МЕНЕДЖМЕНТ
ОСВІТНІЙ МЕНЕДЖМЕНТ

MANAGEMENT
EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT

EMPIRIO
SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

EMPIRIO 3, № 2 (2026)

https://doi.org/10.18523/3041-1718.2026.3.2.145-155
UDC 327:005.8:338.24(477)

Yurii Petrashyk
PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Public Health and Healthcare Management,
I. Horbachevsky Ternopil National Medical University of the Ministry of Health of Ukraine, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1286-110X
yurii.m.petrashyk@tdmu.edu.ua

Liudmyla Trushchenkova
PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Public Health and Healthcare Management,
I. Horbachevsky Ternopil National Medical University of the Ministry of Health of Ukraine, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5396-3973
lyshtabalv@tdmu.edu.ua

PROJECT MANAGEMENT METHODOLOGIES FOR INTERNATIONAL AID: COORDINATING MULTI-STAKEHOLDER RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN UKRAINE

Abstract

The reconstruction of Ukraine after the full-scale Russian invasion constitutes an exceptionally complex set of geopolitical, economic, and social tasks, arguably without close precedent in recent history. Current estimates place direct infrastructure losses at approximately $195.1 billion, while overall recovery needs may reach $588 billion within the coming decade. Such scale requires not only significant financial resources, but also a high degree of coordination between international partners, national authorities, local governments, and civil society actors. This paper considers the problem at the intersection of international relations, public policy, and project management. In particular, it examines how different project management approaches – predictive (traditional), adaptive, and hybrid – are applied in the context of international assistance and reconstruction efforts under conditions of profound uncertainty. Taking into account the macroeconomic environment shaped by the war, the growing number of multi-stakeholder coordination platforms, and the implementation of digital governance instruments such as the DREAM system, the study evaluates the extent to which methodological flexibility can reduce systemic risks. The findings suggest that although international financial institutions tend to rely on structured, linear planning models to ensure accountability and compliance, the Ukrainian context requires a more flexible approach. In practice, this leads to the increasing use of Agile and hybrid methodologies, which allow for adjustment to rapidly changing conditions. At the same time, reforms in public investment management, combined with transparent digital systems, perform not only an anti-corruption function but also contribute to the development of institutional trust, democratic

legitimacy, and long-term socio-economic stability. Thus, project management in this case goes beyond its conventional technical function. It becomes an important instrument for supporting the rule of law and strengthening state institutions in a highly uncertain environment. Particular attention should also be paid to the development of human capital and the capacity of political institutions to operate effectively under such conditions.

Keywords: project management, international aid, post-war reconstruction, multi-stakeholder coordination, Agile, Hybrid management, DREAM ecosystem, public policy, democratic governance.

The full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022 has profoundly disturbed the existing international political order and posed serious challenges for the global community in the areas of conflict management, state resilience, as well as the organization of humanitarian and development assistance.[1] As the war continues, the ongoing destruction of critical infrastructure, large-scale displacement of the population, and disruption of economic linkages have shaped a recovery task of truly historic scale. According to the Fifth Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA5), prepared jointly by the World Bank Group, the Government of Ukraine, the European Commission, and the United Nations, direct losses had reached approximately $195.1 billion by the end of 2025. At the same time, total reconstruction and recovery needs are estimated at nearly $588 billion over the next ten years.[2] Managing a recovery process of such magnitude requires not only the attraction of substantial international financial resources, but also continuous evaluation of geopolitical risks and effective coordination in the implementation of a very large number of parallel public investment projects.[3]

The key scientific and practical difficulty in this context arises from the clear tension between the formalized procedures of international aid delivery and the highly unstable conditions of an ongoing war. Conventional international development projects, usually financed by bilateral donors or multilateral institutions, are characterized by a high degree of regulation.[4] They typically depend on long-term predictive planning, carefully sequenced implementation, and strict compliance requirements aimed at minimizing the risk of misallocation of funds. At the same time, the operational environment in Ukraine is defined by a very high level of uncertainty. It includes repeated attacks on infrastructure, significant volatility of macroeconomic indicators, disruptions in supply chains, and rapid demographic changes. Under such conditions, the coordination of reconstruction efforts involving multiple stakeholders becomes considerably more complicated and requires a substantial reconsideration of established project management approaches.

The core problem is structural and institutional: how can state institutions, local municipalities, and international donors coordinate multi-stakeholder reconstruction efforts effectively when the operational environment is entirely hostile to long-term predictability? The application of modern project management methodologies—transitioning from inflexible linear approaches to adaptive, hybrid, and digital-first frameworks—has emerged as the primary vehicle for solving this problem. Implementing these methodologies is not merely a technical exercise in engineering; it is a vital function of public policy, international relations, and democratic governance that directly impacts Ukraine's institutional capacity and path toward European Union (EU) accession.

---

1 Tinatin Akhvlediani, "Explaining Ukraine's Recovery and Reconstruction: What, How, and When?," CEPS Blog, June 2024, https://cdn.ceps.eu/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Explainer-2024-05_Ukraine-reconstruction-1.pdf.

2 World Bank, *Ukraine Fifth Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA5): February 2022 – December 2025* (Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2026), https://doi.org/10.1596/44369.

3 World Bank, *Ukraine Relief, Recovery, Reconstruction and Reform Trust Fund: Annual Report* (Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2024).

4 Jan Christoph Albrecht, Paula Adams, Carsten Wolff, Rao Aamir Ali Khan, and Saara Sheneen, "Project Management Methodologies of International Development Agencies and the Concept of Sustainable Project Management," *Sustainable Development* (March 2026), https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.70895.

The primary **goal of this article** is to formulate theoretical and methodological approaches to the management of international aid and reconstruction projects in Ukraine, specifically focusing on how project management methodologies function as mechanisms of multi-stakeholder coordination and democratic governance under conditions of extreme uncertainty.

To achieve this goal, the article pursues several specific objectives: to evaluate the comparative efficacy of traditional predictive (Waterfall), adaptive (Agile), and hybrid methodologies within a high-risk, wartime economic environment; to examine the complex multi-stakeholder coordination architecture, including the role of supranational entities like the Multi-Agency Donor Coordination Platform and localized decentralized governance structures; to assess the impact of digital public investment management systems, notably the DREAM platform, in institutionalizing transparent, data-driven project lifecycles; and to identify how these integrated methodological frameworks act as critical safeguards against corruption.

The academic discourse surrounding project management in the context of Ukraine's reconstruction has expanded rapidly, moving from immediate disaster relief frameworks to long-term sustainable development and institutional models. This evolution reflects a growing scientific consensus that post-war recovery is a multifaceted discipline requiring profound integration of spatial planning, economic theory, political science, and advanced management science.

Ukrainian scholarship demonstrates a strong emphasis on adapting traditional project management tools to force majeure conditions. Sukhorukov, Yegorova-Hudkova, and Bojko (2024) explored the use of a logical-structural approach in project management combined with partnership banking.[5] Their research posits that due to the severe shortage of domestic investment, the integration of alternative financial structuring directly into the project management lifecycle is a necessary mechanism to sustain industrial and infrastructure recovery. Expanding on the integration of disciplines, Yehorchenkova and Yehorchenkov (2025) proposed a robust dual framework that intersects spatial planning with project management.[6] They argue that spatial planning dictates what must be rebuilt to ensure sustainability and green innovation, while project management dictates how to navigate post-war instability using Agile adaptations and frameworks.

The shift toward iterative and collaborative operational models is further supported by the bibliometric analysis conducted by Petrukha et al. (2025), which demonstrates a definitive shift toward collaborative design and the Agile paradigm in the Ukrainian construction sector.[7] From a socio-economic perspective, Holovnia et al. (2025) analyzed successful cases of sustainable economic development through project management, emphasizing that the integration of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria into project lifecycles is critical for maximizing regional economic multipliers.[8] Furthermore, the political and civic dimensions of these projects are heavily scrutinized by Ukrainian scholars such as Andrusevych and Kozak (2024), who investigated the role of civil society stakeholders in ensuring a "green reconstruction."[9]

---

5 Arkadii Sukhorukov, Tatiana Yegorova-Hudkova, and Maksim Bojko, "Project Management and Partner Banking as Tools for the Recovery Concept in Ukraine," *Forum for Economic and Financial Studies* 2, no. 2 (2024): 2002, https://doi.org/10.59400/fefs2002.

6 Nataliia Yehorchenkova and Oleksii Yehorchenkov, "How can spatial planning and project management help in rebuilding and recovering Ukrainian cities?," *European Journal of Spatial Development* 22, no 3 (2025): 37–50, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17349773.

7 Nina Petrukha, Oleksii Hromyka, Marianna Kokhan, Oleksandr Kamieniev, and Yevhen Dorozhko, "Project Management in Construction: International Methodologies and Approaches for Ukraine's Reconstruction," *International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences* 15, no. 2 (2025): 1101–1120, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18166690.

8 Yuliia Holovnia, Oleksandr Zhurba, Volodymyr Zakharchuk, Lesya Verbovska, and Volodymyr Havran, "Analysis of Successful Cases of Sustainable Economic Development through Project Management in the Post-War Reconstruction of Ukraine," *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues* 15, no. 3 (2025): 301–310, https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.18572.

9 Andriy Andrusevych and Zoryana Kozak, *Post-war Green Reconstruction of Ukraine: Processes, Stakeholders, Public Participation* (Kyiv: Heinrich Böll Foundation, 2024).

In the broader international literature, the evolution of project management methodologies is increasingly focused on the hybridization of frameworks. Reiff and Schlegel (2022) identified distinct hybrid approaches, such as the "Water-Scrum-Fall" model, which blends the rigorous upfront planning of linear models with the iterative execution of Agile.[10]

Despite these significant theoretical advancements, the literature indicates a systemic gap in frameworks capable of practically managing multi-level interactions within actively unstable contexts. Several **specific dimensions of this problem remain unresolved** in contemporary practice.

First, there is a fundamental and unresolved tension between the fiduciary requirements of international donors and the urgent operational needs of local communities. International agencies traditionally utilize highly predictive methodologies, demanding exhaustive documentation and cost baselining before capital is released.[11] In contrast, local entities require Agile funding mechanisms to respond to immediate infrastructural failures.[12]

Second, the literature has not yet fully resolved the complexities of multi-stakeholder governance in a decentralized state at war. Ukraine's pre-war decentralization reforms empowered local municipalities, yet these entities often lack the sophisticated project management maturity required to interface directly with international donors. Finally, the persistent threat of corruption and the necessity for absolute transparency remain critical vulnerabilities. While digital ecosystems have been proposed to mitigate these risks, the methodological integration of anti-corruption compliance directly into the technical workflows of the project lifecycle is a novel challenge requiring exhaustive analysis.[13]

Macroeconomic and Demographic Constraints on Post-war Recovery. To evaluate the efficacy of varying project management methodologies, it is first necessary to establish the exact parameters of the operational environment. Project management relies on forecasting—estimating costs, scheduling resources, and calculating risks. In Ukraine, standard deterministic forecasting models are fundamentally disrupted by the extreme volatility of a war economy.

Following a devastating economic contraction in 2022, Ukraine's gross domestic product (GDP) demonstrated a volatile recovery trajectory. By early 2026, consumer inflation accelerated to 7.9% year-over-year, driven by increased fuel costs, logistics disruptions, and a sharp increase in electricity tariffs for businesses.[14] Consequently, the National Bank of Ukraine (NBU) was forced to maintain a high key policy rate of 15% to prevent inflation from breaching the psychological threshold of 10%. Concurrently, foreign exchange reserves fell by 5% to $52 billion, and the dollar exchange rate crossed UAH 42/USD under a regime of managed flexibility.[15] Table 1 summarizes the macroeconomic and demographic indicators that directly constrain project management methodologies in Ukraine.

These economic conditions produce significant second- and third-order implications for project planning. For example, a central bank policy rate at the level of 15% effectively limits the ability of domestic construction companies to pre-finance project activities while awaiting reimbursement from international donors. At the same time, rising inflation and the depreciation of the national currency lead to a situation in which the cost of imported materials systematically exceeds initial project estimates.

From a demographic perspective, the situation is no less challenging. The war has resulted in the displacement of millions of people, both within the country and abroad. According to the Ministry of Economy, the return of more than 4.5 million individuals will be necessary to restore Ukraine's economy to its pre-war condition. Without the rapid provision of housing, social infrastructure, and accessible

---

10 Janine Reiff and Dennis Schlegel, "Hybrid Project Management: A Systematic Literature Review," *International Journal of Information Systems and Project Management* 10, no. 2 (2022): 45–63, https://doi.org/10.12821/ijispm100203.

11 Albrecht, Adams, Wolff, Khan, and Sheneen, "Project Management Methodologies of International Development Agencies and the Concept of Sustainable Project Management."

12 Mustafa Nayyem, "Speed in a Crisis: What Europe Can Learn from Ukraine on Emergency Reconstruction," *European Council on Foreign Relations*, May 16, 2025.

13 Basel Institute on Governance, *Assessment of Corruption Risks in the Construction, Reconstruction and Renovation of Civilian Infrastructure of Ukraine* (Basel: Basel Institute on Governance, 2024).

14 Centre for Economic Strategy, "Tracker of the Economy During the War," CES, April 9, 2026, https://ces.org.ua/en/tracker-economy-during-the-war/.

15 Ibid.

Table 1

Constraints of project management methodologies in Ukraine

Macroeconomic/ demographic indicator (early 2026)	Value/status	Direct impact on project management methodologies
Real GDP growth	1.8% (down from 5.5% in 2023)	Limits domestic co-financing capacity; increases total reliance on international donor aid and strict compliance.
Consumer inflation	7.9% (accelerating)	Disrupts cost baselining and long-term procurement contracts, rendering static Waterfall budgets instantly obsolete.
NBU key policy rate	15%	Restricts access to affordable capital for local contractors, necessitating advanced disbursement models from IFIs.
Unemployment rate	15.5%	Creates a paradoxical labor market: high general unemployment yet severe shortages of skilled construction and PM professionals.
Demographic displacement	3.76M IDPs; 5.7M refugees	Shifts spatial planning priorities; necessitates dynamic reallocation of housing and social infrastructure to host communities.
Metallurgy production	15–25% MoM drop; CBAM impacts	High energy costs and new carbon taxes ($400M projected loss) disrupt the domestic supply chain for critical building materials.

Note. Systematized by the authors based on the sources reviewed.

living conditions, there is a serious risk that the loss of human capital will become irreversible. Under these circumstances, project management approaches based on fixed-price contracts, rigid upfront budgeting, and long implementation cycles appear fundamentally ill-suited to the environment. The choice of methodology directly affects how resources are distributed, how risks are managed, and how accountability mechanisms are maintained. In the context of international assistance and large-scale physical reconstruction, three main methodological approaches can be identified.

The Waterfall methodology is a linear, sequential approach where each phase of a project must be entirely completed before the subsequent phase begins. Historically, this deterministic model has been the default standard for international development agencies providing Official Development Assistance (ODA).[16] The primary advantage is predictability and structural control, providing a highly legible audit trail for donors.

However, the application of pure Waterfall methodologies in Ukraine has exposed severe vulnerabilities. International organizations relying on preliminary approvals often require at least a year of preparatory work before capital is deployed. When the Kakhovka hydroelectric power plant was destroyed by Russian forces, threatening the water supply of 1.5 million people, the rigid nature of traditional international aid proved far too slow.[17] The Ukrainian state had to bypass formal international procedures, utilizing emergency state mobilization to construct alternative pipelines within weeks. This incident highlights that in active crisis conditions, the bureaucratic latency inherent in Waterfall models can escalate secondary disasters.

Agile methodology emphasizes extreme flexibility, iterative progress, continuous stakeholder feedback, and the rapid delivery of functional increments. Petrukha et al. (2025) confirm a systemic shift toward the Agile paradigm in the construction industry, driven by the necessity to navigate supply chain disruptions in unstable environments.[18]

Agile approaches allow project managers to modularize reconstruction. Instead of waiting for a comprehensive master plan, Agile permits the immediate restoration of critical nodes—such as a specific power substation or a single hospital wing.[19] In severely damaged cities like Irpin and Bucha, rapid

[16] Albrecht, Adams, Wolff, Khan, and Sheneen, "Project Management Methodologies of International Development Agencies and the Concept of Sustainable Project Management."

[17] Nayyem, "Speed in a Crisis: What Europe Can Learn from Ukraine on Emergency Reconstruction."

[18] Petrukha, Hromyka, Kokhan, Kamieniev, and Dorozhko, "Project Management in Construction: International Methodologies and Approaches for Ukraine's Reconstruction."

[19] Nataliia Yehorchenkova and Oleksii Yehorchenkov, "How can spatial planning and project management help in rebuilding and recovering Ukrainian cities?"

Table 2

Comparative utility of hybrid frameworks within the reconstruction context

Methodology	Core characteristics	Application in Ukrainian reconstruction	Primary limitation
Waterfall	Linear, sequential, fixed scope, strict phasing, heavy documentation.	High-compliance IFI projects, massive infrastructure requiring rigid engineering standards.	Highly vulnerable to supply chain shocks, inflation, and kinetic events; slow mobilization.
Agile	Iterative, incremental, flexible scope, continuous stakeholder feedback.	Emergency infrastructure repair, social services deployment, digital governance tools.	Conflicts with traditional IFI fiduciary rules; difficult to scale without fixed cost baselines.
Hybrid (e.g., Water-Scrum-Fall)	Phased planning/design (Waterfall), iterative execution (Agile), strict auditing.	The standard for major recovery initiatives; integrates upfront donor compliance with localized, adaptive execution.	High organizational complexity; requires advanced project management maturity from local authorities.

Note. Systematized by the authors based on the sources reviewed.

iterative cycles allowed local authorities to integrate feedback from returning citizens in real-time, ensuring reconstruction matched evolving needs.[20] However, scaling pure Agile methodologies across multi-billion-dollar international aid portfolios presents institutional challenges, as bilateral donors inherently resist funding open-ended projects that lack definitive final scopes.[21]

To reconcile the tension between the donor requirement for predictability and the local necessity for rapid adaptation, hybrid project management methodologies have become the prevailing industry standard.[22] As illustrated in Table 2, hybrid methodologies merge the robust upfront planning and rigid governance of the Waterfall model with the execution flexibility and rapid iteration of Agile.

Under frameworks like the "Water-Scrum-Fall" model, initial phases—needs assessment, financial modeling, and procurement planning—are conducted using strict Waterfall principles.[23] This satisfies international donors that the project is conceptually sound and legally compliant. However, the execution phase utilizes Agile sprints, allowing contractors to pivot rapidly in response to localized constraints, such as a disruption in the energy grid. The project then concludes with a Waterfall-style audit to satisfy donor reporting requirements. By standardizing hybrid approaches, the Ukrainian government and international partners can accelerate capital absorption while satisfying the risk-aversion of international capital.

Architectures of multi-stakeholder coordination in international aid. The sheer scale of the estimated $588 billion recovery cost necessitates an architecture capable of coordinating G7 nations, the EU, global financial institutions, national ministries, local governments, and civil society. Misalignment inevitably leads to duplicated efforts and resource fragmentation.

At the apex is the Multi-Agency Donor Coordination Platform for Ukraine. Established by G7 leaders, the Platform operates to direct resources in a coherent, transparent manner, aligning economic assistance with Ukraine's specific recovery priorities and EU accession path.[24] To operationalize macro-funds, institutions utilize mechanisms like the World Bank's Ukraine Relief, Recovery, Reconstruction and Reform Trust Fund (URTF). A critical innovation of the URTF has been its profound focus on institutional capacity—specifically funding Public Investment Management (PIM) reforms.[25]

This focus is manifested in the PREPARE Ukraine project, backed by a $44.3 million IBRD grant. Managed by the PPP agency under the Ministry of Economy, PREPARE Ukraine aims to create a systematic "preparation factory" for projects.[26] This addresses a profound geopolitical insight: the

[20] Transparency International Ukraine, "Rebuilding Irpin, Bucha, and Hostomel: A Year Since De-Occupation," TI Ukraine, April 18, 2023.

[21] Reiff and Schlegel, "Hybrid Project Management: A Systematic Literature Review."

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] European Commission, "Ukraine Donor Platform Holds 16th Steering Committee in Kyiv, Ukraine," European Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations, March 25, 2026.

[25] World Bank, *Ukraine Relief, Recovery, Reconstruction and Reform Trust Fund: Annual Report.*

[26] PPP Agency, "The Government of Ukraine has signed an agreement with the IBRD and IDA to allocate a US$44.3 million grant for the implementation of the PREPARE Ukraine project," PPP Agency, July 10, 2025.

Table 3

Layered responsibilities in the multi-stakeholder ecosystem

Stakeholder tier	Key actors	Primary responsibilities in the PM lifecycle
Supranational/donor	G7, EU, World Bank (URTF), IMF, Multi-Agency Platform	Strategic alignment, capital mobilization, macroeconomic stabilization, defining compliance and ESG standards.
National government	Ministry for Restoration, Ministry of Economy, Recovery Agency	National prioritization, regulatory framework development, operating digital PIM tools (DREAM).
Local municipalities	City Councils (e.g., Irpin, Bucha), hromadas	Bottom-up project initiation, community consultation, direct execution, and spatial planning integration.
Private sector	Domestic contractors, international investors, business advisory council	Physical construction, supply chain logistics, providing private capital, technical innovation, and digital tools.
Civil society and NGOs	Environmental organizations, Transparency International, RISE Coalition	Independent monitoring, ensuring ecological compliance, representing marginalized/IDP voices, tracking anti-corruption.

Note. Systematized by the authors based on the sources reviewed.

availability of capital is rarely the primary bottleneck in post-war recovery. Instead, the true bottleneck is the administrative capacity to generate bankable project proposals that meet international fiduciary standards. By investing in the project preparation phase, the international community ensures that when capital is released, the methodological frameworks are already in place to absorb it efficiently.

Decentralization and localized project management. While supranational platforms coordinate macro-financing, physical execution occurs almost entirely at the municipal level. Ukraine's pre-war decentralization reforms empowered local councils (hromadas) to act as the primary initiators and managers of recovery projects. This decentralized approach shifts the paradigm from top-down central planning to bottom-up prioritization.

In severely damaged regions of the Kyiv Oblast, local authorities successfully orchestrated multi-stakeholder governance models, navigating a matrix of state subsidies, private philanthropic funding, and international NGOs to rapidly restore critical services.[27] However, decentralized execution introduces a high degree of variance in project management capability. Smaller municipalities often lack the technical expertise required to navigate the rigorous procurement rules necessary to attract international capital. To bridge this gap, technical assistance from civil society organizations and international partners is deployed to elevate local project management maturity.[28]

Civil society acts as an indispensable stakeholder within this ecosystem, particularly in advocating for transparency and "green reconstruction." Environmental and climate NGOs consistently push to ensure that rapid recovery does not result in long-term ecological degradation. They demand that the political rhetoric translates into tangible energy efficiency, sustainable urban planning, and climate mitigation at the project level. In 2023 and beyond, there was a notable spike in cooperation between civil society organizations (CSOs) and local authorities, driven by the smaller scale and greater openness of local governance compared to national ministries. Table 3 details the layered responsibilities within this multi-stakeholder ecosystem.

Digital public investment management. Perhaps the most significant innovation emerging from Ukraine's reconstruction is the deep integration of digital technologies into the project management lifecycle. Recognizing the impossibility of managing tens of thousands of simultaneous projects through paper-based channels, the state developed the Digital Restoration Ecosystem for Accountable Management (DREAM).[29]

As seen in Table 4, the DREAM ecosystem is an active, end-to-end digital pipeline for public investment management. It aggregates real-time data from multiple state IT solutions, including the Register of Damaged and Destroyed Property and the ProZorro e-procurement platform.[30] Methodologically, DREAM is revolutionary because it operationalizes international best practices

[27] Transparency International Ukraine, "Rebuilding Irpin, Bucha, and Hostomel: A Year Since De-Occupation."

[28] Andrusevych and Kozak, *Post-war Green Reconstruction of Ukraine: Processes, Stakeholders, Public Participation.*

[29] Open Contracting Partnership, "DREAM: While Fighting for its Future, Ukraine Invented a Better Way to Make Investments That Benefit People and the Planet," Open Contracting, July 10, 2025.

[30] RISE Ukraine Coalition, "The Ministry for Restoration and the RISE Coalition Presented the Communication Platform of the Digital Ecosystem for Reconstruction Management DREAM," RISE Ukraine, 2023.

Table 4

Core components and methodological functions of the DREAM ecosystem

DREAM component	Functionality and methodological purpose	Strategic impact on recovery
Bottom-up initiation	Local communities input localized damage assessments into the registry and propose targeted projects directly into the system.	Empowers decentralized governance; ensures that funded projects match urgent, real-world community needs.
Automated scoring and prioritization	Projects submitted to the system are automatically assigned a priority score based on financial, social, environmental, and urgency metrics.	Removes political bias and clientelism from project selection; enables rapid processing of thousands of proposals.
Single investment window	Acts as a "Bank of Projects," allowing global IFIs and private donors to filter, select, and fund projects matching their specific mandates.	Democratizes access to capital; aligns international donor supply directly with municipal demand, bypassing central bottlenecks.
Lifecycle tracking	Monitors every stage: design documentation, procurement (via ProZorro), construction milestones, and final audit.	Enforces a governed hybrid methodology; ensures execution aligns tightly with initial financial baselines.
"Everyone sees everything"	Real-time open data publication aligned with the global Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS).	Radical transparency; enables civil society, journalists, and international donors to actively monitor anti-corruption compliance.

Note. Systematized by the authors based on the sources reviewed.

directly into its software architecture. The platform's project lifecycle is grounded in the UK's Five Case Model, enforcing correct procedures and reporting requirements automatically as data is entered.[31]

Projects submitted to the system are automatically assigned a priority score based on financial, social, and urgency metrics, removing political bias. Acting as a "Single Investment Window," DREAM allows global donors to filter and fund projects matching their mandates. Its "everyone sees everything" principle, aligned with the Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS), provides radical transparency, enabling civil society and international donors to actively monitor anti-corruption compliance.[32]

Anti-corruption mechanisms and institutional integrity. The successful implementation of hybrid methodologies and digital platforms hinges on institutional integrity. In post-war environments, the influx of massive foreign capital combined with transitional regulatory models creates a highly permissive environment for corruption. The failure to manage this risk directly undermines democratic legitimacy and threatens the continuation of international aid.

Analyses highlight specific, systemic vulnerabilities. The Basel Institute on Governance noted critical risks, including excessive discretion in the selection and prioritization of projects and weak oversight of project documentation quality.[33] Furthermore, a review by Transparency International Ukraine demonstrated that without strict methodological controls and clear legal frameworks, "experimental" pilot recovery projects inevitably stall.[34]

To counter this existential threat, Ukraine's Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2026–2030 embeds corruption prevention directly into the logic of recovery. The strategy emphasizes that isolated projects must be fully integrated into a Unified Public Investment Project Management Information System.[35] By forcing the entire project lifecycle through a digital, transparent pipeline governed by automated rules, the state systematically dismantles the architecture of graft. Civil society organizations are empowered with open-source intelligence tools to conduct rigorous third-party monitoring.[36] Thus, project management methodology transcends its traditional role; it becomes a fundamental instrument for enforcing the rule of law and strengthening political institutions in conditions of profound uncertainty.

---

[31] Open Contracting Partnership, "DREAM: While Fighting for its Future, Ukraine Invented a Better Way to Make Investments That Benefit People and the Planet."

[32] Ibid.

[33] Basel Institute on Governance, *Assessment of Corruption Risks in the Construction, Reconstruction and Renovation of Civilian Infrastructure of Ukraine.*

[34] Transparency International Ukraine, "Analysis of the Draft Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2026-2030," TI Ukraine, 2025.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Andrusevych and Kozak, *Post-war Green Reconstruction of Ukraine: Processes, Stakeholders, Public Participation.*

Conclusions and prospects for further research

The reconstruction of Ukraine can be regarded as a transformative case for the fields of international relations, public policy, and project management. The high level of uncertainty associated with the ongoing war has clearly demonstrated the structural constraints of rigid, traditional models of international assistance. The present analysis indicates that effective coordination of complex, multi-stakeholder reconstruction efforts is not possible without the broad application of hybrid project management approaches. Such approaches make it possible to combine the strict fiduciary and compliance requirements of international donors with the flexibility and adaptability needed by local authorities operating in highly unstable conditions.

At the same time, the emergence of new coordination architectures at the international level, together with the integration of project cycles into transparent digital systems—most notably the DREAM ecosystem—reflects a significant evolution in the management of public investment. These instruments expand access to financial resources and strengthen the role of decentralized communities (hromadas) in defining their own recovery priorities, while also reducing corruption risks through increased transparency.

Prospects for further research should focus on assessing the long-term effectiveness of these hybrid methodologies as the recovery process gradually shifts from emergency response to structural economic transformation. In particular, empirical analysis of the relationship between the institutional and managerial capacity of municipalities and their ability to effectively absorb international funding appears especially relevant. In a broader perspective, the experience of Ukraine is likely to have a lasting impact on both theoretical and applied approaches to crisis governance, post-war recovery, and the development of democratic institutions.

Bibliography

Akhvlediani, Tinatin. “Explaining Ukraine’s Recovery and Reconstruction: What, How, and When?” CEPS Blog, June 2024. https://cdn.ceps.eu/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Explainer-2024-05_Ukraine-reconstruction-1.pdf.

Albrecht, Jan Christoph, Paula Adams, Carsten Wolff, Rao Aamir Ali Khan, and Saara Sheneen. “Project Management Methodologies of International Development Agencies and the Concept of Sustainable Project Management.” *Sustainable Development* (March 2026). https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.70895.

Andrusevych, Andriy, and Zoryana Kozak. *Post-war Green Reconstruction of Ukraine: Processes, Stakeholders, Public Participation.* Kyiv: Heinrich Böll Foundation, 2024.

Basel Institute on Governance. *Assessment of Corruption Risks in the Construction, Reconstruction and Renovation of Civilian Infrastructure of Ukraine.* Basel: Basel Institute on Governance, 2024.

Centre for Economic Strategy. “Tracker of the Economy During the War.” CES, April 9, 2026. https://ces.org.ua/en/tracker-economy-during-the-war/.

European Commission. “Ukraine Donor Platform Holds 16th Steering Committee in Kyiv, Ukraine.” European Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations, March 25, 2026.

Holovnia, Yuliia, Oleksandr Zhurba, Volodymyr Zakharchuk, Lesya Verbovska, and Volodymyr Havran. “Analysis of Successful Cases of Sustainable Economic Development through Project Management in the Post-War Reconstruction of Ukraine.” *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues* 15, no. 3 (2025): 301–310. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.18572.

Nayyem, Mustafa. “Speed in a Crisis: What Europe Can Learn from Ukraine on Emergency Reconstruction.” European Council on Foreign Relations, May 16, 2025.

Open Contracting Partnership. “DREAM: While Fighting for its Future, Ukraine Invented a Better Way to Make Investments That Benefit People and the Planet.” Open Contracting, July 10, 2025.

Petrukha, Nina, Oleksii Hromyka, Marianna Kokhan, Oleksandr Kamieniev, and Yevhen Dorozhko. “Project Management in Construction: International Methodologies and Approaches for Ukraine’s Reconstruction.” *International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences* 15, no. 2 (2025): 1101–1120. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18166690.

PPP Agency. “The Government of Ukraine has signed an agreement with the IBRD and IDA to allocate a US$44.3 million grant for the implementation of the PREPARE Ukraine project.” PPP Agency, July 10, 2025.

Reiff, Janine, and Dennis Schlegel. "Hybrid Project Management: A Systematic Literature Review." *International Journal of Information Systems and Project Management* 10, no. 2 (2022): 45–63. https://doi.org/10.12821/ijispm100203.

RISE Ukraine Coalition. "The Ministry for Restoration and the RISE Coalition Presented the Communication Platform of the Digital Ecosystem for Reconstruction Management DREAM." RISE Ukraine, 2023.

Sukhorukov, Arkadii, Tatiana Yegorova-Hudkova, and Maksim Bojko. "Project Management and Partner Banking as Tools for the Recovery Concept in Ukraine." *Forum for Economic and Financial Studies* 2, no. 2 (2024): 2002. https://doi.org/10.59400/fefs2002.

Transparency International Ukraine. "Analysis of the Draft Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2026–2030." TI Ukraine, 2025.

Transparency International Ukraine. "Rebuilding Irpin, Bucha, and Hostomel: A Year Since De-Occupation." TI Ukraine, April 18, 2023.

World Bank. *Ukraine Fifth Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA5): February 2022 – December 2025*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1596/44369.

World Bank. *Ukraine Relief, Recovery, Reconstruction and Reform Trust Fund: Annual Report*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2024.

Yehorchenkova, Nataliia, and Oleksii Yehorchenkov. "How can spatial planning and project management help in rebuilding and recovering Ukrainian cities?" *European Journal of Spatial Development* 22, no. 3 (2025): 37–50. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17349773.

Юрій Петрашик
Кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри громадського здоров'я та управління охороною здоров'я,
Тернопільський національний медичний університет імені І. Я. Горбачевського МОЗ України,
Україна
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1286-110X
yurii.m.petrashyk@tdmu.edu.ua

Людмила Трущенкова
Кандидатка економічних наук, доцентка,
доцентка кафедри громадського здоров'я та управління охороною здоров'я,
Тернопільський національний медичний університет імені І. Я. Горбачевського МОЗ України,
Україна
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5396-3973
lyshtabalv@tdmu.edu.ua

МЕТОДОЛОГІЇ УПРАВЛІННЯ ПРОЄКТАМИ З МІЖНАРОДНОЇ ДОПОМОГИ: КООРДИНАЦІЯ БАГАТОСТОРОННІХ ПРОЄКТІВ ІЗ ВІДНОВЛЕННЯ УКРАЇНИ

Відновлення України після російського вторгнення є одним із найскладніших геополітичних, економічних і соціокультурних викликів сучасності. За верифікованими оцінками, обсяг прямих збитків, завданих критичній та цивільній інфраструктурі, перевищує 195,1 млрд дол. США, тоді як сукупні потреби у фінансуванні відновлення на найближче десятиріччя сягають понад 588 млрд дол. США. Такий масштаб зумовлює необхідність розроблення та впровадження

комплексних механізмів реалізації відбудови, що передбачає консолідацію зусиль широкого кола стейкґолдерів: міжнародних фінансових донорів, міжурядових організацій, органів державної влади, місцевого самоврядування та інститутів громадянського суспільства.

У статті проаналізовано взаємодію міжнародних відносин, підходів державної політики та сучасних концепцій управління складними проєктами. Досліджено, яким чином трансформація методологій управління від традиційних предиктивних моделей до гнучких і гібридних підходів сприяє ефективному адмініструванню потоків міжнародної технічної та фінансової допомоги в умовах високої невизначеності та ризиків. Окрему увагу приділено аналізу макроекономічного середовища України, формуванню архітектури багатосторонньої координації (зокрема в межах мультидонорської координаційної платформи) та ролі цифрових інструментів у забезпеченні прозорості процесів відновлення.

Головним об'єктом дослідження є Цифрова екосистема для підзвітного управління відновленням (DREAM), яку розглянуто як інструмент цифрової демократії та відкритого врядування. Обґрунтовано, що методологічна гнучкість управління є ключовою передумовою зниження системних ризиків. Показано, що, попри традиційні вимоги міжнародних фінансових інституцій до лінійності процесів і жорсткої звітності, український контекст потребує впровадження адаптивного планування. Інтеграцію реформ управління державними інвестиціями (PIM) і використання цифрових антикорупційних інструментів розглянуто не лише як засоби контролю за ресурсами, а й як основу зміцнення інституційної довіри, демократичної легітимності та довгострокової соціально-економічної стійкості держави. Окремо наголошено на визначальній ролі людського капіталу як ключового ресурсу забезпечення сталого функціонування політичних інститутів в умовах тривалої кризи.

Ключові слова: управління проєктами, міжнародна допомога, повоєнна відбудова, багатостороння координація, Agile, гібридне управління, екосистема DREAM, державна політика, демократичне врядування.

Подано / Submitted: 30.03.2026
Схвалено до публікації / Accepted: 22.04.2026
Оприлюднено / Published: 29.05.2026