www.zakon.kz/sobytiia/6421855-kriminalizatsiya-poboev-vyselenie-agressora-deputat-rasskazal-o-novykh-popravkakh-podgotovlennyykh-mazhilisom.html>.
- [25] Matakbayev, D., & Shauyenov, S. (2025). Improving feed efficiency in Kazakh white-headed cattle: The role of residual feed intake, growth, and dry matter intake. *Scientific Horizons*, 28(6), 9-22. doi: 10.48077/scihor6.2025.09.
- [26] Mergalym, N. (2026). *Big push ahead for Kazakhstan's cattle numbers*. Retrieved from <https://qazinform.com/news/big-push-ahead-for-kazakhstans-cattle-numbers-3671b9>.
- [27] Mussina, G., Kussainov, T., Kadrinov, M., Sarsembayeva, G., & Assilov, B. (2025). Searching for a risk-efficient production structure on crop-livestock farms. *International Journal of Business Information Systems*, 50(8), 22-37. doi: 10.1504/IJIBIS.2025.151328.
- [28] Nurmaganbetova, Zh. (2025). *Kazakh Government presents 2026-2028 economic growth forecast*. Retrieved from <https://qazinform.com/news/kazakh-government-presents-2026-2028-economic-growth-forecast-b80a06>.
- [29] Order of the Acting Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 317 “On Approval of the Rules for Subsidizing the Reimbursement of Part of the Expenses Incurred by an Entity in the Agro-Industrial Complex for Investment Investments”. (2018, July). Retrieved from https://prg.kz/document/?doc_id=31769410.
- [30] Order of the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan – Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 436 “On Approval of the Rules for Subsidizing Interest Rates for Lending to Entities in the Agro-Industrial Complex, as well as Leasing for the Purchase of Farm Animals, Machinery and Technological Equipment”. (2018, October). Retrieved from https://prg.kz/document/?doc_id=37925596.
- [31] Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 3-2/615 “On Approval of the Rules for Subsidizing the Costs of Processing Enterprises for the Purchase of Agricultural Products for the Production of Deep Processing Products”. (2014, November). Retrieved from https://prg.kz/document/?doc_id=31658375.
- [32] Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 108 “On Approval of the Rules for Subsidizing the Development of Livestock Breeding, Increasing the Productivity and Quality of Livestock Products”. (2019, March). Retrieved from https://prg.kz/document/?doc_id=32302766.
- [33] Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 107 “On Approval of the Rules for Subsidizing the Increase in Yield and Quality of Crop Products”. (2020, March). Retrieved from https://prg.kz/document/?doc_id=33097375.
- [34] Order of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 322 “On Approval of the Rules for Lending to Projects in the Agro-Industrial Complex”. (2023, August). Retrieved from <https://surl.li/ttmlbm>.

- [35] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development & Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (OECD & FAO). (2023). *OECD-FAO agricultural outlook 2023-2032*. doi: [10.1787/08801ab7-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/08801ab7-en).
- [36] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2024). *Agricultural policy monitoring and evaluation 2024: Innovation for sustainable productivity growth*. doi: [10.1787/74da57ed-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/74da57ed-en).
- [37] Robinson, S., & Petrick, M. (2024). Land access and feeding strategies in post-Soviet livestock husbandry: Evidence from a rangeland system in Kazakhstan. *Agricultural Systems*, 219, article number 104011. doi: [10.1016/j.agsy.2024.104011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2024.104011).
- [38] Saikanth, D.R.K., Supria, Singh, B.V., Rai, A.K., Rana, S.R., Sachan, D.S., & Singh, B. (2023). Advancing sustainable agriculture: A comprehensive review for optimizing food production and environmental conservation. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*, 35(16), 417-425. doi: [10.9734/ijpss/2023/v35i163169](https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2023/v35i163169).
- [39] Sarbassova, S., Aimurzina, B., & Mataibaeva, G. (2025). Effectiveness of agricultural subsidies in Kazakhstan as a factor of inclusive development. *Economic Series of the Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov ENU*, 3, 205-226. doi: [10.32523/2789-4320-2025-3-205-226](https://doi.org/10.32523/2789-4320-2025-3-205-226).
- [40] Serdalina, A. (2025). *Construction of a meat processing complex has begun in the Abai region*. Retrieved from <https://www.inform.kz/ru/stroitelstvo-myasopererabativayushego-kompleksa-nachalos-v-oblasti-abay-65cace>.
- [41] Shevchenko, P., Miciński, J., & Brel-Kisseleva, I. (2024). Evaluation of Aberdeen angus breeding bulls in the northern region of the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Animals*, 14(6), article number 894. doi: [10.3390/ani14060894](https://doi.org/10.3390/ani14060894).
- [42] Siximbayeva, G., Shayakhmetova, K., Yernazarova, U., & Ruzanov, R. (2025). Efficiency of agriculture subsidies in Kazakhstan. *Central European Journal of Public Policy*, 19(1), 22-37. doi: [10.2478/cejpp-2025-0003](https://doi.org/10.2478/cejpp-2025-0003).
- [43] Sushchenko, O., Tireuov, K., Stoyanova-Asenova, S., Tymkovan, V., & Kozubova, N. (2026). Socio-economic drivers of sustainable agrobusiness development: Implications for responsible SME practices. In M. Petrova (Ed.), *Reshaping socially responsible business practices in small and medium enterprises* (pp. 245-284). Hershey: IGI Global Scientific Publishing. doi: [10.4018/979-8-3373-3805-7.ch008](https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-3805-7.ch008).
- [44] The agricultural sector in Abai region is developing steadily. (2025). Retrieved from <https://massaget.kz/news/abay-oblysyinda-auyil-sharuashyilyigyi-salasyi-turaktyi-131617/>.
- [45] The outstanding subsidy arrears to farmers in the Abai region are promised to be repaid in the spring. (2026). Retrieved from <https://surl.li/jrfydf>.
- [46] Tkacheva, A., Saginova, S., Karimbergenova, M., Taipov, T., & Saparova, G. (2024). Problems and prospects for the development of cluster structuring in the economy of Kazakhstan's agricultural sector: Theory and practice. *Economies*, 12(7), article number 185. doi: [10.3390/economies12070185](https://doi.org/10.3390/economies12070185).
- [47] Tokenova, S., Mussina, R., Zhenskhan, D., Kadrinov, M., & Orynbekova, G. (2025). The present state of development of agricultural cooperatives in Kazakhstan: Problems and Prospects. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, 8(6), 113-127. doi: [10.53894/ijirss.v8i6.9512](https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i6.9512).
- [48] Trading Economics. (n.d.). *Kazakhstan – subsidies and other transfers (% of expense)*. Retrieved from <https://tradingeconomics.com/kazakhstan/subsidies-and-other-transfers-percent-of-expense-wb-data.html>.
- [49] United Nations Development Programme. (2025). *The first biennial transparency report of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. Retrieved from <https://surl.li/epyltb>.
- [50] United States Department of Agriculture Foreign Agricultural Service. (2022). *Kazakhstan finalizes national agricultural sector development project plan 2021-2025*. Retrieved from <https://surl.li/brxujt>.
- [51] Wang, S., Dulatbay, Y., Sun, P., Yessengaliyeva, S., Ling, T.J., Kozhayeva, A., Sugirbay, A., Begeyeva, M., & Nartay, B. (2026). The role of risk preferences in transitioning to organic livestock farming: Evidence from Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Agriculture and Biosciences*, 15(1), 354-363. doi: [10.47278/journal.ijab/2025.191](https://doi.org/10.47278/journal.ijab/2025.191).
- [52] Yegemberdiyev, R., Yessirkepova, A., Baineyeva, P., Kamalov, A., & Orazova, B. (2024). Mechanisms for improving the economic efficiency of livestock development in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *International Journal on Food System Dynamics*, 15(3), 316-328. doi: [10.18461/ijfsd.v15i3.K9](https://doi.org/10.18461/ijfsd.v15i3.K9).
- [53] Yerseitova, A., Issakova, S., Jakisheva, L., Nauryzbekova, A., & Moldasheva, A. (2018). Efficiency of using agricultural land in Kazakhstan. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 6(2), 558-576. doi: [10.9770/jesi.2018.6.2\(7\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2018.6.2(7)).
- [54] Yesbolova, A., Abdikerimova, G., Kuashbay, S., Sadykbekova, A., & Bigeldieva, Z. (2025). Analysis of the current state of dairy cattle breeding in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 614, article number 03029. doi: [10.1051/e3sconf/202561403029](https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202561403029).
- [55] Yessengaliyeva, S.M., Mansurova, M.A., Makhmudov, A.D., & Fedorchenko, L.V. (2021). Current state and development trends of livestock in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Economics: The Strategy and Practice*, 16(2), 134-144. doi: [10.51176/1997-9967-2021-2-134-144](https://doi.org/10.51176/1997-9967-2021-2-134-144).
- [56] Yin, J., & Guo, J. (2026). Sci-tech finance to improve agricultural production efficiency: Empirical evidence from pilot policies. *Sustainability*, 18(10), article number 4910. doi: [10.3390/su18104910](https://doi.org/10.3390/su18104910).

Казакстан Республикасында эт багытындагы мал чарбасын колдоо боюнча мамлекеттик саясат: Абай аймагынын мисалында субсидиялоо жана жеңилдетилген насыя берүү механизмдери

Куаныш Сулейменов

Студент

Казакстан Республикасынын Президентинин алдындагы Мамлекеттик башкаруу академиясы
010000, Абай просп., 33-А, Астана ш., Казакстан Республикасы

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0211-4823>

Аннотация. Бул изилдөө Казакстанда эт багытындагы уй чарбасын колдоого багытталган мамлекеттик саясаттын натыйжалуулугун субсидиялар менен жеңилдетилген насыялоонун регионалдык деңгээлдеги өз ара байланышын талдоо аркылуу баалоону максат кылды. Өндүрүш көрсөткүчтөрүнүн, инвестициялык активдүүлүктүн жана бюджеттик параметрлердин убакыт бою динамикасын түшүндүрүү үчүн институционалдык, салыштырмалуу жана эмпирикалык-статистикалык анализдердин айкалышы колдонулду. Нәтижелер көрсөткөндөй, мамлекеттик колдоонун институционалдык түзүмү көп деңгээлдүү болуп, борбордук жана регионалдык бийлик органдарынын ортосунда ыйгарым укуктардын расмий бөлүнүшү пайда болгон. Абай аймагындагы каржылоо структурасы түздөн-түз колдоонун (4,8 млрд теңге) ордуна каржылык инструменттердин (7,8 млрд теңге) үстөмдүгү менен мүнөздөлгөнү аныкталды, бул инвестициялык активдүүлүктү стимулдаштырууга багытталган саясаттын өзгөрүшүн көрсөтөт. Малдын саны жана өндүрүш структурасына эмпирикалык анализ кеңири өнүгүү моделине артыкчылык берилишин көрсөттү, бул малдын санынын ылдамыраак өсүшү (сиырлардын саны 2,4 %га өсүп) менен, ал эми продукция өсүшү (эт өндүрүшү 2,7 %га өсүп) ортосундагы айырмачылык аркылуу далилденди. Бирок насыя алуу мүмкүнчүлүгү бирдей эмес бойдон калууда, анткени кепилдик талаптары чакан өндүрүүчүлөрдүн каржылоо программаларына катышуусун чектейт. Бул сектор ичиндеги структуралык ажырымдын бекемделишине өбөлгө түзөт: айыл чарба чарбалары эт өндүрүшүнүн 55 %ын түзсө, уй чарбалар болгону 15 %ын гана түзөт. Алынган натыйжаларды жалпылоо мамлекеттик саясаттын натыйжалуулугу каржылоо көлөмү менен гана эмес, колдоо куралдарынын шайкештиги, институционалдык интеграция деңгээли жана ар кандай өндүрүүчү категорияларына жеткиликтүүлүк менен да аныкталарын көрсөттү. Натыйжалардын практикалык маанилүүлүгү кичи өндүрүүчүлөр үчүн субсидия программаларындагы катышуу критерийлерин кайра карап чыгууда, анын ичинде долбоордун кубаттуулук талаптарын төмөндөтүүдө жана айыл чарба тармагында төлөмдөрдү өндүрүш циклдериине шайкеш келтирип бюджетти пландоону жөнгө салууда колдонуу мүмкүнчүлүгүндө жатат

Негизги сөздөр: бюджеттик трансферттер; кийинкиге калтырылган милдеттенмелер; экстенсивдүү модель; инвестициялык долбоорлор; кластердик модель; айыл чарба тармагын санариптештирүү

Государственная политика поддержки животноводства в Республике Казахстан: механизмы субсидирования и льготного кредитования на примере Абайской области

Куаныш Сулейменов

Студент

Академия государственного управления при Президенте Республики Казахстан

010000, просп. Абая, 33-А, г. Астана, Республика Казахстан

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0211-4823>

Аннотация. Целью данного исследования была оценка эффективности государственной политики поддержки мясного скотоводства в Казахстане путем анализа взаимодействия субсидий и льготного кредитования на региональном уровне. Для интерпретации динамики производственных показателей, инвестиционной активности и бюджетных параметров во времени был использован комплекс институционального, сравнительного и эмпирико-статистического анализа. Было установлено, что институциональная структура государственной поддержки приобрела многоуровневый характер с формальным разделением полномочий между центральными и региональными органами власти. Установлено, что структура финансирования в Абайской области характеризуется преобладанием финансовых инструментов (7,8 млрд тенге) над прямыми формами поддержки (4,8 млрд тенге), что свидетельствует о сдвиге в политике в сторону стимулирования инвестиционной деятельности. Эмпирический анализ поголовья скота и структуры производства выявил предпочтение экстенсивной модели развития, о чем свидетельствует более быстрый рост поголовья (на 2,4 %) по сравнению с ростом объемов производства (на 2,7 %). Однако доступ к кредитам остается неравномерным, поскольку требования к залогу ограничивают участие мелких производителей в программах финансирования. Это способствует усилению структурной дифференциации внутри сектора: на долю сельскохозяйственных предприятий приходится 55 % производства мяса, в то время как на долю домохозяйств – лишь 15 %. Обобщение полученных результатов показало, что эффективность государственной политики определяется не только объемом финансирования, но и согласованностью инструментов поддержки, уровнем институциональной интеграции и доступностью для различных категорий производителей. Практическая значимость результатов заключается в их потенциальном использовании при пересмотре критериев доступа мелких производителей к программам субсидирования, включая снижение требований к мощностям проектов, а также при корректировке бюджетного планирования в агропромышленном комплексе путем синхронизации выплат с производственными циклами

Ключевые слова: бюджетные трансферты; отложенные обязательства; экстенсивная модель; инвестиционные проекты; кластерная модель; цифровизация сельскохозяйственного сектора