



UDC 352:346.3/122

[https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2021-1\(26\)-196-217](https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2021-1(26)-196-217)

***Polska Liudmyla Alexandrovna,***  
*postgraduate student of the Department of Management, Public Administration and Administration of the Dnieper State Agrarian and Economic University, 49000, Dnipro, Str. Serhiy Yefremov, 25, tel.: +38 (067) 198 03 81, e-mail: mila8118@meta.ua, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9868-2326>*

***Польська Людмила Олександрівна,***  
*аспірант кафедри менеджменту, публічного управління та адміністрування Дніпровського державного аграрно-економічного університету, 49000, м. Дніпро, вул. Сергія Єфремова, 25, тел.: +38 (067) 198 03 81, e-mail: mila8118@meta.ua, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9868-2326>*

***Польская Людмила Александровна,***  
*аспирант кафедры менеджмента, публичного управления и администрирования Днепропетровского государственного аграрно-экономического университета, 49000, г. Днепр, ул. Сергея Ефремова, 25, тел.: +38 (067) 198 03 81, e-mail: mila8118@meta.ua, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9868-2326>*

---

## ARCHETYPES OF DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP FORMS FOR PROVIDING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL TERRITORIAL COMMUNITIES

**Abstract.** The article examines the main aspects of interaction between the public and private sectors. The analysis of the development of forms of public-private interaction is carried out, using an archetypal approach are analyzed the concept of the archetype of rural areas and the phenomenon of public-private partnership. The main models of public-private partnership are also analyzed; organizational and regulatory mechanisms for improving the public administration system on the basis of public-private partnership in the context of ensuring sustainable development of rural territorial communities are suggested. Based on the analysis of various systems and models of public-private partnership, the main areas of agricultural development and sustainable development of rural territorial

communities were identified, for which the tools of public-private partnership can be effectively applied in order to achieve sustainable socio-economic development of rural areas and their production potential.

In the article, are proposed the ways for improving the regulatory framework governing public relations in the field of public-private partnership, in general, it concerns the need to include the agricultural sector in the list of objects of public-private partnership defined in the Law "On Public-Private Partnership". It is also advisable to expand the concept of public-private partnership, using the international term "public-private partnership", which more accurately defines the essence of contractual relations between state and local authorities with private partners. In the context of the analyzed regulatory legal acts on the development of the institution of public-private partnership, the main areas of public-private partnership for the development of agriculture and rural regions were identified. In general, are proposed areas that would be advisable to develop within the framework of public-private partnership, namely: the sphere of ecological land use and land reclamation, agricultural insurance, sustainable development of rural regions through the construction of infrastructure facilities and the provision of services to the community.

Thus, the study identifies models of public-private partnerships, as well as their areas of application, which can be used by public authorities and local governments to develop future partnership agreements for the development of the agricultural sector and sustainable socio-economic development of rural territorial communities.

**Keywords:** public-private partnership, archetypal approach, archetype of rural territory, models of public-private partnership, agricultural policy.

## **АРХЕТИПИ РОЗВИТКУ ФОРМ ПУБЛІЧНО-ПРИВАТНОГО ПАРТНЕРСТВА ДЛЯ ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ СТАЛОГО РОЗВИТКУ СІЛЬСЬКИХ ТЕРИТОРІАЛЬНИХ ГРОМАД**

**Анотація.** Досліджено основні аспекти взаємодії публічного та приватного сектора. Проаналізовано: розвиток форм публічно-приватної взаємодії за допомогою архетипного підходу; поняття архетипу сільських територій, а також явище публічно-приватного партнерства; основні моделі публічно-приватного партнерства. Запропоновано організаційно-нормативні механізми удосконалення системи публічного управління на засадах публічно-приватного партнерства в контексті забезпечення сталого розвитку сільських територіальних громад. На основі проведеного ґрунтового аналізу різних систем та моделей публічно-приватного партнерства було визначено основні сфери сільськогосподарського розвитку та розвитку сільських територіальних громад, щодо яких можна ефективно застосовувати інструменти публічно-приватного партнерства з метою досягнення сталого соціально-економічного розвитку сільських територій та максимально ефективного використання їх виробничого потенціалу. Також запропоновані шляхи удосконалення нормативно-правової бази, що регулює суспільні відносини у сфері публічно-при-

ватного партнерства. Наголошується на необхідності включення сільсько-господарської сфери до переліку об'єктів публічно-приватного партнерства, визначених у Законі України "Про державно-приватне партнерство". Доцільно також розширити саме поняття державно-приватне партнерство, використовуючи міжнародний термін "публічно-приватне партнерство", яке більш точно визначає сутність договірних відносин, між державними та місцевими органами влади з приватними партнерами. В контексті проаналізованих нормативно-правових актів щодо розвитку інституту публічно-приватного партнерства було визначено основні сфери публічно-приватного партнерства задля розвитку сільського господарства та сільських регіонів. Загалом, запропоновано сфери які було б доцільно розвивати в рамках публічно-приватного партнерства, а саме: сфера екологічного землекористування та меліорації, агрострахування, сталий розвиток сільських регіонів за рахунок будівництва інфраструктурних об'єктів та надання послуг громаді. Таким чином, у дослідженні визначено моделі публічно-приватного партнерства, а також сфери їх застосування, що можуть бути використані органами державної влади та місцевого самоврядування для розроблення майбутніх партнерських угод щодо розвитку аграрної сфери та сталого соціально-економічного розвитку сільських територіальних громад.

**Ключові слова:** державно-приватне партнерство, архетипний підхід, архетип сільської території, моделі публічно-приватного партнерства, аграрна політика.

## **АРХЕТИПЫ РАЗВИТИЯ ФОРМ ПУБЛИЧНО-ЧАСТНОГО ПАРТНЕРСТВА ДЛЯ ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЯ УСТОЙЧИВОГО РАЗВИТИЯ СЕЛЬСКИХ ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНЫХ ОБЩИН**

**Аннотация.** Исследованы основные аспекты взаимодействия публично-го и частного сектора. Проанализированы: развитие форм публично-частного взаимодействия, с помощью архетипного подхода; понятие архетип сельских территорий и явление государственно-частного партнерства; основные модели государственно-частного партнерства. Предложены организационно-нормативные механизмы совершенствования системы публично-го управления на основе государственно-частного партнерства в контексте обеспечения устойчивого развития сельских территориальных общин. На основе проведенного анализа различных систем и моделей государственно-частного партнерства, были определены основные сферы сельскохозяйственного развития и развития сельских территориальных общин, для которых можно эффективно применять инструменты государственно-частного партнерства с целью достижения устойчивого социально-экономического развития сельских территорий и достижения максимально эффективного производственного потенциала. Также предложены пути совершенствования нормативно-правовой базы, регулирующей общественные отношения в сфере публично-частного партнерства. Подчеркивается необходимость включения сельскохозяйственной сферы в перечень объектов государст-

венно-частного партнерства, согласно Закона Украины “О государственном-частном партнерстве”. Целесообразно также расширить само понятие государственно-частного партнерства, используя международный термин “публично-частное партнерство”, которое более точно определяет сущность договорных отношений между государственными и местными органами власти с частными партнерами. В контексте проанализированных нормативно-правовых актов по развитию института государственно-частного партнерства, были определены основные сферы публично-частного партнерства для развития сельского хозяйства и сельских регионов. В общем, предложены сферы, которые было бы целесообразно развивать в рамках государственно-частного партнерства, а именно: сфера экологического землепользования и мелиорации, агрострахование, устойчивое развитие сельских регионов за счет строительства инфраструктурных объектов и предоставления услуг общине. Таким образом, в исследовании определены модели государственно-частного партнерства, а также сферы их применения, которые могут быть использованы органами государственной власти и местного самоуправления для разработки будущих партнерских соглашений по развитию аграрной сферы и устойчивого социально-экономического развития сельских территориальных общин.

**Ключевые слова:** государственно-частное партнерство, архетипический подход, архетип сельской местности, модели государственно-частного партнерства, аграрная политика.

---

**Problem definition.** Ensuring sustainable development of rural areas and the development of their economic potential is the main task in the context of the approved Concept of Rural Development № 995-p dated September 23, 2015. [1], one of the ways to achieve it is the development of cooperation between public authorities, local governments and the private sector based on public-private partnership. Given the lack of funding, both from the state and local budgets, to solve all pressing issues in rural areas, this form of cooperation, combined with the resource capabilities of the state and local communities and financial investments, new technologies, and innovations from private partners, will contribute

to more effective implementation of projects for socio-economic development of rural areas. Therefore, for the development of public-private partnership in rural regions, it is necessary to study the international experience of using this cooperation tool, as well as various models of public-private partnership, and identify the areas and objects of public-private partnership for agriculture. This symbiosis of resources and opportunities will contribute to the general prosperity of rural communities, active participation of citizens in the development of their territories, development of community activities, social security services, infrastructure development, stimulating the introduction of environmental technologies in

agriculture and other important areas of rural life. The article analyses the archetype of rural areas, analyses the historical experience of implementing the tool of public-private partnership, proposed legal and administrative-institutional mechanisms to improve the form of public-private partnership for the management of the public-private partnership. It is proposed to use the model of 'public-private partnership' for the introduction of sustainable methods of land use and soil protection, the development of infrastructure and services in rural areas, as well as the development of agricultural insurance based on the principles of public-private partnership. In general, the article emphasizes the importance of expanding the list of facilities, in a public-private partnership, as well as maintaining ownership and control over these facilities and responsibility for their effective use to achieve sustainable development of the rural community.

Analysis of recent researches and published papers. The study of the problems of the 'archetype of territories' and its influence on state policy was studied in their scientific works: V. Yu. Hleba [2], O. Kovinchuk [3]. The archetypal approach in public administration and modern studies of social reality was studied by E. Afonin, T. Plakhtii [4], A. Makarova [5; 6]. Current issues of theory and practice of public-private partnership in Ukraine have been studied in the works of the following scientists: I. K. Bystriakov, D. V. Klynovyi [7], A. V. Stepanenko, A. A. Omelchenko [8], N. A. Tretiak, O. V. Kalenska [9]. The problems of the history of the phenomenon of public-private partnership and its de-

velopment in modern conditions were studied by foreign scientists and researchers: M. Rankin, T. G. Nogales [10], F. Herman, F. Geerling-Eiff, J. Potters, L. Klerkx [11], M. J. Romero [12], N. D. Caldwell, J. K. Roehrich, G. George [13]. Mechanisms of public-private partnership as a tool for achieving sustainable development of rural areas were studied by the following scientists: A. M. Stativka, I. N. Kulchii [14; 15], V. M. Onehina, L. A. Batiuk [16], T. P. Kalna-Dubniuk, M. V. Beschastna [17]. Issues of public-private partnership development in the agricultural sector have been studied by such scientists as O. V. Zhavnerchyk [18], P. F. Kulynych [19], M. F. Kropyvko, M. M. Ksenofontov, N. V. Khmil [20], M. Kozin, H. Pyrchenkova, O. Radchenko [21], P. Shylepnytskyi [22], L. O. Shashula, I. S. Denysenko [23]. The development of agricultural insurance based on public-private partnership was studied by the following: N. S. Tanklevska, V. V. Yaromolenko [24], K. V. Tretiak [25], N. O. Shypshanova, S. S. Sovshchak, Yu. V. Melnyk [26], A. M. Stelmashchuk [27] and others. However, the topic of developing public-private partnership models and the possibility of their use and adaptation to the conditions of application in the agricultural sector of Ukraine is not sufficiently studied.

**The purpose of the article** is an archetypal analysis of the concept of rural area, the phenomenon of public-private partnership, development of conceptual principles of using the mechanism of public-private partnership in the field of agricultural production, and sustainable development of rural areas.

### **Presentation of the main material.**

Sustainable development has become a new ideology for the development of society in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and is also an alternative to the paradigm of economic growth, based on an extensive model of economic activity that ignored the ecological component of society's life. According to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, the main goal of sustainable development of society is to meet the needs of the current generation, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs [28]. Thus, sustainable community development is a managed integrated socio-economic and environmental development of the territory aimed at meeting the needs of the community, taking into account the needs of future generations. To ensure sustainable socio-economic development of the territory, it is necessary to make the most effective use of the existing potential of the community, taking into account the historically determined criteria for the emergence and development of the territory, geographical location, available natural resources and cultural features of the community, which in turn forms the archetype of the territory. The concept of 'archetype of territory' in his scientific works defined V. Yu. Hleba as the historical core of the city, which has clear functional and stylistic features [2]. This definition determines the archetype of the territory of the city only and does not take into account the archetype of the rural territory. However, it is the rural area that is the archetype, the 'prototype' of today's cities and villages, so the definition of the archetype of the territory should be considered in the

context of the origin and development of rural areas. Rural areas are the cradle of the national identity of the people, its spirituality, which in turn affects the unconscious emotional self-expression of the people, the behaviour of citizens and determines the future development of the state. The archetype of the rural territory is defined as a historical, territorial-functional and cultural prototype of the development of the modern territorial community. The study of the archetype of the territory is very important for the development of the science of public administration because the study of the prototype of society makes it possible to predict its behaviour and future development, which is extremely important for the development of state policies and mechanisms of public administration and their effective implementation. Thus, improving the mechanisms of public management of the agricultural sector of the economy and sustainable development of rural territorial communities is the key to successful land reform, improving the quality of life and well-being in rural territorial communities.

A public-private partnership is one such mechanism. This mechanism is not a new form of cooperation for the public and private sectors. In fact, concessions, as the most common form of the PPP under which a private investor works, supports, and develops infrastructure or provides services of general economic interest, date back thousands of years. Back in Roman times, concessions served as tools for building roads, public baths, and organizing markets. Other well-known examples include medieval Europe, whereas in early 1438, a French nobleman named Louis

de Bernam received a concession on the Rhine River to charge for transportation. There are many examples, so from the beginning of the 17–18<sup>th</sup> centuries, many infrastructure facilities (water channels, roads, railways) in Europe, and then in America, China, and Japan were financed privately under concession agreements. Although this practice has existed for millennia, the **Public-Private Partnership** term, hereinafter referred to as the “**PPP**” was coined and popularized in the 1970s, when neoliberal ideas began to challenge the previously dominant Keynesian paradigm about the need for an active role of the state in the economy in the context of low economic performance, for which the government was accused of its inefficiency. Over time, in the 80s, new ideas for a new public management model emerged. New Public Management (NPM) is an approach that uses new approaches to management in the public sector to improve the efficiency of the organization of public service and the activities of public institutions and organizations, introducing management mechanisms that are used in the private sector. In this context, the PPP has often been used as an alternative to bureaucratic public services and inefficient state-owned enterprises. It was argued that the transfer of state powers and tasks for their implementation to private entities is the main means of reducing the role of the state, improving the efficiency of providing public services, as well as reducing the process of ousting the private sector by state-owned enterprises [29]. The PPP is mainly used for infrastructure projects, such as the construction and arrangement of kindergartens, hospitals, trans-

port systems, water supply systems, irrigation and other infrastructure facilities.

In international practice, the Public-Private Partnership term (“PPP”) is used as a form of cooperation between public authorities and business, the purpose of which is to finance, build, upgrade, manage, maintain infrastructure or provide services (European Commission) [30]. Public-private partnership is aimed at financing, development, implementation and operation of public sector facilities and services and is characterized by the provision of long-term (sometimes up to 30 years) services; sharing part of the risk with the private sector and include various forms of long-term contracts concluded between legal entities and authorities (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) [31]. In our study, we will use the **Public-Private Partnership** term, hereinafter referred to as the “**PPP**”, which is equivalent to the category of ‘state-private partnership’, in our opinion, the latter does not quite comply with the Law of Ukraine ‘*On Public-Private Partnership*’, since the legislation defines not only state authorities, but also local self-government bodies as state partners. Thus, the concept of ‘public-private partnership’ is more in line with the essence of the term public-private cooperation, concerning state and communal property, and the generally accepted international definition of ‘public-private partnership’ (the PPP, 3P, or P3).

Over time, different models of the PPP have emerged around the world, sharing powers, responsibilities, and risks between public and private partners. Before understanding which of

them can best suit the PPP for sustainable rural development, we will analyse the main ones for their further effective use for each type of contractual relationship. The PPP models differ mainly in terms of ownership of capital assets, investment responsibility, risk-taking, and duration of contracts [31]. Mainly the PPP models are used for two main purposes: development of new facilities

(for example, construction of irrigation systems) and work on existing ones (for example, the greening of agricultural lands). Also, the PPP models can be divided into projects aimed at design, construction or creation of facilities and provision of services.

This Table shows the main types of models of cooperation between both public partners and private partners,

**Models of Public-Private Partnership**

<b>Types of Models</b>	<b>Main Specifications</b>
1	2
1. Finance Only (FO)	Under the Financing Only model, a private organization, such as a financial services company or a bank, finances the construction of public infrastructure directly or through mechanisms such as long-term leases or bond issues. The state partner bears all risks and costs for the construction and operation of the facility
2. Design-Bid-Build (DBB)	The Design-Bid-Build model. According to this model, the state partner determines the requirements for the project, provides its financing and design. The procurement procedure is used to select the private bidder responsible for the construction. The state partner is the owner of the newly built facility and provides its maintenance
3. Design-Build-Maintain (DBM)	In the Design-Build-Maintain model, the private partner designs, builds and maintains the infrastructure following the specifications and requirements of the public partner. The price is usually pre-agreed and fixed, so the risks of cost and quality assurance and maintenance of the constructed object are borne by the private partner. The state institution owns and operates the assets
4. Operate-Maintain (OM)	The Operate-Maintain model. In this model, a government agency signs a contract with a private partner to provide or service services through a public institution. Ownership of the asset remains with the public partner. Sometimes this model is referred to as outsourcing agreements
5. Operation License (OL)	Under the Operation License model, a public authority issues a license to a private entity to provide public services, usually for a limited period. This model is often used in IT projects
6. Design-Build-Operate (DBO)	The Design-Build-Operate model. In this model, the private partner designs and builds state property following the requirements and specifications of the state partner at a fixed price. The state entity bears the financing and expenses. Upon completion of construction, the private partner takes the property on a long-term lease to provide services
7. Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO)	The Design-Build-Finance-Operate model. Under this model, a private partner designs, builds and finances a new government facility for a long-term lease. During the lease period, the private partner



1	2
	operates the facility, and after the expiration date, the facility is transferred to the public partner
8. Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT)	The Build-Own-Operate-Transfer model. According to this model, a private partner develops, builds, finances and manages a state-owned facility, while maintaining ownership of the franchise provided by the state entity. The private partner charges the government and/or end-users for the services provided. At the end of the franchise period, ownership of the object is transferred back to the public partner without compensation to the private partner
9. Lease-Develop-Operate (LDO)	The Lease-Develop-Operate model. A private partner leases a public facility, develops and improves it technologically and functionally, as well as operates it. The state partner retains ownership of the object and receives payments under the lease agreement
10. Build-Lease-Operate-Transfer (BLOT)	The Build-Lease-Operate-Transfer model The private partner creates and leases the facility, while the ownership remains with the state partner. The private partner provides services and after the expiration of the agreement, the ownership of the object is returned to the state partner
11. Buy-Own-Operate-Transfer (BUYOOT)	The Buy-Own-Operate-Transfer model. A private partner buys a public facility, uses it for a certain period, and provides a service. Upon expiration, with consent, the object is transferred to the state partner free of charge
12. Design-Build-Finance-Own-Operate-Transfer (DBFOOT)	The Design-Build-Finance-Own-Operate-Transfer model. In this model, the private partner designs, develops, builds and finances and implements the public project. A private partner provides services and uses an object that is his property for a certain period. Until the expiration of this period, the right of ownership is transferred to the state partner without compensation
13. Build-Own-Operate (BOO)	The Build-Own-Operate model. A private partner creates and manages state property owned by them without the obligation to transfer assets to the state partner. The public partner regulates and controls the quality of services provided by the private partner
14. Buy-Build-Operate (BBO)	In the Buy-Build-Operate model, a private partner purchases a government facility by the agreement that the assets must be upgraded and operated for a certain period. The private partner also provides services to the public partner and/or end-users. Upon expiration, the private partner retains ownership of the state asset

Source: Based on the data of the Guidelines for the Development of Public-Private Partnership in Public Administration, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe [31].

but the types of models can be changed and supplemented, and all models are based on the definition of the main parameters of cooperation: division of responsibilities and risks between both public partners and private partners. Each of the models has its own advan-

tages and disadvantages, so you need to take into account all the risks and opportunities when applying in each specific case to get the greatest benefit for the state or community. First of all, it is necessary to determine the type of rights to manage a state or municipi-

pal facility (use, ownership, operation, acquisition, creation, construction, reconstruction, modernization), to determine the distribution of risks, financing conditions and investment. A public-private partnership is an agreement on cooperation between two or more public and private partners, usually of a long-term nature (5 to 50 years), concerning state and communal property. As part of the implementation of the PPP can be concluded: concession agreement, property management agreement (provided that the agreement concluded within the framework of a public-private partnership provides for investment obligations of a private partner), agreement on joint activities and other agreements (Art. 5. of the Law of Ukraine *'On Public-Private Partnership'* [32].

The following elements characterize the PPP:

- Relatively long period of cooperation between the public and private partner on various aspects of the planned project;
- Form of project financing, partly from the private sector, sometimes through additional investments/additional budget funds;
- An important role of a private investor who participates in various stages of the project (design, construction, implementation, financing, etc.). The state partner focuses, first of all, on determining the goals that should be achieved in terms of the interest of the community, the quality of services provided, pricing policy, monitors and is responsible for compliance with these goals;
- Risk sharing between public and private partners. However, the exact

distribution of risks is determined on a case-by-case basis according to the capabilities of stakeholders, in any case, the public sector retains responsibility for providing these services to the population in a way that benefits the public and ensures economic development and improves the quality of life of citizens.

The Guidelines for the Development of Public-Private Partnerships of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe identify the basic principles of good governance [31]: Participation; Decency; Transparency; Accountability; Honesty; Efficiency; and Sustainability.

In Ukraine, the organizational and legal framework for the implementation of cooperation between public partners with private investors, which determine the basic principles of public-private partnership are defined in the following regulations of Ukraine: the Law of Ukraine *'On Public-Private Partnership'* № 2404-VI dated 01.07.2010 [32]; the Law of Ukraine *'On Concession'* № 155-IX dated 03.10.2019 [33]; By-laws governing the implementation of the PPP: Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers *'Some Issues of the Organization of Public-Private Partnership'* № 384 dated 11.04.2011 [34]; Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (CMU) *'On Approval of the Methodology for Identifying Risks of Public-Private Partnerships, Their Assessment and Determining the Form of Their Management'* № 232 dated 16.02.2011 [35]; Order of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine *'Some Issues of Analysis of the Effectiveness of Public-Private Partnership'* № 255 dated 27.02.2012 [36]; Order of the Ministry of Economic

Development, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine *'On Approval of the Procedure for Submission by State Partners (Concessionaires) of the Annual Report on the Implementation of the Agreement Concluded within the Public-Private Partnership, Including the Concession Agreement № 628/34911 dated 06.07.2020' № 986 dated 26.05.2020* [37]; Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers *'On Approval of the Procedure for Replacement of a Private Partner (Concessionaire) under an Agreement concluded within the framework of a Public-Private Partnership (Concession Agreement)' № 541 dated of 01.07.2020* [38]; Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers *'On Approval of the Procedure for Returning the Concession Object to the Concessionaire after the Termination of the Concession Agreement' № 621 dated 22.07.2020* [39]. Regulatory principles of the PPP are also defined in the Commercial Code of Ukraine and the Civil Code of Ukraine (concepts and conditions of agreements).

A public-private partnership, in the field of sustainable development of rural territorial communities, is equal and mutually beneficial cooperation between the state, amalgamated territorial communities (represented by relevant state authorities or local self-government) and the private sector to effectively use the resource opportunities of the territorial community and attract investment, innovation, and technology of private investors to implement socio-economic projects that are important for ensuring the sustainable development of rural territories and the development of the socio-economic potential of the community.

The Law of Ukraine *'On Public-Private Partnerships'* does not consider the sphere of agricultural production at all, except for ensuring the functioning of irrigation and drainage systems, only the second part emphasizes the possibility of applying the PPP in other areas of activity. The possibility and mechanism of using agricultural land plots for the implementation of the PPP also require clarification in the legislation of Ukraine. For rural areas, agricultural land is the main productive asset, and with large-scale land reform and the transfer of state-owned agricultural land to amalgamated territorial communities into communal ownership, the issue arises for rural communities regarding the effective use and protection of land. Effective management of such land requires efforts from both local authorities and the direct participation of citizens. To improve the state of degraded or unproductive land, the public-private partnership mechanism is an effective tool. Thus, in the field of land relations, the following priority measures can be identified for the PPP implementation: the greening of agricultural land; carrying out reclamation measures to restore degraded and unproductive lands; construction of irrigation systems, etc. To this end, the PPP implementation will be quite effective, because the land is provided for long-term use for up to 50 years, with clearly defined requirements that the acquirer of rights to use the land plot must fulfil. For example, the implementation of measures to restore soil fertility on unproductive and degraded lands can be represented by such a model, the public partner provides the PPP object: land, clearly defines the

requirements for the user for up to 50 years, the latter one pays rent, after which the plot is returned to the public partner. Under this model, the public partner benefits from the fact that the quality of the soil is improved through the implementation of land reclamation measures by a private partner, who, in return, receives a plot for rent, with the possibility of instalment rent at the end of soil restoration measures, and with the right to further use the agricultural land for economic activities and return on investment and profit. Taking into account the role of land for a rural community, which is a territorial basis and the main means of production, the right of communal ownership of agricultural land of a rural territorial community should remain with it, and a private partner can have the rights to use the land plot, while the community constantly monitors the fulfilment of all requirements by a private partner. In international practice, the most suitable model for the use of agricultural land as the PPP object: Lease-Develop-Operate (LDO) – the Lease-Develop-Operate model, in which a private partner leases a public facility, develops and improves it is technologically and functionally, and also operates it. The state partner retains ownership of the object and receives payments under the lease agreement. Basically, in the PPP projects, a concession agreement is concluded between the concessioner and the concessionaire, which determines the procedure and conditions for the implementation of the project, which is carried out on the terms of the concession. According to paragraph 11 of Art.1 of the Law of Ukraine ‘On Concession’, a concession is a form of public-private

partnership, which provides for the concessioner to grant the concessionaire the right to create and/or build (new construction, reconstruction, restoration, overhaul, and technical re-equipment), and/or management (use, operation, maintenance) the subject of the concession, and/or the provision of socially significant services in the manner and under the conditions specified in the concession agreement, and also provides for the transfer to the concessionaire of most of the operational risk, including demand risk and/or supply risk [33]. The law also defines the term for which a concession agreement is concluded: it must be at least five years and no more than 50 years, except for the term of the concession agreement for the construction and further operation of highways, which must be at least 10 years. The term of the contract is affected by the term of operation of the concession object and its depreciation, the payback period of the investment, and the period necessary to achieve the objectives of the concession project.

Other important areas for rural development that may involve private partners are the following: 1) construction of water treatment systems, using the latest technologies, construction of water supply and sewerage systems, and the provision of further water supply services to the population (these projects use the LDO model); 2) construction of infrastructure facilities, such as agricultural markets for the sale of agricultural products and wholesale trade (the DBO model can be used); 3) development of rural tourism, holding various cultural events (the PPP: the OM model); 4) construction of waste processing facilities, with their

subsequent operation (DBO); 5) provision of social services, management of a social institution, institution (OM; OL); 6) production and implementation of energy-saving technologies (DBFO); 7) construction and overhaul of residential buildings (DBB).

Another no less important area in which the active participation of the state and the private sector of the economy is required is agricultural risk insurance. The agricultural sector is the riskiest type of economic activity, it is influenced by various natural factors (drought, frost, storms, floods, etc.), which are not subject to forecasting and human impact. Financial and economic risks, such as falling prices for agricultural products, can be no less catastrophic. In many developed countries, agricultural insurance itself is a protection against the risks of crop loss and falling prices. In Ukraine, agricultural insurance is not very common, it is influenced by the high cost of agricultural insurance, distrust of insurance companies, lack of state support, and interest in the development of agricultural insurance. According to the PPP models, the following models can be used for agricultural insurance: Finance Only (FO), Operate-Maintain (OP), Operation License (OL). According to the FO model, a private organization, usually a financial services company, finances the project directly or uses various mechanisms, such as long-term lease or issuance of bonds, the state, in this case, assumes all or part of the risks and costs. According to the OM model: a private operator operates a state asset under a contract for a certain period (the so-called outsourcing agreement means the transfer of certain

functions and tasks by one company to another that specializes in the relevant field). Ownership of the asset remains with the state. However, it is believed that the OM model does not belong to the range of the PPP agreements, and such contracts are considered like service contracts. Another possible model of cooperation in this area could be the OL model (Operating License), under which a public authority licenses a private entity to provide public services.

The PPP cooperation is not limited to these models, because with the continuous development of economic relations, the conditions of the PPP cooperation are changing, but the only thing that should distinguish between ordinary service agreements or other business contracts is that public-private partnerships should be achieved, first of all, socio-economic and environmental goals that affect the improvement of the quality of life of the citizens of Ukraine. The public sector, in turn, controls the quality of public services, problem-solving in rural communities, and is responsible for the effectiveness of public-private cooperation.

**Conclusions.** This form of mutual partnership has quite significant advantages in the management of state and municipal property. Thanks to the PPP mechanism:

- The efficiency of managing state and municipal property objects increases significantly;
- The quality of public services is improving;
- The latest technologies and innovations are used;
- The newest management methods are being introduced, which increases the level of efficiency of decisions made;

- Expenditures of state and local budgets for the maintenance of budgetary institutions and facilities are reduced;

- Risks are distributed between public and private partners;

- The level of efficiency of implemented projects increases due to mutual control and monitoring, thereby eliminating possible corruption components; and

- The international community increases confidence in projects if it involves a state or local government, on the one hand, and a private partner, which opens up access to profitable international financial instruments, on the other hand.

The budgets of rural communities are not enough to solve all problems at the same time, so it is the mechanism for attracting private investors on the terms of public-private partnership that can become a means of solving them. For this mechanism to work, executive bodies must conduct large-scale consultations with representatives of local self-government bodies; provide opportunities for private partners to make their proposals on the PPP facilities to local authorities; widely use non-agricultural activities (development of energy-saving technologies, light industry, etc.); to legally defined in the Law *'On Public-Private Partnership'* the sphere of agricultural activity; the law should specify the conditions for attracting agricultural land on the PPP terms (for example, the transfer of degraded and unproductive agricultural land to a private partner under a concession agreement, the so-called long-term lease with the definition of conditions for use and improvement

of soil quality, while ownership of the agricultural land remains with local authorities) (because in Art. 8. Use of land plots for the implementation of public-private partnership, only conditions are provided for obtaining land plots and/or rights to them for construction by a private partner); introduce mechanisms for public-private cooperation in the field of agricultural insurance, based on the distribution of funding and risks with a private partner. In general, we can identify the following four main spheres of public-private partnership for agricultural development and sustainable rural development:

1. Sphere of land relations (land reclamation, land protection, construction of irrigation systems, the greening of agricultural lands, etc.);

2. Sphere of construction of new infrastructure facilities or improvement of already built ones (improvement of engineering networks and ensuring the development of social infrastructure, sewerage and water supply systems);

3. Sphere of community services (education, sports, recreation, tourism, culture);

4. Sphere of agricultural insurance.

Thus, the use of the mechanism of public-private partnership in the field of land relations, infrastructure projects, services and agricultural insurance makes it possible to combine the resources and financing of the state, local community, and private partners, as a result of which better socio-economic results are achieved, state and municipal resources and property are used more efficiently, innovations, advanced technologies, as well as the latest management systems are introduced, and most importantly, the goals of sustain-

able development of rural communities and the agricultural sector of the economy are achieved.

## REFERENCES

---

1. Rozporiadzhennia Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy "Pro skhvalennia Kontseptsii rozvytku silskykh terytorii": vid 23.09.2015 № 995-r [Order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine "On approval of the Concept of rural development" from 23.09.2015, №995-r]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995-2015-%D1%80#Text> [in Ukrainian].
2. Hleba V. Yu. (2013). Prostorovo-administratyvna orhanizatsiia mista Kyieva ta arkhetypy terytorii [Spatial-administrative organization of the city of Kyiv and archetypes of territories]. *Publichne upravlinnia: teoriia ta praktyka — Public administration: theory and practice*, 3–4, 26–32 [in Ukrainian].
3. Kovinchuk O. (2015). Arkhetyp terytorii ta yoho vplyv na klasteri v realizatsii derzhavnoi polityky rozvytku terytorii [Archetype of the territory and its impact on clusters in the implementation of state policy of territorial development]. *Publichne upravlinnia: teoriia ta praktyka — Public administration: theory and practice*, 1, 116–122. Retrieved from [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr\\_2015\\_1%28spets.\\_21](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr_2015_1%28spets._21) [in Ukrainian].
4. Afonin E., Plakhtii T. (2019). Arkhetypika i publichne upravlinnia: stratehii staloho rozvytku v umovakh tsyvilizatsiinykh zrushen [Archetypes and public administration: strategies for sustainable development in the context of civilizational changes]. *Ukrainskyi sotsium — Ukrainian Society*, 2(69), 142–151 [in Ukrainian].
5. Makarova A. (2020). Arkhetyp yak predmet doslidzhen u suchasnykh ukrainskii humanitarystytsi [Archetype as a subject of research in modern Ukrainian humanities]. *Hileia — Gilea*, 152(1), 171–176 [in Ukrainian].
6. Makarova A. (2020). Arkhetypnyi pidkhdid u suchasnykh ukrainskykh doslidzhenniakh sotsialnoi diialnosti: dosvid ukrainskoi shkoly arkhetypiky [Archetypal approach in modern Ukrainian studies of social activity: the experience of the Ukrainian school of archetypes]. *Humanitarni vizii — Humanitarian visions*, 6(1), 54–59. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.23939/shv2020.01.054> [in Ukrainian].
7. Bystriakov I. K., Klynovyi D. V. (2019). Problematyka implementatsii yevropeiskykh publichno-pryvatnykh formativ staloho hospodariuvannia v Ukraini [Problems of implementation of European public-private formats of sustainable management in Ukraine]. *Ekonomika pryrodokorystuvannia i stalji rozvytok — Environmental Economics and Sustainable Development*, 5(24), 14–20 [in Ukrainian].
8. Stepanenko A. V., Omelchenko A. A. (2019). Formy publichno-pryvatnoho partnerstva v systemi harantuvannia pryrodno-tekhnohennoi ta ekolohichnoi bezpeky [Forms of public-private partnership in the system of guaranteeing natural and man-made and environmental safety]. *Ekonomika pryrodokorystuvannia i stalji rozvytok — Environmental Economics and Sustainable Development*, 5(24), 34–40 [in Ukrainian].
9. Tretiak N. A., Kalenska O. V. (2019). Vykorystannia svitovoho dosvidu publichno-pryvatnoho partnerstva v Ukraini [Using the world experience of public-private partnership in Ukraine]. *Ekonomika pryrodokorystuvannia i stalji rozvytok — Environmen-*

- tal Economics and Sustainable Development*, 5(24), 41–47 [in Ukrainian].
10. Rankin M., Nogales G., Santacoloma P., Mhlanga N., Rizzo C. (2016). *Public-private partnerships for agribusiness development – A review of international experiences*, FAO. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5699e.pdf> [in English].
  11. Hermans F., Geerling-Eiff F., Potters J., Klerkx L. (2019). Public-private partnerships as systemic agricultural innovation policy instruments – Assessing their contribution to innovation system function dynamics. *NJAS – Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences*, 88, 76–95. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.njas.2018.10.001>. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1573521418300332> [in English].
  12. Romero M. (2015). What lies beneath? A critical assessment of PPPs and their impact on sustainable development. *www.eurodad.org*. Retrieved from [https://www.eurodad.org/what\\_lies\\_beneath](https://www.eurodad.org/what_lies_beneath) [in English].
  13. Caldwell N., Roehrich J., George G. (2017). Social Value Creation and Relational Coordination in Public-Private Collaborations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(6), 906–928. Retrieved from doi:10.1111/joms.12268 [in Ukrainian].
  14. Stativka A. M., Kulchii I. M. (2016). Publicno-pryvatne partnerstvo u sferi rozvytku silskykh terytorii [Public-private partnership in the field of rural development]. A. P. Hetman, M. V. Shulhy (Eds.). *Problemy pravovoho zabezpechennia staloho rozvytku silskykh terytorii v Ukraini – Problems of legal support for sustainable development of rural areas in Ukraine*. (p. 137–154). Kharkiv: Pravo [in Ukrainian].
  15. Kulchii I. M. (2017). Publicno-pryvatne partnerstvo yak sposib zabezpechennia staloho rozvytku silskykh terytorii [Public-private partnership as a way to ensure sustainable development of rural areas]. *Problemy zakonnosti – Problems of legality*, 138, 99–108. Retrieved from <http://plaw.nlu.edu.ua/article/view/108564> [in Ukrainian].
  16. Onehina V. M., Batiuk L. A. (2017). Derzhavno-pryvatne partnerstvo ta rozvytok silskykh terytorii v Ukraini [Public-private partnership and development of rural areas in Ukraine]. *Aktualni problemy innovatsiinoi ekonomiky – Actual problems of innovative economy*, 2, 64–71 [in Ukrainian].
  17. Kalna-Dubiniuk T. P., Beschastna M. V. (2015). Sotsialne partnerstvo v silskii mistsevosti z vykorystanniam potentsialu doradchyykh sluzhb [Social partnership in rural areas with the use of the potential of advisory services]. *Ekonomika APK – The Economy of Agro-Industrial Complex*, 7, 71–76. Retrieved from [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/E\\_apk\\_2015\\_7\\_11](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/E_apk_2015_7_11) [in Ukrainian].
  18. Zhavnerchuk O. V. (2016). Mekhanizm derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva v sferi ekolohizatsii silskohospodarskoho zemlekorystuvannia [The mechanism of public-private partnership in the field of greening of agricultural land use]. *Ekonomichni innovatsii – Economic innovations*, 61, 114–123. Retrieved from [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/ecinn\\_2016\\_61\\_13](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/ecinn_2016_61_13) [in Ukrainian].
  19. Kulynych P. F. (2014). Zemelno-pravovi aspekty rozvytku silskohospodarskoi kooperatsii v Ukraini na zasadakh publichno-pryvatnoho partnerstva: shliakhy vdoskonalennia [Land and legal aspects of agricultural cooperation in Ukraine on the basis of public-private partnership: ways to improve].



- Chasopys Kyivskoho universytetu prava – Journal of Kyiv University of Law*, 1, 247–251. Retrieved from [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Chkup\\_2014\\_1\\_58](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Chkup_2014_1_58) [in Ukrainian].
20. Kropyvko M. F., Ksenofontov M. M., Khmil N. V. (2015). Napriamy udoskonalennia derzhavnogo upravlinnia ahrarynym sektorom v umovakh detentralizatsii vlady ta derehuliatzii hospodarskoi diialnosti [Directions for improving public administration of the agricultural sector in terms of decentralization of power and deregulation of economic activity]. *Ekonomika APK – The Economy of Agro-Industrial Complex*, 3, 5–14. Retrieved from [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/E\\_apk\\_2015\\_3\\_3Literature](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/E_apk_2015_3_3Literature) [in Ukrainian].
  21. Kozin M., Pyrchenkova G., Radchenko E. (2020). Public-private partnership in the agricultural sector: empirical estimation by factorial characteristics. State and Prospects for the Development of Agribusiness – INTERAGROMASH 2020 : *Proceedings of 13<sup>th</sup> International Scientific and Practical Conference*. (Vol. 175). Retrieved from [https://www.e3s-conferences.org/articles/e3sconf/pdf/2020/35/e3sconf\\_interagromash2020\\_13016.pdf](https://www.e3s-conferences.org/articles/e3sconf/pdf/2020/35/e3sconf_interagromash2020_13016.pdf) [in English].
  22. Shylepnytskyi P. (2017). The Role of the Public-Private Partnership in Local Development. *Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, Institute of Agricultural Economics*, 14(2), 209–216. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/a/iag/reviea/v14y-2017i2p209-216.html> [in Ukrainian].
  23. Shashula L. O., Denysenko I. S. (2019). Publichno-pryvatne partnerstvo u sferi zemlekorystuvannia: formy zabezpechennia ta kharakterystyky [Public-private partnership in the field of land use: forms of provision and characteristics]. *Ekonomika pry-*
  - rodokorystuvannia i stalji rozvytok – Environmental Economics and Sustainable Development*, 5(24), 96–102. Retrieved from [http://ecops.kiev.ua/files/2019\(5\)/18.pdf](http://ecops.kiev.ua/files/2019(5)/18.pdf) [in Ukrainian].
  24. Tanklevska N. S., Yarmolenko V. V. (2020). Perspektyvy adaptatsii zarubizhnogo dosvidu ahrostrakhuvannia v Ukraini [Prospects for adaptation of foreign experience of agricultural insurance in Ukraine]. *Ekonomika kharchovoi promyslovosti – Economics of food industry*, 12(1), 55–63. DOI: 10.15673/fe.v12i1.1669 [in Ukrainian].
  25. Tretiak K. V. (2019). Ahrostrakhuvannia: Zarubizhnyi dosvid ta resursy shchodo yoho implementatsii v ukrainSKU strakhovu praktyku [Agroinsurance: Foreign experience and resources for its implementation in Ukrainian insurance practice]. *Efektyvna ekonomika – Effective Economics*, 1. Retrieved from <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=6828> DOI: 10.32702/2307-2105-2019.1.32 [in Ukrainian].
  26. Shypshanova N. O., Sovshchak S. S., Melnyk Yu. V. (2018). Zarubizhnyi dovid ahrarynogo strakhuvannia ta mozhlyvosti yoho vprovadzhennia u vitchyznianu strakhovu praktyku [Foreign proof of agricultural insurance and the possibility of its introduction into domestic insurance practice]. *Hroshi, finansy i kredyt – Money, finance and credit*, 22, 872–876. Retrieved from <http://global-national.in.ua/archive/22-2018/164.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
  27. Stelmashchuk A. M. (2019). Formuvannia rynkovoï modeli ahrostrakhuvannia na zasadakh derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva [Formation of a market model of agricultural insurance on the basis of public-private partnership]. *Innovatsiina ekonomika – Innovative Economy*, 1–2(78), 13–24. Re-

- trieved from <http://inneco.org/index.php/innecoua/article/view/4/5> [in Ukrainian].
28. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. (n.d.). *sustainabledevelopment.un.org*. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/5987our-common-future.pdf> [in English].
  29. Jomo K. S., Chowdhury A., Sharma K., Platz D. (2016). Public-Private Partnerships and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Fit for purpose? DESA Working Paper № 148ST/ESA/2016/DWP/148. *www.un.org*. Retrieved from [https://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2016/wp148\\_2016.pdf](https://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2016/wp148_2016.pdf) [in English].
  30. Green Paper on public-private partnerships and Community law on public contracts and concessions (presented by the Commission). (2004). *op.europa.eu*. Retrieved from <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/94a3f02f-ab6a-47ed-b6b2-7de60830625e/language-en> [in English].
  31. *Guidebook on Promoting Good Governance in Public-Private Partnerships*. (2008). New York and Geneva: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. Retrieved from <https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/ceci/publications/ppp.pdf> [in English].
  32. Zakon Ukrainy “Pro derzhavno-pryvatne partnerstvo” : vid 01.07.2010, № 2404-VI [Law of Ukraine “On public-private partnership” from 01.07.2010, № 2404-VI]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2404-17#Text> [in Ukrainian].
  33. Zakon Ukrainy “Pro kontsesiiu” : vid 03.10.2019, № 155-IX [Law of Ukraine “On the concession” from 03.10.2019, № 155-IX]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from [https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/155-20#Text](https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/155-IX#Text) [in Ukrainian].
  34. Postanova Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy “Deiaki pytannia orhanizatsii zdiisnennia derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva” : vid 11.04.2011 № 384 [Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine “Some issues of the organization of public-private partnership” from 11.04.2011, № 384]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/384-2011-%D0%BF#Text> [in Ukrainian].
  35. Postanova Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy “Pro zatverdzhennia Metodyky vyvavlennia ryzykiv zdiisnennia derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva, yikh otsinky ta vyznachennia formy upravlinnia nymy” : vid 16.02.2011, № 232 [Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine “On Approval of the Methodology for Identifying the Risks of Public-Private Partnerships, Their Assessment and Determining the Form of Their Management” from 16.02.2011 № 232]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/232-2011-%D0%BF#Text> [in Ukrainian].
  36. Nakaz Ministerstva Ekonomichnoho Rozvytku i Torhivli Ukrainy “Deiaki pytannia provedennia analizu efektyvnosti zdiisnennia derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva Minekonom-rozvytku Ukrainy” : vid 27.02.2012, № 255 [Order of Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine “Some issues of analysis of the effectiveness of public-private partnership of the Ministry of Economic Development of Ukraine” from 27.02.2012, № 255]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0399-12#Text> [in Ukrainian].
  37. Nakaz Ministerstva Rozvytku Ekonomiky, Torhivli ta Silskoho Hospodarstva Ukrainy “Pro zatverdzhennia Poriadku podannia derzhavnymy

- partneramy (kontsesiiedavtsiamy) shchorichnoho zvituu pro vykonannia dohovoru, ukladenooho v ramkakh derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva” : vid 26.05.2020, № 986 [Order of the Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine “On approval of the Procedure for submission by state partners (concessionaires) of the annual report on implementation of the agreement concluded within the framework of public-private partnership” from 26.05.2020, № 986]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0628-20#Text> [in Ukrainian].
38. Postanova Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy “Pro zatverdzhennia Poriadku zaminy pryvatnoho partnera (kontsesionera) za dohovorom, ukladenyim v ramkakh derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva (kontsesiinym dohovorom)” : vid 01.07.2020, № 541 [Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine “On approval of the Procedure for replacement of a private partner (concessionaire) under an agreement concluded within the framework of a public-private partnership (concession agreement)” from 01.07.2020, № 541]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/541-2020-%D0%BF#Text> [in Ukrainian].
39. Postanova Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy “Pro zatverdzhennia Poriadku povernennia kontsesiiedavtsiu obiekta kontsesii pislia pryypynennia dii kontsesiinoho dohovoru” : vid 22.07.2020, № 621 [Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine “On approval of the Procedure for returning the concession object to the concessionaire after the termination of the concession agreement” from 22.07.2020, № 621]. *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/621-2020-%D0%BF#Text> [in Ukrainian].

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

---

1. Про схвалення Концепції розвитку сільських територій: Розпорядження Кабінету Міністрів України; Концепція від 23.09.2015 р. № 995-р. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995-2015-%D1%80#Text>.
2. *Глеба В. Ю.* Просторово-адміністративна організація міста Києва та архетипи територій // Публічне управління: теорія та практика. Х.: Вид-во “Док. наук. держ. упр”. 2013.
3. *Ковінчук О.* Архетип території та його вплив на кластери в реалізації державної політики розвитку територій // Публічне управління: теорія та практика. 2015. Вип. 1 (спец. вип.). С. 116–122. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr\\_2015\\_1%28spets.\\_21](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr_2015_1%28spets._21)
4. *Афонін Е., Плахтій Т.* Архетипіка і публічне управління: стратегії сталого розвитку в умовах цивілізаційних зрушень // Український соціум. 2019. № 2 (69). С. 142–151.
5. *Макарова А.* Архетип як предмет досліджень у сучасній українській гуманітаристиці // Гілея: наук. вісник. 2020. № 152 (1). С. 171–176.
6. *Макарова А.* Архетипний підхід у сучасних українських дослідженнях соціальної діяльності: досвід української школи архетипіки // Гуманітарні візії. Львів : Вид-во Львівської політехніки, 2020. Т. 6. № 1. С. 54–59. URL: <https://doi.org/10.23939/shv2020.01.054>
7. *Бистряков І. К., Клиновий Д. В.* Проблематика імплементації європейських публічно-приватних форматів сталого господарювання в Україні // Економіка природокористування і сталий розвиток. К.: ДУ ІЕПСР НАН України. 2019. № 5 (24). С. 14–20.

8. *Степаненко А. В., Омельченко А. А.* *Форми публічно-приватного партнерства в системі гарантування природно-техногенної та екологічної безпеки // Економіка природокоористування і сталий розвиток.* К.: ДУ ІЕПСР НАН України, 2019. № 5 (24). С. 34–40.
9. *Третяк Н. А., Каленська О. В.* *Використання світового досвіду публічно-приватного партнерства в Україні // Економіка природокоористування і сталий розвиток.* К.: ДУ ІЕПСР НАН України, 2019. № 5 (24). С. 41–47.
10. *Rankin M., Nogales G., Santacoloma P., Mhlanga N., Rizzo C.* *Public-private partnerships for agribusiness development – A review of international experiences, FAO.* 2016. Rome, Italy. URL: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5699e.pdf>
11. *Hermans F., Geerling-Eiff F., Potters J., Klerkx L.* *Public-private partnerships as systemic agricultural innovation policy instruments – Assessing their contribution to innovation system function dynamics, NJAS // Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences.* 2019, Vol. 88, P. 76–95. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.njas.2018.10.001>. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1573521418300332>
12. *Romero M.* *What lies beneath? A critical assessment of PPPs and their impact on sustainable development.* 2015. URL: [https://www.eurodad.org/what\\_lies\\_beneath](https://www.eurodad.org/what_lies_beneath).
13. *Caldwell N., Roehrich J., George G.* *Social Value Creation and Relational Coordination in Public-Private Collaborations // Journal of Management Studies.* 2017. Vol. 54. Is. 6. P. 906–928. URL: [doi:10.1111/joms.12268](https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12268).
14. *Статівка А. М., Кульчий І. М.* *Публічно-приватне партнерство у сфері розвитку сільських територій. Проблеми правового забезпечення ста-*  
*лого розвитку сільських територій в Україні: монографія / за ред. А. П. Гетьмана та М. В. Шульги.* Харків: Право, 2016. С. 137–154.
15. *Кульчий І. М.* *Публічно-приватне партнерство як спосіб забезпечення сталого розвитку сільських територій // Проблеми законності.* 2017. Вип. 138. С. 99–108. URL: [doi: 10.21564/2414-990x.138.108564](https://doi.org/10.21564/2414-990x.138.108564)
16. *Онегіна В. М., Батюк Л. А.* *Державно-приватне партнерство та розвиток сільських територій в Україні // Актуальні пробл. інноваційної економіки.* 2017. № 2. С. 64–71.
17. *Кальна-Дубінюк Т. П.* *Соціальне партнерство в сільській місцевості з використанням потенціалу дорадчих служб / Т. П. Кальна-Дубінюк, М. В. Бесчастна // Економіка АПК.* 2015. № 7. С. 71–76. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/E\\_apk\\_2015\\_7\\_11](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/E_apk_2015_7_11)
18. *Жавнерчик О. В.* *Механізм державно-приватного партнерства в сфері екологізації сільськогосподарського землекористування // Економічні інновації.* 2016. Вип. 61. С. 114–123. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/ecinn\\_2016\\_61\\_13](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/ecinn_2016_61_13)
19. *Кулинич П. Ф.* *Земельно-правові аспекти розвитку сільськогосподарської кооперації в Україні на засадах публічно-приватного партнерства: шляхи вдосконалення // Часопис Київського ун-ту права.* 2014. № 1. С. 247–251. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Chkup\\_2014\\_1\\_58](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Chkup_2014_1_58)
20. *Кропивко М. Ф.* *Напрями удосконалення державного управління аграрним сектором в умовах децентралізації влади та дерегуляції господарської діяльності / М. Ф. Кропивко, М. М. Ксенофонов, Н. В. Хміль // Економіка АПК.* 2015. № 3. С. 5–14. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/E\\_apk\\_2015\\_3\\_3Literature](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/E_apk_2015_3_3Literature)

21. *Kozin M., Pyrchenkova G. and Radchenko E.* Public-private partnership in the agricultural sector: empirical estimation by factorial characteristics. XIII International Scientific and Practical Conference “State and Prospects for the Development of Agribusiness – INTERAGROMASH 2020”. Volume 175, 2020. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202017513016>
22. *Shylepnytskyi P.* The Role of the Public-Private Partnership in Local Development. *Agricultural Economics and Rural Development*. – Institute of Agricultural Economics, 2017. vol. 14(2), P. 209–216. URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/a/iag/reviea/v14y-2017i2p209-216.html>
23. *Шашула Л. О., Денисенко І. С.* Публічно-приватне партнерство у сфері землекористування: форми забезпечення та характеристики // *Економіка природокористування і сталий розвиток*. К.: ДУ ІЕПСР НАН України. 2019. № 5 (24). С. 96–102. URL: [http://ecops.kiev.ua/files/2019\(5\)/18.pdf](http://ecops.kiev.ua/files/2019(5)/18.pdf)
24. *Танклевська Н. С., Ярмоленко В. В.* Перспективи адаптації зарубіжного досвіду агрострахування в Україні // *Економіка харчової промисловості*. 2020. Т. 12, вип. 1. С. 55–63. URL: [doi: 10.15673/fe.v12i1.1669](https://doi.org/10.15673/fe.v12i1.1669)
25. *Третяк К. В.* Агрострахування: Зарубіжний досвід та ресурси щодо його імплементації в українську страхову практику // *Ефективна економіка*. 2019. №1. URL: [doi: 10.32702/2307-2105-2019.1.32](https://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105-2019.1.32)
26. *Шитшанова Н. О., Совцак С. С., Мельник Ю. В.* Зарубіжний довід аграрного страхування та можливості його впровадження у вітчизняну страхову практику // *Гроші, фінанси і кредит*. 2018. Вип. 22. С. 872–876. URL: <http://global-national.in.ua/archive/22-2018/164.pdf>
27. *Стельмащук А. М.* Формування ринкової моделі агрострахування на засадах державно-приватного партнерства // *Інноваційна економіка*. 2019. С. 13–24. URL: <http://inneco.org/index.php/innecoua/article/view/4/5>
28. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/5987our-common-future.pdf>
29. Public-Private Partnerships and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Fit for purpose? DESA Working Paper No. 148ST/ESA/2016/DWP/148 February 2016. URL: [https://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2016/wp148\\_2016.pdf](https://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2016/wp148_2016.pdf).
30. Green Paper on public-private partnerships and Community law on public contracts and concessions (presented by the Commission), 2004. URL: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52004DC0327>.
31. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. Guidebook on Promoting Good Governance in Public-Private Partnerships. United Nations, New York and Geneva, 2008. URL: <https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/ceci/publications/ppp.pdf>.
32. Про державно-приватне партнерство: Закон України від 01.07.2010 р. № 2404-VI. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2404-17#Text>
33. Про концесію: Закон України “Про концесію” від 03.10.2019 р. № 155-IX. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/155-20#Text>
34. Деякі питання організації здійснення державно-приватного партнерства Постанова Кабінету Міністрів України; Порядок від 11.04.2011 р. № 384. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/384-2011#Text>

- gov.ua/laws/show/384-2011-%D0%BF#Text
35. Про затвердження Методики виявлення ризиків здійснення державно-приватного партнерства, їх оцінки та визначення форми управління ними Постанова Кабінету Міністрів України; Методика, Форма типового документа, Перелік від 16.02.2011 р. № 232. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/232-2011-%D0%BF#Text>
  36. Деякі питання проведення аналізу ефективності здійснення державно-приватного партнерства Мінекономрозвитку України; Наказ, Форма, Методика [...] від 27.02.2012 № 255. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0399-12#Text>
  37. Про затвердження Порядку подання державними партнерами (концесіодавцями) щорічного звіту про виконання договору, укладеного в рамках державно-приватного партнерства, [...] Мінеконом, торгівлі та сг; Наказ, Порядок, Форма [...] від 26.05.2020 р. № 986. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0628-20#Text>
  38. Про затвердження Порядку заміни приватного партнера (концесіонера) за договором, укладеним в рамках державно-приватного партнерства (концесійним договором) Постанова Кабінету Міністрів України; Порядок від 01.07.2020 р. № 541. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/541-2020-%D0%BF#Text>
  39. Про затвердження Порядку повернення концесіодавцю об'єкта концесії після припинення дії концесійного договору Постанова Кабінету Міністрів України; Порядок від 22.07.2020 р. № 621. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/621-2020-%D0%BF#Text>