
Risk Analysis in the Stakeholder-Oriented Management Strategy of Ukrainian Tourism Enterprises During the Post-War Reconstruction Period

Lidiia Lisovska

Doctor of Economic Sciences, Full Professor,
Department of Management of Organisations,
Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine
E-mail: lidia.s.lisovska@lpnu.ua
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9937-3784>

Vasyl Mykhailyshyn

PhD Candidate,
Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine
E-mail: vasyl.v.mykhailyshyn@lpnu.ua
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-9935-1755>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2707-8019/2025-2-20>

Abstract. *The post-war recovery of the tourism sector in Ukraine necessitates the development of management models capable of balancing the interests of multiple stakeholder groups under conditions of uncertainty and resource constraints. The importance of this study lies in the growing significance of stakeholder-oriented approaches as a means of restoring tourism destinations, rebuilding trust, and ensuring the long-term resilience of tourism enterprises. The objective of the research is to evaluate the structure and nature of risks that emerge in stakeholder interaction and to propose a framework for their effective management during the reconstruction period. The methodological basis of the study incorporates risk identification and classification tools, probability–impact assessment, comparative analysis of stakeholder groups, and structural modelling of coordination processes within tourism destinations. The findings indicate that risks inherent in stakeholder-oriented management are multifaceted and interrelated, with the most substantial categories comprising informational, resource-based, communication, reputational and coordination-related risks. The repercussions of such actions are compounded when the distribution of responsibility and access to information among stakeholders is disproportionate. The study proposes an integrated model for risk mitigation that combines institutional mechanisms of co-operation, economic and financial tools for shared investment, organisational solutions at the level of destination management, and digital systems for monitoring and communication. The article's practical value lies in offering tourism enterprises and local authorities a structured approach to strengthening stakeholder collaboration, improving decision-making transparency and increasing the adaptability and competitiveness of tourism destinations in the post-war period.*

Keywords: *stakeholder-oriented management, tourism enterprises, post-war recovery, risk governance, destination coordination, digital tools, collaborative decision-making.*

JEL Classification: L83, M21, Z32

1 Introduction

The development of tourism enterprises in Ukraine is currently unfolding in conditions of prolonged military aggression, structural disruption of demand, and the urgent need for infrastructural and institutional reconstruction. Recent studies indicate significant structural shifts in the tourism industry, including the reorientation towards domestic tourism, a reduction in inbound tourist flows, and changes in consumer preferences under

wartime conditions (Kiziun et al., 2023; Boiko et al., 2024). The post-war recovery of the tourism sector necessitates the restoration of physical assets, the rebuilding of trust and market visibility, the re-establishment of supply chains, and the strengthening of co-operation among businesses, public authorities, local communities (hromadas), and private investors (Slatvinska et al., 2024). In this context, stakeholder-oriented management strategies have become increasingly important,

as they enable coordinated responses to shared challenges through balancing stakeholder interests, joint resource mobilisation, and co-creation of tourism value. However, implementing such strategies is associated with heightened risks, particularly in regions affected by military action. In these regions, environmental, socio-economic and market disruptions shape stakeholder relationships (Terebukh et al., 2023).

The present study is of particular pertinence due to the paucity of research conducted on stakeholder engagement in tourism, particularly with regard to the identification, classification and management of risks associated with stakeholder interaction in the Ukrainian tourism sector. The scientific novelty of the research lies in substantiating a structured approach to analysing risk factors within stakeholder-oriented management models under post-war reconstruction conditions, and in identifying zones of conflict and systemic vulnerability affecting tourism enterprises.

The objective of the present study is to analyse the risks associated with the formation and implementation of stakeholder-oriented management strategies in Ukrainian tourism enterprises during post-war reconstruction.

In order to achieve the stated purpose, the following objectives were defined: firstly, to clarify the conceptual foundations of stakeholder-oriented management in tourism; secondly, to identify key groups of risks and conflict drivers within stakeholder interaction processes; thirdly, to conduct a structural analysis of organisational and economic threats affecting tourism enterprises in the post-war period; and finally, to propose directions for improving risk management mechanisms within stakeholder-oriented strategic frameworks.

The methodological basis of the study is grounded in a combination of systemic and institutional approaches, methods of structural-logical and comparative analysis, content analysis of strategic and analytical documents, as well as expert interviews with representatives of tourism enterprises. Furthermore, risk analysis and matrix assessment methodologies were employed to categorise risks and ascertain their impact and probability.

2 Theoretical Foundations of Stakeholder-Oriented Management and the Nature of Risks in Tourism

The development of tourism enterprises in Ukraine during the post-war reconstruction period is characterised by an increase in the complexity of managerial decision-making. This is driven by two factors: heightened environmental uncertainty and

the necessity to coordinate the interests of multiple stakeholder groups. In this context, a stakeholder-oriented strategy is defined as a management model that integrates the perspectives of key influence groups, including tourists, local communities (hromadas), public authorities, business partners, investors and professional associations, into the processes of strategic planning and destination development (Roik, 2022). In the tourism sector, this approach is of particular importance due to the collective nature of destination value creation, where the competitive position of a destination is shaped by joint actions rather than individual organisational efforts (Marques et al., 2023).

Stakeholder-oriented models of tourism governance necessitate the establishment of coordinated institutional mechanisms and transparency in decision-making processes (Uhodnikova, 2020). It is imperative to ensure financial stability in conditions of heightened external risks, given that financial resilience directly influences the capacity of tourism businesses to adapt and recover (Kozubova & Prokopishyna, 2025). As demonstrated by international experience, the most effective manner in which to manage conflict in the context of tourism development is to formulate a collaborative negotiation process among the key actors involved, with a focus on dialogue and consensus (Almeida et al., 2018). In Ukraine, the application of stakeholder logic to public-private partnership structures offers opportunities for a more balanced distribution of responsibilities and benefits (Zakharkin, 2017). In wartime conditions, tactical management strategies require the rapid reconfiguration of partnerships, the repositioning of markets, and the strengthening of coordination among businesses and authorities (Terebukh & Roik, 2024).

The Ukrainian tourism industry has undergone significant structural shifts in recent years, largely due to the ongoing war. These shifts include a decline in the number of tourism enterprises in frontline regions, a reorientation towards domestic tourism, and substantial changes in consumer mobility patterns (Kiziun et al., 2023; Slatvinska et al., 2024; Boiko et al., 2024). Concurrently, western regions of the country have witnessed an increase in demand for recreational, cultural and wellness services, underscoring the sector's adaptive capacity (State Agency for Tourism Development of Ukraine, 2024). Furthermore, tourism functions as a multi-actor system, where risks are inherently distributed among stakeholders. The distribution of risk among stakeholders is an inherent aspect of tourism development. Power asymmetries, conflicting interests and differing resource

capacities frequently impede consensus-building and joint decision-making (Yang & Wall, 2023; Byrd & Gustke, 2020). During the post-war recovery phase, these risks are known to intensify due to the simultaneous reconstruction of infrastructure and the necessity of engaging local communities in the co-creation of tourism experiences (Alipour et al., 2023; Mihi et al., 2022). Consequently, stakeholder-oriented management demands not only coordination mechanisms, but also structured tools for risk assessment, negotiation and conflict mitigation.

The period from 2020 to 2024 has been characterised by profound structural shifts in how tourism enterprises operate in Ukraine. The 2020–2021 pandemic led to a significant reduction in international and domestic tourist numbers, the temporary closure of accommodation facilities and the suspension of tour operator activity. Following the onset of full-scale military aggression against Ukraine in 2022, a novel phase of transformation was initiated, characterised by a spatial reorientation of tourism activity, the contraction of markets in frontline and temporarily occupied territories, and the rapid reinforcement of domestic tourism demand (State Agency for Tourism Development of Ukraine, 2024).

Tourism enterprises that have a concentration in relatively safe western and central regions have demonstrated an adaptive capacity by expanding event, cultural, gastronomic, and rural tourism formats. Concurrently, the utilisation of digital

solutions has undergone significant proliferation. The advent of online booking systems, review platforms, mobile route applications, CRM systems, and digital mapping services has rendered them pivotal instruments of market interaction (Kozubova & Prokopishyna, 2025). However, the sector continues to face systemic constraints, including the uneven distribution of tourism infrastructure, reduced inflows of foreign tourists, reputational and security risks, differentiated regional recovery trajectories, and limited investment resources. The resilience of the sector is therefore multi-layered and dependent on both territorial conditions and institutional support mechanisms (Slatvinska et al., 2024). Table 1 provides a concise overview of the key performance indicators that demonstrate these structural shifts.

The data highlight the transition of the Ukrainian tourism sector from a pre-war model reliant on combined domestic and inbound tourist flows to a resilience-driven model grounded in domestic tourism demand and adaptive diversification of tourism products (Waligo et al., 2022; Yang & Wall, 2023; Alipour et al., 2023). Concurrently, the industry's recovery is constrained by security, investment, reputational, and infrastructural risks, thereby reinforcing the relevance of stakeholder-oriented risk governance mechanisms, which are discussed in further sections (Kozubova & Prokopishyna, 2025). The post-war reconstruction period in the tourism sector is characterised by an intensification of multidimensional risks, which

Table 1 Dynamics of key performance indicators of tourism and hospitality enterprises in Ukraine, 2020–2024

| Indicator | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024* | Trend / Interpretation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Number of tour operators and travel agents (units) | 2,234 | 2,741 | 1,482 | 1,612 | 1,895 | Gradual recovery following sharp contraction in 2022 |
| Number of accommodation facilities (hotels, hostels, guesthouses), units | 4,812 | 5,046 | 4,219 | 5,070 | 5,540 | Recovery with growth of small-scale and budget formats |
| Number of domestic tourists, million persons | 5.9 | 7.2 | 8.3 | 14.0 | 17.2 | Significant expansion driven by shift towards domestic tourism |
| Inbound tourism, million persons | 3.4 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 0.89 | 1.19 | Slow recovery; security perceptions remain a core barrier |
| Tax revenues from tourism and hospitality, billion UAH | 1.46 | 1.63 | 1.21 | 2.05 | 2.94 | Post-2022 rebound linked to rising internal demand. |
| Tourism tax, million UAH | 133.4 | 244.7 | 128.0 | 222.6 | 273.1 | Stable growth, particularly in central and western regions |
| Share of domestic tourism in total flows, % | 64% | 71% | 83% | 86% | 87% | Sustained dominance of domestic tourism post-2022 |

* Data for 2024 reflect first-half results and operational estimates.

Source: compiled by the authors based on (State Agency for Tourism Development of Ukraine, 2024; Slatvinska et al., 2024; Boiko et al., 2024)

are shaped by both external conditions and the internal organisation of stakeholder relations. Key risk groups include informational, resource, communication, reputational and coordination risks (see Table 2).

The existence of informational risks is predicated on the absence of reliable data pertaining to the state of tourism infrastructure, safety conditions and the genuine expectations of tourists and local communities. The wartime context and subsequent recovery have exacerbated information asymmetry, thereby limiting the ability of tourism enterprises to make rational strategic decisions (Mihi et al., 2022).

The restoration of material facilities, financial capacity, and human capital across regions is an uneven process, and this unevenness is associated with resource risks. According to RDNA3 (2024), there is a strong correlation between the degree of damage to recreational assets and tourism infrastructure, and proximity to combat zones. This results in pronounced disparities in recovery potential. The issue of communication risks is attributable to the absence of institutionalised channels of interaction among tourism enterprises, local authorities, communities and investors. The absence of stable consultation procedures and participatory planning mechanisms has been demonstrated to increase the likelihood of misunderstandings and conflict (Waligo et al., 2022). Reputational risks pertain to the broader international perception of Ukraine as a potentially unsafe destination, which has the potential to impede the resumption of inbound tourism and foreign partnerships (Hall et al., 2020). The challenges associated with coordination are characterised by the complexity of aligning the diverse interests of numerous stakeholders involved in the realm of tourism development. In circumstances of limited resources and ambiguous strategic outlook, stakeholder groups may engage

in competition for financial assistance, tourist influxes, and institutional acknowledgement (Yang & Wall, 2023).

The tourism sector functions as a multi-actor system, comprising tourism enterprises, public authorities, local communities, hospitality and transport providers, cultural institutions, investors, civil society organisations and tourists. While such system complexity enables synergy, it also increases the potential for conflict and misalignment of interests (Byrd & Gustke, 2020).

Within tourism clusters and partnership networks, stakeholder groups often have different motivations and planning horizons. Power asymmetries may arise whereby large enterprises or authorities influence decision-making disproportionately (Font et al., 2021). Local communities (hromadas) may have limited access to participation mechanisms, which can lead to social dissatisfaction and the erosion of destination authenticity (Roik, 2022). The absence of institutionalised coordination rules makes it difficult to balance interests and reduces the predictability of strategic governance (Alipour et al., 2023).

Therefore, risks in multi-actor tourism systems are not accidental anomalies; they are an inherent feature of collective destination governance. Effective post-war reconstruction therefore requires coordinated stakeholder engagement mechanisms, transparent information-sharing systems, and trust-based governance instruments.

3 Risk Typology and Assessment Matrix in Stakeholder-Oriented Tourism Management

In stakeholder-oriented management, risk assessment is conducted within the framework of multi-actor governance. This approach emphasises the coordination of interests, transparency of information and shared stakeholder responsibility for strategic outcomes (Font et al., 2021). The methodological sequence of risk assessment

Table 2 Key risk types in stakeholder-oriented tourism management

| Risk type | Underlying drivers | Manifestation in the tourism sector |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Informational | Data asymmetry, lack of reliable and up-to-date information | Incomplete information on infrastructure, security, visitor expectations |
| Resource | Uneven recovery of financial, material and human resources | Differentiation in the capacity to restore facilities across regions |
| Communication | Absence of stable formats of dialogue and consultation | Fragmented stakeholder engagement processes |
| Reputational | Perceptions of safety and destination attractiveness | Reduced inflow of international visitors; caution among investors |
| Coordination | Diverging interests and unequal distribution of influence | Delays in decision-making; institutional conflict within partnerships |

Source: compiled by the authors based on (Mihi et al., 2022; Waligo et al., 2022; Yang & Wall, 2023)

includes the following steps: (1) identification of risks; (2) qualitative classification; (3) scoring based on probability (P) and impact (I); (4) calculation of the risk priority number ($RPN = P \times I$); (5) allocation of risk ownership and development of response strategies; (6) continuous monitoring through leading and lagging indicators (Mihi et al., 2022; Alipour et al., 2023).

An additional criterion of power and information asymmetry is incorporated for coordination-related risks, as the uneven distribution of influence within clusters, public–private partnerships, and community governance structures often shapes negotiation outcomes and may amplify conflicts of interest (Yang & Wall, 2023; Byrd & Gustke, 2020).

The context of post-war recovery reinforces the structural heterogeneity and interdependence of tourism stakeholders. This necessitates classifying risks by both operational origin and the position of affected actors. Table 3 summarises the main risk categories relevant to the stakeholder-oriented tourism enterprise strategy.

Risk parameters are assessed using a standardised probability–impact scoring system that is widely used in tourism risk governance and multi-stakeholder coordination frameworks (Mihi et al., 2022; Roik, 2022; Kozubova & Prokopishyna, 2025). This approach allows for the comparative

evaluation of risks that are different in nature, such as those arising from information asymmetry, resource imbalances, reputational pressures, and coordination challenges, across multiple stakeholder groups. In order to operationalise this assessment, probability (P) and impact (I) are measured on a three-point scale, and subsequently aggregated into a Risk Priority Number ($RPN = P \times I$), which determines the urgency and scope of managerial response. The scoring framework employed for the evaluation of risk severity and prioritisation is presented in Table 4.

As shown in Table 3, combining probability and impact enables risks to be assessed in a structured and comparable way across tourism enterprises and destination governance systems. High-priority risks ($RPN \geq 6$) suggest that insufficient coordination, trust deficits or resource constraints may jeopardise strategic objectives and necessitate urgent managerial intervention. Medium-priority risks ($RPN = 3\text{--}4$) require systematic monitoring and proactive mitigation, whereas low-priority risks can be monitored as part of routine observation.

In order to illustrate the functionality of this framework in applied management contexts, Table 5 provides an extract from a stakeholder-oriented risk register for a destination or tourism enterprise.

Table 3 Types of risks in stakeholder-oriented tourism enterprise strategy

| Risk class | Essence | Typical sources | Key stakeholders | Indicative monitoring metrics |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Information risks | Insufficient or asymmetric data affecting strategic decisions | Lack of unified registries; outdated or fragmented statistics | Tourism enterprises, DMOs, local authorities, IT providers | Share of regularly updated datasets; completeness of open data coverage |
| Resource risks | Deficits in infrastructure, finance, and skilled labour | War-related destruction; relocation; limited investment access | Investors, hospitality networks, local governments, communities | Capacity utilisation rates; CAPEX level; staffing gap in critical roles |
| Communication risks | Unstable or ineffective interaction channels | Absence of consultation procedures and participatory planning | Local governments, business associations, communities | Frequency of stakeholder consultations; % of proposals reflected in decisions |
| Reputational risks | Negative perceptions affecting destination attractiveness | Security incidents; service failures; media narratives | Tourists, media, DMOs, international partners | Trust and satisfaction indices; repeat visitation rates |
| Coordination risks | Divergent interests and delays in collective decision-making | Power/resource asymmetries; unaligned strategic objectives | Local authorities, cluster organisations, tour operators, communities | Decision-making time; number of dispute escalations/mediations |

Source: compiled by the authors based on (Mihi et al., 2022; Yang & Wall, 2023; RDNA3, 2024).

Table 4 Scales for probability, impact and risk prioritisation

| Parameter | Level | Score | Interpretation |
|------------------------------------|--------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Probability (P) | Low | 1 | Unlikely to occur within the annual planning horizon |
| | Medium | 2 | May arise periodically under specific conditions |
| | High | 3 | Likely or recurrent in operational practice |
| Impact (I) | Low | 1 | Localised and short-term consequences |
| | Medium | 2 | Noticeable influence on a specific segment or destination |
| | High | 3 | System-wide, long-term and multiplier effects |
| Risk Priority Number (RPN = P × I) | Low | 1–2 | Monitoring only |
| | Medium | 3–4 | Mitigation planning required |
| | High | 6–9 | Immediate intervention and assignment of clear ownership |

Source: developed by the authors based on (Mihi et al., 2022; Roik, 2022; Kozubova & Prokopishyna, 2025).

Table 5 Extract from risk register

| Code | Risk description | P | I | RPN | Responsible stakeholder | Mitigation strategy | Monitoring indicators |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------|---|---|-----|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| R-INF-01 | Incomplete or outdated data on tourism flows and events | 3 | 2 | 6 | DMO | Open-data portal; standardised reporting protocols | Share of datasets updated; data refresh interval |
| R-RES-02 | Staff shortages during peak seasons | 2 | 3 | 6 | Hotel/Cluster | Seasonal outsourcing; internship and voucher schemes | Vacancy fulfilment rate; service satisfaction |
| R-COM-03 | Lack of sustained public consultations | 2 | 2 | 4 | Local government/Cluster | Annual consultation cycle; institutionalised participation rules | Frequency of consultations; share of proposals included |
| R-REP-04 | Negative media coverage damaging destination image | 2 | 2 | 4 | Tourism board/PR unit | Crisis communication protocol; reputation monitoring | Sentiment index; repeat visitation rate |
| R-COO-05 | Delays in joint decision-making | 2 | 3 | 6 | Tourism Council | Defined decision-time SLAs; facilitated negotiation | Decision lead-time; number of escalations |

Source: compiled by the authors based on (Mihi et al., 2022; Roik, 2022; Kozubova & Prokopishyna, 2025).

As illustrated by Table 3, the highest-priority risks ($RPN \geq 6$) are predominantly associated with information deficits, resource constraints, and coordination failures. These risk clusters have been identified as systemic in the context of post-war destination governance. These risks are inherently woven into the fabric of tourism systems, characterised by multi-actor interdependencies, uneven access to resources, and an inherent asymmetry in power and information.

The presented framework enables tourism organisations and destination management bodies to prioritise risks in a transparent, comparable and operational manner. It supports evidence-based decision-making and accountability among

stakeholders, providing a structured basis for developing targeted mitigation mechanisms in post-war recovery contexts.

4 Risk Management in Stakeholder-Oriented Strategies of Tourism Enterprises in the Post-War Period

Effective risk management in the post-war reconstruction of the tourism sector requires transitioning from fragmented, reactive measures to an institutionally embedded, system-level, digitally supported approach (Alipour et al., 2023; Font et al., 2021). Since risks in multi-actor systems tend to be cumulative and mutually reinforcing, they must be mitigated simultaneously

across institutional, economic, organisational, and technological dimensions. Effective, stakeholder-oriented risk governance requires not only the identification and monitoring of risk factors, but also the establishment of long-term co-operation mechanisms. These mechanisms ensure predictable interaction and shared responsibility among tourism enterprises, local communities, public authorities, and private partners (Roik, 2022; Kozubova & Prokopishyna, 2025). To implement such an approach, risk management tools can be organised according to their strategic function and dominant mechanism of influence (see Table 6).

The presented framework shows that shifting from situational collaboration to structured, risk-managed partnership models is key to the

recovery of tourism after war. Institutionalisation provides continuity, while economic tools reinforce resilience. Organisational coordination aligns stakeholder incentives, digital systems reduce uncertainty, and mediation tools safeguard legitimacy and social trust.

Therefore, the effectiveness of stakeholder-oriented governance hinges on tourism enterprises and destination institutions integrating these mechanisms into a coherent, iterative risk management cycle rather than applying them selectively or sporadically.

5 Conclusions

This study's findings demonstrate that Ukraine's tourism sector's effective post-war recovery depends fundamentally on tourism enterprises' capacity to

Table 6 Integrated tools for risk management in stakeholder-oriented tourism governance

| Risk management dimension | Key instruments | Mechanism of risk reduction | Expected outcome | Key stakeholders |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Institutional mechanisms | Advisory councils; Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC); Interaction protocols | Establish permanent consultation and co-decision mechanisms; Reduce coordination uncertainty | Increased transparency and inclusivity of decision-making | Local authorities; Destination Management Organisations (DMOs); communities; tourism enterprises |
| Economic & financial mechanisms | Co-investment projects; PPP schemes; risk-sharing funds; tax incentives for cluster projects | Distribute financial exposure across actors; increase resource stability | Strengthened investment capacity and sustainable infrastructure renewal | Investors; hospitality businesses; local governments; banks |
| Organisational mechanisms | Tourism clusters; Destination Coordination Offices (DMOs); joint event calendars and route networks | Synchronise tourism products, logistics and marketing strategies | Reduced market fragmentation and conflict of interests | Tour operators; cultural institutions; transport providers; municipal councils |
| Digital risk governance tools | CRM and CDP systems; open data platforms; real-time tourism flow dashboards | Reduce information asymmetry and uncertainty; enable scenario-based planning | Higher responsiveness, data-driven decisions and trust-building | Tourism enterprises; IT providers; DMOs; tourists |
| Conflict management & mediation | Mediation protocols; consensus-based negotiation frameworks; early social tension monitoring | Prevent escalation of stakeholder conflicts; ensure legitimacy of decisions | Lower reputational and coordination risks; improved social cohesion within destinations | Local communities; business associations; authorities; NGOs |

Source: developed by the authors based on (Font et al., 2021; Alipour et al., 2023; Byrd & Gustke, 2020; Mihi et al., 2022)

manage stakeholder relations in a balanced and strategically coordinated manner. As a multi-actor system, the tourism industry is subject to heightened sensitivity to information asymmetry, resource scarcity, communication barriers, reputational risks and coordination challenges, due to the differing interests, resources and levels of influence of stakeholder groups. These risks are exacerbated by infrastructure reconstruction and the restoration of trust in destinations.

This research involved the systematic identification of risks, which made it possible to pinpoint the most critical zones of vulnerability. These include uneven access to financial and human resources, limited and fragmented communication mechanisms between businesses, the government and communities, the fragile international image of Ukrainian destinations, and the difficulty of aligning strategic objectives across stakeholder groups. As these risks are interconnected and mutually reinforcing, their mitigation requires a comprehensive rather than an isolated response.

The study proposes an integrated stakeholder-oriented risk management framework, including

institutional reinforcement of interaction procedures, joint financial and investment mechanisms for infrastructure renewal, destination-level coordination through clusters and destination management organisations (DMOs), digital, data-driven monitoring systems, and mediation and consensus-based negotiation to prevent or resolve stakeholder conflicts. This approach reduces uncertainty, strengthens mutual trust and ensures transparency in decision-making. It also shifts co-operation from an ad hoc pattern to stable, risk-governed partnership arrangements.

In summary, the recovery of Ukraine's tourism sector cannot be viewed solely in terms of the physical reconstruction of facilities. This must be accompanied by institutional innovation and the cultivation of collaborative governance cultures, as well as the adoption of mechanisms that distribute responsibility and value among stakeholders. Only this comprehensive approach can ensure the resilience of tourism business models, boost the competitiveness of destinations, and generate long-term benefits for communities (hromadas) and visitors.

References

- Kiziun, A. H., Hutsal, L. A., & Tsurkan, I. M. (2023). Analiz rozvytku industrii turyzmu v Ukraini v umovakh rosiisko-ukrainskoi viiny [Analysis of the development of the tourism industry in Ukraine under the conditions of the Russian-Ukrainian war]. *Industriia turyzmu i hostynnosti v Tsentralnii ta Skhidnii Yevropi*, no. 8, pp. 79–87. (In Ukrainian)
- Slatvinska, L., Zbyrannyk, O., & Matsak, N. (2024). Otsinka suchasnoho stanu ta perspektyv rozvytku pidpriemnytstva u haluzi turyzmu v Ukraini z urakhuvanniam naslidkiv viiskovoho stanu [Assessment of the current state and prospects of tourism entrepreneurship development in Ukraine under martial law]. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, no. 59. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2024-59-19> (In Ukrainian)
- Boiko, Z. V., Horozhankina, N. A., & Hrushka, V. V. (2024). Tendentsii rozvytku turyzmu v Ukraini v umovakh voiennoho chasu [Trends in tourism development in Ukraine during wartime]. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, no. 59. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2024-59-7> (In Ukrainian)
- Terebukh, A., Roik, O., & Pankiv, N. (2023). Integral assessment of the impact on Ukraine's environment of military actions in the conditions of Russian aggression. *Ecological Engineering & Environmental Technology*, no. 24(3), pp. 90–98.
- Becken, S., & Hughey, K. F. D. (2021). Linking tourism into emergency management structures to enhance disaster risk reduction. *Tourism Management*, no. 83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104252>
- Hall, C. M., Scott, D., & Gössling, S. (2020). Pandemics, transformations and tourism: Be careful what you wish for. *Tourism Geographies*, no. 22(3), pp. 577–598. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1759131>
- Yang, L., & Wall, G. (2023). Risk negotiation, power asymmetry, and stakeholder dynamics in tourism development. *Tourism Geographies*, no. 25(5), pp. 643–662. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2022.2045337>
- Alipour, H., Kilic, H., & Zamani, H. (2023). Post-conflict tourism recovery governance: Stakeholder engagement and risk balancing. *Annals of Tourism Research*, no. 99. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2023.103482>
- Mihi, A., Carrillo-Hidalgo, I., & Martín, J. (2022). Risk governance in tourism destinations: A stakeholder-based framework. *Tourism Review*, no. 77(3), pp. 897–914. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-06-2021-0262>
- Waligo, V., Clarke, J., & Hawkins, R. (2022). Implementation barriers in multi-stakeholder tourism planning: Conflict and coordination risks. *Tourism Management*, no. 90. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2022.104472>
- Byrd, E. T., & Gustke, L. (2020). Sustainable tourism stakeholder conflict: A framework for consensus. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, no. 28(9), pp. 1428–1446. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1739453>
- Font, X., Guix, M., & Bonilla-Priego, M. J. (2021). Sustainability governance, stakeholder trust and risk. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, no. 29(2), pp. 232–250. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1775622>
- Ugodnikova, O. I. (2020). Kontseptualni pidkhody do modernizatsiyi mekhanizmiv derzhavnoho rehulyuvannya turyzmu ta hotelno-restorannoho hospodarstva shlyakhom vprovadzhennya steykholderno-oriyentovanoyu modellyu stratchichnoho rozvytku [Conceptual approaches to the modernization of mechanisms of state regulation

of tourism and the hotel and restaurant industry by implementing a stakeholder-oriented model of strategic development]. *Law and public administration*. Issue No. 1, volume 2. P. 189–195. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32840/pdu.2020.1-2.29>. (in Ukrainian)

Roik, O. R. (2022). Otsinka ryzykiv pry pobudovi steypkholdernoyi modeli stratchichnoho upravlinnya turystychnym biznesom [Risk assessment in the construction of a stakeholder model of strategic management of tourism business]. *Black Sea Economic Studies*. Issue 76. P. 272–278. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/bses.76-39> (in Ukrainian)

Ekonomichna bezpeka Ukrainy v umovakh dohotryvaloi viiny: ekspertno-analitychna dopovid [Economic Security of Ukraine in Conditions of Prolonged War: Expert-Analytical Report]. (2024). Kyiv: NISS. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53679/NISS-analytrep.2024.08> (In Ukrainian)

Ukraina. Tretia shvydka otsinka zbytkiv ta potreb (RDNA3). Liutyi 2022 – hruden 2023 [Ukraine. Third Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA3). February 2022 – December 2023]. (2024). The World Bank, Government of Ukraine, European Union, United Nations. Available at: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099021324115085807/pdf/P1801741bea12c012189ca16d95d8c2556a.pdf> (In Ukrainian)

Derzhavne ahentstvo rozvytku turyzmu. (2024). Dynamika podatkovykh nadkhodzen po oblastiakh za pershe pivrichchya 2024 roku [Dynamics of tax revenues by regions for the first half of 2024]. Derzhavne ahentstvo rozvytku turyzmu. Available at: <https://www.tourism.gov.ua/blog/dynamika-podatkovih-nadhodzen-po-oblastyah-za-pershe-pivrichchya-2024-roku>. (In Ukrainian)

Kozubova, N., & Prokopishyna, O. (2025). Financial provisions of tourism business risk management. *Economics and Society*, no. 72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2025-72-167>

Almeida J., Costa C., Nunes da Silva F. (2018) Collaborative approach for tourism conflict management: A Portuguese case study. *Land Use Policy*, vol. 75, pp. DOI: 166–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.03.034>

Zakharkin, O. O. (2017). Steypkholderskyi pidkhyd do derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva v upravlinni innovatsiynoyu diyalnistyu pidpryyemstv [Stakeholder approach to public-private partnership in the management of innovative activities of enterprises]. *Market infrastructure*. No. 5. P. 85–89. (in Ukrainian)

Terebukh, A., & Roik, O. (2024). Tactical management of Ukrainian enterprises in wartime. *Economics and region*, no. 1(92). DOI: [https://doi.org/10.26906/EiR.2024.1\(92\).3326](https://doi.org/10.26906/EiR.2024.1(92).3326) (In Ukrainian)