

Huseynova Nigar Latif
PhD in Economics
Azerbaijan State University of Economics
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7940-8628>

Гусейнова Н.Л.
доктор філософії з економіки
Азербайджанського державного економічного університету

MECHANISM FOR EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THE INNOVATION PROCESS BASED ON A SYSTEMIC APPROACH

Summary. Today, organizations operate in fast-moving, unpredictable markets where the drive for innovation is relentless. These conditions are driven by technological disruption, shifting customer preferences, and global competition, forcing companies to continuously deliver new products, services, and business models efficiently and profitably. For most enterprises, the challenge is not just about the generation of ideas but embedding an innovation capability that is sustainable, repeatable, and responsive to changing market demands. Fragmented or ad-hoc efforts at innovation often lead to missed opportunities, wasted resources, and a lack of strategic alignment between innovation projects and core business goals, since only a holistic approach does guarantee long-term success. A systemic framework for innovation management is a holistic approach to managing such complex matters through the integration of the firm's strategy, organization, culture, and governance mechanisms.

Keywords: innovation management, systemic approach, organizational governance, innovation portfolio, Stage-Gate process, innovation culture.

Introduction and problem statement. Innovation has become a critical competitive differentiator in contemporary business environments. However, research demonstrates a persistent gap between organizational investment in innovation and actual returns on innovation investment. According to recent studies, 54% of executives struggle to align innovation strategy with business strategy, and 72% report they are not out-innovating their competition. This paradox reflects a fundamental challenge: most organizations pursue innovation through fragmented, ad-hoc approaches rather than systematic, integrated mechanisms. The concept of “systematic innovation” extends beyond sporadic creativity or brainstorming sessions. As management consultant Peter Drucker defined it, “Systematic innovation is innovation resulting from an intentional and organized process to evaluate opportunities to introduce change.” This definition underscores the necessity for structured, interconnected processes that transform innovative aspirations into realized outcomes. A systemic approach to innovation management recognizes that the innovation process operates within a complex organizational ecosystem where strategy, structure, culture, governance, and execution mechanisms interact dynamically. Rather than optimizing isolated components – such as idea generation or portfolio management – a systemic perspective examines how these components function as an integrated whole. This article presents a comprehensive mechanism for managing innovation processes through this systemic lens, integrating organizational theory,

innovation management frameworks, and systems thinking principles.

Systems thinking represents a fundamental shift from mechanistic, reductionist perspectives toward holistic, integrative approaches to organizational challenges. As an organizational capability, systems thinking enables enterprises to perceive, analyze, and leverage interconnections within and across organizational boundaries. This capability encompasses understanding feedback loops, identifying leverage points, mapping ecosystem relationships, and designing interventions that create sustainable outcomes across complex adaptive systems.

Organizations with mature systems thinking capabilities demonstrate measurable competitive advantages. Research indicates that such organizations achieve 64% better early detection of systemic risks and market disruptions, 47% faster development of breakthrough solutions through systems integration, and 73% faster resolution of complex, multi-departmental challenges. These performance differentials underscore the strategic importance of systemic approaches in contemporary management practice. The systems thinking maturity framework identifies five progressive organizational levels: fragmented (Level 1), emerging (Level 2), integrated (Level 3), adaptive (Level 4), and generative (Level 5). Organizations at Level 3 and beyond demonstrate systems thinking embedded in strategic planning, performance management, and decision-making processes. These organizations employ advanced analytics and modeling tools to understand



complex feedback loops and implement governance structures that enable rapid system-level interventions.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The evolution of innovation management theory reflects progression from linear models toward sophisticated, multidimensional frameworks. Drucker, P. [5] established foundational understanding of systematic innovation as intentional, organized processes, while Cooper, R.G. revolutionized practice through the Stage-Gate framework, introducing structured mechanisms for managing innovation from concept through commercial launch with defined decision criteria at each gate.

Tolstykh, T. [10] argues that strategic portfolio management – deliberately distributing resources across incremental, adjacent, and transformational innovations – constitutes critical organizational capability distinguishing high-performing organizations.

The “systems of innovation” approach extends analysis beyond individual organizations to encompass innovation ecosystems comprising networks of firms, research institutions, and regulatory bodies. Uhlin, Å. articulates that innovation emerges through dynamic interactions among multiple ecosystem actors rather than isolated organizational efforts [10]. This perspective recognizes that organizations operate within broader systems where knowledge flows and institutional frameworks profoundly influence innovation outcomes.

Research increasingly demonstrates that innovation effectiveness depends fundamentally on organizational cultures supporting experimentation and cross-functional collaboration. Brower, T. identifies psychological safety and meaningful work as essential preconditions for sustained innovative contribution. Uhlin, Å. [11] conceptualizes organizational learning systems as critical enablers, arguing that systematizing knowledge capture and dissemination converts isolated experiences into organizational capability.

Recent scholarship integrates systems thinking principles with innovation management frameworks. Midgley, G. [7] establishes that effective innovation management requires understanding organizations as complex adaptive systems exhibiting emergent properties.

Innovation measurement scholarship recognizes limitations of isolated metrics. Cooper, R.G. established that effectiveness measurement requires multidimensional metrics spanning time-to-market, innovation revenue, and strategic alignment [3] [4].

Implementation of systemic innovation management requires phased organizational transformation. Lind, M.R. [6] illustrates such implementation through Boeing's Global Enterprise Technology System, demonstrating how large organizations systematically manage innovation while maintaining strategic coherence.

Current research identifies barriers limiting innovation effectiveness. Brower, T. identifies structural barriers (specialized roles, centralized hierarchies) and cultural barriers (risk aversion, status quo bias) constraining organizational capacity [2]. Removing these barriers requires deliberate organizational design

reflecting systems thinking principles – decentralizing decision authority, reducing formalization, facilitating cross-functional collaboration, and establishing cultures valuing experimentation.

Convergence in contemporary scholarship reveals that innovation effectiveness depends on systemic integration of strategy, structure, culture, governance, and execution mechanisms; organizations benefit from portfolio approaches balancing diverse innovation types; governance architecture must distribute decision authority while preserving strategic alignment; and organizational cultures supporting experimentation represent essential foundations. The systemic approach proposed in this article integrates these theoretical insights into practical framework addressing innovation management as coordinated system rather than isolated functional activities.

Objectives of the article. This article pursues three primary research objectives:

First, to synthesize existing literature on systemic approaches to innovation management, integrating theoretical contributions from organizational theory, innovation management research, and systems thinking disciplines to establish comprehensive understanding of how systemic approaches enhance innovation effectiveness.

Second, to propose an integrated conceptual framework comprising seven interdependent organizational dimensions that function as coherent system enabling organizations to transform innovation from sporadic, ad-hoc activity into systematic, strategically aligned organizational capability.

Third, to provide practical guidance for organizations implementing systemic innovation management mechanisms, including structural recommendations, governance frameworks, culture development strategies, performance measurement approaches, and phased implementation roadmaps enabling progressive organizational transformation.

Results of the study. Innovation management has evolved through several conceptual paradigms reflecting expanding understanding of innovation's organizational complexity. Traditional perspectives emphasized linear, stage-based product development models focusing on technological advancement and commercialization efficiency. Contemporary frameworks recognize the multidimensional nature of innovation encompassing product innovation, process innovation, service innovation, and business model innovation, with each category contributing distinctly to organizational competitiveness and strategic positioning [1].

The systems of innovation approach extends analysis beyond individual organizations to encompass entire innovation ecosystems. This perspective acknowledges that innovation occurs through interactions among multiple actors within structured systems – firms, research institutions, regulatory bodies, and knowledge infrastructure – rather than through isolated organizational efforts. Empirical research identifies seven generic innovation process steps applicable across diverse organizational contexts: Analysis, Ideation,

Feasibility Assessment, Prototyping, Decision-Making, Implementation, and Sustainability. These steps, when integrated into cohesive systems with clear governance mechanisms, stakeholder engagement protocols, and performance measurement frameworks, constitute the foundation for systematic innovation management.

The integration of systems thinking principles with innovation management creates more sophisticated management framework recognizing that innovation management effectiveness depends on coordinated functioning across multiple organizational dimensions. This integrated approach moves beyond isolated functional activities toward coherent organizational systems where innovation becomes embedded in organizational DNA and processes.

Strategic alignment represents the foundation for systematic innovation management. Strategic clarity accounts for 31% of the difference between high and low performing organizations in terms of revenue growth, profitability, customer satisfaction, and employee engagement. Strategic alignment ensures innovation efforts connect purposefully to organizational strategic objectives rather than pursuing random acts of innovation. Innovation activities must translate strategic priorities into specific innovation ambitions, defining the scope, magnitude, and types of innovation the organization intends to pursue. For organizations pursuing growth through market expansion, innovation emphasis may focus on adjacent innovations extending into new geographic markets or customer segments. Conversely, organizations facing mature markets may prioritize transformational innovations creating new market categories. Strategic intent establishes clear direction enabling innovation portfolio composition reflecting strategic priorities while maintaining flexibility for organizational learning and market-responsive adaptation.

Innovation governance defines the system of roles, rules, and processes guiding how innovation happens across the organization. Effective governance brings consistency to complexity, ensuring innovation efforts remain strategically aligned, accountable, and resourced appropriately. Governance structures may be organized through multiple approaches, each presenting distinct advantages and inherent limitations.

Centralized governance models concentrate all innovation activities under single central team reporting to headquarters. This approach creates strong strategic alignment, maintains resource control, ensures workflow consistency, and establishes centralized communication channels. However, centralization may reduce responsiveness to local market needs and potentially stifle grassroots innovation emerging from operational levels, creating organizational barriers between innovation function and core business operations.

Decentralized models embed innovation activities within business units or functional departments with minimal central coordination. This structure enhances market responsiveness, establishes local accountability, preserves business unit autonomy, and aligns innovation with operational realities. Yet decentralization risks

strategic fragmentation, creates process inconsistencies, generates inefficient resource utilization, and fosters competitive hoarding of innovations where business units withhold innovations from other units [9].

Organizations increasingly recognize that optimal governance architecture combines elements from centralized, decentralized, and embedded approaches into hybrid models. Hybrid governance architecture establishes central innovation governance providing strategic direction, portfolio management frameworks, cross-unit coordination, capability development, and process standardization. Simultaneously, each business unit develops and implements innovations within central governance frameworks, enabling market-responsive adaptation while maintaining strategic alignment. Marketing, operations, research and development, and other functions integrate innovation responsibilities within their domains, breaking down traditional silos preventing integrated innovation approaches. Temporary or permanent cross-functional innovation teams bring together talent from diverse functions and business units to execute specific innovation initiatives, leveraging diverse expertise and perspectives in addressing complex innovation challenges.

Innovation portfolio management ensures that organizations balance risk and reward, maintain strategic coherence, and optimize resource utilization across diverse innovation initiatives. Rather than pursuing all appealing opportunities, sophisticated portfolio management deliberately distributes innovation resources across three innovation categories characterized by distinct risk-return profiles and strategic contributions. Incremental innovations improve existing products, services, or processes, typically generating relatively predictable returns with modest resource requirements and near-term revenue contributions. Adjacent innovations extend organizational capabilities into neighboring market segments or customer categories, requiring moderate resource investment with medium-term revenue horizons and moderate strategic expansion potential. Transformational innovations create entirely new market categories or fundamentally reshape business models, demanding substantial resource investment, extending realization timelines to three to five years or longer, but potentially generating breakthrough competitive advantages and market leadership positions.

Effective portfolio management maintains disciplined balance across these three innovation categories. Organizations concentrating resources entirely on incremental innovations exhaust their innovation pipelines as mature markets become saturated, risking competitive disruption when competitors introduce adjacent or transformational innovations. Conversely, organizations overinvesting in transformational innovations may deplete near-term revenue streams and organizational morale if transformational initiatives fail to generate anticipated returns within extended development cycles. Empirical research indicates that optimal portfolio composition varies across organizational contexts;

however, research generally suggests portfolio compositions allocating approximately 60–70% of resources to incremental innovations, 20–30% to adjacent innovations, and 10–20% to transformational innovations enable organizations to maintain near-term revenue contributions while building strategic future capabilities.

The Stage-Gate process comprises alternating stages and gates providing structured framework for managing innovation from initial concept through commercial launch. This process architecture reduces innovation execution risk through systematic evaluation at each gate, ensuring organizational resources flow toward projects meeting predetermined strategic and financial criteria [12].

The process begins with Stage 0 (Discovery), encompassing idea generation and preliminary screening mechanisms identifying potential opportunities aligned with strategic priorities. Organizations systematically capture ideas from multiple sources – employee suggestions, customer feedback, market analysis, technology scanning, and competitive intelligence – rather than relying on sporadic, ad-hoc idea emergence. Preliminary screening evaluates ideas against strategic fit criteria, identifying concepts worthy of deeper investigation while redirecting resources away from strategically misaligned opportunities.

Stage 1 (Scoping) involves preliminary market and technical assessment, defining project scope and articulating resource requirements. Project teams conduct initial market research, assess technical feasibility, and develop preliminary project plans establishing foundations for more detailed planning in subsequent stages.

Stage 2 (Business Plan Concept) requires detailed business case development encompassing comprehensive market analysis and financial feasibility assessment. Teams estimate market size, analyze competitive positioning, project financial returns, and identify required organizational capabilities. This stage produces detailed business plans enabling gate decision-maker to assess project viability comprehensively.

Stage 3 (Development) focuses on product or service development, prototyping, technical problem-solving, and internal capability building. Teams translate business concepts into tangible offerings, validate technical approaches, identify unforeseen challenges, and develop organizational capabilities required for successful implementation.

Stage 4 (Testing and Validation) encompasses market testing, customer validation, prototype testing, and feasibility verification. Organizations introduce offerings to carefully selected customer segments or controlled market environments, gathering customer feedback and validating commercial assumptions before full-scale launch.

Stage 5 (Launch and Implementation) involves commercialization, market introduction, scaling, and monitoring of commercial success. Organizations deploy marketing resources, establish distribution channels, train customer-facing personnel, and implement

monitoring systems tracking market performance and customer response.

At each gate, decision-makers review project progress against predetermined criteria. Strategic fit assessment evaluates alignment with organizational strategic priorities and ambitions. Market potential analysis examines customer need validation, estimates market size, and assesses competitive positioning. Technical feasibility evaluation verifies proof of technical concept, assesses scalability potential, and identifies capability requirements. Financial viability examination projects return on investment potential, estimates payback periods, and confirms resource requirements. Organizational readiness assessment verifies resource availability, confirms capability alignment, and validates implementation timeline feasibility.

Organizational culture profoundly influences innovation effectiveness. Research identifies three essential dimensions that collectively shape organizational innovation capacity: ability, will, and way.

The ability dimension encompasses organizational competency for innovation contribution. Skills and competencies form the foundation, necessitating investment in training programs enhancing individual and organizational capabilities for innovation contribution. Organizations establish continuous learning cultures emphasizing ongoing learning and extracting insights from both successes and failures. Knowledge infrastructure systems enable knowledge capture, sharing, and application across organizational boundaries, ensuring that innovations developed in specific units benefit the entire organization. Organizations valuing diverse perspectives integrate diverse backgrounds, experiences, and thinking styles in innovation activities, recognizing that homogeneous teams often miss creative solutions apparent to individuals with different worldviews and expertise.

The will dimension reflects organizational commitment and motivation for innovation. Leadership commitment fundamentally shapes innovation culture – leaders must actively champion innovation, demonstrate commitment through actions and decisions, and model desired innovation behaviors. Organizations must create environments granting permission to fail, treating experimentation and honest failure as learning opportunities rather than career-limiting events. Recognition and rewards acknowledge innovation contributions, creating appreciation and gratitude that reinforce innovative culture and motivate continued innovation engagement. Psychological safety enables team members to share ideas, make mistakes, and collaborate freely without fear of retribution or career consequences.

The way dimension addresses organizational structure and process enabling innovation. Aligned organizational structures facilitate collaboration, enable rapid decision-making, and support idea flow across hierarchical and functional boundaries. Resource availability allocates dedicated resources – budget,

time, technology – to support innovation initiatives and research activities. Process clarity establishes transparent innovation processes enabling ideas to progress from concept through implementation. Communication channels develop open communication enabling ideas to flow freely transcending hierarchical limitations.

Research identifies seven organizational enablers creating conditions for innovative learning and culture. Empowerment grants individuals autonomy within defined scope to develop solutions, make decisions, and pursue opportunities aligned with organizational direction. Communication and collaboration create dialogue enabling mutual understanding, shared accountability, and collective intelligence. Tolerance for failure establishes environment supporting experimentation where honest failures become learning opportunities. Recognition acknowledges and celebrates contributions to innovation, creating appreciation driving future contributions. Alignment connects individual innovation efforts to organizational objectives, creating shared sense of purpose. Knowledge flows establish systems enabling learning and insight capture flowing across organizational boundaries. Nature of work designs work arrangements enabling different approaches and creative problem-solving [8].

Measuring innovation effectiveness requires multidimensional metrics reflecting innovation process performance and business impact. Process efficiency metrics track innovation speed and execution effectiveness. Time-to-market measures duration from concept approval to commercial launch, indicating innovation velocity and execution efficiency. Idea-to-launch ratio establishes the quantity of ideas required to produce one successful commercial launch, revealing innovation funnel efficiency and quality of initial idea screening. Gate success rate measures percentage of projects proceeding past gates versus termination or hold decisions, indicating portfolio discipline and decision-making rigor. Resource utilization tracks percentage of allocated innovation budget deployed in active projects, revealing portfolio vitality and resource deployment discipline. Portfolio velocity measures number of initiatives moving through pipeline per period, indicating system throughput and organizational innovation productivity.

Business impact metrics assess financial and competitive returns on innovation investment. Innovation revenue measures revenue generated from products and services launched within defined timeframe, typically three to five years. Percentage of sales from innovation expresses share of total revenue attributable to recent innovations, reflecting innovation contribution to organizational revenue streams. Profitability of new products compares gross and net margins of innovations versus legacy products, assessing whether innovations generate superior returns justifying resource allocation. Market share gains evaluate market share expansion through innovation initiatives. Return on innovation investment calculates net economic gain from innovation investments versus total innovation spending, establishing clear financial accountability.

Cost per innovation calculates average cost to bring one innovation from concept through launch. Operational cost reduction measures cost savings achieved through process innovations. Time and resource efficiency tracks progress against planned timelines and budget allocations.

Predictive modeling capabilities forecast innovation return on investment, predict project success probability, and identify optimal portfolio composition through statistical and machine learning techniques. Trend analysis identifies patterns in innovation performance, benchmarks organizational performance against industry standards, and detects emerging opportunities. Root cause analysis investigates performance gaps, identifies systemic barriers to innovation, and supports informed decision-making addressing underlying causation rather than symptomatic responses. Scenario analysis models impact of different resource allocation strategies, portfolio compositions, and strategic priorities on anticipated returns, enabling organizations to evaluate tradeoffs and optimize strategic choices.

Conclusions. The systemic innovation management mechanism proposed in this study integrates organizational strategy, structure, culture, governance, processes, and analytics into coherent framework enabling organizations to transform innovation from sporadic activity into systematic organizational capability. The mechanism comprises seven interdependent dimensions that function as integrated system: strategic intent and goal alignment providing overarching direction; organizational governance defining decision-making and accountability structures; innovation portfolio and resource orchestration optimizing resource deployment; process architecture and stage-gate implementation enabling execution; culture and stakeholder engagement mobilizing organizational and external capabilities; performance measurement and analytics providing visibility and enabling optimization; and feedback mechanisms and continuous adaptation enabling system evolution. The systemic approach emphasizes interdependencies and feedback loops among dimensions, recognizing that optimization of isolated components cannot achieve system-level effectiveness. Rather, coherent alignment across dimensions creates emergent properties – organizational capacity for systematic, repeatable, strategically aligned innovation delivery – that exceed capability of any isolated component.

Organizations implementing this systemic framework can expect:

1. Strategic alignment: Improved connection between innovation investments and organizational strategic priorities
2. Innovation velocity: Accelerated time-to-market through streamlined decision-making and clear processes
3. Resource efficiency: Improved innovation return on investment through portfolio discipline and strategic focus
4. Organizational learningEnhanced capability development through structured reflection and continuous improvement

5. Competitive positioning: Sustained competitive advantage through systematic innovation capacity enabling responsive adaptation to market changes

6. Risk management: Better risk mitigation through diversified portfolio composition and stage-gated decision making

References:

1. Brown, S. L., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1995). Product development: Past research, present findings, and future directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 20 (2), pp. 343–378.
2. Brower, T. (2021). The secrets to happiness at work. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
3. Cooper, R. G. (1998). Benchmarking new product performance: Results of the best practices study. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 1 (2), pp. 6–20.
4. Cooper, R. G. (2002). Stage-Gate process – New product success through disciplined and rapid innovation. In B. A. Thaler (Ed.), *Managing technology-driven strategy* (pp. 45–67). Addison-Wesley.
5. Drucker, P. (1985). Innovation and entrepreneurship. Harper & Row.
6. Lind, J. (2006). Boeing's Global Enterprise Technology System: A framework for managing innovation at scale. *Research-Technology Management*, no. 49 (1), pp. 28–35. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/08956308.2006.11657396>
7. Midgley, G., & Lindhult, E. (2021). A systems perspective on systemic innovation. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, no. 38 (5), pp. 635–670. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2819>
8. National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). (2025). Technology commercialization process. Available at: <https://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/resources/techtransfer/information/commercialization>
9. O'Donnell, E. (2005). Enterprise risk management: A systems-thinking framework for the event identification phase. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 6 (3), pp. 177–195. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2005.05.002>
10. Tolstykh, Tatyana Olegovna; Gamidullaeva, Leyla Ayvarovna; Shmeleva, Nadezhda (2020) : Approach to the formation of an innovation portfolio in industrial ecosystems based on the life cycle concept, *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, ISSN 2199-8531, MDPI, Basel, Vol. 6, Iss. 4, pp. 1–21. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6040151>
11. Uhlin, Å. (2000). The concept of learning within the systems of innovation approaches. *Concepts and Transformation*, 5 (3), pp. 283–319. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/cat.5.3.03uhl>
12. U.S. Department of Energy. (2025). Stage-gate review guide for industrial technologies program. Available at: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/analysis/articles/stage-gate-innovation-management>

МЕХАНІЗМ ЕФЕКТИВНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ ІННОВАЦІЙНИМ ПРОЦЕСОМ НА ОСНОВІ СИСТЕМНОГО ПІДХОДУ

Анотація. Сьогодні організації працюють на швидкозмінних, непередбачуваних ринках, де прагнення до інновацій невпинне. Ці умови зумовлені технологічними збоями, зміною вподобань клієнтів та глобальною конкуренцією, що змушує компанії постійно ефективно та прибутково впроваджувати нові продукти, послуги та бізнес-моделі. Для більшості підприємств завдання полягає не лише в генеруванні ідей, а й у впровадженні інноваційного потенціалу, який є стійким, повторюваним та реагує на змінні вимоги ринку. Фрагментовані або ситуативні зусилля в галузі інновацій часто призводять до втрачених можливостей, марнування ресурсів та відсутності стратегічної узгодженості між інноваційними проектами та основними бізнес-цілями, оскільки лише цілісний підхід гарантує довгостроковий успіх. Системна основа управління інноваціями – це цілісний підхід до управління такими складними питаннями шляхом інтеграції стратегії, організації, культури та механізмів управління фірми. Замість того, щоб зосереджуватися на окремих частинах, де відбуваються інновації, цей підхід зосереджується на цінності цих пов'язаних елементів, які синергетично взаємодіють. Сучасна література та всесвітньо визнані стандарти, такі як ISO 56002, підтримують впровадження загальносистемних механізмів, які повинні включати стратегічне узгодження, чітке управління, динамічне управління ресурсами, структуроване проектування процесів (процес Stage-Gate), надійну взаємодію із зацікавленими сторонами, постійне вимірювання ефективності та адаптацію. Кожен із вимірів є надзвичайно актуальним, оскільки вони узгоджують щоденну діяльність з інновацій з довгостроковим баченням організації та її позиціонуванням на ринку. Наприклад, стратегічне узгодження визначає обсяг та цілі інновацій, таким чином, щоб зусилля створювали цінність у пріоритетних сферах. Управління забезпечує чіткі лідерські ролі, підзвітність та права прийняття рішень, щоб забезпечити просування проектів, мінімізуючи ризики. Оркестрація ресурсів гарантує, що фінансування, навички та технологічна підтримка доступні для ініціатив, з динамічними коригуваннями, що стають можливими завдяки таким механізмам, як дозвоване фінансування та управління портфелем.

Ключові слова: управління інноваціями, системний підхід, організаційне управління, інноваційний портфель, процес Stage-Gate, інноваційна культура.

Стаття надійшла: 11.11.2025

Стаття прийнята: 04.12.2025

Стаття опублікована: 30.12.2025