



e-ISSN 3041-2498

Public Management and Policy

<https://www.eu-scientists.com/index.php/pmap>



Institutionalization of Partnership Relations in Agribusiness: The European Context

Oksana Zhylynska ^{1*} • Oleksandr Starynets ²

¹ Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine). Professor at the Department of Innovation and Investment Management, Doctor of Science in Economics, Professor, Honored Worker of Science and Technology of Ukraine.

² National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine (Ukraine). Acting Professor at the Department of Marketing and International Trade, Doctor of Science in Economics, Honored Economist of Ukraine.

* **Corresponding Author**, e-mail: zhylynska@knu.ua

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Research Article

DOI:

[10.70651/3041-248X/2026.1.17](https://doi.org/10.70651/3041-248X/2026.1.17)

Received:

18 December 2025

Accepted:

20 January 2026

Published online:

23 January 2026

Copyright © 2026
by authors



This is an open access
journal and all
published articles are
licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution-
NonCommercial 4.0
International
(CC BY-NC 4.0)

The article examines the institutionalization of partnership relations in agribusiness in the European context as a set of legal, organizational, and managerial mechanisms that coordinate actors' interests within the agri-food chain, reduce transaction costs, support innovation, and strengthen the resilience of agricultural production. In the European Union, partnership relations have acquired an institutionalized character through recognized organizational forms, regulatory regimes, and instruments of collective action. The European model combines competitive, coordinative, innovative, and sustainability-oriented mechanisms in agribusiness. Its core functional components include supply concentration, marketing coordination, interbranch interaction, knowledge dissemination, innovation support, and the alignment of private and public interests. The European context is considered a reference point for improving the institutional foundations of partnership relations in Ukrainian agribusiness under conditions of European integration. Adapting these approaches can contribute to higher competitiveness of the agricultural sector, stronger organizational capacity, and closer alignment with EU regulatory practices.



KEYWORDS

European integration, institutionalization, agribusiness, partnership relations, agricultural sector, European context, sustainable development.



Інституціоналізація партнерської взаємодії в агробізнесі: європейський контекст

Оксана І. Жилінська ^{1*} • Олександр Г. Старинець ²

¹ Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка (Україна). Професор кафедри менеджменту інноваційної та інвестиційної діяльності, д-р екон. наук, професор. Заслужений діяч науки і техніки України.

² Національний університет біоресурсів та природокористування України (Україна). В. о. професора кафедри маркетингу та міжнародної торгівлі, д-р екон. наук, заслужений економіст України.

* Автор-кореспондент, e-mail: zhylynska@knu.ua

СТАТТЯ

АНОТАЦІЯ

Дослідниця

DOI:

[10.70651/3041-2498X/2026.1.17](https://doi.org/10.70651/3041-2498X/2026.1.17)

Отримана:

18.12.2025 р.

Прийнята:

20.01.2026 р.

Опублікована:

23.01.2026 р.

Авторське право

© 2026 авторів



Цей твір
ліцензовано на
умовах Ліцензії
Creative Commons
«Із Зазначенням
Авторства –
Некомерційна 4.0
Міжнародна»
(CC BY-NC 4.0).

У статті досліджено інституціоналізацію партнерської взаємодії в агробізнесі в європейському контексті як сукупність правових, організаційних та управлінських механізмів, що забезпечують координацію інтересів учасників агропродовольчого ланцюга, зниження трансакційних витрат, підтримку інновацій і підвищення стійкості аграрного виробництва. У Європейському Союзі партнерська взаємодія набула інституційно оформленого характеру завдяки визнаним організаційним формам, регуляторним режимам та інструментам спільної дії. Європейська модель поєднує конкурентні, координаційні, інноваційні та пов'язані зі сталим розвитком механізми функціонування агробізнесу. Її функціональне ядро утворюють концентрація пропозиції, координація збуту, міжгалузева взаємодія, поширення знань, підтримка інновацій та узгодження приватних і публічних інтересів. Європейський контекст розглянуто як орієнтир для вдосконалення інституційних засад партнерської взаємодії в агробізнесі України в умовах євроінтеграції. Адаптація відповідних підходів може сприяти підвищенню конкурентоспроможності аграрного сектору, зміцненню його організаційної спроможності та наближенню до регуляторних практик ЄС.



КЛЮЧОВІ СЛОВА

євроінтеграція, інституціоналізація, агробізнес, партнерська взаємодія, аграрна галузь, європейський контекст, сталий розвиток.

1. Introduction

The modern development of agribusiness increasingly depends not only on market competition in a narrow sense, but also on the ability of agri-food system entities to coordinate, cooperate, jointly manage risks, share knowledge and align strategic interests. In the context of increasing requirements for product safety, environmental sustainability, digitalization, innovation, and supply chain traceability, the operating models of agricultural enterprises, which rely mainly on individual decisions by entities, are increasingly insufficient. This problem is especially acute for small and medium-sized producers, for whom access to the market, financing, innovation, logistics and bargaining power is largely determined by the forms of partnership.

In the European context, partnership in agribusiness has long gone beyond informal or situational cooperation. It has received institutional formalization through a system of legal norms, organizational forms, mechanisms of state support, innovative platforms, and regulatory instruments that ensure a balance among market competition, collective action, and the socially significant goals of agricultural policy. It is not only about cooperatives in the narrow sense, but also about a wider range of institutionally entrenched models of interaction among producers, processors, trade structures, research institutions, advisory services, and public bodies.

For Ukraine, this issue is of particular relevance in connection with the European integration course, the adaptation of agricultural legislation to EU law, the need to increase the competitiveness of the agricultural sector and the search for institutional solutions that can combine market efficiency, sustainability and development potential. Under such conditions, it is of scientific interest not only to describe individual partnership practices but also to examine how partnership interaction in agribusiness is institutionalized in the European environment, what mechanisms ensure its sustainability and effectiveness, and which elements of this experience are relevant to Ukraine.

2. Literature Review

In recent scientific works, partnership in agribusiness is increasingly considered as an important component of the institutional architecture of agri-food chains. In this context, F. Di Marcantonio et al. [7] show that producer organizations can strengthen farmers' bargaining position and influence the terms of trade. C. Russo et al. [28] analyze the relationship between the prohibition of unfair trade practices and the formation of counterweight market power of suppliers. P. Grohmann et al. [27] emphasize the importance of trust and coordination mechanisms in value chains focused on sustainability characteristics. G. V. de Oliveira et al. [5] substantiate the effectiveness of mesoinstitutions as an intermediate link between formal regulation and policy implementation practices, and L. Čechura et al. [3], as well as G. Martino and B. Polenzani [28] prove that it is advisable to consider intersectoral organizations as an institutional mechanism for overcoming coordination failures, asymmetry of power and market imperfections in agri-food chains.

A notable segment of modern literature is devoted to institutional means of ensuring sustainable development, greening and innovative renewal of the EU agricultural sector. T. Runge et al. [37] investigate the practices of implementing eco-schemes in the EU Member States and show significant variability in national models of their implementation. N. Röder et al. [36] draw attention to the fact that the environmental potential of the Common Agricultural Policy after 2022 is determined not by the nominal availability of new tools, but by the specific design of their application. M. R. Mosquera-Losada et al. [30] reveal the importance of EIP-AGRI thematic networks as an infrastructure for knowledge dissemination, cooperation and innovation, while O. Müller and N. Riekötter [31] emphasize the importance of innovation facilitators and joint decision-making in EIP-AGRI operational groups. Taken together, these works show that the environmental and innovation dimensions of modern EU agricultural policy are integrated into broader mechanisms of partnership coordination.

At the same time, modern generalized studies show that partnership in agri-food chains should be considered not only through individual organizational forms, but also through the categories of trust, multilateral coordination and governance models. In particular, J. R. Vries et al. [6] systematize the role of trust in value chains in the agri-food industry, M. Mariono et al. [29] summarize the experience of multilateral partnerships in agriculture, and M. Donner et al. [8] propose a conceptual framework of governance models for sustainable food systems.

The Ukrainian scientific segment is dominated by studies devoted to the strategic adaptation of the agricultural sector to the conditions of European integration, organizational prospects for its development and the search for competitive forms of market interaction. Thus, M. Sitnicki and D. Kurinskyi [39] analyze the managerial prospects for the development of the domestic agricultural sector in connection with the status of Ukraine as a candidate for accession to the European Union. M. Sitnicki et al. [40] substantiate the cluster approach as a tool for strategic strengthening of the Ukrainian agricultural market. Despite this, the institutionalization of partnership interaction as a separate subject of research is only partially covered.

Thus, modern scientific literature sufficiently thoroughly covers certain components of partnership interaction in agribusiness: the functioning of producer organizations, the role of intersectoral structures, mechanisms for countering unfair trade practices, institutional principles of greening, as well as innovative networks and intermediary models of knowledge dissemination. However, these studies mostly remain segmented by individual subsystems of agricultural policy, links in the agri-food chain or specialized EU instruments. A holistic approach to the institutionalization of partnership interaction in agribusiness as a systemic mechanism combining legal forms, organizational structures, coordination regimes, innovation infrastructure and European integration adaptation remains insufficiently developed. This analytical gap determines the subject focus of the article.

3. Problem Statement

The article is aimed at analyzing the institutionalization of partnership interaction in agribusiness in the European context and identifying those mechanisms that are of greatest importance for harmonizing the institutional environment of the agricultural sector of Ukraine with the approaches of the European Union. To achieve this goal, the article solves the following tasks:

- to clarify the theoretical and analytical framework for the study of the institutionalization of partnership interaction in agribusiness through the systematization of its forms, functions and institutional features;
- to analyze the legal, organizational and managerial mechanisms through which partnership interaction is institutionalized in European agribusiness;
- to summarize the functional effects of institutionalized partnerships in the context of coordination of agri-food chains, innovative development, competitiveness and sustainable development;
- to determine the relevance of the European experience for Ukraine and to outline the directions of its adaptation in the context of European integration.

4. Methods and Materials

The methodological basis of the study is a combination of institutional, structural-functional and comparative approaches. The paper uses methods of scientific generalization, systematization, comparative analysis of EU and Ukrainian regulations, as well as analytical documents of the European Commission, OECD and modern scientific publications on agri-food governance, cooperation, innovation systems and partnership in agribusiness. The materials of the study were regulations, directives, strategic documents of the EU and Ukraine, as well as works on producer organizations, intersectoral structures, AKIS, EIP-AGRI and coordination mechanisms in agri-food chains.

5. Results and Discussion

Agri-food chains function as a system of interdependent actors, where coordination is not limited to one-time market transactions and increasingly relies on stable ties, trust and agreed rules of interaction. Individual strategies of small and medium-sized producers remain structurally constrained in terms of market power, access to innovation and risk management, which reinforces the need for partnership models as mechanisms for systemic coordination.

In the article, partnership interaction is interpreted not as a synonym for the cooperative form, but as a system of stable, formally or organizationally ordered ties between participants in the agri-food chain, ensuring coordination of actions, the exchange of resources, risk sharing, and the joint achievement of economic, innovative, and socially significant results. This approach is consistent with

the holistic vision of agri-food governance, within which the quality of coordination is determined by a combination of institutional rules, mechanisms of participation, control and coordination of the interests of the participants in the chain [1]. A meta-analysis by J. Grashuis shows that the propensity of producers to collective action depends on a combination of economic, organizational and behavioral factors, and therefore the sustainability of partnership forms requires appropriate institutional conditions [25]. In the same context, cooperatives can be considered as institutions of joint ownership with clear rules of participation, distribution of rights and control, ensuring the duration of collective action and reducing the risk of coordination failures [26].

The institutionalization of partnership interaction appears as a complex mechanism of combining actors, decision-making procedures, balance of power, and formal and informal norms, which improves the quality of governance in the agricultural sector. In the European context, this logic ensures the inclusion of private partnerships in public agricultural policy and creates a theoretical basis for the adaptation of relevant mechanisms in the context of Ukraine's European integration.

The European model of institutionalization of partnerships in agribusiness is based not on one organizational form of cooperation, but on a set of interrelated legal, organizational, innovative and regulatory mechanisms, through which collective action is built into the system of agricultural governance and market regulation. It is not only about supporting cooperation between producers, but about the formation of a special institutional environment in which partnerships acquire legal recognition, organizational stability and functional linkage to the goals of the Common Agrarian Policy. The regulatory core of this model is formed by Regulation (EU) No. 1308/2013, which defines the place of producer organizations, their associations and intersectoral organizations in the structure of agri-food markets, Regulation (EU) 2021/2115, which translates coordination, modernization and dissemination of knowledge into the plane of strategic plans of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP Strategic Plans), as well as Directive (EU) 2019/633, which establishes a minimum level of protection against certain unfair trade practices in relations between business entities of the agri-food chain [22; 23; 24].

Of particular importance in this construction is the fact that EU law not only allows for certain forms of collective interaction, but also, under certain conditions, provides them with a special legal regime. First of all, we are talking about the mechanisms of joint organization of markets (CMO), which combine the recognition of the relevant organizational forms, special conditions for their activities and individual exceptions from competition rules in those cases when collective action is recognized as justified in view of the goals of agricultural policy. In the same vein, Art. 210a CMO and Commission Guidance C/2023/1446 on the application of Art. 210a of Regulation (EU) No. 1308/2013 details the conditions for applying the exception from Part 1 of Art. 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU; TFEU) for agreements aimed at achieving sustainability standards higher than the mandatory requirements of EU or national law [14]. Thus, the institutionalization of partnerships in EU agribusiness covers both market coordination and marketing, as well as permissible forms of joint achievement of environmental and socially significant results.

The organizational dimension of this model is implemented through producer organizations, associations of producer organizations and intersectoral organizations, which the European Commission directly considers as tools for supply-side concentration, joint planning, logistical support, quality management, strengthening farmers' bargaining power and structured dialogue between links in the agri-food chain [21]. In such an environment, partnership interaction acquires a meso-institutional character: it appears as a stable order of coordination that combines private interests with sectoral governance mechanisms.

The strategic dimension of institutionalization is revealed in the logic of the strategic plans of the Common Agrarian Policy for 2023-2027. (CAP Strategic Plans). Reports by the European Commission and the JRC show that the new CAP is increasingly based on integrated strategic design, within which support for cooperation, innovation, environmental action and organizational forms of collective action is seen as an interconnected set of tools [13; 15; 16]. The institutionalization of partnership interaction occurs through the overall architecture of agricultural policy, which sets the framework, incentives and channels for their practical implementation.

Further strengthening of this architecture can be seen in the proposal COM(2024) 577 final and the accompanying SWD(2025) 260, aimed at strengthening the position of farmers in the food chain [17; 18]. We are talking about the development of written contractual formalization, clarification of mechanisms for price formation and revision, the introduction of mediation in negotiations, as well as

the promotion of additional contractual conditions related to a fairer distribution of added value and short supply chains. Since these acts have not yet completed the full legislative cycle, it is correct to consider them as an indicator of the direction of institutional evolution, and not as an established legal regime. At the same time, the vector of changes itself is indicative: Partnership interaction is increasingly considered as a tool not only for organizational, but also for contractual stabilization of the agri-food chain.

The innovative and knowledge dimension of institutionalization is implemented through AKIS and EIP-AGRI. In the new CAP, AKIS is considered as an organized system of knowledge flows, consultations, digital solutions, innovative support and interaction between research institutions, advisory services, national CAP networks, farmers and other agribusiness actors [10; 41]. EIP-AGRI operational groups serve as an application platform for interactive innovation, and thematic, advisory and network formats provide interregional and transnational diffusion of knowledge, exchange of practices and dissemination of solutions adapted to specific production problems [11; 12]. Empirical studies of EIP-AGRI thematic networks and the role of innovation intermediaries confirm the sustainable nature of mechanisms for joint production and transfer of innovations [30; 31]. Digitalization in this system acts as an environment that enhances the speed of coordination, access to knowledge, and scaling of partner solutions.

The effectiveness of this model depends on the sectoral specifics, the level of organizational maturity of the participants, the design of national strategic plans, the quality of implementation and the ability of the Member States to ensure a link between legal norms and the practice of their application [10; 11; 13; 15; 16; 41]. Therefore, the European model should be assessed as an institutionally developed, but internally variable system, in which the potential of individual mechanisms largely depends on the specific context of functioning.

The combination of market coordination with the goals of sustainable development, greening and sustainability is another key dimension of institutionalization. The European Commission's communication "A Vision for Agriculture and Food", OECD analytical assessments, studies on the role of economic science in the strategic planning of the EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), as well as work on eco-schemes and the environmental potential of the CAP after 2022 show that cooperation, innovation, Short supply chains, environmental standards, and new forms of governance are increasingly seen as complementary elements of a single transformational model [4; 9; 19; 32; 36; 37]. Under these conditions, it is advisable to interpret the institutionalization of partnerships in agribusiness in the EU as a multi-level system in which legal exclusions, organizational forms, knowledge networks and incentives related to the Sustainable Development Goals operate in a mode of institutional complementarity. The effectiveness of the European model is determined not by individual instruments per se, but by their interaction within a single institutional environment, which makes it a relevant reference point for further institutional adaptation of agribusiness in Ukraine in the context of European integration [6; 29].

The general course towards European integration, although it sets the strategic direction for the transformation of Ukraine's agricultural sector, does not, by itself, ensure the formation of effective mechanisms of partnership interaction. This requires institutional content that combines organizational forms of collective action, mechanisms of market coordination, knowledge and innovation systems, and tools for managing state support. The Strategy for the Development of Agriculture and Rural Areas in Ukraine is built in this logic by 2030, which directly provides for the promotion of the creation of producer organizations, the formation of intersectoral organizations, the development of AKIS, the creation of a payment agency and an integrated IACS administration and control system [2]. At the same time, the Ukraine Report 2025 shows that Ukraine is only approaching the appropriate institutional model: in the field of agriculture and rural development, it is between an early stage and a certain level of preparation, and the key tasks remain the strengthening of administrative capacity, the adoption of a framework law on the payment agency, the further formation of the regulatory and organizational framework of FSDN and IACS, as well as the development of LPIS, as well as strengthening advisory services [20].

The European model of institutionalizing partnership interaction is important for Ukraine not as a model for formal copying, but as a source of functionally relevant mechanisms for agrarian transformation. The most applied importance for Ukraine are organizational consolidation and coordination of producers through producer organizations, cooperative forms and intersectoral structures; contractual and protective mechanisms that reduce the asymmetry of market power in the

production and value chain; AKIS and related tools for knowledge dissemination, advisory, digital solutions and interactive innovation; integration of these mechanisms into the broader system of public agricultural policy through the Disbursement Agency, the State Agrarian Register, IACS and other elements of support management [2; 10-12; 20; 22-24; 41]. Taken together, this combination creates the basis for increasing producers' bargaining power, reducing transaction costs, strengthening innovation capacity, and approximating the rules governing the functioning of EU agri-food chains.

Table 1. Forms of institutionalization of partnerships in EU agribusiness and their functional purpose

Form of institutionalization	Legal framework and key instruments	Institutionalization mechanism	Functional effect for coordination and sustainability
Producer Organizations (POs) and Their Associations (APOs)	Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, recognition mechanisms, operational programmes, special collective action conditions [21; 22]	Concentration of supply, joint planning, collective bargaining within the conditions permitted by law, coordination of logistics and quality management	Strengthening farmers' bargaining power, reducing transaction costs, access to collective solutions in sales, processing and marketing
Intersectoral Organizations (IBOs)	Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, provisions on the recognition and conditions for the application of the special coordination regime [21; 22]	Institutionalized vertical dialogue between production, processing and trade, development of standards, dissemination of best practices, increasing market transparency	Reduction of coordination failures along the chain, improvement of information interaction, coordination of behavior without direct administrative intervention in prices
Cooperatives and other legal forms of collective organization of producers	National legislation of the Member States combined with the possibility of recognition as POs/APOs according to the CMO criteria [21; 22]	Pooling of resources, joint management, distribution of risks and results, consolidation of long-term relationships between participants	Organizational stabilization of collective action, increasing the resilience of small and medium-sized producers, institutional consolidation of cooperation
Contractual and protective mechanisms in the agri-food chain	Directive (EU) 2019/633, national acts of its implementation, as well as certain provisions of the CMO on contractual formalization of relations [21; 23]	Minimal protection against certain unfair trade practices, increased predictability of contractual relations, partial reduction of market power asymmetry	Partial alignment of contractual asymmetry, increased predictability of relations, institutional strengthening of the weaker side of the market
AKIS as an institutional environment for knowledge, advisory, and digital coordination	Regulation (EU) 2021/2115, implementation tools within the framework of the strategic plans of the Common Agricultural Policy, EU CAP Network materials [10; 11; 24; 41]	Coordination of advisory services, research, national CAP networks, digital services and knowledge flows within the framework of strategic planning	Systemic diffusion of knowledge, modernization of the agricultural sector, strengthening the link between science, advisory, business and politics
EIP-AGRI Operational Groups and Related Networks	Regulation (EU) 2021/2115, implementation tools under the CAP Strategic Plans, EU CAP Network materials [11; 12; 24]	Interactive innovations, joint development of applied solutions, network exchange of experience, interregional and transnational communication	Accelerating the introduction of innovations, reducing information gaps, forming applied partnerships of collaborative learning [30; 31]
Agreements to achieve increased sustainability standards	Art. 210a of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, C/2023/1446 [4; 14]	Permissible cooperation to achieve sustainability standards higher than mandatory requirements, subject to the need for appropriate restrictions of competition	Combining market coordination with environmental and societal objectives, stimulating voluntary greening and increasing sustainability [4; 9; 19; 36; 37]

Source: Compiled by authors based on [4; 9-19; 21-24; 32; 41].

The adaptation of European instruments in Ukrainian conditions requires significant adjustments. Strategy 2030 explicitly states that the participation of producer associations in the development and management of the value chain remains relatively insignificant, and the innovation and advisory infrastructure is underdeveloped [2]. The OECD additionally points out that the Ukrainian agricultural sector continues to be significantly affected by the war, requires continued demining and the restoration of damaged trade and transport infrastructure. At the same time, support for common sectoral services remains low [33]. Because of this, the direct transfer of EU models without taking into account the

Ukrainian production structure, military restrictions, varying institutional market densities, and the incomplete formation of management and control systems would be methodologically incorrect. It is not about copying CAP or CMO in a ready-made form, but about the step-by-step adaptation of those elements that are truly capable of strengthening producers' organizational capacity, the institutional environment for innovation, and the quality of coordination in value chains.

European integration and digital tools can be considered factors in increasing the competitiveness of the agricultural sector only if they are integrated into a broader system of regulatory, organizational, and market changes [34; 35]. Therefore, it is advisable to interpret the European context as a guideline for the adapted development of partnership interaction in agribusiness in Ukraine. Its practical value lies not in the mechanical transfer of individual forms, but in the use of the logic of institutional complementarity: a combination of producer organizations, intersectoral structures, knowledge and innovation infrastructure, contractual guarantees and management systems of state support within the framework of an integral agricultural policy.

Table 2. Relevant elements of the European model of institutionalization of partnership interaction and directions of their adaptation in Ukraine

Element of the European model	Ukrainian entry point	The main limitation of direct transfer	Adaptation vector for Ukraine
Producer organizations, cooperative and other forms of collective organization	The 2030 strategy provides for the promotion of the creation of producer organizations, strengthening their role in the value chain and the development of cooperatives [2]	Low participation of producer organizations in value chains, heterogeneous structure of the agricultural sector, weaker market self-organization	Step-by-step formation of a system of recognition, support and representation of producer organizations, taking into account the Ukrainian structure of production and market niches [2; 21; 22]
Cross-sectoral organizations as platforms for vertical coordination	The 2030 Strategy directly provides for the formation of intersectoral organizations in accordance with EU approaches [2]	Lack of established practice of sectoral self-regulation and low density of institutional dialogue between production, processing and trade	Creation of sectoral coordination platforms in the most sensitive chains with gradual adaptation to CMO approaches [2; 21; 22]
AKIS, Advisory, and Digital Knowledge Coordination	The 2030 Strategy provides for the formation of AKIS, the integration of research, education and advisory, as well as the development of digital advisory services; preparatory steps for implementation are reflected in the documents of the European Commission [2; 20]	Insufficient development of the advisory network, weaker innovation infrastructure, the need to strengthen advisory services	Development of the national model of AKIS, digital services, communication platforms and pilot mechanisms for knowledge transfer according to the EIP-AGRI model [2; 10-12; 20; 24; 35; 41]
Payment Agency, State Agrarian Register (SAR), IACS, LPIS, FSDN	The Strategy 2030 and Ukraine Report 2025 define the SAR, the payment agency, IACS, LPIS and FSDN as elements of the institutional infrastructure to be phased out [2; 20]	Incompleteness of the legislative framework and institutional development, the need for interoperability and administrative capacity	Step-by-step formation of a public support management infrastructure focused on transparency, targeting and compatibility with European rules [2; 13; 15; 16; 20; 24]
Contractual guarantees and protection against asymmetry of market power	The EU's approaches to written contracts, transparency of contractual relations and counteraction to unfair trade practices are relevant for Ukraine [17; 18; 23]	Higher dependence on military logistics, uneven market power of participants, limited institutions of mediation and contractual protection	Adaptation of contractual and protective mechanisms taking into account Ukrainian market risks and the needs of small and medium-sized producers [17; 18; 23; 33]

Source: Compiled by authors based on [2; 10-13; 15-18; 20-24; 33-35; 41].

6. Conclusions

The article establishes that in the European context, partnership in agribusiness is not a situational form of cooperation, but an institutionalized mechanism for coordinating agri-food chains. Its content goes beyond the narrow understanding of the cooperative form and covers a set of stable legal, organizational, contractual, innovation and knowledge ties between market participants, which made it possible to clarify the theoretical and analytical framework of the study through the distinction

between market interaction, partnership interaction and institutionalized partnership interaction as three levels of coordination in agri-food chains.

The study showed that the institutionalization of partnerships in the EU is based on a multi-level architecture of mechanisms. Its regulatory core is formed by Regulation (EU) No. 1308/2013, Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 and Directive (EU) 2019/633, which together determine the conditions for the recognition of producer organizations, their associations and intersectoral organizations, the framework of permissible collective action, the minimum protection against certain unfair trade practices and the place of knowledge and innovation systems in the structure of EU agricultural policy. Of particular importance is Art. 210a CMO, which, under certain conditions, allows agreements to achieve sustainability standards higher than the mandatory requirements of EU or national law. The European model combines market coordination, collective action, innovative interaction and sustainable development goals in a single institutional field.

It is revealed that the functional effectiveness of this model is provided by the institutional complementarity of tools. Producer organizations and cross-industry structures strengthen bargaining power and coordination along the chain, mechanisms to protect against certain unfair practices partially reduce contractual asymmetry, and AKIS and EIP-AGRI form an institutional infrastructure for the dissemination of knowledge, innovation and applied solutions. The interaction of organizational, legal and knowledge components is the main feature of the European model of institutionalization of partnerships in agribusiness.

The Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy 2030 already lays down individual institutional entry points, including the promotion of producer organizations, cross-sectoral organizations, the development of AKIS, the Payment Agency and IACS. At the same time, the European Commission assesses Ukraine in the field of agriculture and rural development as being between an early stage and a certain level of preparation, and also directly points to the need to strengthen advisory services, adopt a framework law on the Payment Agency, IACS and FSDN and further develop LPIS. The OECD additionally notes that the transformation of the sector is significantly affected by war losses, the need for demining and infrastructure restoration. The adaptation of European mechanisms should be phased, contextualized and combined with the national characteristics of agricultural production and public administration.

The practical value of the European experience for Ukraine lies not in copying individual CAP or CMO norms, but in the use of the logic of institutional complementarity: a combination of producer organizations, intersectoral platforms, knowledge and innovation infrastructure, contractual guarantees and state support management systems within the framework of a holistic agricultural policy. This approach can create a real basis for increasing the competitiveness, organizational capacity and sustainability of Ukrainian agribusiness in the context of European integration.

References

1. Bachev, H., & Ivanov, B. (2024). Framework for a holistic assessment of the quality of agri-food governance in Bulgaria. *Sustainability*, 16(5), 2177. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16052177>
2. Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. (2024). On approval of the Strategy for the Development of Agriculture and Rural Areas in Ukraine for the period until 2030 and approval of the operational plan of measures for its implementation in 2025–2027: Order No. 1163-r dated November 15, 2024. *Official website of the Parliament of Ukraine*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/go/1163-2024-%D1%80>
3. Čechura, L., Samoggia, A., & Jamali Jaghdani, T. (2024). Concentration, market imperfections, and interbranch organization in the Italian processed tomato supply chain. *Agricultural Economics*, (55), 603–620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12835>
4. Dawes, A. (2024). Article 210a of the CMO Regulation: supporting the transition to a sustainable food system in the Union and strengthening the position of producers in the agri-food supply chain. *Zeitschrift für Wettbewerbsrecht*, 22(1), 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.15375/zwer-2024-0106>
5. de Oliveira, G. M., Miranda, B. V., Saes, M. S. M., & Martino, G. (2023). Opening the “black box” of food safety policy implementation: The efficiency-enhancing role of a private meso-institution. *Food Policy*, (121), 102528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102528>
6. de Vries, J. R., Turner, J. A., Finlay-Smiths, S., Ryan, A., & Klerkx, L. (2023). Trust in agri-food value chains: a systematic review. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 26(2), 175–198. <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2022.0032>

7. Di Marcantonio, F., Havari, E., Colen, L., & Ciaian, P. (2022). Do producer organizations improve trading practices and negotiation power for dairy farms? Evidence from selected EU countries. *Agricultural Economics*, (53), 121–137. <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12730>
8. Donner, M., Mamès, M., & de Vries, H. (2024). Towards sustainable food systems: a review of governance models and an innovative conceptual framework. *Discover Sustainability*, (5). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00648-x>
9. Erjavec, E. & Rac, I. (2023), Improving the quality of CAP strategic planning through enhancing the role of agricultural economics. *EuroChoices*, (22), 71–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1746-692X.12393>
10. EU CAP Network. (2023). Guidelines: Evaluating the AKIS Strategic Approach in CAP Strategic Plans. *EU CAP Network*. https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/guidelines-evaluating-akis-strategic-approach-cap-strategic-plans_en
11. EU CAP Network. (2024). Seminar “Fostering an effective and integrated AKIS in Member States”. *EU CAP Network*. https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/seminar-fostering-effective-and-integrated-akis-member-states_en
12. EU CAP Network. (2025). EU CAP Network conference “EIP-AGRI Operational Groups: Innovation in practice”. *EU CAP Network*. https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/eu-cap-network-conference-eip-agri-operational-groups-innovation-practice_en
13. European Commission. (2023). Approved 28 CAP Strategic Plans (2023–2027): Summary overview for 27 Member States. *European Commission*. <https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-06/approved-28-cap-strategic-plans-2023-27.pdf>
14. European Commission. (2023). Communication from the Commission – Commission guidelines on the exclusion from Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union for sustainability agreements of agricultural producers pursuant to Article 210a of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013. OJ C, C/2023/1446. *EUR-Lex*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/C/2023/1446/oj/eng>
15. European Commission. (2023). Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Summary of CAP Strategic Plans for 2023–2027: joint effort and collective ambition. *EUR-Lex*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52023DC0707>
16. European Commission. (2024). *CAP strategic plans of the EU Member States: CSPs master file and key data: overview of the CSPs master file and key financial allocations*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/3104919>
17. European Commission. (2024). Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EU) No 1308/2013, (EU) 2021/2115 and (EU) 2021/2116 as regards the strengthening of the position of farmers in the food supply chain. *EUR-Lex*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52024PC0577>
18. European Commission. (2025). Commission Staff Working Document. Strengthening the position of farmers in the food supply chain. Accompanying the document Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EU) No 1308/2013, (EU) 2021/2115 and (EU) 2021/2116 as regards the strengthening of the position of farmers in the food supply chain. *EUR-Lex*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52025SC0260>
19. European Commission. (2025). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. A Vision for Agriculture and Food: Shaping together an attractive farming and agri-food sector for future generations. *EUR-Lex*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52025DC0075>
20. European Commission. (2025). *Ukraine Report 2025*. Brussels: European Commission. https://enlargement.ec.europa.eu/document/download/17115494-8122-4d10-8a06-2cf275eecd7_en?filename=ukraine-report-2025.pdf
21. European Commission. (n.d.). Producer and interbranch organisations. *European Commission*. https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/common-agricultural-policy/agri-food-supply-chain/producer-and-interbranch-organisations_en
22. European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2013). Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007. *EUR-Lex*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2013/1308/2024-05-13/eng>
23. European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2019). Directive (EU) 2019/633 of 17 April 2019 on unfair trading practices in business-to-business relationships in the agricultural and food supply chain. *EUR-Lex*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2019/633/oj/eng>

24. European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2021). Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 of 2 December 2021 establishing rules on support for strategic plans to be drawn up by Member States under the common agricultural policy (CAP Strategic Plans) and financed by the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), and repealing Regulations (EU) No. 1305/2013 and (EU) No 1307/2013. *EUR-Lex*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/2115/oj/eng>
25. Grashuis, J. (2025). Determinants of collective action by farm producers: A meta-analysis of the likelihood of co-operative membership. *Journal of Rural Studies*, (117), 103639. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2025.103639>
26. Grashuis, J. (2025). Robust collective action by farm producers: Analyzing co-operatives as common property institutions. *International Journal of the Commons*, 19(1), 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.5334/ijc.1372>
27. Grohmann, P., Dietze, V., Krämer, C., & Feindt, P. H. (2023) Governance and trust in sustainability-based agri-food value chains. A comparative analysis of five cases in Germany. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, (7), 1130895. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2023.1130895>
28. Martino, G., & Polenzani, B. (2025). Interbranch organisations: meso-institutions and the coordination problem. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, (21), e46. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744137425100337>
29. Maryono, M., Killoes, A. M., Adhikari, R., & Abdul Aziz, A. (2024). Agriculture development through multi-stakeholder partnerships in developing countries: A systematic literature review. *Agricultural Systems*, (213), 103792. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2023.103792>
30. Mosquera-Losada, M. R., Arias-Martínez, D., Taboada-Iglesias, M. J., Rodríguez-Rigueiro, F. J., Santiago-Freijanes, J. J., Couso-Viana, A., Burssens, S., Feo, E., Spanoghe, P., Rigueiro-Rodríguez, A., Fernández-Lorenzo, J. L., González-Hernández, M. P., Romero-Franco, R., & Ferreiro-Domínguez, N. (2025) The EIP-AGRI thematic networks: fostering innovation in Europe. *Frontiers in Agronomy*, (7), 1595025. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fagro.2025.1595025>
31. Müller, O., & Riekötter, N. (2025). Learning to innovate. Innovation brokers and co-creation in EIP-Agri operational groups in Rhineland-Palatinate. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1389224X.2025.2526362>
32. OECD. (2023). *Policies for the Future of Farming and Food in the European Union*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/32810cf6-en>
33. OECD. (2025). *Agricultural Policy Monitoring and Evaluation 2025: Making the Most of the Trade and Environment Nexus in Agriculture*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a80ac398-en>
34. Perehuda, Y. (2023). European integration and updating of Ukraine's agricultural policy in terms of the competitiveness of livestock products. *Bulletin of East European University of Economics and Management*, 2(30), 41–49. [https://doi.org/10.58252/2078-1628-2023-2\(30\)-004](https://doi.org/10.58252/2078-1628-2023-2(30)-004)
35. Perehuda, Y. (2023). Regulation of the competitiveness of the industries of the agricultural sector of the economy under the conditions of application of digital marketing tools. *Economics and Business Management*, 14(2), 33–45. [https://doi.org/10.31548/economics14\(2\).2023.033](https://doi.org/10.31548/economics14(2).2023.033)
36. Röder, N., Krämer, C., Grajewski, R., Lakner, S., & Matthews, A. (2024). What is the environmental potential of the post-2022 common agricultural policy? *Land Use Policy*, (144), 107219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2024.107219>
37. Runge, T., Latacz-Lohmann, U., Schaller, L., Todorova, K., Daughbjerg, C., Termansen, M., Liira, J., Le Gloux, F., Dupraz, P., Leppanen, J., Fogarasi, J., Vigh, E. Z., Bradfield, T., Hennessy, T., Targetti, S., Viaggi, D., Berzina, I., Schulp, C., Majewski, E., Bouriaud, L., Baci, G., Pecur, M., Prokofieva, I. and Velazquez, F. J. B. (2022), Implementation of eco-schemes in fifteen European Union member states. *EuroChoices*, (21), 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1746-692X.12352>
38. Russo, C., Di Marcantonio, F., Cacchiarelli, L., Menapace, L., & Sorrentino, A. (2023). Unfair trading practices and countervailing power. *Food Policy*, (119), 102521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102521>
39. Sitnicki, M., & Kurinskyi, D. (2022). Managerial perspectives of the development of the domestic agricultural industry in the conditions of Ukraine's status as a candidate for membership of the European Union. *Efektivna ekonomika*, (8). <https://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105.2022.8.14>
40. Sitnicki, M., Kurinskyi, D., Pimenowa, O., Wasilewski, M., & Wasilewska, N. (2024). Strategic formation of agricultural market clusters in Ukraine: Emerging as a global player. *Sustainability*, 16(21), 9430. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16219430>
41. SWG SCAR-AKIS. (2023). *Strengthening EU AKIS: 5th mandate report of the SWG SCAR-AKIS*. Brussels: SWG SCAR-AKIS. https://scar-europe.org/images/AKIS/Documents/AKIS_5th-Mandate-Report_August2023.pdf