

Ukraine's Defense Industry, Military Innovation, and Strategic Integration





Report

Ukraine's Defense Industry, Military Innovation, and Strategic Integration

Author: Aslan Hasanli

Disclaimer

The views and analyses expressed in this paper are solely those of the author and do not represent the official positions of any government, international organisation, or institution with which the author is or has been affiliated.

About Topchubashov Center

Topchubashov Center is an independent non-profit think tank based in Baku, Azerbaijan. It covers the spheres of international affairs, geopolitics, security and energy with the focus on Central and Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia and Middle East. The Center aims to establish the standards of high-quality impartial research and create an international network of authors sharing similar values and worldview.

© Topchubashov Center 2026 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without full attribution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

The Transformation of Wartime Defense Procurement

Technological Innovation and the Evolution of Ukraine's Defense Industry

Economic Governance, International Cooperation, and NATO Integration

Ukraine's Defense Industry as a Strategic Instrument of Deterrence

Conclusion

References

INTRODUCTION

Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 triggered one of the most significant transformations of a national defense industry in recent history. While wars have historically accelerated military innovation, the Ukrainian experience represents a distinctive case in which industrial restructuring, technological development, institutional reform, and international cooperation evolved simultaneously under the pressures of continuous large-scale combat operations. Within only three years, Ukraine transitioned from possessing a relatively limited and state-dominated defense industrial base into one of Europe's fastest-growing military innovation ecosystems.

Before the outbreak of the war, Ukraine inherited a defense-industrial complex largely shaped by the Soviet legacy. Although the country retained considerable engineering expertise and manufacturing capabilities, production remained fragmented, bureaucratic, and heavily dependent on state-owned enterprises. Procurement procedures were often slow, private-sector participation was limited, and investment in advanced military technologies remained insufficient. These structural weaknesses restricted Ukraine's ability to rapidly modernize its armed forces despite the growing security threats that had emerged following Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014.

The full-scale invasion fundamentally altered these conditions. The intensity of the conflict created an operational environment in which traditional procurement cycles and centralized industrial management could no longer satisfy battlefield requirements. Military necessity encouraged rapid experimentation, accelerated decision-making, and unprecedented cooperation between government institutions, private companies, technology startups, and international partners. Rather than relying exclusively on conventional defense manufacturers, Ukraine increasingly adopted a decentralized production model in which innovation originated from numerous private firms capable of responding quickly to changing operational demands.

The quantitative expansion of Ukraine's defense industry illustrates the scale of this transformation. According to official estimates, domestic defense production capacity increased from approximately \$1 billion in 2022 to nearly \$35 billion by June 2025 (Bondar, 2025; Kushnikov, 2025). However, the significance of this development extends beyond industrial output. The Ukrainian case demonstrates how wartime conditions can fundamentally reshape institutional structures, procurement systems, technological innovation, and international defense cooperation within a remarkably short period.

Equally important has been the changing role of the private sector. Whereas state-owned enterprises previously dominated military production, private companies now account for a substantial proportion of newly developed defense technologies. Startups specializing in unmanned aerial systems, artificial intelligence, electronic warfare, software development, and precision-guided weapons have become integral components of Ukraine's defense-industrial ecosystem. This transformation has significantly reduced development timelines while creating a more adaptive relationship between frontline military units and industrial producers.

The international dimension of Ukraine's defense transformation has also become increasingly important. Western governments have gradually shifted from providing primarily military equipment toward investing directly in Ukraine's domestic industrial capacity. This policy reflects an understanding that sustainable military resilience depends not only on external military assistance but also on the ability of Ukraine to

manufacture sophisticated defense systems independently. Consequently, Ukraine has evolved from being primarily a recipient of military aid into an emerging contributor to European defense production and technological innovation.

This report argues that Ukraine's defense industry should be understood not merely as a wartime production system but as an evolving strategic ecosystem that integrates industrial capacity, technological innovation, institutional adaptation, and international cooperation. By examining procurement reforms, technological developments, economic incentives, NATO integration, and broader strategic implications, the report demonstrates how Ukraine has established a new model of defense-industrial development under conditions of prolonged high-intensity warfare.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF WARTIME DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

One of the defining characteristics of Ukraine's defense-industrial transformation has been the restructuring of military procurement mechanisms. Conventional defense procurement systems are generally designed for peacetime environments, emphasizing lengthy planning cycles, extensive administrative oversight, and complex contractual procedures intended to minimize financial and legal risks. While such systems provide transparency and accountability, they frequently lack the flexibility required during high-intensity warfare, where operational requirements evolve within days rather than years. Ukraine's wartime experience illustrates how procurement systems can be redesigned to prioritize speed without abandoning institutional coordination. Rather than treating procurement solely as an administrative function, Ukrainian policymakers increasingly integrated acquisition strategies into broader industrial and economic policy. Procurement became a mechanism for simultaneously strengthening military capability, expanding domestic manufacturing, and attracting international investment into the country's defense sector.

The most influential example of this institutional innovation is the **Danish Model**, which represents a significant departure from traditional military assistance frameworks. Instead of transferring finished weapons from allied military inventories, partner governments allocate financial resources directly to Ukrainian defense manufacturers. This procurement mechanism enables equipment to be produced inside Ukraine, reducing transportation delays while simultaneously strengthening domestic industrial capacity (Bondar, 2025).

From an economic perspective, the Danish Model creates several strategic advantages. Direct investment supports local employment, expands manufacturing infrastructure, and encourages private-sector participation in defense production. From a military perspective, localized production significantly shortens delivery timelines and enables manufacturers to incorporate battlefield feedback into ongoing production cycles. The successful deployment of the **Bohdana self-propelled howitzer**, which reportedly reached frontline units within approximately two months after procurement approval (Bondar, 2025), demonstrates the operational effectiveness of this decentralized procurement approach.

As implementation expanded, the original Danish Model gradually evolved into several complementary procurement mechanisms reflecting different institutional preferences among Ukraine's international partners.

The first variation preserves the original structure in which procurement decisions are jointly validated by the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense and participating partner governments. This arrangement maintains political oversight while allowing financial resources to flow directly into domestic production.

A second model, adopted primarily by the Netherlands and Norway, places greater emphasis on direct contractual relationships with Ukrainian manufacturers. Companies receive advance payments covering approximately **50 to 70 percent** of production costs before manufacturing begins (Bondar, 2025). Such financial arrangements reduce liquidity constraints, enable firms to purchase raw materials in advance, recruit additional personnel, and expand production capacity without relying on commercial credit markets. For rapidly growing defense companies operating under wartime conditions,

advance financing has become a critical factor supporting industrial scalability.

Germany has introduced a third institutional model by recognizing Ukraine's **Defense Procurement Agency (DPA)** as the primary contractual authority (Bondar, 2025). This approach reflects increasing confidence in Ukraine's administrative institutions and reduces the need for intermediary procurement structures managed entirely by foreign governments. In practical terms, it represents an important step toward integrating Ukraine's procurement system with broader European defense governance while simultaneously strengthening domestic institutional capacity.

The financial growth associated with these procurement mechanisms demonstrates their increasing strategic importance. Direct investment into Ukraine's domestic defense production reached approximately **US\$400 million in 2024**, while projected funding for **2025** is expected to approach **US\$6 billion** (Bondar, 2025). Such figures indicate that Western governments increasingly view investments in Ukrainian manufacturing not merely as temporary wartime assistance but as long-term contributions to European defense resilience.

Procurement reforms have also been reinforced through NATO-led institutional coordination. The Priority Ukraine Requirement List (PURL) serves as a centralized mechanism for identifying Ukraine's most urgent operational requirements and aligning allied procurement priorities accordingly (Ministry of Defence of Ukraine, 2025). Rather than allowing individual donor states to independently determine military assistance packages, PURL establishes a coordinated framework that reduces duplication while directing resources toward the most strategically significant capability gaps.

Complementing this mechanism is the **NATO Security Assistance and Training for Ukraine (NSATU)** initiative, which institutionalizes coordination among allied governments responsible for procurement, logistics, military assistance, and force development (North Atlantic Treaty Organization Allied Command Operations, n.d.). Beyond improving operational efficiency, NSATU carries considerable political significance. By embedding military assistance within NATO's institutional framework, the initiative seeks to reduce uncertainty associated with domestic political changes among individual member states. Analysts have therefore described the mechanism as an effort to create a more politically resilient—or "Trump-proof"—system of long-term military assistance (Associated Press, 2025). Under this framework, allied governments had reportedly committed approximately **US\$4.8 billion** by March 2026 for the procurement of U.S.-manufactured defense equipment intended for Ukraine (Welt, 2026).

Regional industrial cooperation has further expanded Ukraine's procurement architecture. The **SAFE Program**, developed in cooperation with Romania, illustrates the emergence of cross-border defense production networks within Eastern Europe. Through a joint investment valued at approximately **€200 million**, Ukrainian and Romanian manufacturers cooperate in drone production, combining Ukrainian battlefield experience with regional industrial capabilities (Ministry of Defence of Ukraine, 2026b). Such initiatives reflect a broader trend toward integrating Ukraine into Europe's emerging defense-industrial ecosystem rather than treating its military production as an isolated national effort.

Collectively, these procurement reforms demonstrate that Ukraine's wartime industrial transformation extends beyond increased manufacturing capacity. The country has effectively redefined procurement as an instrument of strategic policy that simultaneously supports military readiness, economic resilience, institutional modernization, and international defense integration. In doing so, Ukraine has developed a procurement model that may influence future defense-industrial strategies among NATO members facing similar challenges in an increasingly volatile security environment.

TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION AND THE EVOLUTION OF UKRAINE'S DEFENSE INDUSTRY

Technological innovation has become the defining characteristic of Ukraine's wartime defense transformation. While procurement reforms and international financial support have expanded production capacity, technological adaptation has fundamentally altered the way military capability is developed and employed. Unlike conventional defense industries, where research and development often require years before operational deployment, Ukraine has established a highly adaptive innovation ecosystem in which battlefield experience continuously shapes technological development. The result is a shortened innovation cycle that enables new systems to be designed, tested, modified, and redeployed within exceptionally short periods.

This model represents a departure from traditional defense-industrial practices. In many Western defense sectors, technological innovation is largely driven by long-term procurement programs and extensive regulatory processes. Ukraine, by contrast, has adopted a demand-driven innovation model in which operational necessity determines research priorities. Engineers, software developers, drone manufacturers, and military personnel operate within a closely connected ecosystem, allowing lessons from frontline operations to be incorporated directly into successive generations of military equipment. Consequently, the battlefield has evolved into both a combat environment and a testing laboratory for emerging defense technologies.

A central component of this innovation ecosystem is the **Brave1** platform, established to accelerate the development and commercialization of defense technologies (Brave1, n.d.). Rather than functioning solely as a government funding program, Brave1 serves as an institutional bridge connecting private startups, defense companies, military units, academic researchers, and public institutions. Through financial support, technical expertise, and access to military testing environments, the platform has enabled hundreds of companies to transition from experimental development to operational defense production.

The significance of Brave1 lies not only in its financial assistance but also in its institutional flexibility. Startups specializing in first-person-view (FPV) drones, electronic warfare systems, artificial intelligence applications, autonomous platforms, robotics, and military software have been able to develop products in direct cooperation with combat units. This collaborative approach significantly reduces the time required to identify technical shortcomings and implement design improvements. Instead of following traditional acquisition cycles measured in years, many technologies have undergone multiple iterations within a single operational season.

Among the sectors experiencing the most rapid expansion has been unmanned aerial systems. FPV drones have emerged as one of the defining technologies of the Russia–Ukraine war, fundamentally altering tactical operations across the battlefield. Compared with conventional precision-guided munitions, FPV drones offer a relatively low-cost yet highly effective capability against armored vehicles, artillery systems, logistical infrastructure, and fortified defensive positions. Their affordability enables large-scale production, while continuous battlefield feedback allows manufacturers to refine software, communication systems, payload configurations, and survivability against electronic interference.

The strategic value of drone technology extends beyond individual platforms. Ukraine has increasingly emphasized scalable production capable of sustaining prolonged military operations. Rather than pursuing limited quantities of highly sophisticated systems, Ukrainian manufacturers have prioritized cost-efficient mass production while preserving operational effectiveness. This approach reflects an understanding that modern warfare increasingly depends on the ability to replace losses rapidly and maintain persistent operational pressure.

Electronic warfare (EW) has become another critical field of technological innovation. As both Ukrainian and Russian forces rely heavily on drones and digital communications, control of the electromagnetic spectrum has become essential to battlefield effectiveness. Electronic warfare systems are therefore designed not only to disrupt enemy communications but also to protect friendly command networks, navigation systems, and unmanned platforms from hostile interference.

The interaction between drone technology and electronic warfare has generated a continuous cycle of adaptation. As electronic jamming techniques become more sophisticated, drone manufacturers respond by developing improved communication protocols, alternative navigation methods, enhanced antennas, and software capable of operating under degraded signal conditions. This process has transformed electronic warfare into an ongoing technological competition in which innovation cycles are measured in weeks rather than years.

Artificial intelligence has further accelerated this transformation. Increasingly, AI is being integrated into autonomous navigation, target recognition, flight stabilization, and mission execution. Instead of relying entirely on continuous human control, modern unmanned systems can process environmental data, identify designated targets, adjust flight paths, and complete assigned missions with reduced operator intervention. Such capabilities significantly improve operational resilience in environments characterized by intensive electronic warfare and communication disruption.

One of the most important technological developments in this field has been the adoption of **AuterionOS**, together with the **Nemyx** defense architecture (Auterion, 2025). These systems extend the role of artificial intelligence beyond individual drones by enabling the coordination of multiple autonomous platforms operating simultaneously across air, land, and maritime domains. Rather than functioning as isolated assets, unmanned systems become interconnected components of a distributed operational network capable of sharing information and coordinating missions in real time.

This concept, frequently described as **autonomous mass** (Auterion, 2025), represents an important evolution in modern military doctrine. Instead of concentrating military capability within a limited number of expensive platforms, autonomous mass emphasizes the coordinated employment of large numbers of relatively inexpensive unmanned systems. Such an approach increases operational resilience because the loss of individual platforms has only a limited effect on the overall mission. It also complicates enemy defensive planning by presenting multiple simultaneous threats rather than a single predictable attack vector.

The deployment of thousands of AI-enabled strike kits further illustrates this technological shift (Auterion, 2025). These systems enable drones to continue their missions even when communication with operators is interrupted by electronic warfare. Through onboard image processing, target recognition algorithms, and autonomous navigation software, drones can independently identify previously designated objectives and execute terminal attack sequences. This capability reduces dependence on uninterrupted communications while improving effectiveness in heavily contested electromagnetic environments.

Long-range strike capabilities have also undergone substantial modernization. A particularly significant contributor has been **FirePoint**, a defense technology company specializing in missile development, autonomous systems, and aerospace technologies. Valued at approximately **US\$2.4 billion** (Kyiv Post, 2025), FirePoint has become one of the leading examples of Ukraine's transition from Soviet-era industrial structures toward an innovation-driven defense sector.

Under the leadership of Chief Designer **Denys Shtilerman**, FirePoint has adopted an unconventional approach to institutional and technological development. In response to bureaucratic restrictions associated with existing regulatory frameworks, the company reportedly classified its **FP-9** system as a "ballistic-engine unmanned aerial vehicle" rather than a conventional ballistic missile (dev.ua, 2026). Although primarily administrative in nature, this decision illustrates the broader institutional flexibility that has characterized Ukraine's wartime defense innovation. By adapting regulatory procedures to evolving operational requirements, developers have sought to accelerate technological deployment without becoming constrained by outdated legal classifications.

The FP-9 itself reportedly possesses an operational range of approximately **850 kilometers** (dev.ua, 2026), expanding Ukraine's indigenous long-range strike capabilities. Equally significant is the development of the **Flamingo** cruise missile, which has been reported to achieve ranges approaching **3,000 kilometers** while maintaining a production capacity estimated at around **200 missiles per month** (Center for European Policy Analysis, 2025). If sustained, such production demonstrates the remarkable expansion of Ukraine's domestic missile manufacturing capabilities despite the challenges associated with operating under continuous wartime conditions.

Beyond missile production, FirePoint's activities increasingly extend into the space domain. The reported launch of two reconnaissance satellites during **2026** (Kyiv Post, 2026), reflects Ukraine's broader effort to establish greater strategic autonomy in intelligence collection. Earlier interruptions in intelligence sharing with international

partners highlighted the risks associated with excessive dependence on foreign reconnaissance capabilities. Domestic satellite infrastructure therefore represents not only a technological achievement but also an effort to strengthen national decision-making independence during future crises.

Taken together, these developments demonstrate that Ukraine's technological modernization extends well beyond the introduction of individual weapons systems. The country's defense industry has increasingly adopted an integrated innovation model in which drones, electronic warfare, artificial intelligence, missile technologies, software engineering, and space-based intelligence reinforce one another within a unified operational ecosystem. This integration enables continuous adaptation to battlefield conditions while simultaneously strengthening long-term industrial competitiveness.

From a broader strategic perspective, Ukraine's wartime innovation model challenges several assumptions underlying conventional defense-industrial development. Rather than prioritizing lengthy procurement programs and highly centralized production, Ukraine has demonstrated the effectiveness of decentralized innovation networks, rapid technological iteration, and close collaboration between military operators and private industry. These characteristics suggest that future defense-industrial competitiveness may depend less on the size of traditional manufacturing infrastructure and more on the ability to integrate software development, artificial intelligence, autonomous systems, and real-time operational feedback into continuous cycles of technological adaptation.

Accordingly, Ukraine's experience increasingly serves as an important case study for NATO members and other defense-industrial actors seeking to modernize their military innovation systems. The technological lessons emerging from Ukraine are therefore likely to influence not only future weapons development but also broader approaches to defense procurement, industrial organization, and military doctrine across the Euro-Atlantic security community.

ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE, INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, AND NATO INTEGRATION

The sustainability of Ukraine's defense-industrial transformation depends not only on technological innovation and wartime production but also on the establishment of an effective system of economic governance and international cooperation. While rapid innovation has enabled Ukraine to respond to immediate battlefield requirements, long-term industrial resilience requires stable financial incentives, transparent governance, foreign investment, and institutional integration with European and transatlantic security structures. Consequently, economic policy became an integral component of Ukraine's broader national security strategy.

Unlike the initial stages of the war, when the primary objective was to maximize emergency production, recent policy initiatives increasingly focus on creating a competitive and sustainable defense-industrial environment capable of attracting long-term domestic and international investment. Ukrainian policymakers have therefore sought to balance wartime urgency with structural reforms that strengthen industrial competitiveness beyond the immediate military conflict.

A significant step in this direction has been the introduction of the **Defense City** initiative, a special economic regime designed specifically for defense manufacturers (EY Ukraine, 2025). Rather than functioning solely as a tax incentive program, Defense City represents a comprehensive industrial policy aimed at reducing administrative barriers while encouraging private investment in strategic sectors of the defense economy.

The initiative introduces a range of financial incentives intended to stimulate industrial expansion. Defense companies operating under the regime benefit from exemptions from corporate profit tax provided that earnings are reinvested into production and technological development. Additional exemptions from property and land taxes reduce operational costs for manufacturers seeking to expand production facilities (EY Ukraine, 2025). Collectively, these measures improve capital availability while encouraging companies to prioritize long-term industrial investment instead of short-term financial returns.

Customs policy has also been adjusted to support wartime production. The establishment of a simplified "**green corridor**" allows military components, electronic equipment, and specialized industrial materials to enter Ukraine through accelerated customs procedures (Deloitte Ukraine, 2025). Given the increasing dependence of modern defense production on internationally sourced components, reducing customs delays has become an important factor in maintaining uninterrupted manufacturing.

Financial governance has been further strengthened through targeted currency liberalization measures introduced by the National Bank of Ukraine (National Bank of Ukraine, 2026). These regulations simplify cross-border financial transactions for defense manufacturers, allowing companies to purchase foreign technologies, pay international suppliers, and cooperate with overseas partners more efficiently despite wartime restrictions on capital movements. Such measures demonstrate the increasing alignment of monetary policy with national defense priorities.

Another important feature of Defense City is the establishment of specialized legal frameworks for strategically important defense companies. Large unmanned aerial vehicle manufacturers, including firms such as **SkyFall**, have reportedly received tailored regulatory status intended to reduce bureaucratic obstacles associated with licensing, certification, and production expansion (Ministry of Defence of Ukraine, 2026a; Kyiv Independent, 2026). These institutional adjustments reflect a broader recognition that technological innovation requires regulatory flexibility comparable to financial support.

Economic modernization has also been accompanied by a growing emphasis on corporate transparency and financial accountability. As defense production expanded rapidly during wartime, maintaining public trust and international confidence became increasingly important. The reported financial audit of **FirePoint** provides an illustrative example. According to the company's chief designer and co-owner, Denys Shtilerman, FirePoint commissioned an independent pricing audit through one of the Big Four accounting firms. Shtilerman stated that the company's profit margin was **21.52 percent**, compared with a legally permitted margin of **25 percent** (UNN, 2026). The case illustrates the growing importance of financial transparency and accountability within Ukraine's defense-industrial sector. As defense production expands, greater scrutiny of corporate pricing practices and financial management can contribute to maintaining

public trust and strengthening the credibility of defense-industrial governance. Such oversight is also important for reassuring international partners that public resources are subject to institutional controls.

International cooperation has become equally central to Ukraine's defense-industrial development. Since 2022, foreign assistance has gradually evolved beyond direct weapons transfers toward long-term industrial partnerships designed to strengthen Ukraine's domestic manufacturing capabilities. This shift reflects an emerging understanding among Western governments that sustainable military assistance depends upon strengthening Ukraine's ability to produce advanced defense technologies independently.

One of the most significant aspects of this transformation has been the growing presence of major European defense companies within Ukraine. Rather than acting solely as external suppliers, several international firms have established direct production partnerships with Ukrainian industry. Rheinmetall, operating through cooperation with the Ukrainian Defense Industry (UDI), has become one of the most prominent examples of this trend. Similar industrial partnerships involving BAE Systems and Quantum Systems further illustrate the gradual integration of Ukraine into Europe's broader defense-industrial network (Rheinmetall, n.d.; Military Embedded Systems, 2026; Militarnyi, 2026).

These partnerships provide benefits extending well beyond immediate production capacity. Cooperation with established Western manufacturers facilitates technology transfer, improves production standards, introduces advanced management practices, and increases compatibility with NATO procurement requirements. Simultaneously, international companies gain valuable operational knowledge derived from Ukraine's extensive battlefield experience, creating a mutually beneficial relationship between industrial modernization and military innovation.

Nevertheless, international industrial cooperation has not been free from challenges. Institutional disputes, concerns regarding corruption, and information security remain significant obstacles affecting large-scale defense projects. A notable example concerns the reported delays affecting the Freya anti-ballistic missile defense project undertaken in cooperation with Diehl Defence. According to available information, disagreements involving the Anti-Corruption Center (ACC), combined with the unauthorized disclosure of technical design documentation, delayed the project by approximately eight months (HVYLYA, 2026). Similar governance concerns reportedly contributed to postponements affecting the planned construction of an engine manufacturing facility in Denmark (HVYLYA, 2026).

Although these incidents reveal continuing institutional vulnerabilities, they do not appear to have fundamentally altered the trajectory of international defense cooperation. Instead, they underscore the importance of strengthening legal protections for intellectual property, improving information security, and maintaining effective anti-corruption mechanisms capable of supporting increasingly sophisticated multinational defense projects.

Parallel to economic and industrial reforms, Ukraine has accelerated its institutional integration with NATO. Standardization has emerged as one of the most important

As of June 2023, Ukraine had implemented **282 NATO standards**, approximately 25 percent of the total, into its national legislation (Fakhurdinova, 2023), covering areas such as logistics, communications, command structures, equipment compatibility, and operational procedures. The adoption of these standards substantially improves interoperability between Ukrainian forces and allied militaries while facilitating future industrial cooperation.

Beyond technical standardization, Ukraine has also become an important contributor to NATO's institutional learning process. The establishment of the **Joint Analysis, Training and Education Centre (JATEC)** in **Bydgoszcz, Poland** (North Atlantic Treaty Organization Allied Command Transformation, n.d.), reflects recognition that Ukraine's battlefield experience provides valuable insights into the conduct of modern high-intensity warfare. Rather than functioning solely as a recipient of military expertise, Ukraine increasingly contributes operational knowledge that informs NATO doctrine, military education, capability development, and strategic planning.

The importance of this institutional relationship extends beyond training. Ukraine's battlefield experience encompasses large-scale drone warfare, electronic warfare, cyber operations, decentralized command structures, and the integration of artificial intelligence into military operations—capabilities that are expected to shape future NATO force development. Consequently, Ukraine has become both a beneficiary and a contributor within the Alliance's evolving security architecture.

Financial integration represents another significant milestone. NATO's decision to recognize military and industrial assistance provided to Ukraine as contributing toward the Alliance's **5 percent of GDP defense investment benchmark** (North Atlantic Treaty Organization, n.d.; Kyiv Independent, 2025), reflects a broader shift in strategic thinking. Rather than viewing support for Ukraine as external assistance separate from Allied defense planning, NATO increasingly treats investments in Ukraine's defense capacity as investments in collective Euro-Atlantic security. This institutional change strengthens political incentives for continued long-term support while embedding Ukraine more deeply within NATO's evolving defense planning framework.

Taken together, these developments demonstrate that Ukraine's defense-industrial transformation is no longer solely a national modernization project. Through comprehensive economic reforms, regulatory innovation, international industrial partnerships, and institutional integration with NATO, Ukraine has become an increasingly important component of the wider European defense ecosystem. Its defense industry now functions not only as a producer of military equipment but also as a platform for technological cooperation, industrial modernization, and strategic integration across the Euro-Atlantic community.

The convergence of economic governance, international cooperation, and NATO integration therefore represents one of the most enduring outcomes of Ukraine's wartime transformation. Regardless of the eventual outcome of the current conflict, these institutional foundations are likely to shape the future architecture of European defense production and security cooperation for years to come.

UKRAINE'S DEFENSE INDUSTRY AS A STRATEGIC INSTRUMENT OF DETERRENCE

The rapid evolution of Ukraine's defense industry has altered not only the country's military capabilities but also the strategic logic underpinning European security. While defense production has traditionally been viewed as a national function aimed at equipping domestic armed forces, Ukraine's wartime experience demonstrates that industrial capacity itself can serve as an instrument of strategic deterrence. As a result, Ukraine's defense sector has become increasingly integrated into NATO's broader deterrence strategy, contributing to regional security without requiring formal Alliance membership.

NATO's contemporary approach toward Russia can be understood through a dual-track framework that combines direct military preparedness with indirect strategic support. The first component focuses on strengthening the Alliance's eastern flank through enhanced forward deployment, expanded multinational exercises, and increased force readiness. These measures are intended to deter direct military aggression against NATO member states by maintaining a credible military presence across Eastern Europe.

The second component relies on indirect deterrence through sustained support for Ukraine's defense capabilities. Rather than engaging Russian forces directly, NATO seeks to influence the strategic balance by ensuring that Ukraine possesses sufficient military, industrial, and technological capacity to deny Russia the achievement of its long-term political and military objectives. This approach corresponds to what one peer-reviewed study terms **"deterrence by delivery of arms"** (Lupovici, 2023).

Unlike traditional proxy warfare, in which external powers often pursue geopolitical objectives through dependent local actors, Ukraine retains full sovereignty over its military operations and national decision-making. External assistance therefore functions primarily as an enabler of Ukrainian defense rather than a mechanism of external control. The strategic objective is not escalation but denial—making military aggression prohibitively costly while reducing the probability of broader confrontation between NATO and Russia.

Within this framework, Ukraine's defense industry performs several complementary strategic functions. First, it reduces dependence on external weapons deliveries by expanding domestic production capacity. As Ukraine manufactures increasing quantities of drones, artillery systems, electronic warfare equipment, missile technologies, and autonomous platforms, its armed forces become less vulnerable to fluctuations in foreign military assistance or disruptions within international supply chains.

Second, domestic production enhances operational adaptability. Unlike imported weapons systems that may require lengthy procurement procedures or political approval for modifications, Ukrainian manufacturers can rapidly adjust designs according to battlefield experience. This flexibility allows military units to receive updated technologies that directly address evolving operational challenges, thereby increasing overall combat effectiveness.

Third, Ukraine's expanding industrial capacity contributes directly to European defense resilience. By producing advanced military technologies within Europe, Ukraine strengthens the broader defense-industrial base upon which NATO increasingly depends. Consequently, investments in Ukrainian defense production generate strategic benefits extending beyond Ukraine itself, supporting collective security across the Euro-Atlantic region.

Another important dimension of deterrence concerns technological competition. Modern warfare is increasingly characterized by contests over innovation rather than simply numerical superiority in conventional weapons. The integration of artificial intelligence, autonomous systems, electronic warfare, cyber capabilities, and long-range precision strike technologies has fundamentally altered military competition between states.

Ukraine has emerged as one of the leading operational laboratories for these technologies. Unlike controlled testing environments, combat conditions provide immediate feedback regarding system performance, survivability, and operational effectiveness. Lessons derived from Ukrainian battlefield experience therefore contribute not only to domestic military modernization but also to the future technological development of NATO member states and defense industries across Europe.

The integration of Ukrainian operational knowledge into NATO institutions, particularly through organizations such as the **Joint Analysis, Training and Education Centre (JATEC)**, further reinforces this process. Battlefield experience concerning drone warfare, electronic warfare, distributed command structures, and integrated autonomous systems increasingly influences Alliance doctrine, military education, and capability development. As a result, Ukraine contributes not only equipment but also operational knowledge that enhances NATO's long-term strategic adaptation.

From a geopolitical perspective, Ukraine's industrial transformation has also altered its position within the Euro-Atlantic security architecture. During the initial stages of the conflict, Ukraine was widely perceived as a recipient of military assistance requiring external support for national survival. Over time, however, the expansion of domestic defense production, technological innovation, and industrial cooperation has changed this perception.

Ukraine is increasingly viewed as an active contributor to regional security rather than merely a beneficiary of allied assistance. Its defense industry supplies valuable technological innovations, provides combat-tested operational experience, and strengthens Europe's collective industrial resilience. This evolution represents a significant shift in strategic identity, positioning Ukraine as an emerging security provider within the broader European defense ecosystem.

The broader implications extend beyond the current conflict. The institutional innovations developed during wartime—including decentralized procurement, rapid industrial adaptation, public-private technological cooperation, and integrated international manufacturing—challenge many assumptions underlying traditional defense-industrial policy. Future military modernization programs across NATO are likely to incorporate elements of the Ukrainian model, particularly regarding rapid innovation, flexible procurement mechanisms, and close cooperation between operational forces and private industry.

Consequently, Ukraine's defense industry should be understood not solely as an instrument supporting current military operations but as a catalyst for broader transformation within European defense planning. The country's wartime experience has demonstrated that industrial adaptability, technological innovation, and institutional flexibility can collectively generate strategic advantages that extend well beyond conventional measures of military power.

CONCLUSION

Ukraine's defense-industrial transformation represents one of the most remarkable cases of wartime industrial modernization in the twenty-first century. Within only a few years, the country has successfully converted a relatively constrained, state-centered defense sector into a dynamic ecosystem characterized by technological innovation, institutional flexibility, extensive private-sector participation, and growing international integration. This transformation illustrates how prolonged conflict can accelerate structural reforms that might otherwise require decades to achieve.

The evidence examined throughout this report indicates that Ukraine's success cannot be attributed solely to increased financial investment or foreign military assistance. Instead, it has resulted from the interaction of multiple mutually reinforcing factors. Procurement reforms improved production efficiency and reduced delivery timelines. Technology platforms such as Brave1 stimulated innovation by connecting startups with operational military requirements. Advances in unmanned systems, artificial intelligence, electronic warfare, missile technologies, and space-based capabilities expanded Ukraine's technological competitiveness. Simultaneously, economic reforms and international partnerships strengthened the institutional foundations necessary to sustain long-term industrial development.

Ukraine's deepening integration into the Euro-Atlantic security framework has been of equal significance. The adoption of NATO standards, expanding industrial cooperation with European defense companies, and increasing institutional coordination with Alliance structures demonstrate that Ukraine is becoming progressively embedded within the broader European defense-industrial ecosystem. Rather than existing on the periphery of NATO's security architecture, Ukraine increasingly contributes to the Alliance's technological modernization, operational learning, and industrial resilience.

The strategic implications extend beyond Ukraine itself. Contemporary deterrence increasingly depends not only on military force but also on the capacity to innovate, manufacture, and adapt more rapidly than potential adversaries. Ukraine's experience demonstrates that defense industries capable of integrating battlefield feedback, technological experimentation, and decentralized production can generate significant strategic advantages under conditions of prolonged conflict. In this respect, Ukraine has become an important model for future defense-industrial development among NATO members and partner states.

Furthermore, the evolution of Ukraine's defense industry reflects a broader transformation in the nature of modern warfare. The increasing importance of autonomous systems, artificial intelligence, electronic warfare, precision strike capabilities, and distributed production networks suggests that future military

competitiveness will depend less on traditional industrial scale and more on technological adaptability and institutional flexibility. Ukraine has demonstrated that relatively limited resources can generate substantial military capability when supported by innovation-driven governance and effective international cooperation.

Looking ahead, continued investment in domestic production, advanced research, regulatory reform, and multinational industrial cooperation will remain essential for sustaining Ukraine's strategic progress. Challenges related to financing, industrial security, infrastructure protection, and governance will undoubtedly persist. Nevertheless, the institutional foundations established during the current conflict provide a strong basis for continued modernization and deeper integration into European defense structures.

Ukraine's defense industry has evolved far beyond its original role of supplying national military requirements. It has become a strategic asset that contributes to regional deterrence, technological innovation, industrial resilience, and collective Euro-Atlantic security. The transformation documented in this report therefore represents not only a response to wartime necessity but also the emergence of a new model of defense-industrial development whose influence is likely to extend well beyond the conclusion of the current conflict.

REFERENCES

Associated Press. (2025, February 7). Ukraine's Western backers will meet for arms talks as doubts over US intentions grow. U.S. News & World Report. <https://www.usnews.com/news/world/articles/2025-02-07/ukraines-western-backers-will-meet-for-arms-talks-as-doubts-over-us-intentions-grow>

Auterion. (2025, September 3). Auterion launches Nemyx, enabling fully coordinated drone swarms. <https://auterion.com/auterion-launches-nemyx-enabling-fully-coordinated-drone-swarms/>

Bondar, K. (2025, December 10). From production to procurement: How Europe and Ukraine are transforming defense supply chains [Congressional testimony]. Center for Strategic and International Studies. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/production-procurement-how-europe-and-ukraine-are-transforming-defense-supply-chains>

Brave1. (n.d.). About Brave1. <https://brave1.gov.ua/en>

Center for European Policy Analysis. (2025, December 2). Flight of the Flamingo spells trouble for Russia. <https://cepa.org/article/flight-of-the-flamingo-spells-trouble-for-russia/>

Deloitte Ukraine. (2025, September 24). Tax and legal alert: Defense City regime. <https://www.deloitte.com/ua/en/services/tax/perspectives/tax-and-legal-alert-2025-09-24.html>

dev.ua. (2026, February 6). Fire Point completes testing of new ballistics with a range of up to 850 km: FP-7 and FP-9 plan to be codified in February. <https://dev.ua/en/news/fire-point-zavershuie-vyprobuvannia-novoi-balistyky-z-dalnistiu-do-850-km-fp-7-i-fp-9-planuiut-kodyfikuvaty-v-liutomu-1770358101>

EY Ukraine. (2025, October 30). Defense City: Ukraine introduces a special preferential regime for defense sector enterprises. https://www.ey.com/en_ua/it-tax-law-digest/defense-city-ukraine-introduces-a-special-preferential-regime-for-defense-sector-enterprises

Fakhurdinova, M. (2023, July 9). No longer a mésalliance: How well prepared are NATO and Ukraine for each other? (SCEEUS Report Series on Ukrainian Domestic Affairs No. 10). Stockholm Centre for Eastern European Studies. <https://sceeus.se/en/publications/no-longer-a-mesalliance-how-well-prepared-are-nato-and-ukraine-for-each-other/>

HVYLYA. (2026, May 19). 'Freya' as Europe's shield: Fire Point founder claims NGO stalled Ukrainian anti-ballistic project by eight months. <https://en.hvylya.net/news/2619-freya-as-europe-s-shield-fire-point-founder-claims-ngo-stalled-ukrainian-anti-ballistic-project-by-eight-months>

Kyiv Independent. (2025, June 25). NATO allies set new defense spending target at 5% of GDP by 2035, send aid to Ukraine, but fail to condemn Russia. <https://kyivindependent.com/nato-allies-set-new-defense-spending-target-at-5-of-gdp-by-2035-send-aid-to-ukraine/>

Kyiv Independent. (2026, January 14). How can foreign defense manufacturers benefit from Ukraine's Defense City regime? <https://kyivindependent.com/how-can-foreign-defense-manufacturers-benefit-from-ukraines-defense-city-regime/>

Kyiv Post. (2025, December 31). UAE state defense group eyes 30% stake in Ukraine's Fire Point at \$2.5 billion valuation. <https://www.kyivpost.com/post/67234>

Kyiv Post. (2026, May 14). Ukrainian arms giant Fire Point goes spaceward with satellite launches. <https://www.kyivpost.com/post/76125>

Kushnikov, V. (2025, February 26). Production capacity of Ukrainian defense industry increased by 75%. *Militarnyi*. <https://militarnyi.com/en/news/production-capacity-of-ukrainian-defense-industry-increased-by-75/>

Lupovici, A. (2023). Deterrence by delivery of arms: NATO and the war in Ukraine. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 44(4), 624–641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2023.2256572>

Militarnyi. (2026, April 14). Quantum Systems to launch two more joint ventures with Ukrainian manufacturers. <https://militarnyi.com/en/news/quantum-systems-to-launch-two-more-joint-ventures-with-ukrainian-manufacturers/>

Military Embedded Systems. (2026, July 7). BAE Systems to provide more support for Ukraine under new agreements. <https://militaryembedded.com/comms/communications/bae-systems-to-provide-more-support-for-ukraine-under-new-agreements>

Ministry of Defence of Ukraine. (2025, August 4). The United States and NATO launch a new mechanism to support Ukraine. <https://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/ukraine/2025/08/ukraine-250804-ukraine-mod01.htm>

Ministry of Defence of Ukraine. (2026a, January 2). Ministry of Defence grants Defence City's first resident status to the manufacturer of Vampire drones. <https://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/ukraine/2026/01/ukraine-260102-ukraine-mod01.htm>

Ministry of Defence of Ukraine. (2026b, April 1). €200 million under the SAFE instrument: Ukraine and Romania launch drone production projects with EU support. <https://mod.gov.ua/en/news/200-million-under-the-safe-instrument-ukraine-and-romania-launch-drone-production-projects-with-eu-support>

National Bank of Ukraine. (2026, April 24). NBU eases some FX restrictions. <https://bank.gov.ua/en/news/all/pomyaksheno-nizku-valyutnih-obmejen>

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (n.d.). Defence investment and NATO's 5% commitment. <https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/introduction-to-nato/defence-expenditures-and-natos-5-commitment>

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Allied Command Operations. (n.d.). NATO Security Assistance and Training for Ukraine. SHAPE. <https://shape.nato.int/operations/nato-security-assistance-and-training-for-ukraine>

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Allied Command Transformation. (n.d.). Joint centres. <https://www.act.nato.int/about/joint-centres/>

UNN. (2026, May 28). Fire Point responds to allegations of “arms market monopoly,” Mindich, and “inflated prices.” <https://unn.ua/en/amp/fire-point-responds-to-allegations-of-weapons-market-monopoly-mindich-and-inflated-prices>

Rheinmetall. (n.d.). Rheinmetall Ukrainian Defense Industry LLC. <https://www.rheinmetall.com/en/company/subsidiaries/rheinmetall-ukrainian-defense-industry>

Welt, C. (2026, July 10). U.S. security assistance to Ukraine since 2022 (CRS In Focus No. IF12040, Version 36). Congressional Research Service. https://www.congress.gov/crs_external_products/IF/PDF/IF12040/IF12040.36.pdf