Bikulov, D., Zaika, O. & Onyshchenko, O. (2026). Organizational and managerial mechanisms for implementing public-private partnerships in civil protection at the local community level. Management and Entrepreneurship: Trends of Development, 3(37), 463-473. https://doi.org/10.26661/2522-1566/2026-3/37-33

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

RECEIVED:
19 July 2026
ACCEPTED:
20 September 2026
RELEASED:
20 October 2026

CC BY 4.0

UDC 352:351.862:334.012.64

DOI 10.26661/2522-1566/2026-3/37-33

ORGANIZATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IN CIVIL PROTECTION AT THE LOCAL COMMUNITY LEVEL

Damir Bikulov
Doctor of Public Administration, Professor
Zaporizhzhia National University
Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
ORCID 0000-0001-9188-7310

Olena Zaika
Candidate of Sciences in Public Administration, Associate Professor
Zaporizhzhia National University
Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
ORCID 0000-0002-1931-5091

Oksana Onyshchenko
Candidate of Sciences in Public Administration, Associate Professor
Zaporizhzhia National University
Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
ORCID 0000-0002-3009-3856

**Corresponding author email: Elcoronelnotiene1974@gmail.com*

Annotation. Engaging private business in civil protection is becoming a key driver of managerial transformation, completely overhauling approaches to resource mobilization and sustaining the livelihood of territorial communities. Due to military threats, the continuous destruction of infrastructure, and funding shortages in local budgets, Ukraine requires a reliable cooperation model that ensures rapid response, transparency, and trust between the authorities and entrepreneurs. The purpose of this study is to summarize the fundamental approaches to community resilience and develop new managerial mechanisms for state-business collaboration in civil defense at the level of local self-government bodies (LSGBs). The research methodology involves applying a systems approach to analyze the territorial community as an integrated ecosystem. Additionally, methods of structural-functional analysis, comparison, and synthesis were used to form new cooperation algorithms. This methodology enabled the creation of a synergistic complex of mechanisms tailored to Ukrainian crisis conditions. The results of the study revealed that existing models (concessions, emergency financial redistribution, requisitions) focus on ineffective or outdated aspects, creating a legal vacuum and leading to the economic exhaustion of investors. In response, a comprehensive set of tools was developed to legally mobilize private business resources, alleviate entrepreneurs' fears of forced asset requisition, and ensure the continuous operation of infrastructure. Its structural logic incorporates cross-financing of shelters, the issuance of targeted municipal bonds, the emergency sharing of backup capacities, and the creation of autonomous energy zones. The practical results of the study lies in the fact that the proposed mechanisms have the potential to transform chaotic charity into a legally protected and economically justified partnership within the local public administration ecosystem.

Keywords: public-private partnership, civil protection, local self-government bodies, community resilience, organizational and managerial mechanisms, martial law, resilience
JEL Classification: H41, H44, H84, P35, R58, O33

INTRODUCTION

Due to the full-scale armed aggression and the continuous destruction of critical infrastructure, the public administration system has faced new challenges, whereby the responsibility for rescuing the population and ensuring the vital functions of territories has effectively shifted to local self-government bodies (LSGBs). Since local authorities operate with significant financial deficits and a shortage of specialized equipment, local private business remains the only reliable source of heavy machinery, generators, experts, and building materials at the local level. Currently, the interaction between the government and entrepreneurs in the security sector takes place mostly in an ad hoc «manual» mode, where local self-government bodies rely either on voluntary contributions, which leads to the rapid economic depletion of the private sector, or on mechanisms of forced property seizure, which significantly undermines investor confidence. Because the organizational and managerial tools that would ensure a legal, systemic, and mutually beneficial public-private partnership (PPP) in the field of civil protection are currently neither legally enshrined nor methodologically developed, there is a need to create new mechanisms capable of consolidating the individual initiatives of entrepreneurs into a cohesive institutional system for territorial protection.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The issues of community resilience, civil protection, and the adaptation of public-private governance have been studied in detail in the works of many international and domestic experts. The fundamental rules of joint interaction between government and business in the format of broad public participation are described in the analysis by Lutsevych and Barbieri (2026). The theoretical foundations of utilizing PPPs (public-private partnerships) to address social needs and sustainable development goals are examined in detail by Zapatrina (2018), while Krylova and Hlushchenko (2025) have developed tools for assessing the effectiveness of existing partnership mechanisms in Ukraine. The practical aspects of modeling the impact of martial law on regional infrastructure and the role of public administration in its restoration were investigated by Vasina et al. (2024). Special attention is given to the institutional role of government authorities in the context of crises and inclusive recovery. In particular, Zhukovska and Zheliuk (2025) emphasize the inclusive development of territorial communities under wartime conditions, while Sychova and Samofalova (2023) study in detail the mechanisms of public-private partnership specifically in the context of Ukraine’s post-war recovery. Regular changes in local finances and planning under conditions of uncertainty are thoroughly described in the studies by Vakulenko et al. (2025), and Bedriy et al. (2025) outline the financial and legal mechanisms for ensuring sustainable development and basic human rights through local government bodies. The role of local self-government as a key institutional factor in community resilience during the war is substantiated in the work of Kramarenko (2026). Furthermore, Kouskoura et al. (2026) consider civil protection itself as one of the ten defining factors of stable regional competitiveness. Issues of national resilience in the face of Russian aggression and preparation for post-war recovery are widely covered in the research by Khoma (2024).

Despite a significant body of research, most authors consider PPPs as a macroeconomic tool for long-term reconstruction or focus exclusively on state finances. However, a practical problem still exists at the local level, where there is a lack of clear, legally secure organizational and managerial mechanisms that would allow local authorities to rapidly mobilize private business resources for civil

protection purposes «here and now» (without the risk of forced asset expropriation and the economic depletion of investors).

PAPER OBJECTIVE

The purpose of the article is the theoretical and conceptual substantiation, critical audit of existing approaches and development of new original organizational and managerial mechanisms for implementing public-private partnerships in the field of civil protection at the territorial community level. Achieving this purpose involves the following task. 1. to systematize the existing conceptual approaches to understanding PPPs in the security sector; 2. to analyze the practical tools of interaction and identify their critical limitations during martial law; 3. to propose a comprehensive set of mechanisms for managing the resources of local self-government bodies and businesses.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological basis of the study is a systemic approach, which allows the territorial community to be perceived as a cohesive ecosystem where business and local self-government bodies (LSGBs) are closely interconnected elements of a shared security system. During the research, we utilized the methods of structural-functional analysis (to identify the legal and economic weaknesses of existing modes of cooperation), comparison (to compare theoretical concepts of resilience), and synthesis (to develop comprehensive new organizational and managerial mechanisms for stakeholder interaction).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

To establish a solid foundation for the research, it is necessary to systematize the existing views of researchers regarding the interaction system. First, the very concept of involving business in civil protection at the local level should be defined. To this end, we have compiled Table 1, which structures the main philosophical, risk-oriented, and social concepts of private sector engagement in security initiatives. This approach will enable local self-government bodies (LSGBs) to clearly comprehend the complexity of the problem and consciously select approaches for the subsequent development of practical mechanisms.

The conducted analysis of theoretical and conceptual approaches to defining organizational and managerial mechanisms of PPPs in the field of civil protection (Table 1) allows us to trace how the vision of the role of local self-government bodies (LSGBs) is changing. The «Whole-of-Society» model, substantiated by Lutsevych and Barbieri (2026), is based on the idea of shared responsibility. Its implementation changes the traditional governance model, where the state no longer holds a complete monopoly on protection, and local self-government bodies shift from being the sole executor to a coordinator that shares responsibility with equal private partners. The next approach, the «Infrastructure risk management methodology», which draws on the works of Krylova and Hlushchenko (2025), offers a practical assessment of the effectiveness of PPP mechanisms. This approach provides managers with a clear financial dimension, allowing local authorities not merely to rely on intuition, but to mathematically prove the benefits of joint investments and calculate the consequences of risk allocation between the budget and the investor as early as the planning stage.

The third concept, which envisions «Inclusive community recovery», studied by Zhukovska and Zheliuk (2025), focuses on stakeholder engagement and social justice. It demonstrates that an equitable approach to reconstruction planning is crucial for ensuring the access of the most vulnerable groups to safe spaces and, consequently, significantly reduces social tension. In turn, the «Decentralized resilience model», developed by Kramarenko (2026), stems from the need for local authorities to independently respond to large-scale challenges at any point in the country. This

eISSN 2522-1566
ISSUE 3 (37), 2026

approach forces local municipalities to take full responsibility, stimulating them to develop non-standard contracts with local businesses without long waits for top-down directives.

Table 1

Theoretical and conceptual approaches to defining organizational and managerial mechanisms of PPPs in the field of civil protection

№	Conceptual approach	Content and nature of the approach	Impact assessment and significance for LSGB management
1	«Whole-of-Society» model	Philosophy of shared responsibility, where the state, LSGBs, and the private sector act as equal actors in crisis response	Changes the governance paradigm. The LSGB delegates part of the security monopoly to the private sector, acting as a moderator rather than the sole executor
2	Infrastructure risk management methodology	Assessment of effectiveness and risk allocation between the state and business during the operational stages of PPPs	Allows municipalities to mathematically and financially substantiate the feasibility of local budget investments in joint projects
3	Concept of inclusive community recovery	Involving local stakeholders in reconstruction planning, ensuring access of vulnerable population groups to safe spaces	Ensures the targeted use of funds and reduces social tension by transforming business facilities into shelters for the community
4	Decentralized resilience model	The postulate regarding the central government's inability to instantly respond to all challenges, which determines the institutional autonomization of local LSGBs	Forces city halls to take responsibility and develop local, non-standard contracts with businesses without waiting for directives from the center
5	Modeling regional infrastructure recovery	Application of models assessing the impact of martial law on infrastructure to enhance the role of public administration	Allows authorities to objectively assess destruction and coordinate reconstruction with the involvement of private capital
6	Concept of PPP orientation towards sustainable development and regional competitiveness (SDG)	Physical modernization of infrastructure through comprehensive models, taking into account environmental and security imperatives	Transforms industrial zones into real population rescue centers, integrating investor capital into the long-term viability of territories

Source: (Lutsevych, Barbieri, 2026; Krylova, Hlushchenko, 2025; Zhukovska, Zheliuk, 2025; Kramarenko, 2026; Vasina et al., 2024; Zapatrina, 2018; Kouskoura et al., 2026)

This system is complemented by «Modeling regional infrastructure recovery», which relies on the analysis by Vasina et al. (2024). As the authors note, modeling the impact of martial law on

infrastructure requires new approaches to reconstruction from public administration, enabling authorities to objectively assess destruction and coordinate resources. The final element is the «Concept of PPP orientation towards sustainable development and regional competitiveness», advocated by Zapatrina (2018) and Kouskoura et al. (2026). This concept shifts cooperation into the realm of long-term physical modernization, where combining investor funds with environmental standards makes it possible to transform ordinary industrial zones into modern population rescue centers, firmly integrating business into the future security of territories.

For the practical application of theoretical and conceptual approaches to community resilience, it is necessary to identify the real managerial obstacles that hinder their successful coordination. That is why Table 2 was formed, reflecting a critical analysis of existing cooperation mechanisms. This overview will help highlight the key reasons for the failure of traditional management tools, which balance between excessive bureaucracy and direct coercion. Understanding these shortcomings will be the first step towards justifying the complete abandonment of outdated practices.

Table 2

Analysis of existing mechanisms for the implementation of public-private partnerships under wartime conditions

№	Type of existing mechanism (Tool)	Characteristics of functioning	Critical limitations and challenges under martial law
1	Classical concession of infrastructure facilities	Long-term transfer of property management rights with a strict fixation of profit and risk allocation	Complete inability of the parties to guarantee profit under conditions of unpredictable destruction; excessive duration of preparatory procedures
2	Emergency reallocation of local finances	Constant, chaotic redirection of LSGB capital expenditures to current civil protection needs	Disrupts strategic planning. The lack of clear algorithms for co-financing with business creates budget gaps
3	Emergency situational interaction agreements	Ad hoc «manual» telephone management, where authorities ask businesses to provide equipment based on verbal agreements	Creates a legal vacuum. In the event of equipment destruction, businesses have no legal grounds for claiming damages from the state
4	Ensuring basic rights through local budgets	Use of exclusively financial and legal tools of LSGBs to guarantee population security	Limited fiscal base of LSGBs. Without the institutional mobilization of business resources, the community is unable to finance all shelters
5	Algorithm for public-private co-financing	Proportional allocation of funds from the LSGB budget and business accounts for the modernization of joint security systems	Constant delays in treasury payments by the state paralyze settlements, leaving the investor alone with the expense
6	Military-civilian requisition (seizure)	Forced seizure of assets (transport, premises) for protection needs with subsequent, delayed compensation	Breeds total investor distrust. Businesses begin to conceal assets, as the procedure for future compensation is extremely vague.

Source: (Sychova, Samofalova, 2023; Vakulenko et al., 2025; Bedriy et al., 2025; Khoma, 2024)

The analysis of existing cooperation mechanisms (Table 2) clearly shows that classical tools cannot meet the speed and scale of martial law threats. In particular, the «Classical concession of

infrastructure facilities», the use of which in the context of Ukraine's post-war recovery was studied by Sychova and Samofalova (2023), has a primary drawback its orientation toward long-term stability. Under conditions of constant shelling, no local self-government body (LSGB) can guarantee a private partner a stable flow of clients and a fixed profit. Furthermore, lengthy, multi-month bureaucratic approval procedures make concessions absolutely unsuitable for a rapid response to civil protection needs. As for the «Emergency reallocation of local finances» studied in detail by Vakulenko et al. (2025), here the authorities are constantly forced to sacrifice planned community expenditures to eliminate current destruction. This chaotic «firefighting» process not only paralyzes the strategic planning of local self-government bodies (LSGBs) but also causes an acute shortage of funds, since there are still no clear algorithms for co-financing with local business.

The next mechanism, «Emergency situational interaction agreements», boils down to the widespread practice of ad hoc «manual» telephone management. City halls often appeal to entrepreneurs with requests to provide heavy machinery or materials, relying solely on verbal agreements and corporate social responsibility. However, this creates a dangerous legal vacuum where, for example, in the event a private excavator is destroyed during debris removal, the owner officially has no legal grounds to demand compensation for the damages from the state. Attempts to «Ensure basic human rights exclusively through local budgets» as analyzed by Bedriy et al. (2025), inevitably face a lack of funds in communities. Without the continuous involvement of entrepreneurs' funds, no community is physically capable of independently financing the construction of the required number of shelters. The «Algorithm for public-private co-financing» mechanism, which theoretically should equitably distribute the costs of both parties, in practice regularly encounters insurmountable obstacles from the state bureaucratic apparatus. Regular delays in treasury payments by the central government completely block timely settlements, leaving the private investor alone with the financial burden of an unfinished security project.

The most radical mechanism that can be highlighted is «Military-civilian asset requisition», the consequences of which are considered in the context of maintaining national resilience in the works of Khoma (2024). The practice of forced seizure of transport or industrial spaces for defense and protection needs, accompanied by extremely vague and delayed promises of future compensation, breeds complete investor distrust toward the authorities. Instead of cooperating, businesses begin to massively conceal their assets, move resources into the shadow economy, and withdraw capital from the region. All this proves that the current managerial tools of local self-government bodies (LSGBs) not only fail to provide reliable protection but also entail devastating consequences for the local economy.

The deep crisis of existing tools requires fundamentally new managerial solutions. Businesses must be given clear incentives to share their capacities, and local self-government bodies (LSGBs) must have legal instruments to mobilize these resources. To eliminate these legal problems, Table 3 has been compiled, proposing a comprehensive set of new cooperation tools. Their implementation will help transition the parties relations into a transparent legal framework, guarantee the preservation of private capital, and make the protection of territories an economically viable process.

The presented analysis of the proposed comprehensive organizational and managerial mechanisms of PPPs in the field of civil protection and their implementation (Table 3) defines a conceptual shift from coercive administration in favor of a pragmatic economic partnership.

Considering the first mechanism, «Official guarantees of property protection in exchange for cooperation», the greatest barrier to trust is eliminated. Instead of vague threats, local authorities offer the private sector legally binding agreements that guarantee a waiver of the military-civilian requisition of specific assets. In exchange for this «immunity», businesses agree to openly register their heavy machinery in the databases of local self-government bodies (LSGBs) for potential use. The practical consequence of this mechanism is that entrepreneurs stop hiding their production equipment in the «shadows», understanding that their call-up for the liquidation of shelling

consequences will be carried out exclusively with their voluntary consent, and any potential damage to the equipment will be fully covered by targeted insurance.

Table 3

Comprehensive set of organizational and managerial mechanisms for PPPs in the field of civil protection and their implementation

№	Proposed mechanism	Mechanism's operating algorithm	Practical implementation of the mechanism in community conditions
1	Official guarantees of property protection in exchange for cooperation	LSGBs provide official guarantees of non-interference (documentary waiver of requisition) in exchange for the voluntary integration of business equipment into municipal registers	Eliminates business main fear the loss of assets. Entrepreneurs openly declare excavators, knowing that their call-up for an emergency will be voluntary and protected by LSGB insurance
2	Cross-financing of shelter construction	IT and service companies without their own premises finance the capital construction of bunkers at large city factories in exchange for workplace quotas	Monetizes empty industrial basements and relieves the burden on the budget. Guarantees continuous operations for office businesses during air-raid alerts without stopping production
3	Targeted municipal bonds for security needs	The LSGB issues targeted local bonds, payments for which are tied to the deployment of a network of water wells or heating points purchased by local businesses	Transforms charity into investments. The community receives «quick» money for special equipment, and the investor receives a fixed interest rate for the city hall's successful security policy
4	Delegating security tasks to businesses in exchange for benefits	Transfer of municipal tasks (water delivery, property protection after shelling) to private logistics companies in exchange for reduced rental rates on municipal property	Allows LSGBs to avoid maintaining excessive staff and equipment. Functions are performed faster and with higher quality due to the highly specialized expertise of the corporate sector
5	Emergency shared use of reserve capacities	Implementation of digital agreements under which the right to use business generators automatically transfers to rescuers exclusively at the moment an emergency is declared	Eliminates bureaucracy. The generator powers a supermarket in peacetime, but in seconds legally switches to a neighboring «invincibility center» (relief shelter) during a blackout
6	Creation of autonomous energy islands for micro-districts	Engineering integration of the resources of several neighboring enterprises and a municipal institution into a single closed security hub	Guarantees the survival of micro-districts regardless of the state of the central grid. Companies and the LSGB share fuel and security costs strictly proportionally

Source: own study

eISSN 2522-1566
ISSUE 3 (37), 2026

The next mechanism is «Cross-financing of shelter construction», which solves the problem of the uneven distribution of physical capital. Service sector companies that have significant liquidity but lack access to deep shelters act as direct donors for the capital repair of bomb shelters on the territories of old factories. Instead of money, the authorities guarantee these investors fixed quotas for equipped workplaces in these bunkers. This allows for the monetization of colossal industrial downtimes, saves the community budget, and ensures the continuity of economic processes for office businesses even during prolonged air raid alerts.

Analyzing the next mechanism, «Targeted municipal bonds for security needs», facilitates the attraction of «long-term» money. Instead of constantly asking businesses for non-refundable charitable contributions, local self-government bodies (LSGBs) officially issue debt securities, the funds from which are strictly «earmarked» and directed exclusively toward achieving specific goals. By purchasing these bonds, local entrepreneurs transform their social responsibility expenses into a real investment, which, in the event of the successful stabilization of the city's vital functions, will be returned to them with a guaranteed interest rate.

Turning attention to the next mechanism, «Delegating security tasks to businesses in exchange for benefits», local self-government bodies (LSGBs) find a way out of the massive staff shortage in municipal services. City halls do not try to hire new drivers or security guards who are absent from the market, but officially transfer the tasks of delivering drinking water or patrolling facilities to private logistics companies. Payment for this work is not made with scarce budget funds, but through a legal, mutually beneficial reduction in rental rates for municipal land or warehouses, which improves the quality of services thanks to the contractor’s specialized expertise.

The mechanism of «Emergency shared use of reserve capacities» is based on the application of instant-action digital contracts. It legally establishes a rule under which the right to use a powerful generator of a large shopping center automatically, without any paper approvals, transfers to the control of rescuers exclusively from the moment a disaster is officially declared. In peacetime, this installation operates uninterruptedly for the owner’s profit, but in the event of a blackout, it instantly switches to power critical neighboring nodes, eliminating the bureaucratic red tape that usually costs human lives.

The final presented mechanism, «Creation of autonomous energy islands for micro-districts», translates the idea of partnership into a physical, engineering dimension. Instead of isolated survival, several neighboring enterprises unite with the nearest public institution (a school or hospital), creating a single closed form of interaction with a shared deep well and a megawatt-class industrial generator. The financial burden for purchasing fuel and maintaining security is distributed between local self-government bodies (LSGBs) and businesses strictly in proportion to the consumed resources. Ultimately, this creates a network of unbreakable micro-districts capable of functioning as complete energy islands even in the event of the total destruction of main grids.

CONCLUSION

The research results show that the traditional centralized model of civil protection has lost its effectiveness under the conditions of armed aggression and severe resource shortages. Local self-government bodies (LSGBs) have effectively taken on the main burden of rescuing the population, facing an acute need to constantly engage the infrastructure of private business. The analysis of existing tools has shown that the use of lengthy concessions, the chaotic reallocation of budgets, or methods of military-civilian confiscation creates a dangerous legal vacuum. Authorities attempts to maintain interaction in an ad hoc «manual» mode lead to the economic depletion of entrepreneurs, the complete loss of investor trust, and the decline of the local economy. To solve this problem, a set of six comprehensive organizational and managerial PPP mechanisms was developed. These mechanisms completely change the structure of cooperation through the use of «official guarantees of property protection in exchange for cooperation», which eliminates business's fear of asset

confiscation, while «cross-financing of shelter construction» and the issuance of «targeted municipal bonds for security needs» make it possible to legally benefit from the private sector's participation in reconstruction, transforming ordinary charity into economically viable investments. At the same time, «delegating security tasks to businesses in exchange for benefits» partially overcomes the shortage of municipal utility workers, while the «emergency shared use of reserve capacities» ensures the transfer of equipment to rescuers in the first minutes of a crisis. Together, these tools form a solid foundation for the «creation of autonomous energy zones for micro-districts», capable of guaranteeing the population's survival during blackouts. Thanks to these algorithms, local self-government bodies (LSGBs) will be able to transform chaotic social solidarity into a pragmatic, legally protected partnership, which becomes the main driver for preserving investor capital and increasing the overall resilience of territories.

REFERENCES

Lutsevych, O., & Barbieri, J. (2026). Why a 'whole-of-society' model is essential for Ukraine's recovery. Chatham House, 1–76. https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/2026-06/2026-06-22-why-whole-society-model-essential-ukraines-recovery-lutsevych-barbieri.pdf [in English].

Zapatrina, I. (2018). State Support under PPP. New Challenges in the Context of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. European Procurement & Public Private Partnership Law Review, 13(4), 326-337. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21552/epppl/2018/4/10 [in English].

Krylova, I., & Hlushchenko, H. (2025). Otsinka efektyvnosti chynnykh mekhanizmiv realizatsii derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva v Ukraini [Evaluation of the effectiveness of current mechanisms for implementing public-private partnerships in Ukraine]. Filosofiia ta upravlinnia [Philosophy and Governance], (5(9)). DOI: https://doi.org/10.70651/3041-248X/2025.5.07 [in Ukrainian].

Vasina, A., Melnyk, A., Vasin, A., Bashtannyk, V., & Yevsieiev, V. (2024). Modelling the impact of martial law on regional infrastructure and the role of public administration in its restoration. Amazonia Investiga, 13(84), 237–250. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2024.84.12.15 [in English].

Zhukovska, A., & Zheliuk, T. (2025). Inkliuzyvnyi rozvytok terytorialnykh hromad v umovakh viiny ta pisliavoiennoi vidbudovy [Inclusive development of territorial communities in conditions of war and post-war reconstruction]. Visnyk Ekonomiky [Herald of Economics], (4), 24-45. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35774/ [in Ukrainian].

Sychova, V., & Samofalova, T. (2023). Derzhavno-pryvatne partnerstvo u povoiennomu vidnovlenni Ukrainy [Public-private partnership in the post-war recovery of Ukraine]. Derzhavne budivnytstvo [State Building], 2(34), 125-141. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26565/1992-2337-2023-2-10 [in Ukrainian].

Vakulenko, V., Sargiacomo, M., & Klymenko, V. (2025). Addressing complexity and planning for the uncertain: local finances in wartime Ukraine. Public Money & Management, 45(3), 206–216. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2024.2374333 [in English].

Bedriy, R., Osaulenko, S., & Shyshykin, S. (2025). Local self-government and human rights: financial and legal mechanisms for sustainable development. Baltic Journal of Economic Studies, 11(2), 287-292. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2025-11-2-287-292 [in English].

Kramarenko, S. (2026). Local self-government as an institutional factor in the resilience of local communities in wartimes. Academia Polonica, 75(2), 114-122. DOI: https://doi.org/10.23856/7514 [in English].

Kouskoura, A., Kalliontzi, E., Antoniadis, I., & Skalkos, D. (2026). Civil Protection One of the Ten Key Factors Measuring Sustainable Regional Competitiveness. Sustainability, 18(5), 2473. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su18052473 [in English].

Khoma, N. (2024). Rezylientnist Ukrainy v umovakh zbroinoi ahresii Rosii ta pidhotovky do pisliavoiennoi vidbudovy [Resilience of Ukraine in the conditions of Russia's armed aggression and preparation for post-war reconstruction]. Mizhnarodni vidnosyny, suspilni komunikatsii ta rehionalni studia [International Relations, Public Communications and Regional Studies], 2(19), 287-307. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29038/2524-2679-2024-02-287-307 [in Ukrainian].

Khoma, N. M. (2024). Natsionalna stiikist: zmist ta stratehiia zabezpechennia v umovakh viiny ta povoiennoho vidnovlennia [National resilience: content and strategy of provision in the conditions of war and post-war recovery]. Visnyk Mariupolskoho derzhavnoho universytetu. Seriia: Istoriia. Politolohiia [Bulletin of Mariupol State University. Series: History. Political Science], (38), 119-128. DOI:https://doi.org/10.34079/2226-2830-2024-14-38-119-128 [in Ukrainian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Lutsevych O., Barbieri J. Why a ‘whole-of-society’ model is essential for Ukraine’s recovery. Chatham House, 2026. 1–76 p. URL: https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/2026-06/2026-06-22-why-whole-society-model-essential-ukraines-recovery-lutsevych-barbieri.pdf

2. Zapatrina I. State Support under PPP. New Challenges in the Context of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. European Procurement & Public Private Partnership Law Review, 2018, 13(4), 326-337. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21552/epppl/2018/4/10

3. Крилова І., Глущенко Г. Оцінка ефективності чинних механізмів реалізації державно-приватного партнерства в Україні. Філософія та управління, 2025, 5(9). DOI: https://doi.org/10.70651/3041-248X/2025.5.07

4. Vasina A., Melnyk A., Vasin A., Bashtannyk V., Yevsieiev V. Modelling the impact of martial law on regional infrastructure and the role of public administration in its restoration. Amazonia Investiga, 2024, 13(84), 237–250. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2024.84.12.15

5. Жуковська А., Желюк Т. Інклюзивний розвиток територіальних громад в умовах війни та післявоєнної відбудови. Вісник Економіки, 2025, 4, 24-45. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35774/

6. Сичова В., Самофалова Т. Державно-приватне партнерство у повоєнному відновленні України. Державне будівництво, 2023, 2(34), 125-141. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26565/1992-2337-2023-2-10

7. Vakulenko V., Sargiacomo M., Klymenko V. Addressing complexity and planning for the uncertain: local finances in wartime Ukraine. Public Money & Management, 2025, 45(3), 206–216. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2024.2374333

8. Bedriy R., Osaulenko S., Shyshykin S. Local self-government and human rights: financial and legal mechanisms for sustainable development. Baltic Journal of Economic Studies, 2025, 11(2), 287-292. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2025-11-2-287-292

9. Kramarenko S. Local self-government as an institutional factor in the resilience of local communities in wartimes. Academia Polonica, 2026, 75(2), 114-122. DOI: https://doi.org/10.23856/7514

10. Kouskoura A., Kalliontzi E., Antoniadis I., Skalkos D. Civil Protection One of the Ten Key Factors Measuring Sustainable Regional Competitiveness. Sustainability, 2026, 18(5), 2473. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su18052473

11. Хома Н. Резильєнтність України в умовах збройної агресії Росії та підготовки до післявоєнної відбудови. Міжнародні відносини, суспільні комунікації та регіональні студії, 2024, 2(19), 287-307. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29038/2524-2679-2024-02-287-307

12. Хома Н. М. Національна стійкість: зміст та стратегія забезпечення в умовах війни та повоєнного відновлення. Вісник Маріупольського державного університету. Серія:

Bikulov, D., Zaika, O. & Onyshchenko, O. (2026). Organizational and managerial mechanisms for implementing public-private partnerships in civil protection at the local community level. Management and Entrepreneurship: Trends of Development, 3(37), 463-473. https://doi.org/10.26661/2522-1566/2026-3/37-33

Історія. Політологія, 2024, 38, 119-128. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34079/2226-2830-2024-14-38-119-128

ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНО-УПРАВЛІНСЬКІ МЕХАНІЗМИ РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ ПУБЛІЧНО-ПРИВАТНОГО ПАРТНЕРСТВА У СФЕРІ ЦИВІЛЬНОГО ЗАХИСТУ НА РІВНІ МІСЦЕВИХ ГРОМАД

Бікулов Д. Т.
Запорізький національний університет
Запоріжжя, Україна

Заїка О. В.
Запорізький національний університет
Запоріжжя, Україна

Онищенко О. А.
Запорізький національний університет
Запоріжжя, Україна

Залучення приватного бізнесу до сфери цивільного захисту стає головним рушієм змін в управлінні, що повністю оновлює підходи до мобілізації ресурсів і забезпечення життя територіальних громад. Через воєнні загрози, постійне руйнування інфраструктури та нестачу грошей у місцевих бюджетах Україна потребує надійної моделі співпраці, яка гарантуватиме швидке реагування, прозорість і довіру між владою та підприємцями. Метою даного дослідження є узагальнення основних підходів до стійкості громад та розробку нових управлінських механізмів для спільної роботи держави і бізнесу у сфері цивільного захисту на рівні органів місцевого самоврядування (ОМС). Методологією дослідження є застосування системного підходу до аналізу територіальної громади як цілісної екосистеми. Додатково використано методи структурно-функціонального аналізу, порівняння, а також синтезу для формування нових алгоритмів співпраці. Дана методологія дозволила створити синергетичний комплекс механізмів, адаптований до українських кризових умов. Результатами дослідження стало виявлення того, що наявні моделі (концесії, екстрений перерозподіл фінансів, реквізиції) зосереджуються на неефективних або застарілих аспектах, створюючи правовий вакуум та економічне виснаження інвесторів. У відповідь на це було розроблено комплекс інструментів, які дозволять легально мобілізувати ресурси приватного бізнесу, усунути побоювання підприємців перед примусовою реквізицією активів та забезпечити безперервність роботи інфраструктури, а його структурна логіка передбачатиме перехресне фінансування укриттів, випуск цільових муніципальних облігацій, екстрене спільне використання резервних потужностей та створення автономних енерго-зон. Практична значимість дослідження постає в тому, що запропоновані механізми мають потенціал перетворити хаотичну благодійність у юридично захищене та економічно обґрунтоване партнерство в екосистемі публічного управління на місцевому рівні.

Ключові слова: публічно-приватне партнерство, цивільний захист, органи місцевого самоврядування, стійкість громад, організаційно-управлінські механізми, воєнний стан, резильєнтність.