УДК 334.7:338.24:330.341.1
JEL O38, O32, L32
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1777-9546
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-1245-3637
DOI https://doi.org/10.17721/tppe.2025.50.2

Baiura D., Professor, Doctor of Economics
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
baiura_da@knu.ua
Tsybulskyi D., PhD student
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
dmytro.tsybulskyi@knu.ua

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND HIGH-TECH ENTERPRISES: EXPERIENCE AND PROSPECTS

The article examines in depth the collaborative frameworks established between state authorities and high-tech companies aimed at mobilizing resources for economic revitalization and post-conflict reconstruction. Against the backdrop of geopolitical challenges and economic instability, the study emphasizes the critical role of effective public-private partnerships in harnessing innovation, securing financial investments, and implementing technological advancements that are vital for sustainable growth. Utilizing a multifaceted methodological approach, including a thorough literature review, analysis of normative documents, and comparative case studies from countries such as Germany, Israel, South Korea, and the USA, the research identifies key factors that underpin the success of such partnerships. These factors include robust government support manifested through favorable legislation and financial incentives, the seamless integration of academic research with industrial applications, and the adaptability of management practices within high-tech enterprises. The analysis also highlights existing challenges in the Ukrainian context, such as fragmented regulatory frameworks, limited coordination among stakeholders, and restricted access to innovation financing. In response, the article offers strategic recommendations for developing integrated public-private partnership models that can mobilize resources effectively and stimulate economic growth in a post-conflict environment. By fostering intersectoral collaboration, creating innovation clusters, and establishing transparent funding mechanisms, policymakers and business leaders are provided with practical guidelines to adapt successful international practices to local conditions. In conclusion, the study underscores the importance of strengthening state-enterprise cooperation as a cornerstone for building a resilient, innovative national economy capable of meeting contemporary challenges.

Keywords: *strategic partnership, high-tech enterprises, public administration, economic recovery, resource mobilization, innovation, international experience.*

Problem statement. The current economic situation in Ukraine, complicated by military actions, destruction of energy sector objects, population outflow, minimal business activity, and other crisis factors, requires an urgent search for new models of interaction between government structures and the private sector. Particularly relevant is the issue of establishing partnerships with high-tech enterprises capable of not only providing innovative solutions but also contributing to the long-term modernization of the national economy. The absence of a coordinated approach and regulatory framework becomes a serious obstacle to the formation of effective public-private partnerships.

Analysis of recent publications. In recent years, numerous researchers have paid attention to the integration of public and private sectors in the field of innovation. The works [1, 2, 3, 4] examine different approaches to stimulating Research and Development through partnership mechanisms in Ukraine, while foreign researchers [5, 6, 7, 8] emphasize the importance of government initiatives for the formation of innovation clusters. However, despite a wide range of studies, a comprehensive analysis of partnerships during crisis periods remains insufficiently developed, which necessitates further study of this issue.

Unresolved parts of the problem. In the field of interaction between government authorities and high-tech enterprises, there are several issues that require in-depth analysis:

- Regulatory barriers: the absence of a unified legislative mechanism creates legal uncertainty and complicates the investment process.
- Weak coordination: excessive bureaucracy and lack of cooperation experience between various government bodies and enterprises hinder the implementation of complex innovative projects.
- Integration of science and production: the absence of effective channels for cooperation between scientific institutions and high-tech businesses limits the possibilities for research commercialization.
- Financial difficulties: imperfect mechanisms of state funding and innovation support lead to insufficient capital investment in strategically important sectors.

Purpose of the article is to comprehensively analyze existing partnership models between government authorities and high-tech enterprises, identifying the main factors of their success and problematic aspects. Achieving this goal involves:

- Studying modern approaches to cooperation in Ukraine and beyond.
- Identifying key factors that influence the effectiveness of partnership relations.
- Developing practical recommendations for adapting proven international models to the conditions of the Ukrainian economy.

Research methods. The work applies an integrated approach that combines qualitative and quantitative analysis. The main research methods include:

- Literature review of scientific works and regulatory documents, which allows outlining current trends in the field of public-private partnerships.
- Comparative analysis of cooperation models, using the experience of Germany, Israel, South Korea, and the USA.
- Case studies of individual examples of successful integration of state support and innovative business.
- SWOT analysis to identify strengths and weaknesses of existing approaches and determine opportunities for their improvement.

Research results. The conducted analysis revealed that the success of partnerships between government authorities and high-tech enterprises directly depends on several factors:

- **Government support:** effective legislative framework, grant programs, tax incentives, and other financial incentives promote the activation of innovative activities.
- **Integration of science with production:** close interaction between scientific institutions and enterprises ensures rapid implementation of research developments into production processes.

- **Adaptability of management structures:** flexibility of organizational models allows enterprises to respond promptly to changes in market and external conditions.
- **International experience:** cases from Germany, Israel, South Korea, and the USA demonstrate that the integration of government resources with private initiatives creates a synergistic effect necessary for economic recovery and development.

Table 1

Comparative Analysis of Partnership Models

Country	Partnership Type	Main Characteristics	Opportunities for Ukraine
Germany	Public-Private Partnership	Promoting innovation through joint R&D projects, specialized innovation zones, and investments	Development of joint innovation platforms and clusters
Israel	Strategic Alliance	Active involvement of government incentives, support for startup ecosystems, integration of innovations into commercial projects	Creating conditions for startup development and their integration into large clusters
South Korea	Integrated Innovation Clusters	Close cooperation between government, universities, and business, regional innovation hubs	Development of regional centers supporting innovative technologies
USA	Regional Technology Parks	Use of grant funding, local initiatives, and partnership connections between authorities and enterprises	Resource mobilization through local programs and creation of innovation parks

Source: compiled and calculated by the authors based on materials [11].

Analysis of literature [5, 7, 9] allows identifying several main partnership models between government authorities and high-tech enterprises:

- **Public-private partnership (PPP):** This model, widely applied in Germany, is based on joint financing of research projects and development of innovation clusters. According to research [5, 6, 10], an important condition is a clear regulatory framework that ensures transparency of financing procedures and risk distribution.
- **Strategic alliance:** As noted in the works [11, 12], this model is characterized by a high level of integration of government support with private sector measures. This approach is actively used in Israel, where the state provides investment incentives for startups, and companies provide access to the latest technologies and scientific knowledge.
- **Integrated innovation clusters:** The model considered in both South Korea and the USA [9, 11, 13] involves creating regional centers where universities, government institutions, and high-tech businesses interact. This approach allows quick commercialization of scientific research results and promotes long-term economic growth.

Overall, the comparative analysis demonstrates that the success of each model depends on factors such as regulatory framework, financial support mechanisms, and the level of integration between the scientific and production spheres. According to researches [7, 14, 15], the most effective model combines government support with active private sector participation, ensuring flexibility of management structures and rapid knowledge exchange.

Case studies of successful integration of government support and innovative business.

A detailed analysis of practical cases from foreign experience allows outlining effective mechanisms for integrating government support and innovative business:

Germany. One of the striking examples of successful partnership in Germany is the activity of **Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft** - a network of institutes specializing in applied research. According to [16, 17], Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft operates on a public-private partnership model, where government funding combined with private sector investments allows for implementing large-scale research projects. For example, joint initiatives between Fraunhofer and companies from industries such as automotive and electronics have contributed to creating innovative solutions in energy conservation and production digitalization. Additionally, the "High-Tech Gründerfonds" mechanism, supported by both government and private investors, helps young technology startups quickly commercialize their innovations.

Israel. Israel is known for its active government support of the innovation sector through the **Israel Innovation Authority**. According to research [18], the state provides grant funding and tax incentives, allowing startups in early development stages to obtain necessary resources for implementing new technologies. Additionally, cooperation between technical universities, such as **Technion - Israel Institute of Technology**, and high-tech companies contributes to creating a favorable innovation environment in cities like Tel Aviv and Haifa [19].

South Korea. In South Korea, successful integration of government support with innovative business can be observed in the example of **Pangyo Techno Valley** - a specialized innovation park created with government support. According to materials [20, 21], this cluster has become a platform for cooperation between the government, leading universities, and technology companies, including large corporations like **Samsung Electronics**, and numerous startups in

the fields of artificial intelligence, robotics, and information technologies. Government investments in the development of the park's infrastructure and the system of support for innovative projects provide conditions for high competitiveness in the global market.

USA. In the United States, one of the most famous examples is **Research Triangle Park (RTP)** in North Carolina. As noted by [13, 22], the creation of RTP was possible thanks to cooperation between local government structures, three leading universities - **Duke University**, **University of North Carolina**, and **NC State University** - and numerous high-tech companies. RTP has become a center of innovation where government support through infrastructure projects and tax incentives promotes private investment attraction. This regional technology park is a vivid example of how integrated partnership can stimulate the development of new technologies and contribute to job creation.

Thus, the analysis of specific cases from Germany, Israel, South Korea, and the USA indicates that successful integration of government support and innovative business is based on a well-established system of cooperation between government structures, scientific institutions, and enterprises. Government support programs, grant funding, creation of specialized innovation zones, and active partnership with the private sector become key factors that ensure the commercialization of scientific developments and promote the development of a competitive economy.

SWOT analysis to identify strengths and weaknesses of existing approaches and determine opportunities for their improvement.

Applying SWOT analysis allows systematizing the advantages and disadvantages of existing partnership models, as well as identifying external opportunities and threats:

Strengths:

- **Effectiveness of government support:** According to [6, 7, 23] the presence of special financial instruments (grants, preferential lending) contributes to the rapid launch of innovative projects.
- **Integration of science and business:** Close cooperation between scientific institutions and enterprises allows commercialization of scientific developments [6, 7, 9].
- **International experience:** Practices from Germany, Israel, South Korea, and the USA demonstrate that comprehensive partnership models can ensure sustainable economic growth [7, 9, 11].

Weaknesses:

- **Fragmentation of the regulatory framework:** The absence of a unified legislative regulation creates legal uncertainty, which hinders the effective implementation of innovations [1, 24].
- **Bureaucratic obstacles:** Overly complex coordination procedures between different levels of government administration can slow down the implementation of partnership projects [1, 25].
- **Insufficient integration of scientific institutions:** The lack of sufficient mechanisms for knowledge exchange between the academic sphere and business limits the potential for innovation [1, 26].

Opportunities:

- **Development of innovation clusters:** The possibility of creating specialized innovation zones, as in Germany and South Korea, can become a catalyst for economic growth [11, 27, 28].
- **Adaptation of foreign experience:** Using proven international models to modernize Ukrainian partnership relations will allow mobilizing new investments and technologies [8, 11, 27].
- **Digitalization of management processes:** Implementing digital technologies to optimize interaction procedures between government authorities and enterprises will contribute to increasing transparency and management efficiency [8, 11, 29].

Threats:

- **Political and economic instability:** Uncertainty in government administration and external geopolitical risks can negatively affect long-term investment processes [30, 31].
- **Competition for investments:** Intense competition between regions for attracting investments can reduce the effectiveness of partnership initiatives if sufficient coordination between participants is not ensured [32, 33].
- **Technological lag:** Without constant updating of the technological base and modernization of management processes, there is a risk of falling behind world standards [8, 29].

Applying SWOT analysis allows formulating a set of recommendations for improving existing partnership models: it is necessary to develop a unified regulatory framework, optimize bureaucratic procedures, ensure active integration of scientific institutions with innovative business, and implement digital technologies to improve management processes. Such measures will contribute to creating a favorable environment for sustainable economic growth and modernization in the face of modern challenges.

Research on foreign experience shows that the success of partnership initiatives is closely linked to the formation of specialized innovation zones, where the state actively stimulates investment activity through tax incentives and joint financing of R&D. Israel, for example, emphasizes integrating young startups into the larger innovation ecosystem, which facilitates the rapid transition of technologies from laboratory to market. Similarly, South Korea has created regional innovation centers that combine the efforts of government bodies, academic institutions, and the private sector. The USA, through its regional technology parks, demonstrates the possibility of mobilizing local resources to create a favorable investment climate. These examples confirm that adapting proven international practices can become an important factor in modernizing the economic environment in Ukraine.

Conclusions. Based on the conducted research, several key provisions can be highlighted:

1. Effective strategic partnership between government authorities and high-tech enterprises is a necessary condition for mobilizing resources and stimulating economic recovery.
2. A favorable regulatory framework and the use of modern financial instruments contribute to activating innovative activities.
3. Integration of scientific developments into production processes ensures a rapid transition from research to commercial application.
4. The experience of foreign countries shows that adapting comprehensive partnership models contributes to creating innovation clusters and growing economic potential.

5. For further development of partnership relations, it is recommended to develop a unified legislative platform and create specialized coordination bodies.

Prospects for further research. Further research should focus on developing innovative models for integrating public and private resources, analyzing the impact of digital technologies on optimizing partnership processes, and studying the role of regional initiatives in forming a modern innovation environment. It is necessary to conduct empirical research to evaluate the effectiveness of implementing public-private partnerships in various high-tech industries.

References.

1. Heiets, V. M. (2014). Instytutsiina obumovlenist innovatsiinykh protsesiv u promyslovomu rozvytku Ukrainy [Institutional conditionality of innovation processes in industrial development of Ukraine]. Ekonomika Ukrainy, (12), 4-19. http://jnas.nbuv.gov.ua/article/UJRN-0000295802
2. Perminova, S. O., Sytnyk, N. I., & Chuprina, M. O. (2022). Derzhavni stymuly innovatsiinoi diialnosti v konteksti ekonomichnoho vidrodzhennia Ukrainy [State incentives for innovation activity in the context of economic revival of Ukraine]. Ekonomika ta upravlinnia natsionalnym hospodarstvom, 69, 14-18. https://doi.org/10.32782/infrastruct69-3
3. Sychova, V., & Samofalova, T. (2023). Derzhavno-pryvatne partnerstvo u povoiennomu vidnovlenni Ukrainy [Public-private partnership in post-war reconstruction of Ukraine]. Derzhavne budivnytstvo: zbirnyk naukovykh prats, 2(34), 125-141. https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-5274-2024-8(36)-176-190
4. Moskalenko, O. M. (2011). Sotsialno-ekonomichni rezultaty tekhnolohichnoho derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva u sviti ta problemy yoho vykorystannia v Ukraini [Socio-economic results of technological public-private partnership in the world and problems of its use in Ukraine]. Ekonomichna teoriia, (4), 15-25.
5. Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. Research Policy, 29(2), 109-123. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00055-4
6. Durmusoglu, S. S. (2004). Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology. European Journal of Innovation Management, 7(4), 325-326. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060410565074
7. Mazzucato, M. (2014). The Entrepreneurial State – Debunking Public vs. Private Myths. London: Anthem Press.
8. Schot, J., & Steinmueller, W. E. (2018). Three frames for innovation policy: R&D, systems of innovation and transformative change. Research Policy, 47(9), 1554-1567. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.08.011
9. Porter, M. E., & Stern, S. (2001). Innovation: Location Matters. MIT Sloan Management Review, 42(4), 28-36.
10. Shevchuk, A. (2021). Development of the conceptual and categorical apparatus of formation and implementation of public-private partnership in the field of innovation development. Global Prosperity, 1(3-2), 130-139. Retrieved from https://gprosperity.org/index.php/journal/article/view/65
11. Lee, K. (2019). The Art of Economic Catch-Up: Barriers, Detours and Leapfrogging in Innovation Systems. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108588232
12. Avnimelech, G., & Teubal, M. (2006). Creating venture capital industries that co-evolve with high tech: Insights from an extended industry life cycle perspective of the Israeli experience. Research Policy, 35, 1477-1498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2006.09.017
13. Feldman, M. P., & Kogler, D. F. (2010). Stylized Facts in the Geography of Innovation. Handbook of the Economics of Innovation, 1, 381-410.
14. Bloom, N., Van Reenen, J., & Williams, H. (2019). A Toolkit of Policies to Promote Innovation. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 33(3), 163-84. http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.3.163
15. Carbonara, N., & Pellegrino, R. (2019). The role of public private partnerships in fostering innovation. Construction Management and Economics, 38(2), 140-156. https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2019.1610184

16. Koschatzky, K., & Stahlecker, T. (Eds.). (2016). Public-private partnerships in research and innovation: Trends and international perspectives. Fraunhofer Verlag. Retrieved from https://publica.fraunhofer.de/entities/publication/39a90b47-11c3-4b0e-8870-f0239762da89

17. Wessner, C. W. (2013). How Does Germany Do It? Mechanical Engineering, 135(11), 42-47. https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2013-NOV-3

18. Science Business. (2024). Israeli government approves transformative stimulus package to boost high-tech industry. Retrieved from https://sciencebusiness.net/network-updates/israeli-government-approves-transformative-stimulus-package-boost-high-tech

19. Wikipedia contributors. (2024, December 19). Technion – Israel Institute of Technology. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Technion_%E2%80%93_Israel_Institute_of_Technology&oldid=1263923806

20. Dave, A. (2023). Pangyo Techno Valley: A Thriving Startup Hub in Korea. Retrieved from https://www.koreatechdesk.com/pangyo-techno-valley-a-thriving-startup-hub-in-korea/

21. Wikipedia contributors. (2025, March 4). Pangyo Techno Valley. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Pangyo_Techno_Valley&oldid=1278841686

22. Publiced Works. (2014). Research Triangle Park: A Model for University Research and Economic Growth. Retrieved from https://publicedworks.org/2014/10/research-triangle-park-a-model-for-university-research-and-economic-growth/

23. Kattel, R., & Mazzucato, M. (2018). Mission-oriented innovation policy and dynamic capabilities in the public sector. Industrial and Corporate Change, 27(5), 787-801. https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dty032

24. Zyhrii, O., Trufanova, Yu., Parashchuk, L., Sampara, N., & Tsvigun, I. (2023). Law and technology: The impact of innovations on the legal system and its regulation. Social and Legal Studios, 6(4), 267-275. https://doi.org/10.32518/sals4.2023.267

25. Hrabynskyi, I., Horin, N., & Ukrayinets, L. (2017). Barriers and drivers to ecoinnovation: comparative analysis of germany, poland and ukraine. European Management Studies, 11(1), 13-24. https://doi.org/10.26552/EMS.2017.1.13-24

26. Bilyk, R. S. (2015). Features of development of innovative environment in Ukraine in the conditions of global competition. European Journal of Management Issues, 23(4), 27-35. https://doi.org/10.15421/191504

27. Kasych, A. O. (2013). Dosvid formuvannia natsionalnykh innovatsiinykh system u krainakh, shcho rozvyvaiutsia [Experience of formation of national innovation systems in developing countries]. Aktualni problemy ekonomiky, (5), 46-49. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/ape_2013_5_6

28. Jacobs, D., & De Man, A. P. (1996). Clusters, industrial policy and firm strategy. Technology Analysis & Strategic Management, 8(4), 425-438. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537329608522461

29. Nambisan, S., Wright, M., & Feldman, M. (2019). The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship: Progress, challenges and key themes. Research Policy, 48(8), 1-1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.018

30. Savchenko, M. V., & Porokhnia, V. A. (2024). Vplyv heopolitychnoi nestabilnosti na mizhnarodni investytsiini potoky [The impact of geopolitical instability on international investment flows]. Ekonomika i orhanizatsiia upravlinnia, (June 2024), 90-97. https://doi.org/10.31558/2307-2318.2024.1.9

31. Khoma, I., & Vorobii, Kh. (2024). Investuvannia v Ukraini pid chas viiny ta perspektyvy investytsiinykh protsesiv u pisliavoiennyi chas [Investing in Ukraine during the war and prospects for investment processes in the post-war period]. Halytskyi ekonomichnyi visnyk, 86(1), 84-89. https://doi.org/10.33108/galicianvisnyk_tntu2024.01.084

32. Bila, S. O., Zhalilo, Ya. A., Shevchenko, O. V., & Zhuk, V. I. (2011). Innovatsiini pidkhody do rehionalnoho rozvytku v Ukraini: analitychna dopovid [Innovative approaches to regional development in Ukraine: analytical report]. Kyiv: NISD.

33. Ivanova, O., Kancs, D., & Thissen, M. (2019). EU Economic Modelling System: Assessment of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT) Investments in Innovation and Human Capital (EUR 27796). Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. https://doi.org/10.2791/184008

Баюра Д.О., *д.е.н., професор*
КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка
baiura_da@knu.ua
Цибульський Д.І., *аспірант*
КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка
dmytro.tsybulskyi@knu.ua

СТРАТЕГІЧНЕ ПАРТНЕРСТВО МІЖ ДЕРЖАВОЮ ТА ВИСОКОТЕХНОЛОГІЧНИМИ ПІДПРИЄМСТВАМИ: ДОСВІД І ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ

Стаття досліджує механізми співпраці, встановлені між державними органами та високотехнологічними компаніями, спрямовані на мобілізацію ресурсів для економічного відродження та післявоєнної відбудови. На тлі геополітичних викликів та економічної нестабільності дослідження підкреслює вирішальну роль ефективного державно-приватного партнерства у використанні інновацій, забезпеченні фінансових інвестицій та впровадженні технологічних досягнень, які є життєво важливими для сталого розвитку. Використовуючи багатогранний методологічний підхід, що включає ретельний огляд літератури, аналіз нормативних документів та порівняльні тематичні дослідження таких країн, як Німеччина, Ізраїль, Південна Корея та США, дослідження визначає ключові фактори, що лежать в основі успіху таких партнерств. Ці фактори включають значну державну підтримку, яка проявляється через сприятливе законодавство та фінансові стимули, безперешкодну інтеграцію академічних досліджень із промисловими застосуваннями та адаптивність управлінських практик у високотехнологічних підприємствах. Аналіз також висвітлює існуючі виклики в українському контексті, такі як фрагментовані регуляторні рамки, обмежена координація між зацікавленими сторонами та обмежений доступ до фінансування інновацій. Як рішення, стаття пропонує стратегічні рекомендації щодо розробки інтегрованих моделей державно-приватного партнерства, які можуть ефективно мобілізувати ресурси та стимулювати економічне зростання в післявоєнному середовищі. Завдяки сприянню міжгалузевій співпраці, створенню інноваційних кластерів та встановленню прозорих механізмів фінансування, політикам та бізнес-лідерам надаються практичні рекомендації для адаптації успішних міжнародних практик до місцевих умов. У висновках дослідження підкреслюється важливість зміцнення співпраці держави та підприємств, як наріжного каменя для побудови стійкої, інноваційної національної економіки, здатної відповідати сучасним викликам.

Ключові слова: *стратегічне партнерство, високотехнологічні підприємства, державне управління, економічне відновлення, мобілізація ресурсів, інновації, міжнародний досвід.*