

INTERREGIONAL COOPERATION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESILIENT APPROACHES IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF UKRAINE IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBAL TRANSFORMATIONS

In the 21st century, the structural dynamics of international cooperation are increasingly shaped by local processes – from decentralization to urbanization [14; 15]. During the formation of a new world order, cities and regions are becoming not only objects but also active subjects of international relations, capable of implementing policies of sustainable development, environmental security, and social integration [2; 20]. After Russia's full-scale aggression, Ukraine faced the challenge of rebuilding its regional systems based on the principles of resilience – adaptability, inclusivity, and sustainability [19; 22]. In this context, the implementation of the resilient city concept is viewed not only as part of the internal reconstruction policy but also as an instrument for integrating Ukraine into the system of a new international cooperation architecture grounded in sustainable development, innovation, and regional solidarity [1; 7].

The theory of international cooperation considers regional linkages as the meso-level of global interaction, where new political and economic alliances are formed [8; 17]. Within this paradigm, the concept of a resilient city serves as a practical manifestation of structural adaptation: cities become platforms where global norms (UN, UNECE, UN-Habitat) materialize in local solutions – from green construction to decentralized energy systems [4; 21]. As B. Schmögerová [21] emphasized, interregional cooperation is key to addressing transnational challenges of sustainable development, including energy, water resources, and social policy. Ukraine today stands at the epicenter of this process – transferring regional interaction to the international level through joint reconstruction and recovery projects [9].

The war has caused a profound structural transformation of international relations [12]. Ukraine has become a testing ground for new models of multi-actor cooperation – among states, regions, businesses, and civil society [6]. As Koltun, Palamarchuk, and Lutsenko note, interregional

cooperation today ensures effective exchange of resources, technologies, and governance practices between Ukrainian regions and European partners [9]. This process aligns with the logic of decentralized globalization – a trend in which not only states but also local actors become participants in international cooperation [17]. In this way, the resilient city becomes an element of a new multipolar order, where cities act as diplomatic nodes (*city diplomacy*) within the networked structure of international relations.

Post-war urban recovery requires a synthesis of economic modernization and ecological transformation [5]. The introduction of circular economy principles – waste recycling, energy efficiency, eco-design – is forming new economic cooperation chains between regions that align with EU standards and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 11, 12, 13) [20]. In this context, cities become not only growth points but also hubs of ecological diplomacy, where local initiatives in recycling or green energy acquire an international dimension [10; 13]. Thus, the ecological resilience of Ukrainian cities contributes to the formation of global “green” alliances, which constitute part of the structural dynamics of international cooperation in the post-crisis world [14].

The contemporary structural dynamics of the world order are also linked to the transition toward the knowledge economy [1]. In this context, the smart city concept [18] becomes a practical manifestation of international cooperation in the fields of innovation and data. The integration of digital technologies into urban governance represents not only an increase in efficiency but also the creation of networks of informational partnerships between cities [11]. For Ukraine, the implementation of smart city solutions in reconstruction processes signifies entry into the global digital architecture, enabling the exchange of algorithms, management practices, and cybersecurity technologies [4]. This also corresponds to the paradigm of innovative realism in contemporary international relations theory [7].

Urban resilience is impossible without social resilience. As Ushenko and Tupika argue, the institutional resilience of cities is based on social inclusion, energy democracy, and civic participation in decision-making [19]. Khoma emphasizes that the Ukrainian model of resilience is founded on social self-organization and horizontal interaction, aligning it with bottom-up governance concepts in global political economy [22]. The processes of decentralization [3] create preconditions for the emergence of a new architecture of local diplomacy, in which communities act as

partners of international donors and regional governments [16]. This represents a structural shift from centralized to networked cooperation.

Post-war reconstruction in Ukraine may serve as a model for a new form of international cooperation that unites local initiatives, regional partnerships, and global standards [6; 12]. As Soldak et al. note, Ukrainian cities demonstrate the phenomenon of emergent resilience – the ability to recover through self-organization, mutual assistance, and innovation [16]. This experience can be transferred to the global practice of rebuilding other post-conflict territories [5]. Thus, the Ukrainian model of the resilient city shapes a new direction of cooperation through reconstruction, combining humanitarian, economic, and political dimensions of international relations [9; 21].

Hence, the concept of the resilient city in Ukraine is not only about rebuilding urban spaces but also about rethinking the role of regions in the structure of international cooperation [15]. Through interregional interaction, circular economy, decentralized governance, and digital technologies, Ukraine integrates into a new world order based on principles of resilience, innovation, and partnership [20]. The realization of the resilient city concept in Ukraine serves as an empirical example of the structural dynamics of international cooperation – a mechanism for adapting to global crises (environmental, energy, security) – and a model of regional leadership in the post-crisis world, transforming Ukraine from an object into a subject of the new architecture of global collaboration [10; 16].

References:

1. Castellsagué A., Szyszlo P. (2024). Progress and challenges of gender mainstreaming in Spanish university cooperation for international development: The technical staff's viewpoints. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, vol. 25 (7), pp. 1484–1498. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-02-2024-0078>
2. Chankseliani M., McCowan T. (2020). Higher education and the sustainable development goals. *Higher Education*, vol. 81 (1), pp. 1–8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00652-w>
3. Decentralisation reform in Ukraine: Achievements and implementation prospects amidst war conditions. (2024). *Democratic Governance*, 2 (5–17). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56318/dg/2.2024.05>
4. Denis V. (2024). Risk management strategies of urban planning projects in the framework of post-war reconstruction. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1376 (1), p. 012048. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1376/1/012048>
5. Dovgal O., Borko T., Miroshkina N., Surina H., Konoplianyk D. (2024). Circular economy as an imperative for sustainable development. *Scientific Bulletin of*

Mukachevo State University Series "Economics", vol. 11 (1), pp. 19–28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52566/msu-econ1.2024.19>

6. Gerasymchuk V., Andros S. (2023). Economic relations of Ukraine and the Visegrad Group countries: Achievements, problems, prospects. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej Zarządzanie*, vol. 50 (1), pp. 46–56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17512/znpcz.2023.2.04>

7. Haas B., Haward M., McGee J., Fleming A. (2020). Explicit targets and cooperation: Regional fisheries management organizations and the sustainable development goals. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, vol. 21 (1), pp. 133–145. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-020-09491-7>

8. Keijzer N., Galvis L., Delputte S. (2023). Whose policy coherence counts? Assessing sustainable fisheries in Ghana and the European Union's engagement. *Development Policy Review*, vol. 42 (1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12736>

9. Koltun V., Palamarchuk T., Lutsenko L. (2024). Organisational and financial mechanism for improving interregional cooperation in the context of post-war reconstruction of Ukraine. *Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Public Administration*, vol. 20 (2), pp. 16–24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/2616-9193.2024/20-3/12>

10. Kurbatova T., Sidortsov R., Trypolska G., Hulak D., Sotnyk I. (2024). Maintaining Ukraine's grid reliability under rapid growth of renewable electricity share: Challenges in the pre-war, war-time, and post-war periods. *International Journal of Sustainable Energy Planning and Management*, no. 40, pp. 41–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54337/ijsepm.8112>

11. Kusumastuti R., Rouli J., Trialdi L., Safitri R. (2022). Improving urban resilience during COVID-19 pandemic by implementing smart city initiatives: A case of Tangerang City, Indonesia. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1111(1), 012082. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1111/1/012082>

12. Misztal A. (2023). The sustainable development of enterprises in Poland during the war in Ukraine: Geopolitical and socio-economic crises – PESTEL and SWOT analysis. *Optimum Economic Studies*, vol. 4 (114), pp. 189–202. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15290/oes.2023.04.114.11>

13. Petlenko Y. (2024). Financing green energy for enhancing energy security in Ukraine. Financial and Credit Activity. *Problems of Theory and Practice*, vol. 2 (55), pp. 161–179. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55643/fcaptive.2.55.2024.4299>

14. Puertas R., Martí L. (2022). Regional analysis of the sustainable development of two Mediterranean countries: Spain and Italy. *Sustainable Development*, vol. 31 (2), pp. 797–811. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2420>

15. Sedlacek S., Gaube V. (2009). Regions on their way to sustainability: The role of institutions in fostering sustainable development at the regional level. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, vol. 12 (1), pp. 117–134. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-008-9184-x>

16. Soldak M., Mezentshev K., Batunova E., Haase A., Haase D. (2024). Emergent urban resilience in Ukraine: Adapting to polycrisis in times of war. *Ekonomichna Ta Sotsialna Geografiya*, no. 92, pp. 6–13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/2413-7154/2024.92.6-13>

17. Studzieniecki T., Soares J. (2017). Interregional tourism cooperation: A Europe case study. *Holos*, no. 4, pp. 135–158. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15628/holos.2017.5263>

18. Sych O., Pasinovych I. (2025). Smart city as a driver of economic growth and innovative development in Ukraine. *Economics. Finance and Management Review*, vol. 2 (22), pp. 29–41. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5208-2025-2-29-41>

19. Ushenko N., Tupika A. (2025). Stalyi rozvytok mist Ukrainy v umovakh hlobalizatsii: Zarubizhni ta vitchyzniani pidkhody. *Herald of Khmelnytskyi National University*, vol. 338 (1), pp. 354–363. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2025-338-52>

20. Weiland S., Hickmann T., Lederer M., Marquardt J., Schwindenhammer S. (2021). The 2030 agenda for sustainable development: Transformative change through the sustainable development goals? *Politics and Governance*, vol. 9 (1), pp. 90–95. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v9i1.4191>

21. UNECE. (2002, July 19). Interregional cooperation for sustainable development: Regional challenges ahead. Statement by Brigita Schmögnerová to the Economic and Social Council at its 2002 Substantive Session (ECE/GEN/02/19). United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. Available at: <https://unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/press/pr2002/02gen19e.htm>

22. Khoma N. (2024). Ukraine's resilience under conditions of Russia's armed aggression and preparation for post-war reconstruction. *International Relations, Social Communications and Regional Studies*, vol. 2 (19), pp. 287–307. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29038/2524-2679-2024-02-287-307>