

# Quality Competitiveness of Latvia's Food Industry in the Fish Products Group

J. Priede

**Abstract**—The aim of this paper is to develop framework for evaluation of quality competitiveness of countries exports and to use this framework to examine quality competitiveness of Latvia's food industry in the fish products group.

To achieve this aim author studied topic related scientific literature and used appropriate methods to examine quality competitiveness according to the other researchers and author's own developed approach.

To successfully achieve the aim of the paper and fulfill the tasks set the following research methods were used: 1) monographs method; 2) logical - constructive; 3) statistical analysis techniques: structural analysis and regression analysis; 4) graphical method.

At the end of the paper author make conclusions about developed methodology of evaluation of quality competitiveness and main conclusions about examined quality competitiveness of Latvia's food industry in the fish products group.

**Index Terms**—Competitiveness, fish, export, quality.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quality is a complex phenomenon and there exist no general accepted definition, which fits every purpose and all the complexities in teal economics.

While competitiveness of enterprises has been studied by many scholars around the world, competitiveness of nations is a relatively new discipline.

Studies of export competitiveness in the world markets are not new. Several attempts to evaluate export competitiveness have been made in the past, primarily in Eastern Europe. In Czechoslovakia, for example, a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the study was undertaken already in the 1960's. Similar approach was used by World Bank studies of the price and quality competitiveness of exports by other authors.

Quality competitiveness topic is still important and research in this field continuous. Researchers are using different methods to look at the quality of exports and its competitiveness. Researchers are developing different methods and indicators to measure quality competitiveness of exports, product differentiation and quality link to changes in exports, product-quality view, exporters behavior under quality constrains.

Main problem author is facing in this article is measuring quality competitiveness of countries and industries. Until now there are several approaches in the literature how to

measure quality competitiveness of countries or industries or product groups and each one of them has their advantages and disadvantages. Approach is still discussable due to the nature of measuring quality itself and measuring quality competitiveness of country is still quite new and undeveloped field.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF QUALITY COMPETITIVENESS OF COUNTRY AND INDUSTRY

Theoretical and empirical research increasingly point to the importance of product quality in international trade and economic development [1].

Studies of export competitiveness in the world markets are not new. Several attempts to evaluate export competitiveness have been made in the past, primarily in Eastern Europe. In Czechoslovakia, for example, a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the study was undertaken already in the 1960's (see, for example, [2]). Unfortunately, their study covered only the price competitiveness of Czechoslovak exports in the EEC market and the period 1955-64 and selected manufacturing exports. They estimated export prices realized by Czechoslovak exporters in the EEC market and compared them with export prices of countries for the same products of countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).

Similar approach was used by World Bank studies of the price and quality competitiveness of exports by other authors [3].

Quality competitiveness topic is still important and research in this field continuous. Researchers are using different methods to look at the quality of exports and its competitiveness. Researchers are developing different methods and indicators to measure quality competitiveness of export [4], [5], importance of the quality in competitiveness [6], [7], price and non-price competitiveness [8], quality's impact on prices of trade [9], product differentiation and quality link to changes in exports [10], [12], product-quality view [13], exporters behavior under quality constrains [14] and other issues.

Since product quality is not directly observable from trade data, there is a lack of consensus on an appropriate measure of quality. Researchers have traditionally used various price indices to proxy for quality, but this approach ignores the horizontal aspects of product differentiation. On the other hand, efforts to incorporate horizontal differentiation have been relatively scarce and are somewhat difficult to implement at a more aggregate level.

In this paper author decided to pay more attention to Aiginger's ideas in order to better understand the theoretical framework of quality competitiveness.

Manuscript received October 14, 2012; revised December 17, 2012. This work was supported by the ERAF Project 2010/0202/2DP/2.1.1.2.0/10/APIA/VIAA/013.

J. Priede is with the Department of National Economy, University of Latvia Faculty of Economics and Management, 5 Aspazijas blvd., Riga, Latvia, LV-1050 (e-mail: janis.priede@lu.lv).

Higher quality is a necessary precondition for high cost producers to stay competitive. Producing the same quality at a higher price or at lower margins is not feasible in the long run. Many European countries have higher wages than the USA and Japan; this cost advantage is even larger if compared to accession countries and to many new competitors in the globalizing world. It is possible to cope with higher wages by increasing productivity, but since technology and managerial skills are also spreading by the investment of multinational firms, this strategy is not always feasible. Producing a higher quality is an alternative as well as a complement to higher productivity. This strategy is however easier in those industries in which buyers differentiate between quality types, while there are other markets in which price competition is the most important competitive mode. "Quality competition" is competitive environment, in which upgrading quality, and increasing the willingness to pay is important relative to competing at low prices [15].

Activities that upgrade quality are more or better skilled labor, machines, more sophisticated material inputs, but also superior organization on the plant or firm level. Research and development, as well as imitation of the best techniques and processes, may be sources of quality upgrading. Marketing may increase the willingness to pay by providing information about the capabilities of the product or by changing the tastes of consumers. In most, but not all cases, the quality of output is related to the quality of input. Submitting to certifications, setting standards, and benchmarking are other techniques of upgrading the quality of processes, as well as the quality of products, and also market functions. The inputs that help to upgrade quality, economic and political accelerators, are summarized in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Quality competition: preconditions, types and consequences.

It also reports on the indicators that signal quality and consequences for market structure.

Quality differs from productivity, as the latter is defined usually in technical (quantitative) terms, like tons per one unit of labor input. If, however, value added is used as a numerator, then the prices and quality of output are taken into

account. And if we distinguish between several qualifications for labor, the quality of inputs can be incorporated into the denominator of productivity. Nevertheless, productivity studies focus on the quantity of output with respect to the quantity of inputs, trying to do so for indicators which are as homogenous as possible, while quality explicitly addresses the heterogeneity of outputs produced usually with respect to heterogeneous inputs.

Innovations refer to changes in processes and products. New products are usually products of higher quality.

However, they can be relatively cheaper when better materials or superior production processes are used. Tension between higher quality and lower costs may arise.

Adding a further stage of processing usually increases the quality of the product. The additional stage can make the product more durable, more convenient, more specifically suitable and useful for the consumer, investor or producer. A further stage of processing can be to combine hardware with a software; a tangible product with a service or information. There are some cases, where a further stage of processing decreases the user value by decreasing flexibility or compatibility for some purposes.

Quality and profitability are closely related, insofar as the quality of products will usually raise profitability, both by decreasing the competitive pressure as well as by increasing the willingness to pay. However, quality is mainly a characteristic of the product and profitability a result of the production process and the strategy and organization of firms. There can be a conflict between the quality of the product as measured in objective terms and profitability, if quality raises costs more than it raises the willingness to pay. The economic solution is to find the quality that maximizes profits. The resulting "optimal" quality provided may be below that assessed as desirable or feasible by technicians or consumer organizations.

The quality of products should be reflected in the profits and specifically in the persistence of supernormal profits. If the market is not regulated or characterized by entry barriers, each advantage of a specific firm will be contested rapidly by other firms. Only firms which can consistently upgrade quality or which – to use a term taken from strategic management literature – possess a specific nonimitable advantage can accrue higher profits in the long run.

Aiginger also developed three main indicators to assess quality: the unit value of exports (UV), the share of exports in quality sensitive industries, and the share of exports in the high price (quality) segments.

Author in this paper is using the unit value (UV) of exports: this indicator is defined as nominal exports divided into tons. Higher unit values reflect higher willingness to pay for a given product, one reason for this is the higher quality in a market with vertically differentiated products. The unit value for an aggregate is higher if a country focus on more sophisticated or higher processed goods. We can call this indicator "indicator on overall quality" since it comprises many different aspects of product quality.

Author is using unit value of imports and relative unit value as well in this paper to reveal nature of quality

competitiveness.

### III. MEASURING QUALITY COMPETITIVENESS

The most comprehensive measure of quality available for empirical research is the "unit value". According to Aiginger its usefulness in evaluating quality comes from the fact that all of the following activities tend to increase sales relative to physical weight:

- Increasing durability, reliability, compatibility, flexibility
- Using superior material inputs or higher skills
- Making a product more specific to demand
- Refining or further processing a product
- Adding new functions, service or maintenance contracts
- Better design, advertising.

Unit values as indicators of quality have been used in industry studies for assessing qualitative competitiveness and for discriminating between different components of intra-industry trade.

The unit value is defined as nominal value divided into physical volume. In Aiginger's reports it is the gross value of exports or imports in ECU (euro) divided by kilogram. The unit value in general depends on demand and prices, but specifically it reflects changes in quality, shifts to higher product segments and to other value enhancing features (service component, design and advertising). Therefore, unit value is often applied as an indicator in attempts to measure quality and vertical product differentiation. Like any comprehensive indicator, it has advantages and disadvantages. Among the advantages is its availability at nearly every level of disaggregation (6 digit industries or even 9 digit industries), for any country, and even for bilateral country to country trade flows. It is not available for production. For some industries, some information is missing (differing from country to country), implying careful programming techniques for the correct treatment of nominators and denominators.

As far as the interpretation of the unit value is concerned, it is fascinating that most of the components which add value are included. Industries intensively using physical capital exhibit rather low unit values, since capital is used for example in basic steel industries or in basic chemicals for large-scale production. So capital intensive industries rank lower and skill intensive higher in unit values as compared to productivity or value added per employee. This can also be seen as an advantage when we understand that developed countries rely mostly on skills in their efforts to achieve the competitive edge. On the other hand, some industries have intrinsically higher unit values, while they are neither high tech, nor do they use skilled labour, nor is physical capital involved. For example, this holds for textile and apparel industries, in which the unit values are high, since the weight in tons is low. Here, reprocessing also poses a problem. Goods are shipped into low wage countries and return at a somewhat higher unit value, indicating that the high wage country exports the lower quality product (as compared to the re-imported good). Reservations about the use of unit value also hold for precious metals, where supply is scarce relative to demand. Therefore, jewellery, leather, furs, footwear and apparel are among the top industries, as far as absolute unit

value is concerned, without for example any indication of the use of skilled labour or research. However in general, high tech or high skill industries - like aircraft and spacecraft, watches and clocks, TV and radio transmitters and instruments - are also among the industries with the highest export unit values.

A problem in using unit values was that high values could indicate high quality or high costs. A technique proposed by Aiginger [16] enables us to disentangle costs and quality at least partially. If unit values reflect costs, the quantity exported must be low for the high cost country. If it reflects quality, then exports are predicted to be high for the country with the higher unit value. Another objection to the use of unit value is that unit values may include the higher margins created by market power. The greatest market power is primarily expected on domestic markets. If unit values on the international market contain market power, this will be based on a major innovation. And if some firms succeed in becoming world monopolists and are not challenged over a long period of time, they will produce in various countries. Unit values of exports and imports are not fully comparable, since both are measured at the border. Imports include trade costs from the point of origin to the border, exports from the mill to the border. The reporting mode has shifted in the last years from customs agencies to firms. A lot of noise and inconsistency on the product level have arisen from these features, but the rich data set enables us to cope with many outliers and errors. But in the most cases, a careful second look at the data, or the exploitation of the very rich data can eliminate distortions or enable an evaluation of their quantitative impact. In general we use total exports if we focus on the comparison of European countries.

### IV. QUALITY COMPETITIVENESS OF LATVIA'S FOOD INDUSTRY IN THE FISH PRODUCTS GROUP

Author in this section of article will analyze quality competitiveness of Latvia's food industry in the fish products group by applying approaches described in previous sections.

Food industry is one of the main industries in the total exports of Latvia [17]. Agriculture and food products combined 12,7% from all exports in year 2011 (Table I).

TABLE I: STRUCTURE OF EXPORTS OF LATVIA BY THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS IN YEAR 2011

<b>Total, including:</b>	<b>100</b>
wood and wood products	16,8
metal and metal articles	16,4
light industry products	14,5
agriculture and food products	12,7
products of chemical industry and related industries, plastics	10,5
machinery products	9,1
minerals	6,7
vehicles	4,6
other goods	8,7

In the imports in year 2011 agriculture and food products combined even more - 15,1% from all imports.

The food industry is the largest manufacturing industry by

both turnover and the number of employed. The sector is mainly oriented towards the domestic market where slightly more than 70% of all production is sold. Therefore along with the decreasing domestic demand during the crisis, production volumes of the sector decreased rapidly, and the sector recovery is slow. During the crisis production volumes of food and beverages decreased by a fifth and that was slower than average in the manufacturing.

However, the recovery of the food industry is rather slow due to moderate increase of demand in domestic market. In 2010 and 2011, production volumes remained at the level of 2009. The situation is not significantly improving in 2012 – in four months output of the food industry exceeded the level of January-April 2011 just by 1 percent.

Despite the low production volumes, the turnover of food industry has increased considerably. In 2011, it increased by 9.3%, the rise in production sold in export markets (by 21%) contributed the most to the increase in turnover, while revenues from sales in the domestic market increased by 5 percent.

The increase in industry turnover in 2010-2011 was mainly determined by the rise in producer prices due to the rise in food prices worldwide. In 2011, the producer prices in food industry were by 5.9% higher than a year ago.

In 2012, food prices in the world are decreasing and producer prices in the industry are not increasing significantly and in April 2012 they were only by 1.8% higher than in April 2011. Therefore, also the total turnover of the industry has become moderate. In the four months of 2012, turnover exceeded the level of January-April 2011 only by 3.2 percent.

The biggest trade partners of Latvia from January until April 2012 were Lithuania – 17% of the total foreign trade turnover, Russia – 12%, Germany and Estonia – each 10%, Poland – 8%, Sweden and Finland – each 4 percent.

But if we analyze food production export, than during the same period of time biggest trade partners of Latvia were Lithuania – 23% and Estonia – 18% (Fig. 2).




Fig. 2. Food production exports by groups of countries, January-April 2012 (Ministry of economics of the republic of Latvia).

To reveal nature of quality competitiveness of Latvia's food industry in fish products group author calculated relative unit value of trade between Latvia and main trade partners: Belarus, Germany, Denmark, Estonia, France, Lithuania, Poland and Russia. Similar approach was used in [18], [19].

Author used Eurostat databases and calculated Latvia's unit value of fish products export with main trade partner countries and summarized results in Table II.

TABLE II: LATVIA'S UNIT VALUE OF FISH PRODUCTS EXPORT WITH MAIN TRADE PARTNER COUNTRIES, YEARS 1999 – 2011, EURO/100 KG

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Belarus	24,98	29,02	26,57	26,11	22,83	22,54	25,31	25,54	29,01	32,10	34,95	30,42	34,17
Germany	126,66	172,43	239,46	335,47	295,38	274,30	337,85	295,41	332,50	221,54	366,01	754,31	762,34
Denmark	79,06	280,83	161,48	343,52	338,45	314,50	148,13	405,24	114,49	222,61	93,31	80,40	105,55
Estonia	27,62	45,24	46,24	32,69	30,27	80,24	246,66	271,85	289,41	297,79	281,23	220,31	288,26
France	121,51	121,47	N/A	437,96	279,53	312,35	N/A	340,88	313,08	300,71	280,30	429,26	418,70
Lithuania	33,98	113,06	128,62	115,78	115,95	109,70	202,08	205,70	233,65	216,97	267,20	183,18	178,09
Poland	N/A	N/A	14,69	N/A	N/A	N/A	228,91	N/A	137,65	202,37	139,10	112,33	120,27
Russia	15,76	11,56	11,66	20,29	23,75	22,34	23,28	22,32	23,09	25,96	32,17	38,15	42,62

Although the highest value of export in year 2011 was to the Estonia (31,4 million euro) and Lithuania (18,4 million euro), the highest unit value in fish products export is achieved to Germany 762,34 Euro/100kg with a 2 million

euro total export in year 2011.

Author calculated also Latvia's unit value of fish products import with the same trade partner countries and summarized results in Table III.

TABLE III: LATVIA'S UNIT VALUE OF FISH PRODUCTS IMPORT WITH MAIN TRADE PARTNER COUNTRIES, YEARS 1999 – 2011, EURO/100 KG

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Belarus	354,40	388,48	227,48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	132,55	122,21	29,59
Germany	154,64	271,92	196,04	114,96	121,56	186,77	277,55	122,88	407,83	773,41	1053,96	530,23	896,63
Denmark	532,09	324,22	109,43	188,22	201,52	79,61	178,67	253,26	394,76	299,51	332,78	385,98	449,99
Estonia	123,99	57,24	69,99	40,19	81,75	96,73	115,77	111,06	110,76	76,91	66,88	276,46	118,09
France	948,12	944,47	1009,36	245,38	325,31	759,32	477,82	1045,38	963,41	962,32	605,44	548,23	613,21
Lithuania	55,71	67,13	38,32	36,73	34,55	54,48	85,52	93,52	113,81	138,57	226,30	111,62	115,79
Poland	29,62	469,14	332,20	542,30	281,40	106,84	118,34	79,84	89,87	117,56	147,40	176,10	278,99
Russia	65,63	64,28	63,22	87,81	59,79	55,87	55,92	214,04	154,44	N/A	35,30	44,33	445,21

The highest unit value of fish products import in year 2011 was from Germany (896,63 euro/100kg and total import of 1 million euro), France (613,12 euro/100kg and total import of 0,7 million euro) and Denmark (449,99 euro/100kg and total import of 5,9 million euro). Latvia's main trade partners

Estonia and Lithuania imported least fish products in total value than Latvia exported to these countries and also unit value of import was lower than unit value of export which shows quality competitiveness of fish products.

To reveal quality competitiveness of fish products export

to main export countries author use relative unit value as well that shows relationship between unit value of export and unit

value of import. Author calculated relative unit value using data in Tables II and III and summarized results in Table IV.

TABLE IV: RELATIVE UNIT VALUE OF LATVIA'S TRADE WITH FOOD (FISH PRODUCTS) WITH MAIN TRADE PARTNER COUNTRIES, YEARS 1999 – 2011

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Belarus	0,070	0,075	0,117	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0,264	0,249	1,155
Germany	0,819	0,634	1,221	2,918	2,430	1,469	1,217	2,404	0,815	0,286	0,347	1,423	0,850
Denmark	0,149	0,866	1,476	1,825	1,680	3,951	0,829	1,600	0,290	0,743	0,280	0,208	0,235
Estonia	0,223	0,790	0,661	0,813	0,370	0,829	2,131	2,448	2,613	3,872	4,205	0,797	2,441
France	0,128	0,129	N/A	1,785	0,859	0,411	N/A	0,326	0,325	0,312	0,463	0,783	0,683
Lithuania	0,610	1,684	3,357	3,152	3,356	2,014	2,363	2,200	2,053	1,566	1,181	1,641	1,538
Poland	N/A	N/A	0,044	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,934	N/A	1,532	1,721	0,944	0,638	0,431
Russia	0,240	0,180	0,184	0,231	0,397	0,400	0,416	0,104	0,150	N/A	0,911	0,860	0,096

Table IV reveals relative unit value of trade with fish products. According to theoretical framework all indicators above 1.00 (RUV>1.00) tend to indicate competitive trade – export quality and added value is higher than imported.

Relative unit value reveals that great fluctuations in all export markets except main export markets – Estonia and Lithuania where it is possible to make conclusions. If we look just at these two countries than we can see that RUV of trade with Lithuania is more than 1 since year 2000. Although since year 2001 it has decreased from highest 3,357 to 1,538 in year 2011, RUV still strongly shows fish products export quality competitiveness to Lithuania.

Latvia shows high export quality competitiveness also to Estonia (Table IV), RUV is more than 1 since year 2005 and in year 2011 it was 2,441 (except year 2010 when it was 0,797).

Of course we do have to take into account that deeper analysis of fish products group will reveal the nature of the trade and “nature of added value”.

## V. CONCLUSION

Measuring quality competitiveness is very complex. Developed approaches by any author have certain drawbacks and researchers have to take them into account. Unit value of export, unit value of import and relative unit value are good indicators to reveal a nature of quality competitiveness.

Agriculture and food products industry is one of the most important industries in Latvia with 12.7% in total export.

Quality competitiveness of fish products was observed with main trade partners – Lithuania and Estonia.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. C. Hallak and P. K. Schott, *Estimated Cross-country Differences in Product Quality*, Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research, pp. 76, 2008.
- [2] J. Klacsek and J. Pleva, “Efektivnost zahranicne obchodnich operaci na trhu EHS,” *Politicka ekonomie*, pp. 148, 1967.
- [3] Z. Drabek and A. Olechowski, “Price and Quality Competitiveness of Socialist Countries Exports,” *The World Bank*, WPS 317, pp. 24, 1989.
- [4] K. Aiginger, “Europe’s position in quality competition,” *Luxembourg: Office for official Publications of European Communities*, pp. 59, 2001.
- [5] G. Davidsons and A. Kanepajs, “Latvijas eksporta cenu konkurētspējas vērtējums un ārējā pieprasījuma attīstības analīze,” *Bank of Latvia*, pp. 30, 2008.

- [6] J. Priede and R. Škapars, “Theoretical Aspects of Measuring Countries Quality Competitiveness of Exports,” in *Proc. 5th International Scientific Conference*, Pula: Papyrus, pp. 654-671, 2011.
- [7] J. Priede, “Implementation of Quality Management System ISO 9001 in the World and Its Strategic Necessity,” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 58, pp. 1466-1475, 2012.
- [8] K. Benkovskis and J. Worz, “Evaluation of Non-Price Competitiveness of Exports from Central, Eastern and Southeastern European countries in the EU market,” *Bank of Latvia*, pp. 30, 2012.
- [9] K. Benkovskis and J. Worz, “How Does Quality Impact on Import Prices?,” *Oesterreichische Nationalbank*, pp. 45, 2011.
- [10] Y. Kandogan, “Does Product Differentiation Explain The Increase in Exports of Transition Countries?,” William Davidson Institute Working Papers, *University of Michigan Business School*, pp. 23, 2003.
- [11] Y. Kandogan, “The Reorientation of Transition Countries’ Exports: Changes in Quantity, Quality and Variety,” William Davidson Institute Working Papers, *University of Michigan Business School*, pp. 42, 2003.
- [12] Y. Kandogan, “How Much Restructuring did the Transition Countries Experience? Evidence from Quality of their Exports,” William Davidson Institute Working Papers, *University of Michigan Business School*, pp. 32, 2004.
- [13] J. C. Hallak, “Product quality and the direction of trade,” *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 68, pp. 238-265, 2006.
- [14] J. Hallak and J. Sivadasan, “Firms’ Exporting Behavior under Quality Constraints,” *IPC Working Paper Series*, *University of Michigan*, pp. 64, 2009.
- [15] K. Aiginger, “The Qualitative Competition of High Wage Countries,” *Measuring the Position of Countries on the Quality Ladder*, Austrian Institute of Economic Research and University of Linz, pp. 19, 1997.
- [16] K. Aiginger, “A framework for evaluating the dynamic competitiveness of countries,” *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, pp. 159-188, 1997.
- [17] Ministry of Economics of the Republic of Latvia, *Economic Development of Latvia*, LLC Latgales Druka, pp. 142, 2012.
- [18] J. Priede and R. Škapars, “Quality competitiveness of Latvia’s metal industry in the iron and steel product groups,” *Economics and Management – Kaunas: Kaunas University of Technology*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 202-209, 2012.
- [19] J. Priede and R. Škapars, “Quality Competitiveness of Latvia’s Wood Industry,” *European Integration Studies*, Research and Topicalities, Kaunas: Technologija Kaunas, no. 5, pp. 229-236, 2011.



**J. Priede** is an Assistant professor, University of Latvia Faculty of Economics and Management. Doctor of Economics from the University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia, 2010. Master of social sciences in Economics (with honors) from the University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia, 2006. Major fields of study: Competitiveness (Microeconomics and Macroeconomics), Trade, Innovation, Business Economics and Strategy, Quality Assurance and Management. Visiting lecturer at the Bremen University and University of Aveiro. Lecturer for the Summer School “Economics and Management of Innovation” organized by the Campus Europae. Author of 20 publications and participant of 12 International Scientific Conferences.