Критерии оценивания заданий заключительного этапа
по направлению «Менеджмент»

Маркетинг

Критерии оценки олимпиадных работ по профилю «Менеджмент», трек «Маркетинг» КОД -190. Вариантная часть (анализ статьи):

	Критерии с описанием	Кол-во баллов
1	**Название статьи:** - предложено подходящее название статьи - дана аргументация относительно названия	От 0 до 6 баллов
2	**Основные ограничения исследования:** **-** названы ограничения (учитывается количество и релевантность) - дано описание обозначенных ограничений	От 0 до 8 баллов
3	**Дополнительные методы исследований:** - обозначены альтернативные методы исследований - методы указаны в привязке к основным задачам/областям изучения	От 0 до 8 баллов
4	**Распространение инсайтов на другие сегменты e-com:** - названы подходящие сегменты рынка/потребителей (учитывается их количество и релевантность) - есть описание того, как могут быт применены инсайты	От 0 до 8 баллов
5	**Возможности применения на практике результатов исследования:** - указано возможное применение результатов с опорой на текст статьи - представлено авторское видение возможности использования, приведены примеры	От 0 до 10 баллов
6	**Прогноз по изменению e-com рынка:** - названы факторы развития рынка электронной коммерции (учитывается количество и релевантность) - дан аргументированный прогноз с примерами	От 0 до 10 балло
	ИТОГО	До 50 баллов

Примеры проверенных работ прикладываются для вопроса по управленческой проблеме, для вопроса по налоговым режимам и правовой форме добавлены подробное описание, что планируется отслеживать в ответах - аналог модели ответа.

Критерии для оценки вопроса по управленческой проблеме:
Diagnosis (the essence of the problem/paradox has been correctly identified):
0 marks — incorrect or absent
2 marks — partial or imprecise
4 marks — accurate and clearly articulated

Theoretical Framework (a specific concept, model, or theory has been applied)
0 marks — no reference to theory
2 marks — mentioned without elaboration
4 marks — applied correctly

Specific Priority Action (the mostly important action)
0 marks — generic or templated response
2 marks — a valid action is identified
4 marks — a complete and detailed description of the action, clear and concise
6 marks — clarity in the description of the action + arguments and justification in comparison with alternative actions

Personal Experience (a specific subject is named — company, organisation, or project — a specific mechanism for addressing the problem is described, and an explicit link is made: "my experience confirms / contradicts" the conclusion regarding the priority action)
0 marks — generic or templated response
2 marks — a concrete example of a similar managerial problem is provided
4 marks — example + mechanism for addressing the problem
6 marks — example + mechanism for addressing the problem + connection to the priority action

Критерии для проверки работ по вопросу о налоговых режимах и правовой форме:
0-20 marks “Correctness of Choice”:

0-10 marks “Correctness of Calculations”:
10 marks: calculations are performed correctly for all tax regimes; expenses are correctly allocated across tax regimes; the composition and amount of tax are determined.
5 marks: calculations are performed correctly for at least 3 tax regimes, with correct allocation of expenses across them and correct determination of the composition and amount of tax.
0 marks: calculations are absent, entirely erroneous, or contain numerous methodological errors.

0-5 marks “Internal Consistency of Assumptions and Calculations”
5 marks: all tax regimes are presented without internal contradictions in the assumptions
3 marks: for at least 3 tax regimes, the assumptions are correct, consistent, and do not contradict one another
0 marks: assumptions are not formulated, or are entirely or substantially contradictory to the calculations

0-5 marks “Choice of Tax Regime and Legal Form”
5 marks: the choice is well-reasoned and includes a comparison with other tax regimes

0 marks: the choice is arbitrary, without justification, or entirely incorrect.

0-5 marks “Managerial Justification”:
1 mark: administrative burden and speed of launch are linked to the chosen tax regime
2 marks: a minimum of three risks are identified
1 mark: a minimum of two risks are identified
2 marks: the restrictions of the tax regime are explicitly set out (employees, caps, receipt issuance)
0 marks: the managerial justification for the proposed choice is absent or is abstract without explanation

0-5 marks “Critical Thinking”:
3 marks: a minimum of 3 traps specifically from the text are identified and explained as to why each constitutes a trap
2 marks: a minimum of 2 traps specifically from the text are identified and explained as to why each constitutes a trap
1 mark: a minimum of 1 trap specifically from the text is identified and explained as to why it constitutes a trap

2 marks: 3 genuinely substantive clarifying questions are posed
1 mark: 2 genuinely substantive clarifying questions are posed
0 marks: traps are not identified, are identified incorrectly, questions are absent, trivial ("What colour are the candles?"), or merely restate facts already known from the task.

Description of each criterion
0-20 marks for “Correctness of Choice”:
0–10 marks: revenue has been correctly calculated accounting for 4% returns, and core expenses have been correctly identified (cost of goods, marketplace commission, delivery compensation, and other expenses), with tax rates and rules correctly applied (Professional Income Tax — 4% for income from people and 6% for income received form companies; Simplified Taxation System “Revenue” — 6% on revenue; Simplified Taxation System “Revenue minus Expenses” — 15% on profit, and VAT at 0% up to 60 million roubles; General Taxation System — for sole traders, personal income tax at 13% on income up to 2.4 million roubles; for sole traders, personal income tax at 15% on income between 2.4 and 5 million roubles, applied to the amount exceeding the threshold; for companies corporation tax at 25% and VAT at 20%)
0–5 marks: internal consistency of assumptions and calculations (assumptions do not contradict calculations — for example, whether the candle conformity certificate needs to be taken into account; 1. for Professional Income Tax, the calculation is based on revenue only; 2. for the Simplified Taxation System "Revenue", the calculation covers revenue plus the fixed contribution and 1% on income exceeding 300,000 roubles, with VAT at 0% up to 60 million roubles; 3. for the Simplified Taxation System "Revenue minus Expenses", the calculation is based on profit incorporating the fixed personal contribution and 1% on income exceeding 300,000 roubles, raw materials and component costs, and VAT at 0% up to 60 million roubles; 4. for the General Taxation System (companies), the calculation is based on profit incorporating the fixed personal contribution and 1% on income exceeding 300,000 roubles, raw materials and component costs, VAT at 20%; and 5. for the General Taxation System (sole traders), personal income tax at 13% on income up to 2.4 million roubles, personal income tax at 15% on income between 2.4 and 5 million roubles applied to the amount exceeding the threshold, the fixed personal contribution

and 1% on income exceeding 300,000 roubles, raw materials and component costs, and VAT at 20%)
0–5 marks: selection of the correct tax regime and legal form (Professional Income Tax; self-employed individual)

0–5 marks for "Managerial Justification":
0–1 mark: administrative burden/speed of launch are linked to the choice of regime (for the Professional Income Tax regime, registration and record-keeping are simpler, administrative burden is minimal, and an accountant is not required at start-up; under the given parameters, the Professional Income Tax regime yields the best net take-home income compared to the Simplified Taxation System or the General Taxation System)
0–2 marks: risks (marketplace, returns, liquidity, growth) are identified in specific terms (compliance risk: employees may not be hired; assistance from the "acquaintance" must be formalised as a legitimate contractor arrangement or excluded; Professional Income Tax cap risk: turnover and the interpretation of "income" under the agency scheme must be monitored; a transition to sole trader status under the Simplified Taxation System should be planned in advance as the business grows; operational risk of marketplace dependency: exposure to changes in platform rules, deductions, promotional conditions, and returns; a liquidity reserve is required)
0–2 marks: regime restrictions (employees, caps, receipt issuance) are accounted for (no employees, income below 2.4 million roubles, tax rates for different client types — natural persons and legal entities — are taken into account)

0–5 marks for "Critical Thinking":
0–3 marks: a minimum of 3 traps from the text are identified and explained as to why each constitutes a trap ("Oksana believes that a self-employed individual is not entitled to sell goods through online marketplaces. If turnover exceeds 2 million roubles over 9 months, an obligation to pay VAT arises automatically. Oksana is also convinced that operating as a sole trader is always more advantageous, as all expenses can be taken into account. However, the marketplace tends to favour sellers operating under the general taxation system, as it is beneficial for the marketplace to reduce the amount of VAT remitted to the budget. Furthermore, under the Simplified Taxation System at 6%, tax is paid on the amount credited to the account after deduction of the marketplace commission." + The delivery contradiction: "the buyer always pays for delivery", yet the seller compensates 79 roubles per order — this must be explicitly recognised as an expense or deduction)
0–2 marks: 3 genuinely substantive clarifying questions are posed (not "what colour are the candles", but rather: "What is the contractual arrangement with the marketplace (agency/commission/sale-and-purchase), and in whose name is the receipt issued — the buyer or the marketplace as a legal entity?" "Will there be regular assistants, and how will payments to them be structured (contractor agreement, one-off services, another self-employed individual)?" "What is the growth plan: is turnover expected to exceed the Professional Income Tax cap, and should a transition to sole trader status under the Simplified Taxation System be planned in advance — and if so, at what point and under what triggers?")

Международный менеджмент

Questions for your consideration

1. What specific risk arises if an MNE uses GenAI for IMS without controlling for training data provenance and country-level digital capability (both mentioned in the article)? Answer must connect to at least one IB concept.
2. The article frames AI as both reducing transaction costs and potentially increasing barriers (data localization, regulation growth, protectionism). **Question:** Construct a logical argument that reconciles these two claims without contradiction. Then state the condition under which the reconciliation fails.
3. The authors propose future work using CAGE for AI-assisted market selection and even suggest transforming OLI into an AI model for entry mode choice. **Question:** Identify one element of OLI (O, L, or I) that is fundamentally hard to "encode" into an AI system without turning it into a tautology. Explain why, using a concrete example.
4. The paper warns regulation may "impede innovation" yet also stresses compliance with international standards. **Question:** Give one example of a situation where more regulation increases adoption (not decreases), and justify it through trust, risk, and cross-border legitimacy.
5. The authors describe AI as enabling prediction, automation, and augmentation. **Question:** Using the automation-augmentation paradox, identify one IB function where augmentation is strategically safer than automation, and justify it with cross-border accountability logic.

Критерии оценивания критического анализа предложенной статьи

- Понимание исследовательского фокуса, корректное выявление основного вопроса статьи и логики авторской аргументации.
- Системное понимание содержания, целостное и осмысленное восприятие материала, а не фрагментарный пересказ.
- Умение применять релевантные модели и теории международного бизнеса и менеджмента для анализа (не формальное упоминание).
- Владение понятийным аппаратом, точность терминологии, корректное использование профессиональных понятий.
- Логика и аргументация, наличие причинно-следственных связей, последовательность рассуждений, обоснованность выводов.
- Аналитическая глубина и оригинальность, способность выходить за рамки текста статьи, выявлять ограничения, допущения и управленческие последствия.
- Профессиональный кругозор, связь идей статьи с более широким контекстом международного бизнеса, глобальных стратегий и управленческих решений.
- Фактологическая корректность и релевантность, отсутствие фактических ошибок, уместность и применимость выдвигаемых идей.

Допускается вариативность ответов, выбор примеров, теорий и аналитических подходов определяется отвечающим, однако они должны быть концептуально обоснованы и соответствовать логике задания и формулировкам вопросов.

1. Risk of using GenAI for international market selection (IMS)

If a multinational enterprise uses generative AI for international market selection without controlling for training data provenance and country-level digital capability, the key risk is a systematic strategic misjudgment embedded in algorithmic outputs. This risk arises because AI models may rely on biased, incomplete, or non-representative datasets, leading to distorted assessments of market attractiveness. From an international business perspective, this problem reflects information asymmetry and exacerbates the liability of foreignness, as firms base decisions on misleading signals rather than context-specific knowledge. Moreover, ignoring country-level digital capability creates a mismatch between the firm's digital strategy and the host country's infrastructure, undermining implementation feasibility. For instance, an AI system may identify a high-growth emerging market as attractive but fail to capture weak digital ecosystems, resulting in an ineffective entry strategy. Thus, instead of reducing uncertainty, AI can amplify strategic errors at scale, embedding flawed assumptions into decision-making processes.

2. Reconciling "AI reduces transaction costs" and "AI increases barriers"

The apparent contradiction can be resolved by distinguishing between firm-level efficiency effects and institutional-level constraints. At the micro level, AI reduces transaction costs by improving information processing, automating tasks, and enhancing coordination efficiency, consistent with Transaction Cost Economics (Coase). However, at the macro level, AI triggers regulatory responses such as data localization requirements, increased compliance obligations, and digital protectionism. These developments increase institutional transaction costs, particularly in cross-border operations. Therefore, AI simultaneously decreases operational costs while increasing regulatory and compliance costs, reflecting the logic of Institutional Theory, where efficiency gains are conditioned by the regulatory environment. This reconciliation fails when institutional costs outweigh efficiency gains—for example, when regulatory fragmentation across countries prevents the scaling of AI solutions. In such cases, AI ceases to be a cost-reducing technology and instead becomes a source of friction in international business.

3. The hardest OLI component to encode into AI

Within Dunning's OLI paradigm, Ownership advantages (O) are the most difficult to encode into an AI system without reducing the concept to a tautology. Ownership advantages include tacit knowledge, organizational culture, brand reputation, and dynamic capabilities—elements that are inherently context-dependent, socially embedded, and difficult to quantify. Any attempt to model these factors algorithmically risks circular reasoning: the system may define ownership advantage as whatever leads to success, thereby explaining outcomes using the outcomes themselves. For example, the success of a luxury brand in Japan depends not only on measurable variables such as price or demand, but also on symbolic legitimacy and cultural resonance. These factors cannot be fully captured through structured data, and proxies (e.g., brand awareness metrics) fail to reflect their deeper meaning. From the perspective of the Resource-Based View (RBV/VRIO), ownership advantages are path-dependent and non-observable, which makes them fundamentally resistant to full algorithmic representation.

4. When regulation increases AI adoption

An example where increased regulation leads to greater AI adoption can be observed in cross-border financial services or HR analytics under strict data protection regimes (e.g., GDPR-like frameworks). While regulation is often seen as a constraint, it can actually reduce uncertainty and build trust, thereby encouraging adoption. Firms are more willing to implement AI when legal boundaries are clear, risks are defined, and compliance standards are standardized across markets. At the same time, customers and stakeholders develop greater confidence in AI-driven processes due to stronger data protection and accountability mechanisms. This dynamic can be explained through Institutional Theory, where legitimacy enhances adoption, and through Transaction Cost Economics, where reduced uncertainty lowers perceived risk. Thus, regulation can function not as a barrier but as an enabler of scalable and legitimate AI use in international contexts.

5. Automation vs. augmentation in international business

Within the automation–augmentation paradox, international negotiations and cross-border strategic decision-making represent a domain where augmentation is strategically safer than full automation. While AI can significantly enhance decision quality by providing data analysis, forecasting, and scenario modeling, fully automating such functions introduces substantial risks. Negotiations involve cultural nuance, implicit communication, and trust-building, which are difficult for AI to interpret accurately. More importantly, automation creates an accountability gap: if an AI system makes a strategic decision, it becomes unclear who is responsible for its consequences. From the perspective of Agency Theory, this represents a problematic delegation of decision-making authority without effective control. In contrast, augmentation preserves human oversight while leveraging AI capabilities, ensuring that decisions remain legitimate, accountable, and context-sensitive. Therefore, in complex cross-border environments, augmentation is not only safer but also strategically superior.

Управление в сфере науки, технологий и инноваций

В рамках трека использовались открытые вопросы, по ним нет единого варианта с универсальным ответом. Критерии оценивания прилагаю ниже:

Ответы на каждый вопрос оцениваются по способности участника логично и аргументировано излагать свои мысли, демонстрировать широкий кругозор в предметной области и знание ключевых научных и аналитических работ.

The criteria for evaluation each question:

1) The ability to express thoughts in a logical manner, supporting them with a reasonable and relevant arguments (10 points);

2) Demonstration of a broad outlook in the subject area (5 points);

3) Knowledge of key scientific and analytical works and correct application of relevant STI concepts and theories (10 points).