



DOI: 10.58423/2786-6742/2026-13-128-144  
УДК 332.1:352:005.21:339.9

### **Olena KOROHODOVA**

Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor of the Department of International Economics  
National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”  
Kyiv, Ukraine

ORCID ID: [0000-0003-2338-365X](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2338-365X)

Scopus Author ID: [57315283000](https://scopus.org/authorid/57315283000)

e-mail: [korogodova.olena@gmail.com](mailto:korogodova.olena@gmail.com)

(Corresponding author)

### **Natalya CHERNENKO**

Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor of the Department of International Economics  
National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”  
Kyiv, Ukraine

ORCID ID: [0000-0002-7424-7829](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7424-7829)

Scopus Author ID: [57315068300](https://scopus.org/authorid/57315068300)

### **Yaroslava HLUSHCHENKO**

Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor of the Department of International Economics  
National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”  
Kyiv, Ukraine

ORCID ID: [0000-0003-1454-0369](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1454-0369)

Scopus Author ID: [57215932085](https://scopus.org/authorid/57215932085)

## **RESOURCE PROVISION OF TERRITORIAL COMMUNITY RESILIENCE IN WARTIME CRISIS AND MIGRATION CHALLENGES**

**Анотація.** У статті розглянуто питання посилення стійкості територіальних громад у кризових умовах шляхом удосконалення систем управління їхніми ресурсами в ситуації глобальної нестабільності, спричиненої епідемічними потрясіннями, воєнними конфліктами, вимушеною міграцією, повномасштабною війною та стійкими структурними дисбалансами в економіці. Показано, що руйнування інфраструктури, демографічні втрати, масове переміщення населення, активізація міграційних процесів і зміни у соціально-трудовах відносинах у поєднанні зі скороченням фінансово-економічної бази громад за умов зростання соціальних потреб зумовлюють необхідність переходу від фрагментарних і реактивних управлінських рішень до інтегрованих та адаптивних моделей місцевого управління. Обґрунтовано, що стійкість територіальних громад визначається не лише наявністю ресурсів, а й спроможністю громад стратегічно їх мобілізувати, цифрово поєднувати та ефективно використовувати людський, соціальний та інституційний капітал, особливо в



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)



умовах міграційно зумовлених шоків на ринку праці та дисбалансів робочої сили. На основі теорії мобілізації ресурсів, концепції багатовимірного капіталу громади, підходів до оцінювання вразливості й спроможностей, а також концепції соціально-екологічної стійкості виявлено наукову прогалину, пов'язану з недостатньою систематизацією управлінських інструментів розвитку громад за одночасного впливу реформ децентралізації, міграційного тиску та воєнних викликів. Узагальнення міжнародного та українського досвіду підтверджує потребу відмови від вузько фінансово орієнтованої моделі управління на користь багатофакторного підходу, який поєднує інструменти стратегічного планування, цифрові й аналітичні рішення, механізми розвитку людського капіталу та управління нематеріальними активами громади. У результаті сформовано комплексну класифікацію інструментів ефективного управління ресурсами територіальних громад у кризових умовах, структуровану за функціональним призначенням, джерелами мобілізації та механізмами реалізації. Доведено, що підвищення стійкості громад у воєнний та післявоєнний періоди потребує поєднання довгострокового стратегічного бачення з гнучкими короткостроковими управлінськими рішеннями, спрямованими на пом'якшення міграційно зумовлених шоків на ринку праці, посилення інституційної спроможності та забезпечення інклюзивного й сталого місцевого розвитку. Практична цінність отриманих результатів полягає в можливості їх використання для підвищення якості управлінських рішень, зміцнення економічної й організаційної спроможності громад та формування адаптивних моделей управління в умовах високої невизначеності.

**Ключові слова:** міжнародні проєкти в кризових умовах, ресурсне забезпечення міжнародної діяльності, кризове управління, шоки на ринку праці, стійкість громад, страхування, економічна політика, стандарти ЄС, людський капітал, міграційні виклики.

**JEL Classification:** R11, H72, H70

**Absztrakt.** A tanulmány a kistérségek válsághelyzetekben való ellenálló képességének megerősítését vizsgálja az erőforrás-gazdálkodási rendszerek fejlesztésén keresztül, a globális instabilitás olyan körülményei között, amelyeket járványügyi sokkok, fegyveres konfliktusok, kényszermigráció, teljes körű háború, valamint a gazdaság tartós strukturális egyensúlytalanságai idéznek elő. A tanulmány rámutat arra, hogy az infrastruktúra pusztulása, a demográfiai veszteségek, a népesség tömeges áthelyeződése, a migrációs folyamatok felerősödése és a szociális-munkaügyi viszonyok átalakulása, a kistérségek pénzügyi-gazdasági bázisának szűkülésével és a társadalmi szükségletek növekedésével együtt, szükségessé teszik az áttérést a fragmentált és reaktív irányítási döntésekről az integrált és adaptív helyi kormányzási modellekre. A tanulmány alátámasztja, hogy a kistérségek ellenálló képességét nem csupán az erőforrások rendelkezésre állása határozza meg, hanem az is, hogy a közösségek mennyire képesek azokat stratégiai módon mobilizálni, digitálisan összekapcsolni, valamint hatékonyan hasznosítani az emberi, társadalmi és intézményi tőkét, különösen a migráció által kiváltott munkaerőpiaci sokkok és munkaerő-egyensúlytalanságok körülményei között. Az erőforrás-mobilizáció elmélete, a közösségi tőke többdimenziós koncepciója, a sérülékenység és a kapacitások értékelésére irányuló megközelítések, valamint a társadalmi-ökológiai reziliencia koncepciója alapján a tanulmány olyan tudományos hiányterületet azonosít, amely a közösségfejlesztés irányítási eszközeinek elégtelen rendszerezéséhez kapcsolódik a decentralizációs reformok, a migrációs nyomás és a háborús kihívások egyidejű hatása mellett. A nemzetközi és ukrán tapasztalatok összegzése megerősíti annak szükségességét, hogy a szűken pénzügyi orientációjú irányítási modell helyett olyan többtényezős megközelítés érvényesüljön, amely egyesíti a stratégiai tervezés eszközeit, a digitális és analitikai megoldásokat, az emberi tőke fejlesztésének mechanizmusait, valamint a kistérségek immateriális erőforrásainak kezelését. A kutatás eredményeként a tanulmány a kistérségek válsághelyzetekben alkalmazható hatékony erőforrás-gazdálkodási eszközeinek komplex osztályozását alakítja ki, amely funkcionális rendeltetés,



*mobilizációs források és megvalósítási mechanizmusok szerint strukturált. Bizonyítást nyer, hogy a kistérségek ellenálló képességének erősítése a háborús és háború utáni időszakban a hosszú távú stratégiai jövőkép és a rugalmas, rövid távú irányítási döntések összekapcsolását igényli. Ezek a döntések a migráció által kiváltott munkaerőpiaci sokkok enyhítésére, az intézményi kapacitás megerősítésére, valamint az inkluzív és fenntartható helyi fejlődés biztosítására irányulnak. Az eredmények gyakorlati értéke abban áll, hogy felhasználhatók az irányítási döntések minőségének javítására, a kistérségek gazdasági és szervezeti kapacitásának megerősítésére, valamint adaptív irányítási modellek kialakítására magas fokú bizonytalanság körülményei között.*

**Kulcsszavak:** nemzetközi projektek válsághelyzetekben; a nemzetközi tevékenység erőforrás-biztosítása; válságmenedzsment; munkaerőpiaci sokkok; közösségi reziliencia; biztosítás; gazdaságpolitika; uniós standardok; emberi tőke; migrációs kihívások.

**Abstract.** *The article focuses on strengthening community resilience in crisis conditions through the improvement of resource management systems of territorial communities under global instability caused by epidemic shocks, military conflicts, forced migration, full-scale war, and persistent structural economic imbalances. It is demonstrated that infrastructure destruction, demographic losses, large-scale population displacement, intensified migration processes, and the transformation of social and labor relations, combined with the shrinking financial and economic base of communities amid growing social needs, necessitate a shift from fragmented and reactive managerial practices to integrated and adaptive local governance models. The study substantiates that the resilience of territorial communities depends not only on the availability of resources but also on the capacity to strategically mobilize, digitally integrate, and effectively utilize human, social, and institutional capital, particularly in the context of migration-induced labor market shocks and workforce asymmetries. Drawing on resource mobilization theory, the concept of multidimensional community capital, approaches to vulnerability and capacity assessment, and the social-ecological resilience framework, the article identifies a research gap related to the insufficient systematization of managerial instruments for community development under the simultaneous influence of decentralization reforms, migration pressures, and wartime challenges. The synthesis of international and Ukrainian experience confirms the need to move beyond a narrowly finance-oriented management model toward a multifactor paradigm that integrates strategic planning instruments, digital and analytical tools, human capital development mechanisms, and approaches to managing intangible community assets. As a result, a comprehensive classification of instruments for effective resource management of territorial communities in crisis conditions is developed and structured according to their functional purpose, sources of mobilization, and implementation mechanisms. It is proven that enhancing community resilience during wartime and post-war recovery requires a combination of long-term strategic vision with flexible short-term managerial responses aimed at mitigating migration-related labor market shocks, strengthening institutional capacity, and ensuring inclusive and sustainable local development. The practical significance of the findings lies in their applicability for improving managerial decision-making, reinforcing the economic and organizational capacity of communities, and forming adaptive governance models capable of functioning under high uncertainty.*

**Keywords:** *international projects in crisis conditions, resource provision of international activity, crisis management labor market shocks, community resilience, insurance, economic policy, EU standards, human capital, migration challenges.*

**Problem description.** Under conditions of global instability driven by epidemic challenges, military conflicts, wars, and economic imbalances, the issue of resilience of territorial communities within national economies has become critically important, particularly in the context of the implementation of international projects in crisis conditions and cross-border cooperation initiatives. The destruction of infrastructure,



irreversible human losses, intensified migration processes, and the erosion of the economic base amid rising social needs necessitate a shift from fragmented practices toward an integrated and coherent system of governance.

The capacity of communities to effectively withstand crisis phenomena directly depends on both the quality and the volume of their resource endowment, as well as on the effectiveness of mechanisms for managing available resources, including resource provision of international activity, risk management and insurance instruments aimed at mitigating financial losses, compensating damage to communal assets, infrastructure, and human capital under crisis and wartime conditions. Moreover, labor market shocks and community resilience have become closely interconnected, as migration-induced changes in employment structures, workforce availability, and income generation significantly affect the economic stability of communities. In this context, one of the key tasks is the systematization and classification of management instruments, which provides an analytical foundation for their informed selection, adaptation, and implementation within the framework of economic policy and EU standards for resilient and inclusive local development.

**Literature review.** A central place in the formation of the theoretical framework is occupied by the resource mobilization theory proposed by McCarthy and Zald [1]. This classical model, despite its long trajectory of development, retains substantial scholarly relevance for local development research, particularly in studies addressing crisis management and community resilience, as it emphasizes the capacity of communities to effectively mobilize and combine internal and external resources in pursuit of collective goals, including resources attracted through international projects and external partnerships.

In addition, a comprehensive typology of capitals (natural, cultural, human, social, political, financial, and infrastructural) proposed in [2] may serve as a conceptual basis for the classification of management instruments, within which insurance mechanisms can be interpreted as a component of financial and institutional capital that enables risk redistribution, supports crisis management, and enhances community resilience to external shocks, including those related to labor market disruptions and migration challenges [3-4]. The Vulnerability and capacity assessment (VCA) approach focuses on identifying community weaknesses and strengths under conditions of instability [5], while the concept of social-ecological resilience conceptualizes the community as an adaptive system capable of absorbing, withstanding, and transforming in response to external shocks [6].

Contemporary research extends these classical approaches by incorporating new methodologies for assessing the resource capacity of communities under conditions of instability. In particular, scholars increasingly focus on the interrelation between human capital and migration challenges, labor market adaptability, and community resilience, emphasizing the role of digital and analytical tools in supporting evidence-based economic policy decisions aligned with EU standards of local and regional development. Within the context of urban resilience, scholars propose the application



of complex systems models that integrate social and environmental indicators through network-based and simulation approaches, thereby providing comprehensive support for managerial decision-making regarding urban resources and their interactions within the community's life-support system [7]. Equally important are studies that introduce novel quantitative methods for measuring community resilience, including fuzzy logic-based approaches to assessing adaptability and recovery capacity [8]. Ukrainian and regional studies further confirm the relevance of developing resource management instruments under current conditions. Analyses of priority areas for monitoring and evaluating community development underscore the importance of integrating governance strategies that ensure transparency, public participation, and adaptability to emerging challenges [9].

It must be in line with the principles and standards of EU economic policy and governance. Moreover, recent scholarly work increasingly focuses on the design and implementation of practical management mechanisms in the context of strengthening public governance, including the digitalization of administrative tools, the promotion of public-private partnerships, and the attraction of investment for the sustainable development of communities [10]. In previous publications, the authors have considered various aspects of strengthening the resilience of territories within the framework of economic policy and EU standards, namely, "the strategic development of human capital as a key factor in restoring social cohesion, economic resilience and sustainable development" through the formation of "an integrated human capital ecosystem that includes education, entrepreneurial support and digital transformation" [11]. This approach has made it possible to justify the transition from reactive crisis management to the creation of institutional support and adaptive management models in post-conflict conditions. The authors also identified resource provision as a key factor in the development and sustainability of territorial communities, where the proposed Cobb-Douglas function allows for formalizing the dependencies between the main resource components and the level of community capacity, which makes it possible to ensure a reasonable allocation of resources to achieve an optimal balance [12].

At the same time, while acknowledging the significant contributions of Ukrainian and international scholars to the development of the theoretical and methodological foundations of resource management at the local level, it is necessary to emphasize the need for further advancement of scientific approaches specifically in the domain of systematization and classification of instruments for effective community resource management, particularly in the context of crisis management and international projects in crisis conditions.

**Identification of previously unresolved parts of the overall problem.** The scientific problem of developing a comprehensive, multidimensional systematization and classification of instruments for effective resource management of local communities remains unresolved. Such a system would need to integrate international experience, the outcomes of Ukraine's decentralization reform, and the emerging



requirements of a wartime economy, including labor market shocks and migration challenges.

**Goals of the article.** The purpose of this article is to substantiate the systematization and classification of instruments for effective resource management of local communities under conditions of crisis and wartime challenges, ensuring alignment with economic policy and EU standards, and to provide guidance for the practical application of these instruments in both short-term recovery and long-term development scenarios.

**Methods and methodology.** The methodological design of this study is based on an approach that integrates theoretical synthesis, comparative analysis, and systematic classification of management instruments.

The research relies on four established theoretical concepts. Resource mobilization theory, introduced by McCarthy and Zald [1], provides the conceptual basis for examining how territorial communities identify, attract, and strategically combine internal and external resources, including those mobilized through international projects in crisis conditions. The community capitals framework [2] served as the structural foundation for constructing the classification of management instruments. The vulnerability and capacity assessment approach [5] informed the analytical logic used to identify community weaknesses and adaptive strengths under conditions of instability. The social-ecological resilience concept [6] offered a systems-level perspective, framing territorial communities as adaptive units capable of absorbing, withstanding, and transforming in response to external shocks. Integrating these four concepts allowed community resilience to be defined not as a static attribute but as a dynamic capacity for strategic resource governance. A structured review of scholarly literature was conducted, covering publications in the fields of local governance, crisis management, human capital development, digital governance, and community resilience. The review included both international peer-reviewed sources and Ukrainian-language academic contributions to ensure contextual relevance for the conditions of Ukraine's wartime economy and decentralization reform. Sources were selected based on their relevance to the research objectives, methodological rigor, and the extent to which they addressed the intersection of resource provision, labor market dynamics, and institutional capacity at the local level. This review helped identify the existing research gap.

International and Ukrainian experience in community resource management under crisis conditions was systematically compared. The comparative analysis included practices from EU member states related to digital governance (including the DESI methodology [21–23]), smart urban governance frameworks [22], and the implementation of public-private partnerships and participatory budgeting mechanisms. Ukrainian experience was examined through the outcomes of decentralization reform, wartime asset management priorities [24], and the practical application of project-based governance at the community level [20]. This comparison made it possible to identify transferable instruments and the conditions under which



their adaptation to Ukrainian realities is feasible. The central methodological contribution of the study is the development of a comprehensive classification of community resource management instruments under crisis conditions. The classification was constructed according to three criteria: functional purpose (the managerial goal each instrument serves), source and type of resource mobilized (financial, human, intangible, digital), and the mechanism of engagement (the procedural channel through which each instrument is activated). The resulting taxonomy, presented in Table 1, includes five categories of instruments: strategic and methodological; digital and analytical; human capital mobilization; financial and economic; and intangible asset management.

The study also incorporates elements of policy analysis, drawing on normative documents, program frameworks, and institutional initiatives at national and international levels. This includes an examination of UNDP community support programs [27], the university-community partnership initiative [30], the policy of Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute on engagement with displaced persons [31], and broader EU standards for good governance, digitalization, and sustainable local development. This applied synthesis ensures that the proposed classification is grounded in verifiable institutional practice rather than remaining purely theoretical.

**Main research results.** Earlier investigations have examined the concept of community resilience, which has been interpreted in various ways depending on the analytical focus, including adaptive capacity, social cohesion, institutional stability, and the availability of resources under external shocks [13-17]. However, existing interpretations often insufficiently emphasize the role of integrated resource management and local governance instruments in shaping community resilience, especially in crisis and wartime conditions. In this study, community resilience is defined as the capacity of a territorial community to mobilize, integrate, and strategically manage material, human, financial, digital, social, and intangible resources, including insurance mechanisms in order to ensure continuity of basic functions, adapt to crisis conditions, and create foundations for recovery and long-term development.

The practical realization of this multi-dimensional resilience model is increasingly dependent on the alignment of local governance mechanisms with the overarching framework of economic policy and EU standards. This alignment acts as a catalyst for the transition from theoretical definitions to the practical implementation of standardized, transparent, and efficient management systems, while also enhancing the resource provision of international activity and mobilization of human capital for post-crisis recovery.

Systematization makes it possible to overcome the fragmentation of managerial approaches, while classification enables the structuring of instruments according to their functional purpose, criteria of application, and relevance for addressing labor market shocks and migration challenges. The scientific validity of this approach is grounded in the integration of international best practices, the outcomes of Ukraine's



decentralization reform, and the emerging requirements of a wartime economy. Effective community resource management under crisis conditions requires a comprehensive approach that encompasses both organizational-managerial and technical-methodological instruments.

Strategic and methodological instruments for shaping the long-term development vision of territorial communities include socio-economic development strategies, post-crisis recovery programs, project management within international projects in crisis conditions, and foresight studies. These instruments provide the foundation for planning, priority setting, and the implementation of managerial decisions in the medium- and long-term perspective, thereby enhancing the institutional capacity of communities, their adaptability to contemporary challenges, and resilience to labor market shocks and migration pressures. Strategic planning entails an analysis of the community's internal economic conditions and external influences, including resource provision of international activity and alignment with economic policy and EU standards, while local development management is based on subordinating all activities to a unified strategy implemented through continuous project-based activity [18]. Foresight tools encompass analytical, expert-based, and creative methods of shaping future visions, enabling communities not only to respond to challenges but also to proactively construct development scenarios, taking into account human capital and migration challenges [18; 19]. The introduction of project management ensures a systemic approach to the work of local self-government bodies through project prioritization based on analytical data and residents' needs, thereby increasing accountability for development outcomes and supporting crisis management and community resilience [20].

Digital and analytical tools, including geographic information systems, dashboards, and index models for assessing potential and vulnerability, serve as a strategic foundation for building community resilience. The implementation of such information and analytical management systems not only meets the standards of the EU economic policy in the field of digital governance, but also forms a "smart governance" ecosystem, where data becomes a tool for strengthening human capital and adapting to international transformational challenges [21]. As Meijer and Bolívar (2016) point out, the transition to "smart governance" involves not only technological renewal, but also institutional transformation, where digital tools become mediators between the government and the community [22]. Compliance with the standards of the EU digital policy is confirmed by the implementation of index models similar to the DESI methodology (European Commission, 2020), which allows comparing the level of digitalization of communities at the international level [21-23]. Data from diverse sources are increasingly used by governments and civil society to monitor and influence managerial decision-making processes [24]. Within the framework of the implementation of modern priorities of economic policy and EU standards, digital and analytical tools, including geographic information systems (GIS), interactive dashboards and index models for assessing potential, are transformed into strategic



levers for strengthening community resilience. This toolkit ensures the transition to evidence-based governance (data-driven decision-making) and supports the development of human capital through the implementation of the concept of “smart governance”. The use of GIS portals for spatial development modeling and asset monitoring not only optimizes resource management, but also allows communities to integrate international transformational dimensions, adapting local self-government to the high standards of the European Union digital ecosystem [25;26].

Instruments for mobilizing human capital encompass participatory mechanisms of public engagement, the involvement of volunteer initiative groups, the integration of expert potential, and the development of a project-oriented culture among youth. These practices form part of the traditional collective model of local economic development, which has demonstrated high effectiveness and economic feasibility in communities with limited resources. Within this model, temporary volunteer groups are formed, comprising key stakeholders who possess relevant competencies, knowledge, and social capital necessary for addressing specific tasks or identifying promising development directions. A defining characteristic of such groups is their short-term nature; however, the outcomes of their activities are strategically oriented and aimed at long-term impact, contributing to community resilience and crisis management [27]. The involvement of external experts in the development of strategic planning documents significantly enhances their credibility and provides participants with greater confidence in the decisions adopted, particularly in the context of international projects in crisis conditions and the resource provision of international activity [18;19].

Financial and economic instruments that constitute the toolkit of EU-aligned local economic policy and economic standards and ensure the sustainable development of territorial communities include local development budgets, emergency response funds, public-private partnership mechanisms, insurance instruments (municipal property insurance, infrastructure insurance, agricultural and catastrophe insurance, as well as mechanisms of public-private insurance partnerships), and grant and investment platforms. Within this group of instruments, insurance mechanisms play a crucial role in strengthening the financial stability of territorial communities by enabling the redistribution of risks associated with infrastructure destruction, natural hazards, military actions, and other force majeure circumstances.

Under wartime conditions, insurance mechanisms complement budgetary resources by providing compensation channels and reducing the fiscal burden on local budgets in the post-crisis recovery phase. Taken together, these financial and economic instruments play a key role in building the financial capacity of communities, enabling the implementation of strategic initiatives even under conditions of constrained resources, while mitigating labor market shocks and migration challenges. In line with this understanding, contemporary academic literature emphasizes the need to integrate financial mechanisms with social and environmental criteria. Such an interdisciplinary approach forms a new paradigm of



resource management based on the principles of balanced development, environmental responsibility, and social inclusiveness. Accordingly, effective financial resource management must account for long-term environmental risks and the needs of local communities.

Instruments for managing intangible assets, such as cultural heritage, social memory, and local identity, play an important role in strengthening social cohesion and community resilience, particularly under wartime conditions. Their application contributes to community consolidation and the formation of collective agency, transforming intangible resources into a factor of strategic development. In addition, management instruments may be classified according to the sources of resources, their types, and mechanisms of mobilization, including insurance-based mechanisms that transform potential losses into predictable financial flows and enhance long-term planning capacity of territorial communities. This approach reflects the transition from a narrowly finance-oriented model to a multifactor management paradigm that integrates material, human, informational, and cultural assets.

The proposed systematization reflects the institutionalization of the shift from the traditional prioritization of material and financial resources toward a multifactor management model that integrates social, intellectual, and cultural assets. Under wartime and post-war conditions, such an integrative paradigm creates a methodological foundation for the formation of resilient, innovation-oriented communities capable of adaptively responding to crisis factors and ensuring development at the local level. The relevance of this systemic approach directly stems from the expansion of powers and responsibilities of communities resulting from Ukraine's decentralization reform, which granted territorial communities new competences, particularly in the areas of development planning, budget management, and investment attraction [24]. This paradigm shift requires local self-government bodies and active citizens to apply innovative and adaptive approaches to managing available resources, including human capital and migration-related challenges.

Mechanisms introduced prior to 2022 have been substantially adjusted in response to the realities of the full-scale invasion. Under conditions of martial law, limited financial resources, and mass population displacement, the capacity of communities to effectively counter crisis situations depends on their ability to mobilize and rationally use all available assets, including not only the material base but also human, social, and intangible capital.

The development of territorial communities in Ukraine, especially following the launch of the decentralization reform, has unfolded against the backdrop of a global transformation in the paradigm of local governance. Over the past 50 years, three key transformations have occurred in the practice of territorial community development planning in developed countries [18]. First, the level of responsibility has shifted, with territorial communities assuming near-complete responsibility for local conditions, including the quality of work, education, leisure, and life. Second, the methodology of local development management has changed, incorporating tools for strategic



planning, crisis management, and foresight in line with EU standards. Finally, the subject of governance has evolved, as cities have begun to independently expand their sphere of influence within regions, building competitive advantages and creating joint projects through partnerships and inter-municipal cooperation [18]. These transformations indicate a shift from a passive, dependent model of governance to an active and agent-centered one, in which the community becomes the driving force of its own development. Under wartime conditions when state resources are limited and external assistance requires proactive engagement, this approach is not merely desirable but critically necessary for survival.

Effective management of the assets and resources of territorial communities becomes the foundation for financing residents' priority needs and ensuring economic growth [24], and it requires the application of a comprehensive set of instruments that can be classified according to their purpose (Table 1).

The classification of instruments presented in Table 1 demonstrates that the effectiveness of crisis management is determined not only by material resources but also by the intellectual, social, and cultural assets of a community. Success lies in the ability to mobilize informal structures (action groups), employ digital technologies for evidence-based decision-making, and adapt intangible assets such as cultural heritage to strengthen social cohesion, community resilience, and local identity. It should be noted separately that the full-scale phase of the war has inflicted substantial damage on the economy and infrastructure, necessitating a reconfiguration of the economy to operate under the conditions of martial law. Community development priorities have shifted markedly, becoming focused primarily on security, survival, and the mitigation of labor market shocks and migration challenges.

It is important to recognize that the challenges faced by communities vary significantly depending on their geographical location. Rear-area communities, such as those in Lviv or Zakarpattia regions, have confronted the tasks of accommodating internally displaced persons and functioning as humanitarian hubs. Frontline territories serve as "transit hubs," while communities located directly in active combat zones pursue a primary objective-survival and, to the extent possible, the maintenance of essential municipal services [24].

This specificity requires flexible and adaptive governance, in which long-term strategic planning is complemented by short-term, targeted actions that respond to the most urgent needs of residents. In addition, logistical constraints, resource shortages (particularly human capital), and infrastructure destruction have become significant barriers to business activity and sustainable development, limiting opportunities for recovery, investment attraction, and the resource provision of international activity.



**Table 1**

**Classification of Community Resource Management Tools in Times of Crisis**

<b>Instrument Category</b>	<b>Main Instruments</b>	<b>Main Management Function</b>	<b>Engagement Mechanism</b>
Strategic and Methodological	Socio-economic development strategies, post-crisis recovery programs, foresight studies, project management frameworks (including international projects in crisis conditions), alignment with EU standards and economic policy.	Long-term planning, priority setting, strategic coordination, enhancing community resilience.	Coordination with local authorities, expert panels, participatory planning workshops.
Digital and Analytical	GIS mapping, dashboards for decision-making, simulation and modeling tools, predictive analytics for labor market shocks and migration flows, e-governance platforms, digital participatory tools.	Evidence-based decision-making, monitoring, resource allocation, forecasting, integration of resource provision of international activity.	Online surveys, data sharing platforms, participatory digital platforms, community feedback loops.
Human Capital Mobilization Tools	Volunteer action groups, engagement of local experts, youth project-oriented programs, academic-practitioner integration initiatives.	Mobilization and development of human capital, knowledge transfer, capacity building, enhancing adaptive and collective capacity.	Workshops, trainings, mentoring, volunteer programs, community consultations, project-based youth programs.
Financial and Economic	Local development budgets, emergency funds, public-private partnerships, insurance instruments (municipal, infrastructure, agricultural, catastrophe), grants and investment platforms.	Resource mobilization, risk mitigation, financing recovery and strategic initiatives, strengthening financial resilience.	Participatory budgeting, grant competitions, partnerships, insurance schemes, co-financing initiatives.
Intangible Asset Management Tools	Cultural heritage initiatives, preservation of social memory, local identity programs, community cohesion projects, social capital development, digital platforms for cultural engagement.	Strengthening social cohesion, local identity, adaptive capacity, collective agency, promoting community resilience.	Community forums, cultural events, participatory projects, collaboration with NGOs and educational institutions, online engagement platforms.

*Source: compiled by the authors based on [1;2; 6-12; 18;19; 24; 28;29]*

Numerous international and Ukrainian initiatives provide support to communities. These include, for example, UNDP programs and other international projects in crisis conditions that assist communities through grant competitions for



Regional and Local Development Agencies; educational initiatives such as the “Universal Design School” aimed at inclusive development; and youth-oriented programs such as “InEvolve.” These initiatives are designed to strengthen resilience, foster economic growth, and expand community capacities [27]. Worth noting as well is a project implemented by the International Renaissance Foundation in cooperation with the Alliance of Ukrainian Universities, which sought to integrate academic expertise with community practitioners to reinforce local reconstruction plans. The project included training programs in project management, grant writing, and economic development, as well as advisory support from university experts. This approach enhances community self-reliance, mobilizes human capital, and facilitates a more effective linkage between theory and practice [30]. Igor Sikorskiy Kyiv Polytechnic Institute is also involved in this initiative, having developed a dedicated “Policy on Engagement with Local Communities to Improve Healthcare and Well-being, Including Programs for Displaced Persons and Refugees.” This policy is aimed at integrating university resources into community support through healthcare, social inclusion, and partnership development, thereby strengthening the role of higher education institutions as actors of local development [31].

One of the principal obstacles faced by communities is limited financial capacity [20]. Many territorial communities operate under constrained budgets, which complicates the implementation of large-scale projects aimed at improving infrastructure, education, or healthcare. This challenge has been significantly exacerbated by the war, which has led to a decline in economic activity and a widening fiscal deficit. Losses of up to 50 percent of production capacity and a reduction in tax revenues have been recorded, substantially limiting opportunities for self-financing [24]. In addition, bureaucratic barriers and the complexity and duration of administrative procedures may deter potential investors and entrepreneurs from undertaking business projects [32]. Community development is further constrained by a range of systemic barriers, among which the most critical are limited financial resources, shortages of qualified personnel, insufficient project management and foreign language competencies, and the predominance of operational activities over strategic planning, which is crucial for aligning with economic policy and EU standards [31-34]. While the war did not create these problems, it has significantly intensified them, making the implementation of adaptive and innovative models of resource management and crisis management an urgent necessity.

**Conclusions and prospects for further research.** The synthesis of the research findings indicates that effective resource management of territorial communities under crisis and wartime conditions requires a transition from fragmented, reactive approaches to a holistic, multifactor model that integrates financial, material and technical, human, informational, and intangible resources on the basis of systematic structuring and functional classification of management instruments. The proposed approach makes it possible to organize the toolkit of local governance, enhance the robustness of managerial decision-making, and strengthen the institutional capacity of communities in contexts characterized by constrained resources and high uncertainty.



This approach also highlights the growing importance of insurance instruments as an integral component of multifactor resource management models, particularly in terms of risk mitigation, financial resilience, and post-war recovery of territorial communities. In addition, it addresses the necessity of preparing communities to cope with labor market shocks and migration challenges, enhancing community resilience, and improving the resource provision of international activity through participatory and evidence-based practices.

The proposed systematization of resource management instruments is consistent with the principles and standards of EU economic policy and governance, particularly regarding good governance, digitalization, sustainability, inclusiveness, and multi-level coordination, while also addressing the specific challenges of crisis management, post-conflict reconstruction, and wartime conditions.

Future research avenues should focus on the empirical validation of the proposed classification at the level of individual territorial communities, the development of indicators to assess the effectiveness of different resource groups, and the exploration of mechanisms for integrating digital, participatory, project-based, and culturally oriented instruments into the practice of post-war recovery and the long-term development of local communities. Moreover, further studies could examine the role of international projects in crisis conditions in strengthening the capacity of local governance, mobilizing human capital, and fostering resilient, adaptive development models under high uncertainty.

**Acknowledgement.** *The authors express their sincere gratitude to the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine for supporting this research. The implementation of the study was made possible within the framework of the research project (State Registration No. 0126U003572) under international scientific and technological cooperation, in accordance with the Protocol of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Ukraine–NATO Joint Working Group on Scientific and Environmental Cooperation dated 4 July 2017. The authors also acknowledge the National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute” for facilitating the funding arrangements approved on 23 January 2026 (No. 05.02/47/26) within the NATO Programme “Science for Peace and Security”.*

**Funding.** *This research was funded with the support of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. The article was carried out within the framework of the research project (State Registration No. 0126U003572) funded by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine as part of international scientific and technological cooperation, in accordance with the Protocol of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Ukraine–NATO Joint Working Group on Scientific and Environmental Cooperation dated 4 July 2017, and the list approved by the National Technical University of Ukraine ‘Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute’ dated 23 January 2026 of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine No05.02/47/26, regarding the provision of funding for the research project under the NATO Programme “Science for Peace and Security”.*

**Conflicts of Interest:** *The author declares no conflicts of interest.*

**Declaration on the use of AI.** *During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used an artificial intelligence-based language editing tool (Grammarly) to assist with translation and grammar refinement. The tool was used solely for linguistic support. All scientific content, interpretations, results, and conclusions are entirely the responsibility and intellectual contribution of the authors.*



## References

1. McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1212–1241. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226464>
2. Emery, M., & Flora, C. (2006). Spiraling-up: Mapping community transformation with community capitals framework. *Community Development*, 37(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330609490152>
3. Postek, L., & Walerych, M. (2026). The impact of Ukrainian immigration on labour market dynamics in Poland: A Bayesian VAR analysis. *Economic Modelling*, (155), Article 107441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2025.107441>
4. Wagle, U. R. (2024). Labor migration, remittances, and the economy in the Gulf Cooperation Council region. *Comparative Migration Studies*, (12), Article 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-024-00390-3>
5. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. (2006). *Vulnerability and capacity assessment: Lessons learned and recommendations*. IFRC. <https://www.ifrc.org/docs/idrl/I1040EN.pdf>
6. Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.04.002>
7. Fuentes, M., Cárdenas, J. P., Olivares, G., Rasmussen, E., Urbina, C., Salazar, S., & Vidal, G. (2024). *Harnessing network science for urban resilience: The CASA model's approach to social and environmental challenges*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.08015>
8. De Iuliis, M., Kammouh, O., & Cimellaro, G. P. (2022). *Measuring and improving community resilience: A fuzzy logic approach*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.04335>
9. Hrymak, I. (2024). The role of the public in the formation and improvement of governance for creating a favorable environment for the development of territorial communities. *Publichne upravlinnia: kontseptsii, paradyhma, rozvytok, udoskonalennia*, (8), 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2786-6246-2024-8-44-54> [in Ukrainian].
10. Korchynska, O., Yaremko, I., Bilyk, O., Dorosh, I., & Myroshnychenko, A. (2025). Public administration tools for building local communities: Challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 1(11), 45–56. <https://oidaijsd.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/18-11-04-03-UR3-25-OK.pdf>
11. Chernenko, N., Korohodova, O., & Hlushchenko, Y. (2025). Crisis management in the local communities through the development of human capital. *Achievements of the Economy: Prospects and Innovations*, (20). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15846559>
12. Chernenko, N. O., Korohodova, O. O., & Hlushchenko, Ya. I. (2025). Theoretical and methodological foundations and practical instruments of resource provision of local communities. *Zdobutky ekonomiky: perspektyvy ta innovatsii*, (20). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16384599> [in Ukrainian].
13. Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1–2), 127–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6>
14. Pakhnenko, O. M. (2022). The essence and components of community resilience in the context of COVID-19. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, (39). <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2022-39-51> [in Ukrainian].
15. Stolyaryk, O. (2025). Modern conceptions of community resilience: Lessons for training social workers. *Social Work and Education*, 12(1), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.25128/2520-6230.25.1.8> [in Ukrainian].
16. Mamatova, T., & Borysenko, V. (2023). The theoretical foundations of studying public administration processes in ensuring the resilience of territorial communities in Ukraine.



- Derzhavne upravlinnia ta mistseve samovriaduvannia*, (2). <https://doi.org/10.32782/2414-4436/2023-2-9> [in Ukrainian].
17. Baćilo, I. (2025). Rescue Light Communication System (RLCS): Enhancing emergency signaling in crisis situations. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.18485/ijdrm.2025.7.1.4>
  18. Vasylychenko, H., Parasiuk, I., & Yeremenko, N. (2015). *Planning the development of territorial communities: A textbook for local government officials*. TOV “Pidpryemstvo ‘VI EN EI’”. <https://www.auc.org.ua/sites/default/files/library/1plangrweb.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
  19. Hlushchenko, Ya., Korohodova, O., Moiseienko, T., & Chernenko, N. (2024). Features and principles of foresight of international activity. *Pidpryemnytstvo ta innovatsii*, (33), 144–150. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2415-3583/33.25> [in Ukrainian].
  20. How to effectively implement project management in communities? (2024). *Merezha UPLAN*. <https://uplan.org.ua/news/iak-efektyvno-vprovadzhuvaty-proiektnyi-menedzhment-u-hromady> [in Ukrainian].
  21. European Commission. (2020). *Digital Economy and Society Index (DESI) 2020: Methodological note*. [https://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/dae/document.cfm?doc\\_id=67082](https://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=67082)
  22. Meijer, A., & Bolívar, M. P. R. (2016). Governing the smart city: A review of the literature on smart urban governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82(2), 392–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314564308>
  23. Klievink, B., Romijn, B. J., Cunningham, S., et al. (2017). Big data in the public sector: Uncertainties and readiness. *Information Systems Frontiers*, (19), 267–283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-016-9686-2>
  24. Stonianska, I. Z. (Ed.). (2022). *Challenges and priorities of asset management of territorial communities under wartime conditions: Scientific and analytical report*. DU “Instytut rehionalnykh doslidzhen imeni M. I. Dolishnoho NAN Ukrainy”. <https://ird.gov.ua/irdp/p20220034.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
  25. Sofianopoulos, S., Faka, A., & Chalkias, C. (2025). SDI-enabled smart governance: A review (2015–2025) of IoT, AI and geospatial technologies: Applications and challenges. *Land*, 14(7), Article 1399. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land14071399>
  26. European Commission. (2024). *Report on the state of the Digital Decade 2024*. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/report-state-digital-decade-2024>
  27. United Nations Development Programme. (2023). UNDP announces a grant to enhance the capacity of regional and local development agencies in partner communities. *United Nations Development Programme in Ukraine*. <https://www.undp.org/uk/ukraine/news/proon-oholoshuyehrant-dlya-pokrashchennya-spromozhnosti-ahentsiy-rehionalnoho-ta-mistsevoho-rozvytku-u-partnerskykh-hromadakh> [in Ukrainian].
  28. Ushenko, N., & Kurochka, O. (2025). State and dynamics of human capital development: Cross-country comparisons of the EU and Ukraine. *Chasopys ekonomichnykh reform*, (4), 123–134. [in Ukrainian].
  29. Chernenko, N., & Hlushchenko, Ya. (2025). Resource provision of communities and resilience of critical infrastructure under crisis conditions. *Acta Academiae Beregsasiensis. Economics*, (10), 263–275. <https://doi.org/10.58423/2786-6742/2025-10-263-275> [in Ukrainian].
  30. LRHub. (2023). *Strengthening community capacity for recovery through piloting cooperation with universities*. <https://lrhub.org.ua/en/projects/21> [in Ukrainian].
  31. National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute.” (n.d.). *Policy on cooperation with the local community to improve healthcare and well-being systems, including programs for displaced persons or refugees*. <https://kpi.ua/policy/local> [in Ukrainian].
  32. Pronko, L. M., Zataidukh, K. Yu., & Chornyi, Ya. I. (2024). Economic development of territorial communities: Essence, features and strategic prospects. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, (59). <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2024-59-65> [in Ukrainian].



33. Zhydyk, Ya., & Didur, I. (2025). Top 3 obstacles preventing communities from developing projects and attracting funding. *Detsentralizatsiia v Ukraini*. <https://decentralization.ua/news/19457> [in Ukrainian].
34. Hlushchenko, Y., Korohodova, O., Chernenko, N., & Moiseienko, T. (2023). The path to Industry 5.0: A green economy evolution and energy innovations for sustainable development. *Economic Bulletin of NTUU KPI*, (26), 18–24. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2307-5651.26.2023.287404>

<i>Отримано:</i>	03.01.2026	<i>Beérkezett:</i>	2026.01.03	<i>Received:</i>	03.01.2026
<i>Прийнято до друку:</i>	30.04.2026	<i>Elfogadva:</i>	2026.04.30	<i>Accepted:</i>	30.04.2026
<i>Опубліковано:</i>	29.05.2026	<i>Megjelent:</i>	2026.05.29	<i>Published:</i>	29.05.2026