

Malakhovskiy Yuriy,
PhD in Economic, Associate Professor,
Central Ukrainian Technical University,
Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine
Nabulsi Hussein Naef,
PhD in Economic,
American University of Culture and Education, Beirut, Lebanon

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF USA AND UK EXPERIENCE IN REGULATING PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP IN THE SOCIAL SPHERE OF NATIONAL ECONOMY

The main current feature of the deployment of the public-private partnership (PPP) in the course of state regulation of the SSNE in the United States is the clear emphasis on the formation of radical innovative public-private partnerships (RIPPP). This tendency was especially evident after the crisis of 2008-2009, after which the practical application of RIPPP became significantly more active. It turned out that this concept of PPP not only allows us to combine the two dominant theoretical concepts in the US – the “entrepreneurial state” and “the leading role of entrepreneurship in innovation” – but also to declare them the most important application tool for the development of breakthrough technologies of the NBIS-spectrum (Industrial Revolution 4.0).

Characteristic features of NBIS-technologies, which are fully connected with the increasing knowledge of the material production, are: continuous growth of information and reduction of the material component of the participation of clustered organizational and production systems in the operation of global value chain (GVC); miniaturization, the tendency to reduce energy intensity, material resources and product stock; flexibility, modularity, unification as a feature of the production process and trends in the development of technology “new generation industries” (advanced manufacturing); network-cluster production models instead of vertically integrated structures; the use of “just-in-time” and “lean production” methods of production based on the use of hybrid technology systems that can not only minimize production deficiencies but also autonomously and efficiently modify production patterns as required; orientation to new clean energy sources; development of qualitatively new technologies of material production, transport and logistics (nanotechnology, 3D printing, etc.); a significant reduction in the role of the traditional manufacturing industry, which is based on costly, endangered, due to the proliferation of the additive manufacturing technologies of material combining in order to create a real

object from the 3D model. The content change is to increase the competitiveness of the manufacturing industry through the enhanced integration of CPS (cyberphysical systems – integrated small Internet-connected devices and mechanical systems) into protocols for the production of factory processes of “distributed network factories”; accentuated emphasis on the quality and efficiency of production processes, which is equivalent to consumer-oriented “Internet of things (IoT)” and managed by artificial intelligence to the full-scale constant benefits of consumers.

Formation of specialized units of GVC – collective projects with its timeframes and sequence of actions is due to the association of geographically distributed, decentralized and interactive regional (territorial) innovative societal ecosystem (R(T)ISS), which brings to life the necessity of studying the “glocal” order of GVC ordering, means that these are not any cluster agglomerations, but only the most active innovation type – R(T)ISS. The distinctive feature and characteristic feature of the activity of R(T)ISS is functioning in the form of an innovative (self-regulated) network of local stakeholders, which create new products on a collective basis and in a continuous mode, constantly deepen their industrial specialization on the basis of innovations, including social, subject to analytical research as an open, established social and creative ecosystem of a group of geographically concentrated companies and their institutional stakeholders, primarily universities and regional state agencies as active participants in the production of specialist knowledge of the third type.

Only those resulting from the complex process of creation and dissemination with the participation of numerous actors of innovation networks and clusters, knowledge of the higher strategic order (Strategic Knowledge Arbitrage and Serendipity, SKARSE) are suitable for “embedding” in a specific socio-technological context, can serve as guidelines for the formation flows (creation of stocks) of hybrid, state or private, implicit or codified, real or virtual goods of the post-industrial economy. Specialist knowledge model of the third type is defined as the architecture of the system of arbitrary (outside the original subject areas) or intuitive (unintentional, random) production and the “flow” of knowledge between workers, groups and functional domains, which actively uses its own knowledge, learning and training cognition in multilateral, polycentric, multimodal and multilayer formats.

The transformation of material and intellectual resources into the final result of the knowledge economy – innovative knowledge – occurs as a result of the implementation of the processes of co-competition, co-specialization and co-evolution in the course of their generation by

appropriate means. At that, only knowledge capable of being created, manifested, redistributed and recombined with more efficient (also economical) ways of obtaining, controlling build-up, and using unapproved, verified, stable and scalable financial benefits are recognized as suitable for use in the conditions of a post-industrial economy.

Collaboration-competition (co-competition), co-evolution SKARSE is a process of creating new knowledge in the course of interactions and changes occurring at different levels of the organization and gaining additional momentum due to the co-generation and complementary nature of such knowledge, the necessary condition for the emergence of which is a voluntary change by the creator parameters of its earlier (temporarily) stable ecosystems, constant adaptation to the environment, the level of instability which constantly grows on the basis of the use of critical factors of development – the position of the firm, the slope activities and performance.

Co-specialization is a process of learning and learning that motivates individuals or their groups to expand their roles, go into new subject areas and domains, and engage in complementary and mutually reinforcing engagement.

The formalized model of the “triple helix” is the basis of the strategic horizon of the European Commission’s Research and Innovation Strategy for Smart Specialization (RIS3). The dynamic strategy, which is based on the operational basis of regional development and stimulation of the knowledge economy, ensures the successful combination of social ecology, production of knowledge of the third type and innovation. Since the “core” of the RIS3 quad-wave, helix model is the user of innovation, whose degree of participation in it is determined on the basis of “custom design”, whose purpose is to promote the fulfillment by consumers of the function of co-developers and co-producers. In addition, in the process of parallel, with global production networks, the formation of global innovation networks, there is a process of competitive “intelligent specialization” R(T)IS.

The obvious benefit of such a development scenario is that at the national innovation ecosystem (NIES) level, savings are made on the costs of creating import substitution sectors and the programmatic “unification” of the required set of industry/sectoral innovation ecosystem (I(S)IS) within the framework of traditional industrial policy (through the use of complementary technologies of mass outsourcing, offshoring (international outsourcing), smart-sourcing, re-shoring, which provides targeted development of specific national export industries in the global coordination of communications. Instead, it is possible to concentrate funds on creating a barrier-free network environment for “transferring” knowledge between

sectors and territories, which is a powerful guarantee of the formation of a stable demand for innovation on the scale of national economy, as well as the possibility of their widespread use. The creation of conditions for the use of digital technologies, the organizational restructuring of the production landscape to the mode of dominance of network ecosystems, the continuous innovation of technology, products and services is consistent with the policy of strengthening the competitive position in world markets, not by improving its own production technologies, but by improving the environment where they arise and renew. That is, the object of today's competition between the regions is to better organize the production process at this or that stage of GVC. The formation of clusters of "smart specialization" underlying the modern industrial and regional policy of the EU today becomes a key element of a locally oriented innovation policy that can be identified through five principles: the direction of "reasonable specialization" on the types of activity rather than the sectors / firms, which simultaneously provides an increase in the efficiency of the branch activity and creates the potential (including the knowledge base) for diversification into new branches; encouraging entrepreneurial discoveries with the potential of laying the foundation for a regional strategy of "smart specialization" in specific activities; constant initiative diversification of the types of "reasonable specialization"; constant innovative experimentation, experimental training and development of ideas of self-realization; the inclusiveness of all the R(T)ISS in the implementation of the strategy of "smart specialization", the effective practical implementation of which is possible with respect to the methods and sequence of step-by-step development of successful strategies RIS3. Increasing innovation competitiveness of the region is impossible without the parallel development of the social sphere of the R(T)ISS, which ultimately provides a longer duration of the achieved effect of "smart specialization".

The British PPP model in the SSNE is universally suitable for practical use. According to the latest trends in the development of research in this area, the following forms of cooperation are recognized as promising, in which the state partner concludes, on a competitive basis, with a private agreement on the design, construction and operation of the facility throughout the life cycle of the service, pay the project in equal parts only after its introduction in operation subject to the maintenance of a private partner object in accordance with the defined functional requirements. The attraction of investment funds is regulated by analogy with the "blending" of structural and investment funds with PPP projects developed by the European Center for Expertise.

The national experience of using PPP models in the SSNE of the UK, in comparison with the domestic one, is much more significant and extends to a much wider list of infrastructure objects.

First, the national PPP practice in the SSNE of the UK involves the use of an expanded list of indicators for evaluating its effectiveness. The calculation of indicators of budgetary, social, financial efficiency, techniques of technical and economic analysis of risks at the stage of competitive consideration of options for the implementation of PPP projects, in contrast to domestic practice, is significantly expanded through the use of appraisal procedures not only at the stages of project implementation, but also at the stage of analysis of the realized project and its completion.

Secondly, in the context of increasing the efficiency of PPP' regulation in the SSNE of Ukraine in the conditions of decentralization of management and transition to models of increasing the level of autonomy in the process of formation and use of local budgets, the experience of diversification of recommended models of partnership into selected regions of the country is becoming significant. To do this, on an ongoing basis, an integrated assessment of the actual state and prospects for the dissemination of PPP as part of the indicators of the regional formation level is carried out. Only following the results of this assessment proposals are made on the priorities of the regulatory influence of the EAPA on the implementation of PPP procedures in the SSNE with the participation of all stakeholders.

Thirdly, the practice of state regulation of PPP in the SSNE is based on the continuous improvement of the already functioning model of "risk matrix" for project implementation, includes an extended list of categories of risks, provides for a refinement of their location, which ensures the possibility of their use for the development of detailed maps of their prevention, relaxation and elimination.

Fourth, in view of the fact that the UK-based mechanism for regulating PPP in the SSNE has been influenced by the risk factors inherent in all countries for the failure of the parties to the partnership resulting from the prior agreements of economic interests, and the process of regulating the economic development of the R(T)ISS pursues a goal satisfaction of vital needs not only of partnerships, which are in commercial relations but of the whole of stakeholders, preliminary examination of PPP projects involves compulsory cash payments x streams: operational and investment activity, indicators of public efficiency of PPP investment projects; operational, investment and financial activity at the stage of determining the indicators of commercial efficiency in a similar list of indicators; operational and investment activity in the case of estimating the budget efficiency of the

PPP investment project with the calculations of the budget effect, the discounted budgetary effect, taking into account the distribution coefficient, the index of profitability of budget guarantees, the internal rate of budget efficiency.

Fifthly, “road maps” on the way of eliminating possible threats to the implementation of PPP projects in the SSNE at the locations of placement in the implementation of regulatory actions of the EAPA provide a list of measures feasibility, legal expertise, transaction pricing audit, system formation non-financial criteria for evaluating private partners, time management, engineering expertise, crisis management, competency management, operational management, emergency management, use the latest financial instruments, in-depth technical analysis, management of framework agreements, guarantee of unforeseen impact of external risks and force majeure, management of constant changes.

Sixth, from an organizational point of view, in comparison with international practice, PPP projects in the SSNE include a wider list of implementation phases, which include: defining the interests of the parties to cooperate in order to select a specific PPP mechanism; analysis of options for meeting project needs; preliminary analysis of the suitability of an object for implementation; technical, legal, market, financial, environmental analysis of the project; project research on risks, profitability, availability and value for consumers; studying the value of the project of cooperation for the market; conducting of obligatory tender; calculation of state financing for unprofitable projects; ensuring the possibility of monitoring the project by the customer.

Seventh, widespread practical use, taking into account the specifics of the UK national legislation in the field of PPP, has become a model, which are creative alternatives to the traditional “Life Cycle Contract” (LCC) – PFI modifications analogous to the DBFO, which are prioritized in the EU during the program period 2014-2020.

Eighth, the obligatory procedures for monitoring EAPA of the effectiveness of the PPP implementation in the SSNE in the case of the use of traditional partnership models are carried out according to the algorithm in which its object are performance indicators or their discounted values.