

УДК 35.07:351.86

<https://doi.org/10.62664/cpa.2025.02.16>

Vitalii MALIMON,

Associate Professor of the Department of Public Administration,

Management and National Security

Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas

Candidate of Science in Public Administration, Associate Professor

ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0446-3902>

(© MALIMON V., 2025)

**POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION AND NATIONAL
RESILIENCE: HUMANITARIAN POLICY AS A FACTOR
IN INSTITUTIONAL REFORM
OF THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM**

Post-war recovery is increasingly moving beyond purely material reconstruction and emerging as a comprehensive transformation aimed at restoring and building the capacity of public authorities to ensure security, provide basic services continuously, and strengthen social cohesion in conditions of prolonged uncertainty, recurring threats, and resource constraints. With this approach, the decisive result is not only the volume of reconstructed objects, but above all the stability of the management system — the ability of institutions to act consistently, coherently and fairly, maintaining public trust and the manageability of public processes.

The purpose of this article is to provide a scientific justification for the mechanisms through which humanitarian policy can act as a factor in the institutional renewal of the public administration system, as well as to develop

proposals for their practical implementation in the context of post-war transformation.

The methodological basis of the study is a conceptual generalisation and interdisciplinary synthesis of scientific works devoted to the reform of public administration in post-conflict conditions, the manageability of humanitarian interaction, the restoration of social cohesion, crisis management and the institutional adaptation of public authorities. Analytical tools are proposed — a matrix of «humanitarian policy → institutional renewal» and a management cycle of humanitarian policy, which make it possible to build evidence-based reform design, aligning humanitarian priorities with levers of institutional capacity (regulatory framework, programme and budget planning, human resources, information systems, coordination, accountability).

The practical significance of the work lies in the formation of packages of management decisions aimed at transitioning from fragmented interventions to consistent policies: from integrated assessment of needs and risks to the introduction of service standards and delivery routes, the creation of coordinated registries and data to ensure targeting, the establishment of inter-agency and inter-level coordination, the strengthening of accountability and quality control, and the institutionalisation of «system learning» through regular evaluation of results and adjustment of management procedures.

Key words: *post-war recovery, national resilience, humanitarian policy, institutional renewal, social cohesion, public administration.*

Віталій МАЛІМОН,

доцент кафедри публічного управління,
адміністрування і національної безпеки

Івано-Франківський національний технічний університет нафти і газу

кандидат наук з державного управління, доцент

ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0446-3902>

ПОВОЄННЕ ВІДНОВЛЕННЯ ТА НАЦІОНАЛЬНА СТІЙКІСТЬ: ГУМАНІТАРНА ПОЛІТИКА ЯК ЧИННИК ІНСТИТУЦІЙНОГО ОДНОВЛЕННЯ СИСТЕМИ ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ

Повоєнне відновлення дедалі чіткіше виходить за межі суто матеріальної відбудови й постає як комплексна трансформація, спрямована на відновлення та нарощування спроможності публічної влади забезпечувати безпеку, неперервне надання базових послуг і зміцнення соціальної згуртованості в умовах тривалої невизначеності, повторюваних загроз і ресурсних обмежень. За такого підходу визначальним результатом є не лише обсяг реконструйованих об'єктів, а передусім стійкість управлінської системи — здатність інституцій діяти послідовно, узгоджено й справедливо, підтримуючи довіру населення та керованість публічних процесів.

Метою статті є наукове обґрунтування механізмів, завдяки яким гуманітарна політика може поставати чинником інституційного оновлення системи публічного управління, а також розроблення пропозицій щодо їх практичного впровадження в умовах повоєнної трансформації.

Методологічну основу дослідження становлять концептуальне узагальнення та міждисциплінарний синтез наукових праць, присвячених реформуванню публічної адміністрації в постконфліктних умовах, керованості гуманітарної взаємодії, відновленню соціальної згуртованості, кризовому управлінню та інституційній адаптації публічної влади. Запропоновано аналітичні інструменти — матрицю «гуманітарна політика → інституційне оновлення» та управлінський цикл гуманітарної політики, що дають змогу вибудовувати доказово орієнтоване проєктування реформ, узгоджуючи гуманітарні пріоритети

з важелями інституційної спроможності (нормативне регулювання, програмно-бюджетне планування, кадровий потенціал, інформаційні системи, координація, підзвітність).

Практична значущість роботи полягає у формуванні пакетів управлінських рішень, спрямованих на перехід від фрагментарних втручань до послідовної політики: від інтегрованого оцінювання потреб і ризиків — до запровадження стандартів послуг і маршрутів їх надання, створення узгоджених реєстрів і даних для забезпечення адресності, вибудовування міжвідомчої та міжрівневої координації, посилення підзвітності й контролю якості, а також інституціоналізації «навчання системи» через регулярне оцінювання результатів і коригування управлінських процедур.

Ключові слова: *повоєнне відновлення, національна стійкість, гуманітарна політика, інституційне оновлення, соціальна згуртованість, публічне управління.*

Problem statement. Post-war conditions impose a dual governance requirement on the state. First, it must rapidly restore the performance of core public functions — security and the rule of law, social protection, health care, education, and the delivery of critical services. Second, it must reconsider and normatively order the mechanisms through which these functions are guaranteed so that the administrative system can operate under sustained risk. Accordingly, the task is not a mechanical reinstatement of pre-war practices, but the construction of an institutional architecture capable of functioning amid recurrent crisis shocks, uneven and volatile resource provision, disruptions to logistics, workforce losses, and prolonged uncertainty regarding security and socio-economic trajectories. Within contemporary scholarly approaches, state resilience is understood not as the passive «*endurance*» of crisis, but as an active capacity for adaptation and recovery that secures the continuity of public

services while preserving legitimacy, public trust, and the governability of public processes [10; 11; 17].

In this framework, humanitarian policy emerges as a critically important determinant of resilience because it targets domains whose effectiveness cannot be reduced to physical reconstruction metrics: the restoration of human capital, the maintenance of social cohesion, the protection of population mental health, the strengthening of trust in institutions, the safeguarding of cultural identity, and the reproduction of a community's symbolic foundations. These intangible parameters largely determine society's capacity to interact with the state, comply with established rules, participate in recovery, and withstand social tensions. At the same time, humanitarian policy is structurally prone to fragmentation: its implementation often takes a programme- and project-based form, operates within short funding cycles, applies heterogeneous service standards, and relies on parallel decision-making channels. This increases the risk of a dual governance track — separating state procedures from those of donor and implementing actors — and complicates the institutional consolidation of achieved results.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The existing body of scholarship provides grounds to identify several conceptual and methodological pillars (key strands) that constitute the analytical framework for examining post-war recovery, national resilience, and the role of humanitarian policy in the institutional renewal of the public governance system.

Post-conflict reform of public administration

Research demonstrates that administrative transformation in post-conflict societies cannot be reduced to organisational «*reconfiguration*», staff reductions or reallocations, or the mechanical adoption of standard managerial procedures. Its effectiveness is determined by the interplay of institutional design and politico-administrative capacity, including political will, the consistency of reform implementation, the legitimacy of adopted decisions, the alignment of

key stakeholder interests, and the ability to overcome resistance to change. A recurrent emphasis is placed on the necessity of reform coherence: fragmented, non-systemic interventions in the absence of a shared концептуальна основа often generate institutional discontinuities and parallel lines of accountability [7; 12].

Governability of humanitarian interaction and networked implementation mechanisms

A distinct strand of the literature highlights the inherently multi-actor nature of the humanitarian domain, where multiple levels of government, international organisations, civil society associations, charitable foundations, private service providers, and local communities operate simultaneously. Under such conditions, outcomes depend less on the activity of individual actors than on the governability of their interaction: clearly defined participation rules, transparent resource-allocation procedures, harmonised service standards, data interoperability, and effective coordination and accountability arrangements. It is stressed that, in the absence of institutionally embedded coordination mechanisms, humanitarian efforts may devolve into a set of incompatible programmes, thereby undermining targeting accuracy, equity of access, and trust in public institutions [2; 3].

The humanitarian – development – peace triad as a basis for long-term effectiveness

Contemporary scholarship argues that resilience in post-conflict settings emerges only when short-term humanitarian support evolves into transformative development-oriented solutions and is accompanied by peacebuilding practices. Otherwise, interventions tend to produce a «*short-breath*» effect: assistance may address urgent needs quickly, yet fails to remove the structural drivers of vulnerability and does not become embedded in state procedures and financial mechanisms. Accordingly, long-term impact is linked to aligned objectives,

coordinated planning, shared performance indicators, and the integration of programmes into national governance and financing systems [13; 20].

Resilience in public governance: the relationship between administrative values and governance capacities

Conceptual studies underscore that strengthening resilience is not an «*add-on*» to governance; rather, it requires balancing potentially competing administrative values, including stability and flexibility, procedural orderliness and rapid response, centralisation and decentralisation, and control and trust. In this regard, the focus shifts to institutional capacities: risk anticipation, organisational learning, the accumulation and dissemination of knowledge about crisis decisions, the development of digital governance instruments, accountability arrangements, and stakeholder engagement as conditions for enhancing legitimacy and the quality of public policy [10; 17].

*Adaptive governance under war and recovery
(empirical evidence from Ukraine)*

Empirical studies of Ukraine indicate that, under conditions of war and post-war transformation, institutional change can be accelerated through a combination of inter-agency collaboration, partnerships with communities and civil society institutions, and the digital enablement of service delivery. Digital solutions (registries, electronic services, data exchange) function not only as technological tools but also as drivers of changes in governance practice: they influence the distribution of responsibility, reduce the time costs of coordination, enhance transparency, and can strengthen the targeting of support. At the same time, accompanying risks are emphasised, including unequal access, data fragmentation, the need for robust legal safeguards for personal data protection, and the institutional consolidation of new interaction rules within the «*state – community – partner*» triangle [11; 15].

Purpose of the study is to provide a scholarly justification of the mechanisms through which humanitarian policy can enable the institutional

renewal of the public governance system in the context of post-war recovery and the strengthening of national resilience.

Presenting main material. National resilience in wartime and the post-war period should be understood as an overarching capacity of the public governance system to maintain functional effectiveness and governability under conditions of sustained threats and uncertainty, by ensuring: 1) the continuity of life-essential public services and the preservation of a minimally sufficient infrastructural and service capacity of the state; 2) social integration, the restoration of public trust, and the reduction of risks of societal disintegration and polarisation; and 3) systematic risk anticipation and mitigation, the managed acceptance of residual risks within legally defined procedures, and organised recovery after losses through the accumulation of institutional experience and the prevention of recurrent failures in the performance of public functions. This perspective demonstrates that resilience is not a one-off outcome of reconstruction; rather, it constitutes a governed dynamic condition of public authority in which prevention, response, recovery, and the systematic improvement of administrative procedures are mutually reinforcing.

Within this logic, humanitarian policy is treated not as an isolated sector of public policy, but as a system-forming integrative mechanism that links the objectives of security, recovery, and development with the principles of justice and the protection of human rights. It shapes the regulatory and organisational conditions of access to services and support by entrenching standards of equality and non-discrimination, establishing criteria for targeting and prioritisation, designing instruments to support vulnerable groups, and creating institutional preconditions for the restoration of social ties and cooperation at the community level. As a result, humanitarian policy directly affects state legitimacy through citizens' everyday experience of interaction with institutions, their perception of fairness in resource allocation, the predictability of governance decisions, and the availability of reliable support mechanisms in crisis circumstances [8; 9; 13].

Based on a systematisation of scholarly sources, we identify six interrelated mechanisms of humanitarian policy implementation through which it can generate an institutional effect — namely, enhanced governability, predictability, accountability, and resilience of the public governance system.

(M1) Regulatory and standard-setting mechanism

The substance of humanitarian needs and legal guarantees is translated into legally *закреплені* service standards and procedural rules. This includes specifying minimum levels and quality of support, eligibility criteria, delivery algorithms and timelines, needs verification procedures, complaint and appeal mechanisms, and requirements for inter-agency information exchange. Such standardisation reduces ad hoc decision-making, narrows the scope for discretionary («*manual*») resource allocation, and strengthens legal certainty, institutional predictability, and equality of access for beneficiaries. Particularly important are standards on non-discrimination, the protection of vulnerable groups, and the provision of safe interaction procedures, especially in contexts of trauma exposure [9; 17].

(M2) Budgetary and programme-based mechanism

Institutional renewal is ensured by shifting from one-off, situational measures to a programme-targeted organisation of humanitarian policy, in which goals, objectives, expected outputs/outcomes, and performance indicators are defined ex ante and aligned with resource provision. A programme approach promotes planning discipline, comparability of expenditures and results, medium-term budgeting, and accountability for achieved effects rather than merely for funds spent. This is particularly salient under blended financing (state, local, and donor resources), where a programme framework helps avoid duplication, funding gaps, and the «*project fragmentation*» of interventions [4; 13].

(M3) Institutional and coordination mechanism

Because humanitarian policy is implemented by multiple actors across multiple levels of government, the alignment of powers and coordination becomes pivotal: defining mandates, roles, responsibility boundaries, and procedures for joint planning, interaction, and oversight. The «*humanitarian – development – peace*» linkage becomes attainable only when stable institutional «*seams*» connect immediate response with long-term recovery and social-integration programmes. In practical terms, this requires inter-agency coordination platforms, calendar synchronisation of programmes, and harmonised standards and decision-making procedures at national, regional, and local levels [2; 20].

(M4) Digital and registry-based mechanism

The resilience and governability of humanitarian policy increase through interoperable registries of beneficiaries, needs, services, and decisions, coupled with structured data exchange among institutions. This reduces duplication, improves targeting accuracy, accelerates response, and enhances procedural transparency. At the same time, digitalisation must be accompanied by robust legal safeguards: personal data protection, access segmentation, cyber-protection protocols, data-quality controls, and mechanisms for error correction. Ukraine's wartime experience indicates that digital instruments not only speed up service delivery but can also reshape institutional collaboration practices between public authorities and partners by shifting interaction toward standardised procedures and data-driven workflows [11].

(M5) Local participation and institutional embedding in communities

The long-term effectiveness of humanitarian policy increases when communities are not passive recipients of assistance but co-producers of decisions: they participate in needs identification, prioritisation, service design, quality monitoring, and feedback processes. This approach strengthens trust, improves targeting accuracy, ensures contextual fit, and supports the restoration

of horizontal social ties. The literature underscores that institutional «*embedding*» of humanitarian programmes into local structures (administrative service centres, educational institutions, primary health care, social protection services, and cultural institutions) is a critical condition for sustaining results after external financing ends [1; 15].

(M6) Institutional learning and political adaptation mechanism

Crisis periods open opportunities for accelerated revision of ineffective rules and the introduction of new solutions; however, such changes become durable only when they are institutionalised — codified in legal acts, procedures, quality standards, evaluation systems, and staff training frameworks. Institutional learning encompasses the systematic collection of results data, analysis of failures and successful practices, programme adjustment, competency development, and the formation of a culture of responsibility and evidence-based decision-making. Political adaptation is expressed in the state's capacity to recalibrate priorities and instruments in line with evolving risks without losing policy coherence or public trust [8; 18].

To support reform design, two analytical instruments are proposed:

1) The «*humanitarian policy → institutional renewal*» matrix (see Table – Diagram 1), which indicates which humanitarian strands most strongly «*feed*» institutional modernisation through rules, budgets, staffing, digital registries, partnerships, and accountability.

2) The governed humanitarian policy cycle (see Table – Diagram 2), tracing the trajectory from diagnostics to institutionalisation while specifying the critical capacities required at each stage.

The matrix presented in Table 1 captures the structural relationship between the core humanitarian policy mechanisms (M1–M6) and the governance levers of institutional renewal in the public governance system. Its analytical value lies in specifying the relative strength of each mechanism's influence on particular levers (rules and standards; programme – budget

provision; coordination and mandates; data/registries; partnerships and participation; accountability and quality).

Table 1. Core humanitarian policy mechanisms and their contribution to institutional renewal levers (scale 1-5)

	Rules & standards	Funding & programmes	Mandates & coordination	Data & registries	Partnerships & participation	Accountability & quality
M1 Regulatory & standard-setting	5	3	3	2	2	4
M2 Budget-programmatic	3	5	3	3	2	4
M3 Institutional coordination	3	3	5	3	4	4
M4 Digital & registry-based	2	3	3	5	3	4
M5 Local participation & embedding	2	3	4	3	5	3
M6 Institutional learning & adaptation	3	3	3	3	3	5

Note: 1 = low contribution; 5 = maximum contribution to the corresponding governance lever.

This makes it possible to design reforms with a clear understanding of which instrument is expected to generate a given institutional outcome. Higher scores in the matrix are interpreted as predominantly direct, scalable, and institutionalised effects — those that translate humanitarian needs and support practices into formalised rules, procedures, and organisational capacities of the governance system [9; 13; 17].

The analysis of Table 1 yields several substantive conclusions. First, the core of the institutional effect is generated by the regulatory/standard-setting mechanism (M1) and the budgetary/programme-based mechanism (M2): service standards and minimum guarantees provide legal certainty and equality of access, while programme-targeted organisation ensures resource discipline, comparability between expenditures and results, and accountability for

outcomes — particularly important under blended financing arrangements [4; 9; 13; 17]. Second, the institutional/coordination mechanism (M3) functions as a prerequisite for integrating humanitarian, recovery, and peacebuilding measures into a single governance contour: without harmonised mandates and procedures for inter-agency and multi-level interaction, the risks of parallel programming and policy fragmentation increase substantially [2; 20]. Third, the digital/registry-based mechanism (M4) enhances targeting accuracy, response speed, and quality control through data; however, its effectiveness depends on prior standardisation and on institutionally defined allocations of responsibility [11; 9]. Finally, local participation and institutional embedding (M5) and institutional learning (M6) sustain change over time: the former through co-production of policy and the rebuilding of trust at the community level, and the latter through the codification of adjustments in evaluation procedures, quality assurance, and organisational practice — thereby converting crisis experience into reproducible governance solutions [1; 8; 15; 18].

Table-Diagram 2. Governed humanitarian policy cycle for national resilience

	Data & assessment	Rules/ procedures	Finance	People	Coordination	System learning
1. Needs diagnostics	5	3	2	2	3	3
2. Risk prioritisation	4	4	3	2	4	3
3. Programme design	4	5	5	3	4	3
4. Delivery & services	3	4	4	5	4	3
5. Impact evaluation	5	3	3	3	3	5
6. Consolidation of change	3	5	4	4	4	5

Logic: from diagnostics to institutionalisation; higher values indicate critical capacities at each stage (scale 1-5).

Table – Diagram 2 serves as an evidence-informed instrument for the design and audit of humanitarian policy under conditions of war and post-war recovery. It combines two analytical layers:

1) Stages of a governed policy cycle (from diagnostics to the consolidation of change).

2) Critical governance capacities without which national resilience cannot be ensured at each stage:

data and assessment (the evidence base);

rules/procedures (legal certainty and standards);

finance (resource discipline);

people (human resources capacity and implementation capability);

coordination (alignment of mandates and decisions);

system learning (feedback loops and institutionalisation).

The 1–5 scale reflects the relative criticality of a given capacity for the successful completion of a particular stage. It is not an «*evaluation of performance quality*»; rather, it is a map of governance priorities indicating where the system must be strongest in order to avoid devolving into chaotic response, programme fragmentation, or loss of trust.

The proposed sequence reproduces a full governance loop in crisis conditions:

1) Needs diagnostics — identifying actual vulnerabilities and the scale of needs.

2) Risk prioritisation — moving from a list of problems to a governed order of action.

3) Programme design — translating priorities into programmes, rules, resources, and assigned responsibilities.

4) Implementation and service delivery — the actual provision of services and support.

5) Impact evaluation — measuring results and adjusting policy instruments.

6) Consolidation of change — institutionalising effective solutions in rules, procedures, budgets, and practices.

The presence of stages 5–6 — featuring mandatory evaluation and consolidation — distinguishes governed humanitarian policy from situational response: resilience emerges when the system learns and codifies updated rules.

How does this matrix support «national resilience»?

The matrix links humanitarian policy to three dimensions of resilience:

service continuity (stages 3–4; levers of finance/people/coordination);

trust and social integration (fair-access rules + transparent procedures + accountability);

risk governability and recovery after losses (stages 1–2–5–6; data + system learning).

In effect, it constitutes a model of the minimum necessary governability: if the system is weak in the «*critical cells*» (e.g., lacks registries/data at stage 1 or fails to consolidate changes at stage 6), policy does not shift into a resilience mode and remains dependent on external resources and project-based fragmentation.

Below we present a scientifically grounded and internally coherent package of proposals designed to ensure that humanitarian policy generates an *institutional outcome* — changes in rules, procedures, allocations of responsibility, resource architectures, and governance capacities — rather than being limited to documenting completed activities. The package follows a logic of governed transformation: *needs* → *normative codification and standards* → *resource provision* → *assignment of implementers* → *data and record-keeping* → *accountability* → *adjustment* → *institutional consolidation*.

1. *Strategic entrenchment of humanitarian policy as a component of national resilience.* Humanitarian policy should be institutionally defined as an

intersectoral resilience framework rather than a set of «*social directions*». Strategic documents and medium-term budgeting should enshrine minimum guarantees of life-essential services, priorities for restoring human capital, and criteria of social cohesion as measurable policy outcomes. This moves humanitarian commitments from a declarative level to the status of a state function subject to resourcing, monitoring, and control [13; 17].

2. *A single integrated needs-and-risks assessment methodology as the basis for comparable decisions.* A unified integrated assessment methodology for state authorities, communities, and partner organisations is a necessary condition for overcoming data incompatibility and heterogeneous approaches to prioritisation. The methodology should include standardised vulnerability indicators, prioritisation rules, requirements for data collection and verification, and procedures for publishing aggregated results. This ensures comparability of governance decisions, transparency of priorities, and reduces opportunities for ad hoc resource reallocation [9; 18].

3. *Normative regulation of core humanitarian services and their delivery procedures.* Core humanitarian service packages should be developed and codified in normative acts, with defined access pathways, response timeframes, quality criteria, record-keeping rules, and complaint-handling procedures. A decisive condition for institutional impact is the personalisation of responsibility: linking standards to the competencies of specific institutions and officials and establishing control indicators (including non-discrimination, accessibility, and the safety of procedures). This constrains discretionary «*manual*» governance and strengthens legal certainty of access to support [10; 12].

4. *Targeted programmes instead of dispersed payments: a verifiable support logic.* The shift from fragmented payments to targeted programmes should rest on transparent eligibility criteria, clearly defined priority groups, vulnerability thresholds, and mandatory audits of targeting effectiveness (i.e.,

whether support reaches the intended groups). An institutional prerequisite is interoperability among registries of beneficiaries, services, and decisions, alongside anti-duplication mechanisms, data-update protocols, and data-quality controls [4; 11].

5. A single «*assistance – development – peace*» coordination contour as a condition of policy coherence. An inter-agency coordination mechanism with a clear mandate should be instituted to align programmes at national, regional, and local levels: synchronisation calendars, approval procedures, responsibility allocation, and shared performance indicators. Without such a contour, humanitarian, recovery, and peacebuilding measures operate as parallel streams, reducing long-term impact and generating institutional fragmentation [2; 20].

6. *Local participation as a mandatory element of the governance cycle.* Local participation in the design and monitoring of humanitarian programmes should be normatively *закреплена* as a standard of good governance: co-production with communities, involvement of local service providers and educational and cultural institutions, and defined procedures for consultation and feedback. This increases contextual fit, strengthens trust, and makes outcomes more durable after external funding ends [1; 15].

7. *Transparency of humanitarian policy as an institutional prerequisite for integrity.* Transparency should be built through open selection rules, publicly accessible (within permissible limits) registries of decisions and expenditures, independent complaint channels, procedural protection for whistleblowers, and regular assessments of abuse risks. Personal data protection must be implemented as a set of procedural safeguards: access regimes, operation logging, and liability for violations. This increases trust and reduces corruption risks in the most conflict-prone domain of resource allocation [3; 7].

8. *Recovery-oriented human resources policy and competence formation for resilience.* Institutional renewal requires a *кадрова* foundation. Training and retraining programmes are needed for managers and frontline service staff with

a focus on risk management, crisis communication, ethics of engagement with traumatised communities, inter-agency cooperation, data work, and results evaluation. These competencies should be embedded in appraisal systems, job descriptions, and professional standards [10; 17].

9. *Culture and memory as governance resources for cohesion and legitimacy.* Support for cultural infrastructure, heritage, local memory practices, and cultural education should be treated as an instrument for restoring the social fabric — reducing tensions, rebuilding horizontal ties, and strengthening identity and trust. Institutional impact requires stable programmes, access standards, and integration of the cultural dimension into community recovery plans rather than relegating it to a secondary domain [19].

10. *Integration of psychosocial support into the core service system.* Psychosocial support should be institutionally integrated into health care, education, and social protection through standardised pathways, cross-sector interaction protocols, training of first-contact specialists, and referral mechanisms. This reduces long-term human capital losses, risks of violence and social disintegration, and simultaneously strengthens trust in state services as reliable under crisis conditions [5; 6].

11. *Territorial recovery planning that accounts for communities' institutional capacity.* Recovery prioritisation should consider not only the scale of destruction but also a community's capacity to sustain and manage new functions: human resources potential, fiscal base, institutional maturity, and service accessibility. Applying «*capacity-to-sustain*» criteria as a mandatory component of project selection helps prevent situations where newly created infrastructure is not supported by governance resources [11; 15].

12. *Institutional learning and formalised policy adjustment as the final stage of the cycle.* After major programmes are implemented, impact evaluations should be conducted, followed by procedurally mandatory adjustments: updating standards, revising targeting criteria, clarifying mandates, refining

budget models, and strengthening quality-control mechanisms. The decisive condition is a legally and procedurally defined «*output*» from evaluation results into new rules, rather than leaving them as reports without governance consequences [8; 18].

Conclusions. The article demonstrates that post-war recovery should be interpreted not as a set of reconstruction works, but as the restoration and expansion of the institutional capacity of public authorities to ensure governability under sustained threats. National resilience is defined as the integrated capacity of the public governance system to guarantee the continuity of life-essential services, maintain social integration and trust, anticipate and manage risks, and organise recovery after losses while accumulating institutional experience. It is substantiated that humanitarian policy performs an integrative resilience function, as it translates support for individuals into standards and procedures, programme – budget decisions, clearly assigned responsibilities, data infrastructures, and accountability mechanisms, thereby strengthening state legitimacy. Six mechanisms of institutional renewal are systematised, and two reform-design instruments are proposed: the «*humanitarian policy → institutional renewal*» matrix and a governed policy cycle from needs diagnostics to the institutional consolidation of change. A package of governance decisions is developed, focused on service standardisation, targeting accuracy, registry interoperability, coordinated action, procedural transparency, and mandatory evaluation with procedurally formalised adjustment.

Directions for further research include operationalising the proposed mechanisms through an indicator system to measure social cohesion, trust, and fairness of access; developing audit methodologies for targeting accuracy and service quality; and empirically testing the effectiveness of coordination and digital/registry-based solutions across communities of different types and levels of institutional capacity.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Barakat S., Milton S. Localisation Across the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*. 2020. Vol. 15 (2). URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1542316620922805>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1542316620922805>.
2. Baroncelli E. Implementing the Humanitarian-development-peace nexus in a post-pandemic world : Multilateral cooperation and the challenge of inter-organisational dialogue. *Global Policy*. 2023. Vol. 14. P. 22–28. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1758-5899.13186>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13186>.
3. Beagles J. E. Humanitarian INGO governance arrangements and forms of coordination. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 2021. Vol. 32 (2). URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/nml.21482>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21482>.
4. Blum J. R., Rogger D. Public Service Reform in Post-Conflict Societies. *The World Bank Research Observer*. 2021. Vol. 36 (2). P. 260–287. URL: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099717209132329579/pdf/IDU0d44e633c024820420b08d510b0f8e09e3660.pdf>.
5. Burde D., Kapit A., Wahl R. L., Guven O., Skarpeteig M. I. Education in Emergencies : A Review of Theory and Research. *Review of Educational Research*. 2017. Vol. 87 (3). P. 619–658. URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0034654316671594>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316671594>.
6. Campbell S. P., Matanock A. M. Weapons of the weak state : How post-conflict states shape international statebuilding. *The Review of International Organizations*. 2024. Vol. 19 (3). P. 469–513. URL:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11558-024-09546-3>. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-024-09546-3>.

7. Cohen N. Public administration reform and political will in cases of political instability : Insights from the Israeli experience. *Public Policy and Administration*. 2022. Vol. 38 (4). P. 405–423. URL:
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/09520767221076059>. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767221076059>.

8. Crow D. A., et al. Policy learning and change during crisis : COVID–19 policy responses across six states. *Review of Policy Research*. 2023. Vol. 40 (1). P. 10–35. URL:
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ropr.12511>. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12511>.

9. Domorenok E., Graziano P. & Polverari L. Policy integration, policy design and administrative capacities. Evidence from EU cohesion policy. *Policy and Society*. 2021. Volume 40, Issue 1. P. 58–78. URL:
<https://academic.oup.com/policyandsociety/article/40/1/58/6402166>. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2021.1930697>.

10. Duit A. Resilience thinking : lessons for public administration. *Public Administration*. 2016. Vol. 94 (2). P. 364–380. URL:
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/padm.12182>. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12182>.

11. Gustafsson M., Matveieva O., Wihlborg E., et al. Adaptive governance amidst the war : Overcoming challenges and strengthening collaborative digital service provision in Ukraine. *Government Information Quarterly*. 2025. Vol. 42. Article 102056. URL:
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0740624X25000504>. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2025.102056>.

12. Hillman B. Public administration reform in post-conflict societies : lessons from ACEH, Indonesia. *Public Administration and Development*. 2013.

Vol. 33 (1). URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pad.1643>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1643>.

13. Howe C., Suich H., Vira B., Mace G. M. Creating win-wins from trade-offs? Ecosystem services for human well-being : A meta-analysis of ecosystem service trade-offs and synergies in the real world. *Global Environmental Change*. 2014. Vol. 28. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378014001320?via%3Dihub>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.07.005>.

14. Ikpe E., Alao A., Nyokabi K. N. Beyond liberal institution (re)building : conversations on peacebuilding and statebuilding in Sierra Leone. *Conflict, Security & Development*. 2021. Vol. 21. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14678802.2021.1974685>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2021.1974685>.

15. Malchykova D. Planning Regional Reconstruction amidst Conflict : Balancing Territorial Governance in (Post-)War Ukraine. *Transactions of the Association of European Schools of Planning*. 2025. Vol. 9 (1). URL: <https://transactions-journal.aesop-planning.eu/index.php/TrAESOP/article/view/130/79>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24306/TrAESOP.2025.01.001>.

16. Mitoulis S. A., Argyroudis S., Linde N., et al. A conflict-resilience framework for critical infrastructure peacebuilding. *Sustainable Cities and Society*. 2023. Vol. 91. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210670723000161?via%3Dihub>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104405>.

17. Profiroiu A. G., Nastacă C.-C. What strengthens resilience in public administration institutions? *Eastern Journal of European Studies*. 2021. Vol. 12 (SI). URL: https://ejes.uaic.ro/articles/EJES2021_12SI_PRO.pdf. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47743/ejes-2021-SI05>.

18. Tokakis V., Polychroniou P., Boustras G. Crisis management in public administration : The three phases model for safety incidents. *Safety Science*. 2019. Vol. 113. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0925753518310117?via%3Dihub>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2018.11.013>.
19. Wardekker A., Nath S., Handayaningsih T. U. The interaction between cultural heritage and community resilience in disaster-affected volcanic regions. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 2023. Vol. 145. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901123001090?via%3Dihub>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2023.04.008>.
20. Volkdal K. Integrating peacebuilding into the triple nexus : insights from UNICEF's dual mandate. *Development in Practice*. 2025. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/09614524.2025.2544902?needAccess=true>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2025.2544902>.

REFERENCES

1. Barakat S., Milton S. (2020). Localisation Across the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 15 (2). URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1542316620922805>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1542316620922805>. [in English]
2. Baroncelli E. (2023). Implementing the Humanitarian-development-peace nexus in a post-pandemic world : Multilateral cooperation and the challenge of inter-organisational dialogue. *Global Policy*, 14, 22–28. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1758-5899.13186>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13186>. [in English]
3. Beagles J. E. (2021). Humanitarian INGO governance arrangements and forms of coordination. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 32 (2). URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/nml.21482>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21482>. [in English]

4. Blum J. R., Rogger D. (2021). Public Service Reform in Post-Conflict Societies. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 36 (2), 260–287. URL: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099717209132329579/pdf/IDU0d44e633c024820420b08d510b0f8e09e3660.pdf>. [in English]
5. Burde D., Kapit A., Wahl R. L., Guven O., Skarpeteig M. I. (2017). Education in Emergencies : A Review of Theory and Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 87 (3), 619–658. URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0034654316671594>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316671594>. [in English]
6. Campbell S. P., Matanock A. M. (2024). Weapons of the weak state : How post-conflict states shape international statebuilding. *The Review of International Organizations*, 19 (3), 469–513. URL: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11558-024-09546-3>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-024-09546-3>. [in English]
7. Cohen N. (2022). Public administration reform and political will in cases of political instability : Insights from the Israeli experience. *Public Policy and Administration*, 38 (4), 405–423. URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/09520767221076059>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767221076059>. [in English]
8. Crow D. A., et al. (2023). Policy learning and change during crisis : COVID–19 policy responses across six states. *Review of Policy Research*, 40 (1), 10–35. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ropr.12511>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12511>. [in English]
9. Domorenok E., Graziano P. & Polverari L. (2021). Policy integration, policy design and administrative capacities. Evidence from EU cohesion policy. *Policy and Society*, 40, Issue 1, 58–78. URL: <https://academic.oup.com/policyandsociety/article/40/1/58/6402166>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2021.1930697>. [in English]

10. Duit A. (2016). Resilience thinking : lessons for public administration. *Public Administration*, 94 (2), 364–380. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/padm.12182>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12182>. [in English]
11. Gustafsson M., Matveieva O., Wihlborg E., et al. (2025). Adaptive governance amidst the war : Overcoming challenges and strengthening collaborative digital service provision in Ukraine. *Government Information Quarterly*, 42, Article 102056. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0740624X25000504>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2025.102056>. [in English]
12. Hillman B. (2013). Public administration reform in post-conflict societies : lessons from ACEH, Indonesia. *Public Administration and Development*, 33 (1). URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pad.1643>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1643>. [in English]
13. Howe C., Suich H., Vira B., Mace G. M. (2014). Creating win-wins from trade-offs? Ecosystem services for human well-being : A meta-analysis of ecosystem service trade-offs and synergies in the real world. *Global Environmental Change*, 28. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378014001320?via%3Dihub>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.07.005>. [in English]
14. Ikpe E., Alao A., Nyokabi K. N. (2021). Beyond liberal institution (re)building : conversations on peacebuilding and statebuilding in Sierra Leone. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 21. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14678802.2021.1974685>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2021.1974685>. [in English]
15. Malchykova D. (2025). Planning Regional Reconstruction amidst Conflict : Balancing Territorial Governance in (Post-)War Ukraine. *Transactions of the Association of European Schools of Planning*, 9 (1). URL:

- <https://transactions-journal.aesop-planning.eu/index.php/TrAESOP/article/view/130/79>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24306/TrAESOP.2025.01.001>. [in English]
16. Mitoulis S. A., Argyroudis S., Linde N., et al. (2023). A conflict-resilience framework for critical infrastructure peacebuilding. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 91. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210670723000161?via%3DiHub>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104405>. [in English]
17. Proftiroiu A. G., Nastacă C.-C. (2021). What strengthens resilience in public administration institutions? *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, 12 (SI). URL: https://ejes.uaic.ro/articles/EJES2021_12SI_PRO.pdf. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47743/ejes-2021-SI05>. [in English]
18. Tokakis V., Polychroniou P., Boustras G. (2019). Crisis management in public administration : The three phases model for safety incidents. *Safety Science*, 113. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0925753518310117?via%3DiHub>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2018.11.013>. [in English]
19. Wardekker A., Nath S., Handayaningsih T. U. (2023). The interaction between cultural heritage and community resilience in disaster-affected volcanic regions. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 145. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901123001090?via%3DiHub>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2023.04.008>. [in English]
20. Volkdal K. (2025). Integrating peacebuilding into the triple nexus : insights from UNICEF's dual mandate. *Development in Practice*. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/09614524.2025.2544902?needAccess=true>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2025.2544902>. [in English]