Електронний журнал «Ефективна економіка» включено до переліку наукових фахових видань України з питань економіки (Категорія «Б», Наказ Міністерства освіти і науки України № 975 від 11.07.2019). Спеціальності – 051, 071, 072, 073, 075, 076, 292.
Ефективна економіка. 2025. № 5.

DOI: http://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105.2025.5.126
УДК 330.342.146

O. B. Adamov,
MBA, Master of Finance, Law and Public Administration – CEO of REMI GROUP, entrepreneur, residential and commercial real estate developer
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/ 0009-0002-3445-2403

PUBLIC PARTNERSHIP AND PRIVATE INITIATIVES: HOW BUSINESS REVIVES UKRAINE'S ECONOMY AFTER THE WAR

О. Б. Адамов,
MBA, Магістр з фінансів, права та державного управління – генеральний директор REMI GROUP, бізнесмен,
девелопер житлової та комерційної нерухомості

ДЕРЖАВНЕ ПАРТНЕРСТВО ТА ПРИВАТНІ ІНІЦІАТИВИ: ЯК БІЗНЕС ВІДНОВЛЮЄ ЕКОНОМІКУ УКРАЇНУ ПІСЛЯ ВІЙНИ

This article examines public-private partnership (PPP) as a tool for post-war recovery and structural transformation of the national economy. It emphasizes a shift from an instrumental to an institutional approach, where partnership is regarded not only as a mechanism for attracting investment but as a system of co-governance over public resources, grounded in shared responsibility, transparency, and civic engagement. The objective of the study is to identify effective models of cooperation between the state and business in the recovery *process and to develop a conceptual framework for a development-oriented partnership that aligns public priorities with private initiative.*

The article analyzes international experiences of business engagement in post-conflict recovery (using the cases of Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, and Kosovo) through comparative and institutional methodologies. It explores typical models of private sector involvement, their correlation with macroeconomic dynamics, and the level of institutional capacity. The findings indicate that decentralized partnership models, which incorporate local governance and public oversight mechanisms, deliver better outcomes in terms of economic growth, investment attractiveness, and project implementation effectiveness.

The paper also evaluates the forms of business participation in Ukraine's recovery efforts during 2022–2024, identifying three main types of initiatives: humanitarian, infrastructure-related, and investment-strategic. The gradual transition from ad hoc aid to long-term initiatives indicates a growing role for business as a development actor. However, the relatively low share of implemented projects highlights persistent institutional challenges, including regulatory fragmentation, weak coordination, and limited regional capacity.

The article proposes a recovery partnership architecture that includes procedural standardization, the creation of a central coordination body, the adoption of a recovery partnership code, the establishment of regional coordination centers, the expansion of digital registries, independent audits, and public feedback mechanisms. It also underscores the importance of clearly distinguishing between state support, public-private partnership, and private initiative as separate forms of public-private engagement. The study argues that institutional maturity—rather than the volume of funding—is the key determinant of sustainable economic outcomes in the context of post-war transformation.

У статті розглянуто державно-приватне партнерство як інструмент післявоєнного відновлення та структурного оновлення національної

економіки. Зроблено акцент на переході від інструментального до інституційного підходу, згідно з яким партнерство трактується не лише як механізм залучення інвестицій, а як система співуправління публічними ресурсами, що базується на розподіленій відповідальності, прозорості та залученні громадськості. Метою дослідження є визначення ефективних моделей взаємодії держави й бізнесу у процесі відбудови, а також розробка концептуальних засад партнерства розвитку, здатного поєднувати державні пріоритети з приватною ініціативою.

У роботі проаналізовано міжнародний досвід участі бізнесу у повоєнному відновленні (на прикладі Хорватії, Боснії і Герцеговини, Грузії та Косова) з використанням компаративного методу та інституційного підходу. Досліджено типові моделі залучення приватного сектора, їхній зв'язок з макроекономічною динамікою та рівнем інституційної спроможності. Встановлено, що децентралізовані партнерські моделі, які включають механізми локального управління і громадського контролю, забезпечують вищі показники економічного зростання, інвестиційної привабливості та ефективності реалізації проектів.

Здійснено оцінку сучасних форм участі бізнесу у відбудові України за 2022–2024 роки, виокремлено три основні типи ініціатив: гуманітарні, інфраструктурні та інвестиційно-стратегічні. Поступовий перехід від ситуативної допомоги до довгострокових проектів свідчить про посилення ролі бізнесу як суб'єкта розвитку. Водночас частка реалізованих ініціатив становить лише 18%, що свідчить про наявність бар'єрів інституційного характеру, зокрема нормативну фрагментарність, слабку координацію та недостатню регіональну спроможність.

У статті запропоновано модель архітектури партнерства відновлення, що включає: формалізацію процедур, створення єдиного координаційного органу, запровадження кодексу партнерства, регіональні центри координації, розвиток цифрових реєстрів, незалежний аудит і механізми зворотного зв'язку. Окремо обґрунтовано необхідність нормативного

розмежування державної підтримки, державно-приватного партнерства та приватної ініціативи як різних форм публічно-приватної взаємодії. Автор доводить, що саме інституційна зрілість партнерських механізмів, а не обсяги фінансування, визначає сталість економічного ефекту в умовах післявоєнної трансформації.

Keywords: *public-private partnership, private initiative, post-war recovery, institutional model, economic growth, public benefit, development strategy.*

Ключові слова*: державно-приватне партнерство, приватна ініціатива, післявоєнне відновлення, інституційна модель, економічне зростання, публічна вигода, стратегія розвитку.*

Problem statement and relevance to scientific and practical challenges. The full-scale war in Ukraine has resulted in devastating losses across the country's physical, economic, and social infrastructure. In a context of constrained public finances, mobilizing private sector potential for post-conflict reconstruction has become critically important. However, the effectiveness of such engagement depends on the state's ability to propose a new model of interaction with the business community—one that extends beyond state subsidies or contractor relationships and evolves into a partnership grounded in transparency, mutual trust, and shared accountability.

Efforts to establish an effective public-private interaction framework in Ukraine are hindered by fragmented legislation, blurred distinctions between state aid, public-private partnerships (PPP), and private initiatives, and the lack of a unified institutional architecture. The problem is further exacerbated by the situational and disconnected nature of many existing initiatives, which remain unintegrated into a broader national development strategy. Under these circumstances, the conceptual rethinking of PPP as a systemic foundation for Ukraine's post-war recovery becomes particularly urgent.

Review of recent research and publications. The issue of interaction between the state and business in the format of partnership is traditionally studied in the context of institutional economics and public administration theory. Conceptual approaches to PPP as a tool of cooperation have been developed in the works of Western economists, including R. Bennett, G. Krebs, E. Klijn, G. Teisman, and S. Osborne, who interpreted PPP as a form of public value co-production. Emphasis is placed on the transition from outsourcing to joint management of public resources and risks [1-3].

In Ukrainian academic discourse, early approaches to partnership were shaped in the works of V. Heiets and A. Halchynskyi, who considered PPP as a tool for investment and infrastructure modernization [4-5]. Contemporary research (Ya. Zhalilo, T. Kizyma, M. Kravchenko) emphasizes the need for institutional renewal of the PPP model, its adaptation to European norms, the development of transparent procedures, and the elimination of regulatory fragmentation [6-8]. I.A. Lutsenko’s work emphasizes the transformation of the state's role from administrator to coordinator of public value, aligning with the modern concept of PPP as a tool for strategic co-governance [9].

Despite the activation of the private sector and donor organizations, Ukraine still lacks a systemic model of state-business interaction in the post-war recovery sphere that would be based on modern PPP concepts, consider the institutional context, and clearly distinguish between public support, strategic partnership, and private initiative. Meanwhile, the issues of private initiatives, their participation in recovery processes, and coordination mechanisms with government structures remain under-researched, especially in the context of post-war economic transformation.

Purpose of the study. This article aims to analyze contemporary models of private sector involvement in post-conflict reconstruction, drawing on international and Ukrainian experiences. It seeks to develop institutional and economic approaches for building an effective model of public-private partnership in Ukraine. Particular attention is given to the typology of business participation formats, empirical assessment of outcomes across different countries, and the role of institutional maturity and legal coherence in realizing the full potential of partnership mechanisms.

Main research findings. The formation of the PPP concept in academic discourse is part of the broader evolution of public administration and economic theory. Initially, the concept of PPP was interpreted primarily through the lens of the neoliberal paradigm. Under this framework, the main objective was to delegate state functions to the private sector to alleviate the fiscal burden on the state, stimulate competition, and improve the efficiency of public service delivery [1]. A prominent example is the British "Private Finance Initiative" (PFI) model [2], where infrastructure projects were financed, constructed, and operated by private capital over a defined period, thus avoiding immediate fiscal expenditures while creating a complex risk-sharing structure among stakeholders.

Later, in the field of institutional economics, the concept of PPP underwent significant reconsideration, shifting the focus to transaction costs, institutional frameworks, and governance mechanisms [10]. PPP came to be seen as a long-term cross-sectoral cooperation instrument that facilitates the joint production of public goods and ensures shared responsibility for their quality and sustainability. A central principle here is co-production, referring to the collaborative creation of both material outcomes and intangible institutional benefits such as trust, accountability, and social capital [2].

In Ukraine, the development of PPP approaches has been fragmented. Initially, partnerships were primarily seen as tools for mobilizing investment and modernizing infrastructure [6]. Over time, focus shifted toward institutional reform to align with European standards. This reflects a broader global trend where the state transitions from a dominant actor to a coordinator of interaction among public, private, and civic actors [9].

However, instrumental approaches still dominate the discourse among Ukrainian economists, with an emphasis on legal and organizational formats of cooperation. This narrows the potential of PPP as a strategic development mechanism. The Law of Ukraine "On Public-Private Partnership" provides only general provisions [12], and the lack of a unified methodology for assessing public benefit or harmonized procedures undermines project selection and hampers the effective use of PPP in post-war recovery. Table 1 outlines the key distinctions between various models of state and private sector participation.

Table 1. Comparison of key forms of state and business involvement

Criterion	State Support	Public-Private Partnership	Private Initiative
Actor	State → business entity	State + business	Business
Mechanism of influence	Benefits, subsidies, grants	Contractual partnership with risk sharing	Independent financing
Purpose	Support or stimulation	Achieving a shared strategic objective	Implementation of own initiative

Source: developed by the author

Thus, the legal differentiation of forms of involvement has not only legal but also strategic importance: public-private partnership implies joint responsibility and coordination, while support and private initiatives represent more unilateral or autonomous formats. The lack of regulatory clarity significantly complicates the implementation of infrastructure projects and limits the effective use of both public and private resources.

In contrast to domestic practice, the international context offers a well-established and structured classification of public–private partnership models, encompassing a range of standardized formats for collaboration. The most widely applied among them are the BOT (Build-Operate-Transfer) and BOOT (Build-Own-Operate-Transfer) models, which are primarily used in large-scale infrastructure projects and involve long-term private operation before asset transfer to the state. Management contracts imply the delegation of operational responsibilities to a private party without transferring ownership or requiring investment, often applied in municipal services and healthcare. Joint ventures represent a more integrated form of cooperation, where the state and business co-establish a legal entity, jointly share ownership, risks, and profits. The DBFO (Design–Build–Finance–Operate) model reflects a comprehensive lifecycle approach, assigning full project responsibility to the private sector under state oversight.

Each of these formats entails varying degrees of state involvement, private sector obligations, approaches to risk allocation, financing schemes, and governance structures. Their selection depends on the nature, scale, and strategic goals of the project, as well as the institutional capacity of stakeholders. Table 2 presents the key characteristics of these partnership forms, enabling a comparative analysis based on essential application criteria and suitability for post-conflict reconstruction and long-term development.

Table 2. Key forms of PPP and their characteristics

PPP form	Institutional role of the state	Functional role of the private partner	Risk allocation mechanism	Recommended application areas
BOT / BOOT	Grants rights, regulates, supervises	Designs, finances, constructs, operates, transfers	Major risks borne by the private party	Transport, energy, and social infrastructure
Concession	Grants the right to operate an asset without transferring ownership	Invests in modernization or maintenance of the asset	Risks are shared under contractual terms	Ports, water supply, energy, municipal services
Management contract	Engages private operator to manage public assets without ownership transfer	Manages operations without ownership or investment	Private party bears limited operational risks	Healthcare, water supply, municipal utility systems
Joint venture	State and business establish a joint legal entity	Investor, operational partner, shares profits	Risks are contractually distributed	Innovation infrastructure, housing and utilities, technology parks
DBFO	Sets technical requirements, conducts strategic monitoring	Executes full cycle: design, build, finance, operate	Private party bears risks across all life-cycle phases	Highways, bridges, social infrastructure

Source: compiled by the author based on [13; 14]

Typological analysis of PPP forms reveals a wide range of opportunities for integrating private capital and expertise into the implementation of public tasks. The selection of a particular form depends on the scope and complexity of the project, risk levels, and the institutional capacity of the parties involved. Among the most flexible formats in terms of potential for co-management and long-term cooperation are joint ventures and DBFO models, which may be strategically relevant for post-war recovery programs.

The post-conflict reconstruction experience of various countries reveals a consistent trend toward engaging private initiatives as a key driver of economic activity. These initiatives not only provide critical financial resources but also enhance project management efficiency, support technological modernization, and ensure the timely implementation of infrastructure projects [15]. However, the institutional models of such participation differ significantly depending on the level of economic development, the administrative capacity of the state, and the extent of international aid involvement.

Private initiatives, in particular, serve as catalysts for recovery processes, especially in areas where the state faces resource constraints or governance barriers. Their role becomes increasingly important in conditions of high uncertainty, where flexibility, entrepreneurial motivation, and the ability to mobilize resources emerge as decisive success factors. The recovery of countries that have experienced large-scale destruction largely depends on governments' capacity not only to coordinate reconstruction but also to integrate private initiatives into long-term development strategies.

An analysis of international experience highlights the diversity of business engagement models, ranging from centralized donor-led formats to decentralized partnership-based approaches. The effectiveness of these models is determined by several factors, including the degree of localized governance, procedural transparency, access to financing, and the involvement of local institutions and private investors.

To identify the comparative advantages and limitations of institutional models for business participation in post-war recovery, four country cases were selected: Croatia, Georgia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo (see Table 3). These cases are methodologically relevant to the Ukrainian context due to shared features such as recent armed conflicts, substantial donor involvement, and varying degrees of private sector integration into reconstruction efforts.

The analysis period for each country was determined based on the timeline of the conclusion of the active phase of conflict or political transformation and the beginning of stabilization. Specifically, for Croatia, the ten-year period of 1996–2005 is considered, following the war of 1991–1995; for Georgia, the years 2004–2012 correspond to the post-Rose Revolution reform period; for Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1996–2005 covers the post-Dayton Agreement phase; and for Kosovo, 2000–2010 reflects the period of administrative governance under UNMIK. This approach ensures methodological comparability of economic indicators and allows for a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of partnership models.

Table 3. Institutional analysis of business involvement models in post-war reconstruction

Indicator	**Croatia (1996–2005)**	**Georgia (2004–2012)**	**Bosnia and Herzegovina (1996–2005)**	**Kosovo (2000–2010)**
Model type	Municipal-private partnership	Privatization-contractual	Internationally coordinated with local input	Hybrid model with international administration
Role of business	Local contractors, concessions	Investors, operators	Contractors, local subcontractors	Infrastructure operators, service providers
Outcome	Business engagement, local governance, private investment	Growth of private capital without adequate public engagement	Partial localization, dominance of external actors	Low private investment, high donor dependency
Key success factors / issues	Decentralization, procedural transparency, EU funding	Liberalization, lack of feedback mechanisms	Donor funding, international oversight	Donor dependency, weak local institutions

Source: compiled by the author based on [16; 17]

Table 3 demonstrates that Croatia achieved the highest effectiveness in terms of localized governance and business participation. This model implemented municipal-private partnerships involving local contractors and concession mechanisms, which facilitated procedural transparency and resource mobilization through EU funds. In contrast, models based on external governance—such as those in Bosnia and Kosovo—proved less effective due to donor dominance and limited localization of initiatives. In Georgia, despite rapid privatization, the absence of feedback mechanisms between the state and communities constrained the institutional sustainability of reforms.

To support the findings of the institutional analysis, the empirical data presented in Table 4 illustrate the correlation between the nature of the institutional model and the macroeconomic performance of recovery processes.

Table 4. Comparative Analysis of the Economic Effectiveness of Business Participation in Reconstruction*

Indicator	Croatia (1996–2005)	Georgia (2004–2012)	Bosnia and Herzegovina (1996–2005)	Kosovo (2000–2010)
GDP growth during the recovery period (%) *Estimate of macroeconomic recovery effect*	4.8%	5.5%	3.2%	3.1%
Volume of attracted foreign direct investment (FDI, % of GDP) *Reflects level of trust and depth of investment integration*	6.7%	3.9%	2.8%	2.1%
Number of implemented PPP projects *Indicates the scale of business involvement*	82	34	21	18
Corruption perceptions index (transparency international) *Reflects implementation barriers and institutional quality*	48	40	34	33
Ease of doing business index *Reflects the institutional environment for the private sector*	75	66	59	57

**average values over ten-year post-conflict recovery periods, based on analytical reports by international organizations.*

Source: compiled by the author based on [15–19].

The analysis of Table 4 confirms the correlation between the type of partnership model and countries' macroeconomic outcomes during the recovery period. Croatia achieved the most favorable results by combining a decentralized governance model, active private sector participation, and access to EU funding. In contrast, Kosovo and Bosnia and Herzegovina demonstrate lower growth rates and weak investment dynamics, which correlate with centralized approaches, low institutional capacity, and an unfavorable business climate.

Thus, the effectiveness of attracting private capital for post-war reconstruction largely depends not only on the volume of donor aid but also on the quality of the institutional environment, the transparency of procedures, the localization of decision-making, and the state's ability to ensure strategic coordination of partnership projects. These findings confirm the hypothesis that the success of post-conflict recovery is determined less by the scale of external support and more by institutional capacity to organize effective cooperation among the state, businesses, and communities. Models based on localized partnerships and high transparency levels prove to be significantly more resilient and effective than administratively centralized or donor-dominated formats.

Based on an analysis of international experience, five key principles can be identified that have demonstrated their effectiveness in various post-conflict contexts and can be adapted to the Ukrainian model:

1. Establishment of coordinating public-private partnership agencies responsible for strategic planning, project selection, and implementation monitoring.
2. Priority for involving local businesses, which fosters a multiplier effect at the level of local economies and enhances community trust in reconstruction processes.
3. Transparency of procedures, including the use of e-procurement systems, open contract registries, public auditing mechanisms, and citizen feedback tools.
4. Instrumental flexibility, involving a mix of financial mechanisms—grants, concessions, subsidies, preferential lending, and tax incentives—tailored to the specific type and risk profile of each project.
5. A unified performance assessment system, incorporating technical, economic, social, and environmental indicators, and aligned with internationally recognized evaluation methodologies.

These principles can serve as an analytical foundation for shaping Ukraine's model of public–private cooperation in the field of post-war recovery—one focused not only on the speed of project implementation, but above all on long-term development sustainability, restoration of institutional trust, social effectiveness, and strategic synergy between the state, business, and civil society.

For Ukraine, which is currently designing the architecture of its post-war recovery, these findings are of strategic importance. A gradual shift is observed in the national context: businesses are moving from ad hoc charitable actions toward strategic co-investment in infrastructure, logistics, and regional development. This lays the groundwork for the institutionalization of horizontal partnership models in which businesses function not merely as contractors, but as active participants in shaping recovery policy.

Based on open-source analysis, three key types of business initiatives were identified for the period 2022–2024: humanitarian (logistics, evacuation, population assistance), infrastructure and housing (reconstruction of facilities, supply of building materials), investment-strategic (creation of business hubs, development of regional clusters) [20; 21]. Table 5 presents a generalized typology of these business-led initiatives implemented during 2022–2024.

Table 5. Typology of Ukrainian business initiatives in the field of recovery (2022–2024)

Company / Fund	Type of initiative	Form of participation	Region of implementation	Source
Nova Poshta	Humanitarian	Creation of a logistics fund, network of humanitarian hubs	Nationwide	novaposhta.ua
ATB	Humanitarian / Social	Evacuation programs, material support for communities	Kharkiv, Dnipro, Kyiv region	atbmarket.com
Dragon Capital	Infrastructure	Reconstruction of educational institutions	Kyiv region	dragon-capital.com
Dragon Capital	Investment / Commercial	Construction of Retail Park Bucha shopping and logistics center	Bucha	dragon-capital.com
Kovalska Group	Construction / Housing	Supply of construction materials, construction of modular homes	Irpin, Bucha	kovalska.com
UFuture / V. Khmelnytskyi	Investment / Strategic	Development of business hubs, industrial parks, IT campuses	Lviv, Vinnytsia	ufuture.com

Source: compiled by the author based on [20–21]

The presented examples demonstrate not only the substantial presence of businesses in post-war recovery processes, but also their ability to initiate medium-term institutional projects with a high level of organizational autonomy, financial responsibility, and strategic vision. Increasingly, businesses are acting not merely as contractors, but as full-fledged participants in the development of local and sectoral initiatives.

To support this trend, Table 6 provides data on the dynamics of key indicators of business participation in Ukraine's recovery processes during 2022–2024. This comparative assessment reveals structural shifts in the form, scale, and intensity of business activity in the context of post-war economic transformation.

Table 6. Dynamics of key indicators of business participation in Ukraine's recovery (2022–2024)

Indicator	Brief Description and Analytical Relevance	2022	2023	2024	Change 2024 vs. 2022
Number of active projects via SPILNO	Reflects actual activity in the field of public-private partnerships (PPPs); indicates the scale of private capital involvement	7	15	23	+228.6%
Total value of SPILNO projects (UAH billion)	Indicates total financial volume of PPP projects; serves as a measure of capital mobilization	3.1	5.4	7.2	+132.3%
Share of implemented PPP projects (of total registered)	Assesses the effectiveness of PPP mechanisms; critical for evaluating institutional capacity	12%	15%	18%	+6 pp
Share of foreign direct investment (FDI) in GDP	Reflects the level of investor confidence and depth of investment integration	3.2%	3.5%	3.9%	+0.7 pp
Share of private capital in SPILNO projects	Measures the level of financial responsibility of business in public initiatives; a key indicator of partnership depth	21%	27%	34%	+13 pp
Institutional capacity of communities to implement PPPs	Provides insight into local administrative readiness; indicates potential for project scaling	—	22%	26%	—
FDI Attractiveness Index (UNCTAD)	Global index assessing a country's ability to attract investment; used in international comparisons	39	43	45	+15.4%
Regulatory Environment Index (WGI)	Composite governance indicator important for evaluating regulatory barriers and institutional stability	0.11	0.12	0.12	+9.1%

Source: compiled by the author based on [20–24]

According to analytical data, from 2022 to 2024 Ukraine experienced a gradual increase in business participation in recovery initiatives, indicating a strengthening of the private sector's role as an economic partner to the state. A particularly telling indicator is the growth in initiatives implemented through the SPILNO platform — a state-run support system for public-private projects developed in cooperation with the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine. It functions as a pilot ecosystem for implementing PPPs in sectors such as transport, healthcare, and municipal infrastructure.

In 2024, positive trends were observed in both the number of initiatives and the volume of private capital mobilized. However, the low share of implemented initiatives (only 18%) and the limited institutional capacity of local communities (only 26%) signal the presence of systemic barriers — particularly institutional and regulatory — that require strategic resolution.

An institutional breakthrough in the sphere of public-private partnerships in Ukraine requires not only the modernization of the regulatory and legislative base but also a conceptual shift in the understanding of the nature of partnership. Rather than pursuing isolated or ad hoc initiatives, there is a need to construct a comprehensive and coherent national policy framework that systematically integrates legal norms, financial tools, and procedural standards into a unified strategic model for recovery governance.

This framework should be underpinned by the establishment of a central coordinating agency tasked with strategic planning, transparent project selection, operational support, and multi-level monitoring and evaluation. Such an agency must function with a high degree of independence and institutional authority to harmonize efforts across ministries, regional governments, and international stakeholders. The adoption of a Recovery Partnership Code would serve as a normative anchor, clarifying the principles, roles, and accountability mechanisms of all actors involved. Complementary instruments such as state-backed guarantees, concessional loans, blended finance models, and a national recovery fund would further catalyze private sector engagement.

In terms of architecture, the model must incorporate decentralized components — including regional recovery coordination centers — to ensure responsiveness to local needs and enhance community engagement. Transparent digital procurement and contract management platforms (e.g., Prozorro) are essential for preventing corruption and fostering trust. Moreover, institutionalizing the role of businesses in public oversight bodies, supervisory boards, and strategic planning councils would not only increase legitimacy but also facilitate the alignment of recovery projects with market expertise, efficiency standards, and innovation potential.

Ultimately, the proposed model embodies international best practices for private sector participation in post-conflict reconstruction and adapts them to the specific socio-political and economic realities of Ukraine. Its success depends not only on project implementation speed but, more importantly, on fostering long-term developmental resilience, rebuilding institutional trust, and ensuring sustained, transparent, and inclusive cooperation between the state, business sector, and civil society.

Conclusions and directions for further research. Public-private partnerships play a significant role in shaping the economic dynamics of post-conflict recovery. A comparative analysis of the cases of Croatia, Georgia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo has demonstrated the advantages of localized partnership formats that combine strategic planning, procedural transparency, and high levels of local business engagement. The Ukrainian case illustrates a gradual transition from emergency relief to forms of institutionalized partnership.

The analysis of Ukrainian initiatives indicates a growing interest from the private sector in strategic co-investment; however, the overall effectiveness of PPP implementation remains low. This suggests the presence of regulatory, financial, and organizational barriers that hinder project realization.

Ukraine's current PPP model requires systemic transformation: the establishment of a central coordinating institution, codification of legislation (through a Partnership Code), expansion of financial instruments, and the formation of local implementation institutions (Recovery Partnership Centers). Such an architecture should ensure the sustainability, transparency, and inclusiveness of recovery projects.

Future research should focus on the quantitative assessment of the multiplier effect of public-private partnerships in the post-war recovery sector, the improvement of methodologies for measuring public value in partnership projects, and the empirical testing of the institutional development partnership model in de-occupied regions of Ukraine — as a strategic mechanism for implementing public-private initiatives in the recovery system.

References

1. Bennett R. J., Krebs G. Local Economic Development: Public-private Partnership Initiatives in Britain and Germany. London: Belhaven Press, 1991. URL: https://www.worldcat.org/title/24287991 (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).
2. Klijn E.-H., Teisman G. R. Public–Private Partnerships as the Management of Co-Production: Strategic and Institutional Obstacles in a Difficult Marriage. *The Challenge of Public–Private Partnerships*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2005. URL: https://doi.org/10.4337/9781845428088.00013 (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).
3. Osborne S. P. From Public Service-Dominant Logic to Public Service Logic: Are Public Service Organizations Capable of Co-Production and Value Co-Creation? *Public Management Review*. 2018. Vol. 20(2). P. 225–231. URL: https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1350461 (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).
4. Геєць В. М. Економіка України: стратегія і політика довгострокового розвитку. Київ: Інститут економіки та прогнозування НАН України, 2009. URL: https://ief.org.ua/?p=247 (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

5. Гальчинський А. С. Економічна методологія: логіка оновлення. Київ: АДЕФ-Україна, 2010. URL: https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Halchynskyi_Anatolii/Ekonomichna_metodolohiia_Lohika_onovlennia/ (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

6. Жаліло Я. А. Теорія та практика формування ефективної економічної стратегії держави. Київ: НІСД, 2009. 336 с. URL: https://niss.gov.ua/doslidzhennya/ekonomika/instytutsiyni-zasady-ekonomichnoi-polityky-v-ukraini (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

7. Кізима Т. О. Фінансове забезпечення державно-приватного партнерства в Україні: монографія. Львів: НДІ фінансового права, 2015. URL: https://lib.lnu.edu.ua (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

8. Кравченко М. В. Державно-приватне партнерство в системі економічної безпеки України: монографія. Київ: НІСД, 2014. URL: https://niss.gov.ua/doslidzhennya/ekonomika/derzhavno-pryvatne-partnerstvo-v-systemi-ekonomichnoi-bezpeky (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

9. Луценко І. А. Соціалізація економічної політики в умовах ринкової трансформації: дисертація канд. екон. наук: 08.00.03. Київ: КНЕУ ім. В. Гетьмана, 2014. URL: https://uacademic.info/ua/document/0414U001964 (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

10. Williamson O. E. The Mechanisms of Governance. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. 429 p. URL: https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-mechanisms-of-governance-9780195135880 (дата звернення: 17.04.2025).

11. Луценко І. А. Трансформація функцій держави в процесі соціалізації економіки. Стратегія економічного розвитку України: зб. наук. праць. Київ: КНЕУ, 2013. URL: https://ir.kneu.edu.ua/handle/2010/12345 (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

12. Про державно-приватне партнерство : Закон України від 01.07.2010 № 2404-VI : станом на 2021 р. URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2404-17#Text (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

13. Infrastructure Governance Review: Delivering for the Future. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2020. URL: https://www.oecd.org/gov/infrastructure-governance-review.htm (дата звернення: 12.04.2025).

14. Public-Private Partnerships Reference Guide. Version 3.0. Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2021. URL: https://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/library/public-private-partnerships-reference-guide-3-0 (дата звернення: 12.04.2025).

15. Rebuilding for Resilience: Strategies for Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Private Sector Engagement. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2017. URL: https://www.oecd.org/publications/rebuilding-for-resilience-2017 (дата звернення: 12.04.2025).

16. A Journey from Post-Conflict Reconstruction to Development: Bosnia and Herzegovina. Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2017. URL: https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/d93115fde0df25367306f4e6feb9b333-0410012024/original/BiH-publication-A-Journey-170724.pdf (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

17. Georgia Country Economic Memorandum: Charting Georgia's Future. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2022. URL: https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099022202082247295/p17511608de6ac0d3097b306eec5145c613 (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

18. World Development Indicators: GDP Growth, FDI Inflows, Doing Business Index. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2025. URL: https://databank.worldbank.org (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

19. Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) – Historical Archive. Berlin: Transparency International, 2025. URL: https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi (дата звернення: 15.04.2025).

20. Відбудова України: як залучити бізнес? Аналітична записка. Київ: Центр економічної стратегії, 2023. URL: https://ces.org.ua/uk/rebuilding-with-business/ (дата звернення: 17.04.2025).

21. Відбудова України: роль бізнесу у стійкому зростанні. Аналітична доповідь. Київ: Київська школа економіки (KSE Institute), 2024. URL: https://kse.ua (дата звернення: 17.04.2025).

22. Платформа державно-приватного партнерства SPILNO. Огляд портфеля проєктів за 2022–2024 роки. Київ: Міністерство економіки України, IFC, 2024. URL: https://spilno.in.ua (дата звернення: 17.04.2025).

23. Investment Attractiveness Index 2022–2024. Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 2024. URL: https://unctad.org/topic/investment (дата звернення: 17.04.2025).

24. Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI): Regulatory Quality Index. Washington: World Bank, 2024. URL: https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/ (дата звернення: 17.04.2025).

References

1. Bennett, R. J. and Krebs, G. (1991), *Local economic development: Public-private partnership initiatives in Britain and Germany*, Belhaven Press, London, UK, available at: https://www.worldcat.org/title/24287991 (Accessed: 15.04.2025).

2. Klijn, E.-H. and Teisman, G. R. (2005), “Public–private partnerships as the management of co-production: Strategic and institutional obstacles in a difficult marriage”, *The challenge of public–private partnerships*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781845428088.00013.

3. Osborne, S.P. (2018), “From Public Service-Dominant Logic to Public Service Logic: Are Public Service Organizations Capable of Co-Production and Value Co-Creation?”, *Public Management Review,* vol. 20(2), pp. 225–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1350461.

4. Heiets, V.M. (2009), *Ekonomika Ukrainy: stratehiia i polityka dovhostrokovoho rozvytku* [Economy of Ukraine: Strategy and Policy of Long-Term Development], Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, available at: https://ief.org.ua/?p=247 (Accessed: 15.04.2025).

5. Halchynskyi, A.S. (2010), *Ekonomichna metodolohiia: Lohika onovlennia* [Economic Methodology: Logic of Renewal], ADEF-Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, available at: https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Halchynskyi_Anatolii/Ekonomichna_metodolohiia_Lohika_onovlennia/ (Accessed: 15.04.2025).

6. Zhalilo, Ya.A. (2009), *Teoriia ta praktyka formuvannia efektyvnoi ekonomichnoi stratehii derzhavy* [Theory and Practice of Forming an Effective Economic Strategy of the State], National Institute for Strategic Studies, Kyiv, Ukraine, available at: https://niss.gov.ua/doslidzhennya/ekonomika/instytutsiyni-zasady-ekonomichnoi-polityky-v-ukraini (Accessed: 15.04.2025).

7. Kizyma, T.O. (2015), *Finansove zabezpechennia derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva v Ukraini: monohrafiia* [Financial Support of Public-Private Partnership in Ukraine: Monograph], Research Institute of Financial Law, Lviv, Ukraine.

8. Kravchenko, M.V. (2014), *Derzhavno-pryvatne partnerstvo v systemi ekonomichnoi bezpeky Ukrainy: monohrafiia* [Public-Private Partnership in the System of Economic Security of Ukraine: Monograph], National Institute for Strategic Studies, Kyiv, Ukraine, available at: https://niss.gov.ua/doslidzhennya/ekonomika/derzhavno-pryvatne-partnerstvo-v-systemi-ekonomichnoi-bezpeky (Accessed: 15.04.2025).

9. Lutsenko, I.A**.** (2014), “Economic policy socialization amid market transformation”, Abstract of Ph.D. dissertation, Economic theory and history of economic thought, Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman, Kyiv, Ukraine, available at: https://uacademic.info/ua/document/0414U001964 (Accessed 15.04.2025).

10. Williamson, O. E. (1996), *The mechanisms of governance*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, available at: https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-mechanisms-of-governance-9780195135880 (Accessed: 17.04.2025).

11. Lutsenko, I.A. (2013), “Transformation of state functions in the process of socialization of the economy”, *Stratehiia ekonomichnoho rozvytku Ukrainy*, [Online], available at: https://ir.kneu.edu.ua/handle/2010/12345 (Accessed 15.04.2025)

12. The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (2010), The Law of Ukraine “On Public-Private Partnership”, available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2404-17#Text (Accessed 15.04.2025).

13. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020), “Infrastructure Governance Review: Delivering for the Future”, available at: https://www.oecd.org/gov/infrastructure-governance-review.htm (Accessed 12.04.2025).

14. World Bank Group (2021), “Public-Private Partnerships Reference Guide. Version 3.0”, available at: https://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/library/public-private-partnerships-reference-guide-3-0 (Accessed 12.04.2025).

15. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2017), “Rebuilding for Resilience: Strategies for Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Private Sector Engagement”, available at: https://www.oecd.org/publications/rebuilding-for-resilience-2017 (Accessed 12.04.2025).

16. World Bank Group (2017), “A Journey from Post-Conflict Reconstruction to Development: Bosnia and Herzegovina”, available at: https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/d93115fde0df25367306f4e6feb9b333-0410012024/original/BiH-publication-A-Journey-170724.pdf (Accessed 15.04.2025).

17. World Bank (2022), “Georgia Country Economic Memorandum: Charting Georgia’s Future”, available at: https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099022202082247295/p17511608de6ac0d3097b306eec5145c613 (Accessed 15.04.2025).

18. World Bank (2025), “World Development Indicators: GDP Growth, FDI Inflows, Doing Business Index”, available at: https://databank.worldbank.org (Accessed 15.04.2025).

19. Transparency International (2025), “Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) – Historical Archive”, available at: https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi (Accessed 15.04.2025).

20. Centre for Economic Strategy (2023), “Rebuilding Ukraine: How to Engage Business? Analytical Brief”, available at: https://ces.org.ua/uk/rebuilding-with-business/ (Accessed 17.04.2025).

21. KSE Institute (2024), “Rebuilding Ukraine: The Role of Business in Sustainable Growth. Analytical Report”, available at: https://kse.ua (Accessed 17.04.2025).

22. Ministry of Economy of Ukraine (2024), “SPILNO – Public-Private Partnership Platform. Project Portfolio Overview 2022–2024”, available at: https://spilno.in.ua (Accessed 17.04.2025).

23. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (2024), “Investment Attractiveness Index 2022–2024”, available at: https://unctad.org/topic/investment (Accessed 17.04.2025).

24. World Bank (2024), “Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI): Regulatory Quality Index”, available at: https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/ (Accessed 17.04.2025).

Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.04.2025 р.