

Baydyldyna A.M.¹, Zhunisova G.E.², Petr Hajek³

¹Doctor of Economics, Professor, e-mail: Adilya.Baydildina@kaznu.kz

²2-year doctoral student, e-mail: nietbaeva_gulnar@mail.ru

Kazakh national University named after al-Farabi, Kazakhstan, Almaty

³Ph.D, Central Bohemia University, Czech, Prague

**«IN MODELS» AS ANALYTICAL INDICATORS
OF COMPETITIVENESS**

Measuring competitiveness offers hundreds of analytical options. We have chosen to analyze and compare companies of confectionery sector in Kazakhstan. We opted to use bankruptcy models and compare competitiveness through the financial situation of main competitors on that market. Companies analyzed comprise of two Ukrainian companies (Konti and Roshen), Russian companies (Nestlé Russian branch serving also Central Asian markets and KDV – Yaskino) and three local corporations Rakhat, Bayan Sulu and Konfety Karagandy. Models used for analysis are Altman z-score model, Taffler z-score model, IN99, IN01, IN05 models. The IN models were created in the Czech Republic based on companies' data from the 1990s which was the period of higher inflation, small currency and big banking crisis, massive imports, developing competition and infrequent political turmoil. These models have comparably much greater benefits for analyzing companies in Kazakhstan because they are based on hundreds of companies in contrast to tens of companies on which Altman or Taffler based their famous and highly predictive models. We present an analysis of models in 2007 – 2016 period based on publicly accessible data. We show the IN models have valuable benefits for comparison compared with other older models and that they can disclose certain events or corporate situations in a clearer way than other Altman or Taffler z-score models and should be used in Kazakhstan and improved to suit better the local market environment.

Key words: bankruptcy, valuation, sweets, IN models, Altman, competitiveness, Taffler, z-score model.

Байдильдина А.М.¹, Жунисова Г.Е.², Питр Хайек³

¹э.ғ.д., профессор, e-mail: Adilya.Baydildina@kaznu.kz

²2-курс докторанты, e-mail: nietbaeva_gulnar@mail.ru

әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: nietbaeva_gulnar@mail.ru

³Phd докторы, Богемия орталық Университеті, Чехия, Прага қ.

«IN модельдері» бәсекеге қабілеттіліктің талдамалы көрсеткіштері ретінде

Бәсекеге қабілеттілікті бағалау жүзеге асыру үшін көптеген талдамалық көрсеткіштер ұсынылады. Біз Қазақстан кондитерлік секторының компанияларын талдауға және салыстыруды таңдадық. Біз банкроттық модельдерін пайдаланып, бәсекелестікті осы нарықтағы негізгі бәсекелестердің қаржылық жағдайымен салыстырдық. Салыстыру мақсатында екі украиндық компаниялар (Konti және Roshen), ресейлік компаниялар Нестле (Орталық Азия нарығына қызмет ететін Nestle Ресей бөлімшесі) мен KDV-Яшкино және үш жергілікті компаниялар: Рахат, Баян Сұлу және Қарағанды конфеттері компаниялары алынды. Талдау үшін пайдаланылатын модельдер Altman z-score моделі, Taffler z-score моделі, IN99, IN01, IN05 модельдері. IN модельдері 1990 жылдардан бастап жоғары инфляция, шағын валюта үлкен банк дағдарысы, массивтік импорт, бәсекелестікті дамытатын және саяси сілкініссіз кезеңдер болған компаниялардың деректеріне негізделген. Бұл модельдер Қазақстандағы компанияларды талдау үшін айтарлықтай артықшылықтарға ие, өйткені олар танымал және жоғары болжамды ондаған компаниялар үлгілеріне негізделген Альтман немесе Taffler модельдерінен айырмашылығы жүздеген компанияларға негізделгендігінде. Біз жалпыға қол жетімді деректер негізінде 2007-

2016 жылдардағы жағдайды талдауды ұсынамыз. Біз IN модельдерін басқа модельдермен салыстырғанда салыстыру үшін құнды артықшылықтарға ие және кейбір Альтман немесе Taffler модельдеріне қарағанда белгілі бір оқиғаларды немесе корпоративтік жағдайларды ашық түрде жариялауға және Қазақстандағы жергілікті нарықтық ортада қолдануға тиімділігін көрсетеміз.

Түйін сөздер: банкроттық, бағалау, IN модельдері, Altman, бәсекеге қабілеттілік, Taffler, z-score моделі.

Байдильдина А.М.¹, Жунисова Г.Е.², Питр Хайек³

¹д.э.н., профессор, e-mail: Adilya.Baydildina@kaznu.kz

²докторант 2 курса, e-mail: nietbaeva_gulnar@mail.ru

Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

³доктор Phd, Центральный Университет Богемии, Чехия, г. Прага

«Модели IN» как аналитические показатели конкурентоспособности

Измерение конкурентоспособности предлагает сотни аналитических вариантов. Мы проанализировали и сравнили компании кондитерского сектора в Казахстане и решили использовать модели банкротства и сравнить конкурентоспособность в финансовом положении основных конкурентов на этом рынке. Анализируемые компании состоят из двух украинских компаний (Конти и Рошен), российских компаний (российский филиал Nestle, обслуживающий также рынки Центральной Азии и KDV – Яшкино) и трех местных корпораций Рахат, Баян сулу и конфеты Караганды. Модели, используемые для анализа, – это модель Z-score от Altman, модель Z-score Taffler, IN99, IN01, IN05. Модели IN были созданы в Чешской Республике на основе данных компаний 1990-х годов, которые были периодом более высокой инфляции, малой валюты, крупным банковским кризисом, массовым импортом, развитием конкуренции и нечастыми политическими потрясениями. Эти модели имеют сравнительно большие преимущества для анализа компаний в Казахстане, поскольку они основаны на сотнях компаний, в отличие от десятков компаний, на которых Альтман или Таффлер основывали свои знаменитые и высокопрогнозируемые модели. Мы представляем анализ конкурентоспособности компании в период 2007 – 2016 гг. На основе общедоступных данных мы показываем, что модели IN имеют ценные преимущества для сравнения по сравнению с другими более старыми моделями и что они могут раскрывать определенные события или корпоративные ситуации более четко, чем другие модели Z-score Альтамана или Taffler, и должны использоваться в Казахстане и улучшаться в лучшую сторону.

Ключевые слова: банкротство, оценка, сладости, модели IN, Альтман, конкурентоспособность, Taffler, z-score модель.

Introduction

Confectionery business in Kazakhstan is famous and produces great quality products. Unfortunately, in last ten years had to adapt to many changes, including cocoa prices significant changes multiplied by the depreciation of tenge, and growth and recession periods of the Kazakhstan's economy. Regardless, citizens never stopped buying the sweets.

The financial analysis offers many models to analyze the likelihood of bankruptcy or solvency conditions that usually serve only to company financial director or investment companies for their decision-making about buying or selling shares. Analyses comparing companies from almost any whole sector in Kazakhstan are nonexistent.

We have decided to change this situation and analyze companies that cover a significant portion of confectionery business in Kazakhstan altogether (see data chapter for individual companies analyzed).

That includes companies from Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, and Ukraine.

To proceed with such an analysis, we have selected models used in the EU and USA, but also frequently used models in the Czech Republic, which were developed using data from thousands of companies compared to tens of the Altman or Taffler models.

The objective of this research paper is to compare and comment results of various financial analysis models using publicly accessible accounting data since 2007, recommend changes to some models while analyzing usefulness (positives and negatives) of such models under Kazakhstan economy conditions.

Materials and Methods

Ten years ago, in 2007, started a subprime banking crisis in the USA. It sparked global recession and crises on various asset markets around the

world during next 2-3 years including Kazakhstan. The banking sector in Kazakhstan was hit and credit market froze. That resulted in a Government intervention. During the great recession the price of the main export product of Kazakhstan, the oil, plummeted. Its price has a significant influence on the exchange rate of tenge to USD.

Since then it is hard and expensive to get any credit. Banks are very risk-averse, and interest expenses of companies are high when compared to the EU countries, or countries in the Eastern Europe. Table 1 shows the situation: inflation is increasing with the depreciation of tenge. To limit the inflation, the central bank decided to increase target interest rate, which led to skyrocketing interest expenses of all indebted companies. Consumer expenditures (where spending on sweets belongs) show slow growth in last two years as GDP growth does.

Therefore, we can expect citizens to be buying relatively smaller amounts of sweets and thus production and sales of the confectionery industry cannot be expected to rise significantly.

Main import commodity and unreplaceable production input for confectionery industry is cocoa. See Figure 1 for price fluctuations in KZT and USD on world markets. We can see that cocoa prices started to significantly increase during fall of 2014 to reach multiples of prices that were common between 2007 and 2013. The same chart also shows a significant increase of USDKZT exchange rate affecting negatively (concerning costs) other imported commodities for whole industry as well. Besides mentioned expenses on cocoa, the sector also faces other import tariffs and price fluctuations for sugar, nuts and other ingredients not produced in Kazakhstan, or in the countries of the Customs Union.

Table 1 – Selected indicators of Kazakhstan economy

Indicator	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Source
CPI [% YoY change]	10.8	17.2	7.3	7.1	8.3	5.1	5.8	6.7	6.6	14.5	WB
CPI [2010=100]	74.3	87.0	93.4	100.0	108.3	113.9	120.5	128.6	133.2	157.1	IFS
Central Bank Policy Rate [% p.a.]	11.0	10.5	7.0	7.0	7.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	16.0	12.0	IFS
USDKZT [Period Average]	122.6	120.3	147.5	147.4	146.6	149.1	152.1	179.2	221.7	342.2	IFS
GDP growth [% p.a.]	8.9	3.3	1.2	7.3	7.4	4.8	6.0	4.2	1.2	1.0	WB
Household final consumption, [% YoY change, constant KZT]	10.8	6.9	0.7	11.2	11.9	10.3	10.4	1.5	1.8	n/a	WB, Authors

Source: (IMF, 2017), (World Bank, 2017), own calculations based on WB Data.

According to (Euromonitor, 2016) the import duty on the cocoa product has been reduced by Eurasian Economic Commission at the start of 2017 from 3-5% to 0% of the customs value. The 0% will apply to non-defatted cocoa paste, cocoa butter, and cocoa fat. The new tariff will not affect Rakhat, Bayan Sulu and Konfety Karagandy (further referred as KK) because they have their own cocoa beans processing facilities. However, other local companies, such as Hamle (bought in 2017 by Ulker Biskuvi Sanayi for 3 mil. USD) and Almatinskiy Produkt (producing mostly Helva and other cheap products that are less popular), do not have the equipment for roasting and processing cocoa beans.

Literature review

To analyze financial trends of individual companies, we have selected (considering the

availability of indicators) the following bankruptcy and creditworthiness models: Altman z-score model, Taffler z-score model, IN99, IN01, IN05, and Creditworthiness index.

Certain peculiarity making hard any such analysis in Kazakhstan is sometimes unclear accounting terminology resulting in problematic «translation» of certain indicators used in various models in other countries. It would be impossible to do such an analysis without consultations with local accounting experts knowing the specific terminology of indicators in each Czech, English and Kazakh environment. Our experience is that research based on a plain translation of indicators from local websites would be unusable. For the purpose to clear doubt for anybody, who would like to replicate our analysis, we present a three-language terminology table of indicators used (see Annex).

These models belong to the group of indicator systems, which are supposed to assess the financial

situation of the company. Since the values of these indicators are very important for banking institutions, when deciding about granting or rejecting a credit. Their purpose is to eliminate limitations and potentially missing information discovered by the ratios. (Kislingerová, 2008)

Creditworthiness models examine the financial health of a company based on macroeconomic and microeconomic principles and also on an experience and knowledge of the financial analyst. Creditworthiness models assess the financial health of the company in comparison with other companies, or they use a point system, in which the companies are classified according to their financial situation. (Grünwald, 2007)

As (Kislingerová, 2008) points out: the purpose of the bankruptcy models is to predict a threat to the financial health of the analyzed company and the likelihood of bankruptcy. The term financial distress represents a state of the company in which it is not capable of settling its debts, or the value of its debts exceeds the value of its assets. In other words when a company becomes illiquid or insolvent.

Altman Z-score

According to (Vochozka, 2011) the Altman Z-score belongs to the group of bankruptcy models. This model is named after Prof. Edward Altman who on the grounds of several ratios and statistical analysis managed to evaluate the bankruptcy

likelihood of the company or the probability of decline two years in advance and with up to 70 % success rate five years in advance. According to (CRF, 2017), the z-score is known to be about 90% accurate in forecasting business failure one year into the future and about 80% accurate in forecasting it two years into the future.

Results and Discussion

Prof. Altman constructed it by using discriminant analysis with five ratios used in the equation, according to which is possible to identify a bankrupting company. (Vochozka, 2011)

$$Z = 1.2 * X(1) + 1.4 * X(2) + 3.3 * X(3) + 0.6 * X(4) + 1.0 * X(5)$$

where:

X (1) = (working capital [current assets – short-term liabilities] / total assets

X (2) = retained earnings / total assets

X (3) = EBIT / total assets

X (4) = market value of equity / book value of debt

X (5) = sales / total assets

Z > 2.99 the business is in a good position, financially healthy

1.81 < Z < 2.99 gray zone of unmatched results

Z < 1.81 bankruptcy has significant probability

The higher values of the Z- score, the financially healthier the company is.

Table 2 – Results of Altman z-score model

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Rakhat	4.21	4.54	5.53	7.01	7.92	7.54	6.72	6.73	6.46	6.68
Bayan Sulu	1.27	1.53	1.07	3.22	2.83	3.27	3.18	2.90	2.30	4.91
Konfety K.	2.54	2.38	2.73	1.86	2.26	2.68	3.28	-0.66	-16.43	-3.84
Nestle	0.91	1.01	1.12	1.14	1.19	1.22	2.13	2.01	2.09	1.89
Roshen	1.83	1.25	1.76	1.33	5.13	1.61	3.98	2.56	3.09	3.18
KDV-Yaskino	2.92	2.71	3.87	4.26	2.79	2.20	1.83	1.44	1.71	2.04
Konti	2.58	2.57	2.52	1.89	1.77	2.79	2.91	2.94	2.22	2.06

Source: Authors

We can see Konfety Karagandy faced several important events in 2014. First 24 Jan 2014 the main shareholder of the Apex’s way (Kazakhstan) sold 90% of shares (all they owned) to Centis International Ltd. (British Virgin Islands). Apex way owned the shares only since December 2013 when they bought them from British UIG Ltd. According to the decision of the Novosibirsk region, Arbitration court

the KK owed 221,045,487 RUB past due to trading company Armatele LLC. The debt has to be paid by the end of the year 2017 (Konfety Karagandy, 2015). Then on February 11, tenge devalued by 20% against US dollar, which significantly increased the dollar value of KK foreign debt. After the change of ownership, the KK went through a restructuring in 2014, changed management, and with decreasing

sales since then through early summer of 2016 they decided to shut the production completely down to buy new equipment. (NovoeTV, 2016). Date of production reopening is unknown.

We can see several companies struggled to survive during the Great Recession and frozen credit market. Nestle managed to survive with support from the holding company in Switzerland. Bayan Sulu struggled through the whole recession because of a significant increase in the volume of receivables. Also, the company received new credit and sold owned shares to increase its financial situation. Roshen faced a similar environment in Ukraine and got out from it with a significant increase in liabilities and bank credit in 2008, and 2009 respectively. Bank credits increased until 2011 and in 2012 started to decrease. In 2007 Nestlé had almost ten-fold volume of Short-term financial investments (probably shares to improve financial stability) compared to other years. KDV-Yaskino took in 2015 lots of bank credit to survive the long-term liabilities that skyrocketed in 2014.

In 2010 Roshen started to invest into the construction of a new factory in Lipetsk region of Central Russia which finished in 2013 and cost 250 mil. USD. (Focus, 2010). In 2013 Roshen after the approval of the annual accounts for the 2011-2012 revealed the fact of overstating net costs and understating the profit for 2011 and 2012. The identified error led to the increase in taxable profits in 2011 and 2012, and the additional payment of 1,307,789.79 RUB profit tax. (Roshen, 2014). The factory in Lipetsk was closed in March 2014 due to problems that emerged during the Russian annexation of Crimea which happened 20 Feb 2014 – 19 Mar 2014. (BBC, 2014)

Taffler’s model. It is a bankruptcy model that indicates the probability of bankruptcy of the company. The model was published in

1977. (Atlantis, 2017) Taffler’s z-score model discrimination function has the form of modification of (Růčková, 2011) with four ratios.

$$TZ = 0.53 * R1 + 0.13 * R2 + 0.18 * R3 + 0.16 * R4$$

where:

R1 = Earnings before taxes / short-term liabilities

R2 = current assets / liabilities

R3 = short-term liabilities / total assets

R4 = sales / total assets

TZ > 0.3 low probability of bankruptcy of the company

0.2 < TZ < 0.3 gray zone of unmatched results

TZ < 0.2 increased probability of bankruptcy of the company

The original version of Taffler’s model uses the share of financial assets net of current liabilities to operating costs instead of sales to total assets and does not use gray zone. When evaluating the original Taffler’s Model, the gray zone is not used. Enterprises are classified according to the index outcome only on bankruptcy and credibility; zero is the critical value for the determining the category. A positive index corresponds with credit business and vice versa. (Vochozka, 2011)

Růčková (2011) used the same breakdown of enterprises according to the established value of the Taffler’s Model. Rather than evaluating enterprises as creditworthy, she states that the company has a small probability of bankruptcy and instead of bankruptcy enterprises says that the company has a high probability of bankruptcy.

The [Taffler] model is shown to have the clear predictive ability over time period [of 25 years] and dominates more naïve prediction approaches. [This] study also illustrates the economic value to a bank of using such methodologies for default risk assessment purposes. (Agarwal & Taffler, 2007)

Table 3 – Results of Taffler z-score model

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Rakhat	0.91	0.71	1.32	1.98	3.06	3.05	2.92	3.26	2.21	2.47
Bayan Sulu	0.38	0.39	0.35	0.66	0.75	0.70	0.63	0.59	0.59	0.53
Konfety K.	0.43	0.51	1.98	1.43	2.06	1.68	0.73	-0.60	-0.66	-2.68
Nestle	0.46	0.52	0.53	0.55	0.50	0.54	0.55	0.53	0.53	0.52
Roshen	0.68	0.84	0.55	0.46	1.51	0.38	0.51	1.13	-0.24	0.16
KDV-Yaskino	0.79	0.81	1.27	1.25	0.56	0.46	0.35	0.40	0.33	0.47
Konti	0.62	0.60	0.60	0.47	0.47	0.67	0.70	0.70	0.58	0.59

Source: Authors

We have already described the KK situation. The Roshen company became a victim of war in Ukraine and shut down newly built Russian factory. The loss of rich Donbas to pro-Russian separatists caused a significant loss in 2015 for many Ukrainian firms, causing an increase in debt and interest expenses.

IN Models – Credibility indexes

According to (Neumaier & Neumaierová, 2002) the IN models belong to the group of bankruptcy models and were created for the conditions of the restructuring Czech market during the 1990s. The authors using discriminant analysis, ratios and weighted mean values created a function for identification of bankrupting companies. IN models has gone through several phases of evolution, the first being the IN95 index, which focused on the company from the creditor’s point of view and included Past due liabilities, an indicator not being published by companies in Kazakhstan (so we cannot use it in our analysis). Then the IN99 index followed, which assessed the company from the perspective of the owner. These two resulted in bankruptcy index IN01, which connects both of the previous indexes and also includes the economic added value. The last version emerged in 2005 when IN01 was updated into the bankruptcy index IN05. (Neumaierová & Neumaier, 2005).

IN99 Index

$$IN99 = -0.017 * A + 4.573 * C + 0.481 * D + 0.015 * E$$

where:

A = assets / liabilities

C = EBIT / total assets

D = sales / total assets

E = current assets / short-term liabilities

IN99 > 2.07 The company creates a new value for the owner (dark green)

1.42 <= IN99 <2.07 Rather it creates value for the owner

1.089 <= IN99 <1.42 It is not possible to determine whether or not company creates value for the owner

0.684 <= IN99 < 1.089 Rather does not create value for the owner

IN99 <0.684 Enterprise does not create value for the owner (dark red)

The IN index may be an appropriate indicator of value creation, especially if it is not possible to work with market prices for a company’s shares due to their low ability to provide information or if no equity cost can be determined. With the success rate of 86.4%, the index proves the value creation and with an even higher rate of success 98.9% has been able to identify that there is no value creation. (Atlantis, 2017)

Table 4 – Results of IN99

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Rakhat	1.13	0.97	1.03	1.08	1.42	1.16	0.75	0.40	1.19	1.43
Bayan Sulu	0.66	0.96	0.68	0.73	0.65	0.62	0.62	0.68	0.79	0.89
Konfety K.	1.04	0.78	1.12	0.10	0.75	0.79	1.27	-1.68	-12.66	-3.45
Nestle	0.62	0.58	0.70	0.71	0.81	0.77	0.80	0.70	0.75	0.73
Roshen	1.20	0.53	1.54	0.87	0.34	0.34	0.13	0.43	0.08	0.20
KDV-Yashkino	1.63	1.48	1.89	1.32	1.14	0.83	0.58	0.70	0.77	0.97
Konti	1.27	1.26	1.26	1.00	1.04	1.63	1.59	1.68	1.59	1.55

Source: Authors

According to (Atlantis, 2017) the construction was based on a discriminatory analysis and was based on the data of 1915 enterprises from the Czech Republic that were divided into three groups: 583 were in the group of enterprises creating value, 503 enterprises in bankruptcy or just before bankruptcy, and 829 other enterprises.

IN99 focuses on the company through lenses of the owner. The greener the fields, the happier the

owner. We can see that almost all companies had to experience very tough times in last decade. Besides already commented situation of KK, Rakhat shows relative ability to get out of surprising negative events as recession or depreciation faster than its competitors. Konti results are a surprise as in the environment of recession, frozen credit markets, depreciation of UAH and war in Ukraine remains in relatively much healthier conditions compared to the competition. In

2010 and 2011 the profit and stocks increased as well as bank credits. Total liabilities increased in 2010 by 64 % from 2 568 139 to 4 227 610 UAH. Konti also did something the KK did not: converted all their debts in EUR and USD to UAH on September 9, 2009, so they evaded later depreciation of UAH that would hit them hard when the war with Russia-supported separatists started after the annexation of Crimea in 2014. Konti faced high Ukrainian interest rates between 2010 and 2011 (after the conversion of all debt to UAH the rates started to fall from around 26 % to 17 %). (Audit reports for 2009 and 2011 from Konti reporting, 2017) In our opinion, the IN99 describes the conditions of analyzed companies in the given environment in a more vivid way than Altman's z-score, which also shows very useful and interesting results.

Table 5 – Results of IN01

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Rakhat	1.99	2.37	2.75	3.73	4.27	4.74	5.11	6.49	3.59	3.91
Bayan Sulu	0.83	0.94	0.82	1.58	1.77	1.78	1.55	1.43	1.54	1.20
Konfety K.	1.27	1.12	3.87	2.20	3.31	3.02	1.70	-1.00	-10.59	-2.96
Nestle	1.70	1.75	1.73	1.81	1.55	1.74	1.76	1.62	1.74	1.73
Roshen	2.52	0.76	2.24	1.32	5.88	1.11	2.34	1.49	1.34	1.90
KDV-Yashkino	2.11	2.21	2.68	2.26	1.93	1.25	1.09	0.92	0.87	1.22
Konti	1.32	1.30	1.29	1.04	1.07	1.80	1.82	1.81	1.66	1.66

Source: Authors

Together with IN05, the IN01 uses interest expenses which show especially in case of Konfety Karagandy serious problems with credit repayment. KK as mentioned went through a restructuring in 2014, in early summer of 2016 shut the production to buy new equipment. Date of production reopening is unknown. To be able to run analysis on KK, we had to limit the ceiling of the ratio EBIT / Interest expenses to 9 if the result was to be higher (in absolute value as well) to limit distortion of the z-score result. In fact (Neumaier & Neumaierová, 2002) note that in similar cases (when the ratio would skyrocket up to infinity – including cases of zero interest expenses) the 9 is maximum value to be used. This ceiling we implemented affected results of IN01 and IN05 for Rakhat, KK, Nestle, Roshen, and KDV – Yashkino.

IN01 shows us a balanced view of the whole sector and points out just the financial distress of Konfety Karagandy.

IN01 Index

The IN01 merges creditworthiness and bankruptcy models.

$$IN01 = 0.13 * A + 0.04 * B + 3.92 * C + 0.21 * D + 0.09 * E$$

where:

A = assets / liabilities

B = EBIT / interest expenses

C = EBIT / total assets

D = sales / total assets

E = current assets / short-term liabilities

IN01 > 1.77 Enterprise creates a value

0.75 <= IN01 < 1.77 Creditworthy business not creating value

IN01 < 0.75 Enterprise is on the way to bankruptcy

IN05 Index

IN05 is the latest known index of Inka and Ivan Neumaier. This index is an update of the IN01 index of the Industrial Data Tests of 2004. The ratios are same with IN01. The index formula IN05 is:

$$IN05 = 0.13 * A + 0.04 * B + 3.97 * C + 0.21 * D + 0.09 * E$$

where:

A = assets / liabilities

B = EBIT / interest expenses

C = EBIT / total assets

D = sales / total assets

E = current assets / short-term liabilities

IN05 > 1.6 The enterprise creates a value

0.9 < IN05 < 1.6 Gray zone of unmatched results

IN05 < 0.9 The enterprise destroys value, threat of bankruptcy

(Neumaierová & Neumaier, 2005)

Table 6 – Results of IN05

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Rakhat	2.00	2.37	2.75	3.74	4.28	4.75	5.12	6.49	3.60	3.92
Bayan Sulu	0.84	0.94	0.82	1.59	1.78	1.78	1.55	1.43	1.55	1.21
Konfety K.	1.28	1.12	3.88	2.20	3.31	3.02	1.71	-1.03	-10.73	-3.00
Nestle	1.71	1.75	1.73	1.82	1.55	1.74	1.77	1.62	1.75	1.74
Roshen	2.53	0.76	2.25	1.33	5.89	1.11	2.34	1.49	1.34	1.90
KDV-Yashkino	2.12	2.23	2.69	2.27	1.93	1.25	1.09	0.93	0.87	1.23
Konti	1.33	1.30	1.29	1.04	1.08	1.81	1.83	1.82	1.67	1.67

Source: Authors

IN05, on the other hand, shows more distressed periods of analyzed companies. KDV – Yaskino red field is caused by the significant increase in liabilities in 2014. Similarly, as KDV – Yaskino, Bayan Sulu, and Roshen red fields, just below the threshold, show period of depreciation and severe crisis in Ukraine (Roshen, compared with much more stable Konti). Bayan Sulu increased common capital in 2009 16-fold. Credits also increased significantly in 2009 while cash from operating activities was nearly non-existent.

Conclusion

The IN models showed us certain «hand» intervention into the models is necessary because the market is very specific and offering one would say changing and significant permanent challenges. It is certainly not for beginners to operate in such a market. Another specific of the whole market is high interest rates causing fluctuating and hardly predictable interest expenses of all indebted companies. We see foreign exchange risk can cause even clinical death as in case of Konfety Karagandy. Depreciation linked to oil prices that plummeted during the Great Recession is a permanent threat

because given current oil supply and demand trends it is unlikely the RUB and KZT currencies will strengthen in the near few years. Oil prices may even decrease a bit with next recession in the region, or with global problems that will sooner or later come, and companies will face distress conditions again. Such an environment cannot be called standard and regarding financial analysis methods and models certainly would appreciate similar approach as in the Czech Republic. In Prague, the Ministry of Industry and Trade through cooperation with the University of Economics in Prague operates a web portal where every company can enter their data and receive model results.

It is called Benchmarking Diagnostic System of INFA Financial Indicators. (MPO, 2007) This system serves businesses to verify their financial health and compare their results with the industry’s best industry or industry-wide industries, identifying the company’s major advantages and helping to reveal the biggest problems, being the very first step in their solution. It is the starting point for shaping and defining a business strategy. Our analysis showed that presented models could be effectively used for competitiveness analysis on the market with many challenges.

References

- 1 Arntzen, B. C., Brown, G. G., Harrison, T. P., & Trafton, L. L. (1995). Global supply chain management at Digital-Equipment-Corporation. *Interfaces*, 25(1), 69–93.
- 2 Beamon, B. M. (1999). Measuring supply chain performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 19(3–4), 275–292.
- 3 Cachon, G. P., & Lariviere, M. A. (2005). Supply chain coordination with revenue-sharing contracts: Strengths and limitations. *Management Science*, 51(1), 30–44.
- 4 Chen, F., Drezner, Z., Ryan, J. K., & Simchi-Levi, D. (2000). Quantifying the bullwhip effect in a simple supply chain: The impact of forecasting, lead times, and information. *Management Science*, 46(3), 436–443.
- 5 Chen, F., Federgruen, A., & Zheng, Y. S. (2001). Coordination mechanisms for a distribution system with one supplier and multiple retailers. *Management Science*, 47(5), 693–708.

- 6 Christopher, M. (2000). The agile supply chain—competing in volatile markets. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 29(1), 37–44.
- 7 Dybskaya V.V., Sergeev V.I. *Logistics. Full course of MBA / Moscow: Eksmo, 2009.*
- 8 Dyer, J. H., Cho, D. S., & Chu, W. J. (1998). Strategic supplier segmentation: The next “best practice” in supply chain management. *California Management Review*, 40(2), 57–77.
- 9 Emmons, H., & Gilbert, S. M. (1998). Note. The role of returns policies in pricing and inventory decisions for catalogue goods. *Management Science*, 44(2), 276–283.
- 10 Ertogral, K., & Wu, S. D. (2000). Auction-theoretic coordination of production planning in the supply chain. *IIE Transactions*, 32(10), 931–940.
- 11 Ivanov D.A. *Supply chain management. St. Petersburg: Publishing house Polytechnical University, 2009.P.156.*
- 12 Fedotov Yu.V., Krotov K.V. Supply chain management: the problem definition of the term and area of research // *Russian Journal of Management*. 2011. Т. 9, No. 2. P. 49 – 58
- 13 Fisher, M. L. (1997). What is the right supply chain for your product? *Harvard Business Review*, 75(2), 105–116.
- 14 Fleischmann, M., Beullens, P., & Bloemhof-Ruwaard, J. M. (2001). The impact of product recovery on logistics network design. *Production and Operations Management*, 10(2), 156–173.
- 15 Fox, M. S., Barbuceanu, M., & Teigen, R. (2000). Agent-oriented supply-chain management. *International Journal of Flexible Manufacturing Systems*, 12(2), 165–188.
- 16 Frohlich, M. T., & Westbrook, R. (2001). Arcs of integration: An international study of supply chain strategies. *Journal of Operations Management*, 19(2), 185–200.
- 17 Guide, V. D. R., Jayaraman, V., Srivastava, R., & Benton, W. C. (2000). Supply-chain management for recoverable manufacturing systems. *Interfaces*, 30(3), 125–142.
- 18 Gupta, A., & Maranas, C. D. (2003). Managing demand uncertainty in supply chain planning. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, 27(8–9), 1219–1227.
- 19 Harrison A. *Logistics. The strategy of managing and competing chain of supply chain. M.: Case and Service, 2010.P.325.*
- 20 Kurenkov P.V., Balalaeu A.S., Zabnenkov V.S. Systematization of functions logistics intermediaries in transport // *Logistics today*. 2011. № 3.P.19.
- 21 Kuznetsov A.V., Kurenkov P.V., Filipchenko S.A. Market development transport services companies operating in Europe // *Zheleznodorozhny transport*. 2010. № 12.P.32.
- 22 Lee, H. L. (2002). Aligning supply chain strategies with product uncertainties. *California Management Review*, 44(3), 105–119.
- 23 Lee, H. L., Padmanabhan, V., & Whang, S. J. (1997a). Information distortion in a supply chain: The bullwhip effect. *Management Science*, 43(4), 546–558.
- 24 Lee, H. L., Padmanabhan, V., & Whang, S. J. (1997b). The bullwhip effect in supply chain. *Sloan Management Review*, 38(3), 93–102.
- 25 Narashimhan, R., & Jayaram, J. (1998). Causal linkages in supply chain management: An exploratory study of North American manufacturing firms. *Decision Sciences*, 29(3), 579–605.
- 26 Naylor, J. B., Naim, M. M., & Berry, D. (1999). Leagility: Integrating the lean and agile manufacturing paradigms in the total supply chain. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 62(1–2), 107–118.
- 27 Oliver, R. K., & Webber, M. D. (1982). Supply-chain management: Logistics catches up with strategy. *Outlook*; reprinted in Christopher, M. G. (1992), *Logistics, the strategic issue* (pp. 63–75). London: Chapman and Hall.
- 28 Ohotnikov I.V., Sibirko I.V. *Management of logistics systems. Moscow: MAX Press, 2014.P.225.*
- 29 Ozer, O., & Wei, W. (2006). Strategic commitments for an optimal capacity decision under asymmetric forecast information. *Management Science*, 52(8), 1238–1257.
- 30 Savaskan, R. C., Bhattacharya, S., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (2004). Closed-loop supply chain models with product remanufacturing. *Management Science*, 50(2), 239–252.
- 31 Sergeev V.I., Dorofeeva E.A. Terminological aspects of the concept «Stability» of supply chains in the focus of logistical integration, // *Logi-and supply chain management*. 2010. № 3.P.22.
- 32 Van Leeuwen, T., & Tijssen, R. (2000). Interdisciplinary dynamics of modern science: Analysis of crossdisciplinary citation flows. *Research Evaluation*, 9(3), 183–187.

Литература

- 1 Арнтцен Б.С., Браун Г.Г. Харрисон Т.П. и Трафтон Л.Л. (1995) Глобальное управление цепочками поставок в Диджитал Икюпмент Корпорэйшн. *Интерфейс*, 25 (1), 69-93.
- 2 Бимон, Б. М. (1999). Измерение производительности цепочки поставок // *Международный журнал по операциям и управлению производством*, 19 (3-4), 275-292.
- 3 Качон, Г. П., и Ларивиере, М. А. (2005). Координация цепочки поставок с контрактами по распределению доходов: Сильные стороны и ограничения // *Наука управления*, 51(1), 30–44.
- 4 Чен, Ф., Дрезнер, З., Рян, Ж. К., Симчи-Леви, Д. (2000). Количественная оценка эффекта «хлыста» в простой цепочке поставок: влияние прогнозирования, времени выполнения и информации // *Наука управления*, 46 (3), 436-443.
- 5 Чен, Ф., Федергруен, А., и Женг, У. С. (2001). Механизмы координации для системы распределения с одним поставщиком и несколькими розничными торговцами. *Наука управления*, 47 (5), 693-708.

- 6 Кристофер, М. (2000). Цепочка поставок конкурирует на нестабильных рынках // Управление промышленным маркетингом, 29 (1), 37-44.
- 7 Дыбская В.В., Сергеев В.И. Логистика. Полный курс МВА. – М.: Эксмо, 2009.
- 8 Диер, Ж. Х., Чо, Д. С., и Чу, В. Ж. (1998). Стратегическая сегментация поставщиков: следующая «наилучшая практика» в управлении цепочками поставок. Калифорния Манаджмент, Ревью 40 (2), 57-77.
- 9 Эммонс, Х., и Гилберт, С.М. (1998). Заметка. Роль политики возврата в ценообразовании и решениях инвентаризации для товаров каталога // Управленческая наука, 44 (2), 276-283.
- 10 Ертограл, К., и Ву, С. Д. (2000). Теоретико-теоретическая координация планирования производства в цепочке поставок. ПЕ, 32 (10), 931-940.
- 11 Иванов Д.А. Система управления цепями поставок. – СПб.: Издательство Политехнического университета, 2009. – Р. 156.
- 12 Федотов Ю.В., Кротов К.В. Управление цепочками поставок: определение проблемы термина и области исследований // Российский журнал управления. – 2011. – Т. 9, № 2. – С. 49 – 58
- 13 Фишер, М. Л. (1997). Какая правильная цепочка поставок для вашего продукта? Гарвард Бизнес Ревью, 75 (2), 105-116.
- 14 Флейшман, М., Беюленс, П., и Блщехоф-Руваард-Ruwaard, Ж. М. (2001). Влияние восстановления продукта на дизайн логистической сети. Управление производством и операциями, 10 (2), 156-173.
- 15 Фокс, М. С., Барбусеану, М., и Тайген, Р. (2000). Агентно-ориентированное управление цепочками поставок // Международный журнал гибких производственных систем, 12 (2), 165-188.
- 16 Фролих, М. Т., и Вестброок, Р. (2001). Дуги интеграции: международное исследование стратегий цепочки поставок // Джурнал оф Оперейшн Манажмент, 19 (2), 185-200.
- 17 Гуид, В.Д. Р., Жейараман, В., Сривастава, Р., и Бентон, В. С. (2000). Управление цепочками поставок для восстановительных производственных систем // Интерфейсы, 30 (3), 125-142.
- 18 Гупта, А., и Маранас, С. Д. (2003). Управление неопределенностью спроса при планировании цепочки поставок // Компьютеры и химическая инженерия, 27 (8-9), 1219-1227.
- 19 Харрисон А. Логистика. Стратегия управления цепочкой поставок и конкуренции. – М.: Дело и обслуживание, 2010. – Р. 325.
- 20 Куренков П.В., Балалаев А.С., Забненков В.С. Систематизация функций логистических посредников в транспорте // Логистика сегодня. – 2011. – № 3. – Р. 19.
- 21 Кузнецов А.В., Куренков П.В., Филипченко С.А. Развитие рынка транспортных услуг, работающих в Европе // Железнодорожный транспорт. – 2010. – № 12. – Р. 32.
- 22 Ли, Х. Л. (2002). Выравнивание стратегий цепочки поставок с неопределенностью продукта // Калифорния Манажмент Ревью, 44 (3), 105-119.
- 23 Ли, Х. Л., Пэдмэнэхан, В., и Ванг, С. Ж. (1997а). Искажение информации в цепочке поставок: эффект быка // Управленческая наука, 43 (4), 546-558.
- 24 Ли, Х. Л., Пэдмэнэхан, В., и Ванг, С. Ж. (1997б). Эффект «хлыста» в цепочке поставок // Слоан Манажмент Ревью, 38 (3), 93-102.
- 25 Нарашимхан, Р., и Джейрам, Жи. (1998). Причинные связи в управлении цепочками поставок: исследовательское исследование североамериканских производственных фирм // Принятие решений, 29 (3), 579-605.
- 26 Нейлор, Джи. В., Нэйм, М. М., и Берри, Д. (1999). Леажилити: Интеграция логичных и гибких производственных парадигм в общей цепочке поставок // Международный журнал по экономике производства, 62 (1-2), 107-118.
- 27 Оливер, Р. К., и Веббер, М. Д. (1982). Управление цепочками поставок: Лоджистикс катчес ап витз стратегжи. Перспективы; перепечатано в Кристофер, М. Г. (1992), Лоджистикс, стратегический вопрос (стр. 63-75). Лондон: Чепмен и Холл.
- 28 Охотников И.В., Сибко И.В. Управление системами логистики. – М.: МАХ Прес, 2014. – Р.225.
- 29 Озер, О., и Вэй, В. (2006). Стратегические обязательства для принятия оптимального решения в рамках асимметричной прогнозной информации // Менеджмент науки, 52 (8), 1238-1257.
- 30 Саваскан, Р. С., Бхаттачария, С., и Ван Вассенков, Л. Н. (2004). Модели с цепями с обратной связью // Менеджмент науки, 50 (2), 239-252.
- 31 Сергеев В.И., Дорофеева Е.А. Терминологические аспекты концепции «Стабильность» цепей поставок в центре логистической интеграции // Управление логистикой и цепочками поставок. – 2010. – № 3. – Р. 22.
- 32 Ван Лиувен Т., и Тайджссен П. (2000). Междисциплинарная динамика современной науки: анализ междисциплинарных потоков цитирования // Оценка исследований, 9 (3), 183-187.