

UDC: 330.34.01:330.16](477):159.9

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-18-3-369-382>

Prykhodchenko Liudmyla Leonidivna,
professor, Doctor in public administration, head of Public Administration and Regionalism Chair Odessa Regional Institute for Public Administration, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, 65009, Odessa, Str. Genuevska, 22, tel.: 066-76-181-42, e-mail: liudmyla.prykhodchenko@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-6454-6729

Приходченко Людмила Леонідівна,
професор, доктор наук з державного управління, завідувач кафедри публічного управління та регіоналістики Одеського регіонального інституту державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України, 65009, м. Одеса, вул. Генуезька, 22, тел. 066-76-181-42, e-mail: liudmyla.prykhodchenko@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-6454-6729

Приходченко Людмила Леонидовна,
профессор, доктор наук по государственному управлению, заведующая кафедры публичного управления и регионалистики Одесского регионального института государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 65009, г. Одесса, ул. Генуэзская, 22, тел. 066-76-181-42, e-mail: liudmyla.prykhodchenko@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-6454-6729

Lesyk Olena Vasylivna,

PhD in public administration, senior lecture of Public Administration and Regionalism Chair Odessa Regional Institute for Public Administration, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, 65009, Odessa, Str. Genuevska, 22, tel.: 066-44-84-777, e-mail: lesik.elena2014@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-1542-284X

Лесик Олена Василівна,

кандидат наук з державного управління, старший викладач кафедри публічного управління та регіоналістики Одеського регіонального інституту державного управлін-



ня Національної академії державного управління при Президенті України, 65009, м. Одеса, вул. Генуезька, 22, тел. 066-44-84-777, e-mail: lesik.elena2014@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-1542-284X

Лесик Елена Васильевна,

кандидат наук по государственному управлению, старший преподаватель кафедры публичного управления и регионалистики Одесского регионального института государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 65009, г. Одесса, ул. Генуэзская, 22, тел. 066-44-84-777, e-mail: lesik.elena2014@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-1542-284X

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF STRATEGIC PRIORITIES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION OF UKRAINE: ARCHETYPAL PARADIGM

Abstract. Through the prism of formed by the historical tradition of archetypes the sustainable development strategic priorities as a component of strategic planning and the object of efforts consolidation of public authorities, business structures and the public in the medium and long-term perspective are considered as well as their conditionality is determined. These are determined the requirements for distinguishing the stages of fundamental transformations in the process of reforming the public administration system, and their compliance with the stages of development during the years of independence are analyzed. The emphasis is on optimization requirements (complexity, organizational flexibility, stratification or ranking of goals, the pace of transformations), stemming from the objective aspects of archetypes of the modern Ukrainian society. It is established that for national experience of reforming characteristic features are: refusal from the analysis of own experience; distortion of information flows; failures in policy implementation and unpopular transformations; the tendency to increase the number and complexity of structures and scale of tasks that is difficult to adapt to changing conditions; lack of effective leadership and management skills. The problematic issues that arise in the process of strategic priorities realization are singled out.

On the basis of the analysis of the reasons that make impossible the sustainable regional development on the basis of regional development strategies of Ukraine for the period up to 2020, it is justified the need of updating the methodological provision for their development and revision. The practical experience in determining sustainable development strategic priorities on the example of Vinnitsa is investigated. It is indicated the objective (based on the archetypes formed by the historical tradition) and subjective (due to the variability and specificity of their manifestations) factors of the unpopularity of strategic transformations,

the reasons for failures in the reforms implementation, the negative effects of their manifestations, which in aggregate made it possible to identify the main threats to the implementation of the sustainable development strategic priorities.

Keywords: strategic priorities, sustainable development, public administration system, reform, transformations, optimization requirements, archetypal paradigm.

ТЕОРІЯ ТА ПРАКТИКА РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ СТРАТЕГІЧНИХ ПРІОРИТЕТІВ СТАЛОГО РОЗВИТКУ УКРАЇНИ: АРХЕТИПНА ПАРАДИГМА

Анотація. Кризь призму сформованих історичною традицією архетипів розглянуто стратегічні пріоритети сталого розвитку як складову стратегічного планування та об'єкт консолідації зусиль органів публічної влади, бізнес-структур та громадськості на середньо- та довгострокову перспективу і вказано на їх зумовленість. Визначено вимоги для виокремлення етапів кардинальних перетворень, що здійснюються в ході реформування системи публічного управління та проаналізовано їх дотримання в поетапності розбудови за роки незалежності. Акцентовано увагу на оптимізаційних вимогах (комплексності, організаційній гнучкості, стратифікації або ранжуванні цілей, темпах трансформаційних перетворень), що впливають з об'єктивних аспектів, що наявні в сучасному вітчизняному суспільстві архетипів. Встановлено, що для вітчизняного досвіду реформування характерними ознаками є: відмова від аналізу власного досвіду; викривлення інформаційних потоків; невдачі в реалізації політик та непопулярність перетворень; тенденція до збільшення кількості та складності структур і масштабів завдань, що складно адаптувати до змінних умов; брак ефективного лідерства та навичок управління змінами. Виокремлено проблемні питання, що виникають у процесі реалізації стратегічних пріоритетів.

На основі аналізу причин, що унеможливають сталий регіональний розвиток на основі стратегій регіонального розвитку регіонів України на період до 2020 р., обґрунтовано потребу в оновленні методичного забезпечення їх розроблення та перегляду існуючих. Досліджено практичний досвід щодо визначення стратегічних пріоритетів сталого розвитку на прикладі м. Вінниця. Вказано на об'єктивні (що спираються на сформовані історичною традицією архетипи) та суб'єктивні (зумовлені варіативністю та специфічністю їх виявів) чинники непопулярності стратегічних перетворень, причини, що зумовлюють невдачі при здійсненні реформ, негативні наслідки їх вияву, що в сукупності надало змогу визначити основні загрози для реалізації стратегічних пріоритетів сталого розвитку.

Ключові слова: стратегічні пріоритети, сталий розвиток, система публічного управління, реформування, трансформаційні перетворення, оптимізаційні вимоги, архетипна парадигма.

ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА РЕАЛИЗАЦИИ СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКИХ ПРИОРИТЕТОВ УСТОЙЧИВОГО РАЗВИТИЯ УКРАИНЫ: АРХЕТИПНАЯ ПАРАДИГМА

Аннотация. Сквозь призму сформированных исторической традицией архетипов рассмотрены стратегические приоритеты устойчивого развития как составляющая стратегического планирования и объект консолидации усилий органов публичной власти, бизнес-структур и общественности на средне- и долгосрочную перспективу и указано на их обусловленность. Определены требования для выделения этапов кардинальных преобразований, осуществляемых в процессе реформирования системы публичного управления и проанализировано их соблюдение за годы независимости. Акцентируется внимание на оптимизационных требованиях (комплексности, организационной гибкости, стратификации или ранжировании целей, темпе трансформационных преобразований), которые вытекают из объективных аспектов, присутствующих в современном отечественном обществе архетипов. Установлено, что для отечественного опыта реформирования характерными признаками являются: отказ от анализа собственного опыта; искривление информационных потоков; неудачи в реализации политик и непопулярность преобразований; тенденция к увеличению количества и сложности структур и масштабов задач, их адаптация к изменяющимся условиям; недостаток эффективного лидерства и навыков управления изменениями. Выделены проблемные вопросы, возникающие в процессе реализации стратегических приоритетов.

На основе анализа причин, которые делают невозможным устойчивое региональное развитие на основе стратегий регионального развития регионов Украины на период до 2020 г., обоснована необходимость в обновлении методического обеспечения их разработки и пересмотра существующих. Исследован практический опыт по определению стратегических приоритетов устойчивого развития на примере г. Винница. Указано на объективные (которые опираются на сформированные исторической традицией архетипы) и субъективные (обусловленные вариативностью и специфичностью их проявлений) факторы непопулярности стратегических преобразований, причины, обуславливающие неудачи при осуществлении реформ, негативные последствия их проявления, что в совокупности дало возможность определить основные угрозы для реализации стратегических приоритетов устойчивого развития.

Ключевые слова: стратегические приоритеты, устойчивое развитие, система публичного управления, реформирование, трансформационные преобразования, оптимизационные требования, архетипная парадигма.

Problem statement. The practice and implementation of various strategic programs at the present stage of development gives grounds to assert of modern state building in the context of substantiation of expediency

that the definition and implementation of sustainable development strategic priorities and related policies is first of all the initiation of a certain type of reforms aimed at improving the public administration system and the formation of a sufficient scale of strategic potential with optimizing the parameters of its use. In Ukraine, in line with the Strategy for Sustainable Development “Ukraine 2020” [1], these are determined the goals, directions, strategic priorities of the state development, which are specified in the Concept for the Reform of Local Self-Government and Territorial Organization of Power in Ukraine [2], the State Strategy for Regional Development till 2020 [3], the Program and Action Plan of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, and correlate with the general course of European integration (“European Principles of Public Administration” (OECD, 1999; SIGMA, 2017). They are the basis for implementing European standards of living in Ukraine through the implementation of 62 reforms and development programs that require rapid transformations in the administrative subsystem based on a radical reorganization of existing administrative mechanisms. However, the real achievements over the past 4 years for the accomplishment of key indicators attest to the slow pace of their achievement [4, p. 471–473], which is largely due to the neglect of the national endogenous potential, national features, traditions and available archetypes. So, we’ve got a crisis in the administration system, which indicates the existence of problem issues as well the theory, methodology as practice of implementing strategic priorities, which in turn are

exacerbated by the lack of constructive interaction between central and local government bodies, local self-government, representatives of science, business and the public.

Analysis of recent publications on the issues and identification of previously unsettled parts of the general problem. The methodological basis of the research of the questions of sustainable development strategic priorities forming and ways of their realization is the works of domestic and foreign scientists: S. Albert, S. Bila, B. Garrett, B. Danilishin, M. Dyussozh, M. Dolishny, V. Keretsman, V. Mamonova, P. Nadolishny, M. Porter and others. These works form the basis for the research of socio-economic and environmental components of sustainable development, mainly at the regional level, and serve as a methodology for development strategies researching. At the same time, the research of problem issues and the substantiation of ways for overcoming them in the process of the sustainable development priorities implementation was not paid attention.

The purpose of the article. Based on the substantiation of the theoretical foundations of the sustainable development strategic priorities, the definition of requirements and characteristics of the process of reforming the public administration system, to investigate problem issues and identify the main threats for their implementation in Ukraine.

The presentation of the main research material with the full substantiation of the scientific results. Strategic priorities are an integral part of strategic planning and determine not only the mechanisms for ensuring national

security, but also the direction of the socio-economic sphere development in the medium-term perspective. At the same time, they can be considered as an object of efforts consolidation of state authorities and local self-government bodies, business structures and the public in the medium and long-term perspective, a key to achieving social consensus on the solution of topical problems of sustainable development at the local, regional, national levels.

Development priority which is objectively defined (including taking into account the peculiarities of the development of the village, district, city and oblast, state as a whole), is backed by the existing resource supply, becomes the basis for successful achievement of the sustainable balanced development goal, competitiveness growth of the regions and the state. Strategic development priorities determine the definition of tasks and tools for solving social problems, increase the level of economic potential of territories, their economic performance, profitability of business and incomes, and, as a result, create conditions for the general increase of social standards, quality of life and the business environment development. In strategies are typically involved complex, large-scale, non-differentiated transformations, in which components with not identified high and low risks. Therefore, instead of building up activities on the basis of the selection of less risky components, if these are provided that they are potentially successful, we get mixed in terms of complexity, scale and degree of risk activities, which ultimately complicates the possibility of risk management and control of major risks.

The implementation of strategic priorities also involves the consolidation of the efforts of disparate authorities, that is, the consistency of forecast indicators and vision of the future, planned documents (in terms of goals, tasks, terms), coordination of activities, etc. It is about a joint coordinated activity of all components of the public administration system to achieve the declared goals, which will enable them to be successfully implemented.

Scientists Sauer K., Gemino A. and Reich B. [5] and Fishenden J. and Thompson M. [6] found that the risk of failures in the implementation of any strategies, programs and projects, including governmental, is growing from the increasing in the number of persons who are involved in its implementation and in the time for which they are calculated. So, if the task needs to be spent less than 24 man-months, there is a 25 % probability of failure, provided that this number is 500–1,000 man-months, then this probability is 50 %, 1,000–2,400 – the risk tripleth and is 75 %, and there were no successful projects with labor costs over 2,400 man-months at all.

Taking into account the complexity of reforms outlined in the Strategy, it is impossible to make the transformation in one stage, as far as the fundamental transformations have to be in harmony with the informal structure of the system, which changes quite slowly. Therefore, it is necessary to define the requirements for distinguishing transformation stages:

- the result of each stage should be a holistic functionally completed set of activities (autonomous reform, the results of which can be evaluated);

- each of the stages is the basis for building a complex of transformations of a higher quality level: the results of the previous ones are aimed at achieving the goals of the following stages; effective forms of transformation need to be preserved, regressive — to be removed, complement with new forms (methods, technologies);

- to overcome the increasing complexity, discoordination and other dysfunctions should be systematically allocated in the complicated structure of a group of homogeneous or closely related components, to create mechanisms for their coordination;

- the development of each new stage appropriate to carry out through the advance promotion of leadership subsystems that have the highest organizational potential for the development of progressive approaches and technologies.

We would like to stress the fact that during the years of independence, and the actual development of a modern public administration system, in stages of reform, almost none of the above requirements were met. Every new governmental team outlined its own trajectory of transformations, however, its cadence made it possible to implement (and not always) only the first stage of such transformations. As a matter of fact, during the period of Ukraine's independence, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine was headed by 21 prime ministers (including several times), with 20 relevant government programs operating there. And this despite the fact that the implementation of complex transformations is a difficult and long-term process and requires the implementation of a complex algorithm, with pre-

dictions of more complex and profound transformations.

Taken to attention the potential hidden in archetypes (democracy, lack of own statehood, local self-identification, etc.) [7], let's compare it to the society's perception of the reforms. The most noticeable, according to the general public opinion, are the changes connected with the decentralization reform. The level of this reform implementation is steadily growing, the estimation of the effectiveness of the reforms by the population is also quite high, and almost 50 % of the population has experienced significant changes in the implementation of this reform (we note that the level of perception of other reforms ranges from 15 to 25 %).

Another disadvantage of reform, in the outlined sense, is the rejection of the own experience analysis, which, in essence, is a consequence of the manifestation of the archetype of its own statehood long absence. Quite often we are witnessing a situation in which all previous developments are a priori recognized as negative: so, among all the Prime Ministers of Ukraine, only V. Groisman thanked his predecessors for the quality work, while the rest of the same critically advocated the activities of predecessors and their consequences.

Also, the optimization requirement is complexity, within which the additive character and synergistic effect from uniting efforts is revealed. Complexity implies:

- the comprehensiveness and mutual co-ordination of the impacts on the object of administration: “the conduction of some, even the most appropriate, measures will not give a proper return if

they are isolated. Taken outside the system, they can contradict each other and not lead to the desired effect” [8, p. 9];

- complementarity of the forms and dynamism of the ways of the system, which involves a combination of the best domestic and adaptive foreign practices of the public administration system reforming, based on its endogenous potential;

- complementary combination of components. This aspect works best within the public authorities’ structure, since its specificity is best disclosed in relation to the organizational structure of a separate functional unit.

Regarding the organizational flexibility of the public administration system – the possibilities to change according to the conditions of the external and internal environment, to change the functional purpose, in accordance with the dynamism of intermediate goals, etc., for this, the development of such features of the system is a priority.

Considering the planning process begins with goal-setting, it is necessary not only to identify the priority tasks (“links”), but also to stratify or to rank targets. That is, it makes impossible one-step transformation, or transformation over a short period of time. Thus, with this special significance the process of goal-setting becomes: the discordance of the goals to the real opportunities for their achievement causes defeat the entire process of reform. Also important is the transformations pace of the system development that should be synchronized not only with internal needs but also with the requirements of the environment, with both a significant lag behind the others and the excessive dynamism

of transformations under certain conditions are suboptimal.

Given the above, it is worthwhile to outline a number of reasons for failures in reforms implementation:

- distortion of information flows, the results of which may be completely missing information on the condition of the reformed object, that is, the lack or incompleteness or unreliability of the source data (for example, the Strategy of public administration reform was developed in the absence of a systematic idea of the object of reform, and complete integrated analysis was carried out as early as mid-2018); in the end, the authorities can’t adequately plan the needs for change and how they have to be implemented;

- failures in policy implementation and unpopular transformations (data from sociological surveys indicate an existing tendency to lower confidence in the authorities and increasing skepticism about the prospects for reforming success [9]; thus, trust to public administration bodies is catastrophically low, and a significant part of the population sees it precisely in the administrative workers (public servants and politicians) the main brake factor for reforms). In essence, solving this complex and large-scale problem lies in the course of the movement in all key areas of the reform, as the development of relationships, especially taking into account the potential by adjusting the influences in the form of feedback, will actually allow the defined strategic priorities to be effectively implemented;

- the tendency to increasing of the number and complexity of structures and tasks scale that is difficult to adapt to changing conditions (simultaneous

implementation of a range of strategic reforms and a long transition period resulted the existence of a number of duplicating structures in the public administration system; the complexity of the division of powers and responsibilities (for example, between rayon councils, rayon state administrations and newly formed united territorial communities, especially if the latter united all communities of the district), dilution of control area);

- lack of effective leadership and special management skills.

Thus, when we talk about problems in strategic priorities implementing, we should highlight the following:

- the ambitiousness and complexity of the planned transformations, which, coupled with the long-term perspective, present a grave risk of changes in the legislation, vectors of public policy and their implementation technologies;

- a critical perception of the interim results of the goals implementation, negative analysts' evaluation and public discontent, which may lead to a failure of plans implementation, while such incompleteness causes a reduction in the effectiveness of the strategy, and the unpopularity of reforms, as evidenced by world practice, is often due to the roots of change that in turn, yields positive results on the condition of full realization of the planned course and only in the long-term perspective;

- low level of professional competence of both public servants and consumers. At the same time, the level of consciousness of the latter is decisive, since large-scale transformations should be approached with a strategic vision and awareness of social necessity.

Ukraine's loss of key positions in the international economic space, lack of readiness for new external and internal challenges, and the aggravation of problems at the local level are the result of deepening of both economic and social and humanitarian disparities between the regions, which in aggregate constitutes a threat to the security of the state. After all, without realistic consideration of regional aspects, achieving sustainable development in general is not possible.

The formulation and implementation of regional development strategies as a document outlining prospects contributes to the effective use of existing resource potential, the identification and use of unique competitive advantages, which creates the preconditions for economic growth and social and humanitarian development, ensuring stability in general. Recall that the Strategies for Regional Development of Ukraine's Regions until 2020 were approved in the second half of 2014–2015 (except for the strategies of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and Sevastopol), which was envisioned by the State Strategy for Regional Development for the period till 2020 [3] for implementation Action Plan for its realization.

In defining archetypes [7], we noted the territorial (regional, local) self-identification, which is one of the most controversial archetypes. In the national realities and according to the historical preconditions in this archetype, its manifestation in the administration object hides the threat of a split of the country in accordance with the language, religious, foreign policy preferences of certain territorial communities. By means of this archetype it is

possible to clearly illustrate the need to ensure the consolidation of the nation, the formation of self-identification at the level of “I am a citizen of Ukraine”. Taking into account national characteristics and significant differences within the framework of European integration aspirations, it would be worth taking the key principle of building the EU – unity in diversity. On the basis of this it is possible to start the consolidation of the entire society and the formation of a national identity. Especially considering the fact that on time, the presence of real external threats serves as an additional consolidating factor.

Among the reasons that make sustainable regional development and their transformation into competitive regions impossible, is defined [10]:

- lack of systemic approaches and coherence of the strategy, both with the priorities of the state regional policy, as well as with the program documents and directions of the region’s development;

- low effectiveness of regional development strategic planning, including forecasting: the plan of action is foreseen for only 5 years, and the lack of vision of future development scenarios transforms the strategy into operational plans, which serve to clarify the current goals, mechanisms and means of achieving them – we work according to the principle “Extinguishing the fire”;

- static and focused on addressing existing regional development problems.

Undoubtedly, the process of formation and implementation of strategies for regional development is directly dependent on the external environment –

changes in the socio-political situation and market principles of the economic component. These actualize the need for updating methodological support for strategy development. In particular, during the period from 2015 to 2016, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the Ministry of Regional Development of Construction and Housing and Communal Services of Ukraine adopted a number of normative and legal documents:

- The procedure for the development of the State Strategy for Regional Development of Ukraine and the plan for its implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan (11.11.2015, Decree № 931);

- The procedure for the formulation of regional development strategies and action plans for their implementation, as well as the monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the implementation of these regional strategies and action plans (11.11.2015, Decree № 932);

- Methodology for developing, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of implementation of regional development strategies and plans for their implementation (31.03.2016, order number 632).

As the existing regional development strategies were approved in 2014–2015 on the basis of previous methodological recommendations from 2011, this necessitates a regular updating and adjustment of three-year plans for their implementation. The above-mentioned methodological recommendations from 2016 in fact can be applied only to monitoring the implementation

of strategies and assessment of implementation of action plans for their implementation.

Let's consider in more detail the practical experience in determining strategic priorities of sustainable development on the example of Vinnitsa. Thus, "Development Strategy of Vinnytsia-2020" [11] focuses on achieving a high standard that meets modern requirements, the level and quality of life, and comfortable conditions for living on the basis of the formation of a competitive economy and a developed social sphere. For these, five strategic directions is identified and approved: the formation of a strong local community; economic development aimed at high and quality employment; sustainable environmental development and improvement of the quality of communal services; quality of social life; balanced spatial development.

For example, within the first strategic priority "Formation of a strong local community" over the past two years, 77 projects was implemented, of which 27 was implemented for the purposes of "Vinnitsa as a city with a developed civil society" and "Leadership of Vinnitsa in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of local municipality". Behind these figures, the daily work of the executive committee of the city council and its deputy corps on development: administrative and social services oriented to citizens, civil society institutions, urban identity, etc. And all this is accompanied by constant training not only direct employees, but all involved participants in the implementation of the development strategy: forums, trainings, round tables, conferences, etc.

It should also be added that for implementation of the "Development Strategy of Vinnytsia-2020" a number of conceptual programs was adopted, the implementation of which is aimed at achieving development priorities. In particular: Investment Promotion Program in Vinnitsa for 2018–2020, approved by the decision of the City Council dated November 24, 2017 № 930; The marketing strategy of the city of Vinnitsa-2020, approved by the decision of the city council dated June 27, 2018, № 1222. Thus, the implementation of the Marketing Strategy of the city of Vinnytsia-2020 will contribute to the formation of a positive investment and tourist image of the city, creating real opportunities for attracting investment, establishing effective regional and international relations.

An example of the potential effectiveness of implementing rather unpopular reforms is the provision of transport services. With the aim of overcoming the unprofitableness of local public transport by local government bodies of Vinnitsa, it was decided to abandon the services of private carriers and allocate part of the budget funds for the creation of municipal tram and trolleybus and bus parks. Despite the clarity and planning of the reform, the clear miscalculation of loads and the study of passenger flows in the first stages of implementation, it was not only unpopular, but also caused significant social discontent, and residents of certain parts of city even organized demonstrations to cancel such decisions. However, after a series of corrective actions, after the inhabitants of the city got used to the newly formed system, it was possible not only to update the rolling stock of

the municipal transport, but also to ensure the transportation of passengers according to clear schedules, and the result obtained now has rather high estimates of the inhabitants of the city.

Conclusions and perspectives of further research. The reasons for failure in the reforms implementation are: failure to take into account endogenous potential and available archetypes; distortion of information flows, the results of which may be completely missing information about the state of the reformed object; failures in policy implementation and unpopular transformations; the tendency to increasing the number and complexity of structures and scale of tasks that is difficult to adapt to changing conditions; the lack of effective leadership and change management skills, etc. The negative consequences of the manifestation of these factors are:

- the increasing complexity of administrative procedures (the transition period is due to the introduction of new rules and procedures in parallel with existing ones, which reduces the level of transparency and confidence to the authorities);

- complication in coordinating the activities of structures (the problem of fuzzy distribution of powers, the presence of gaps and duplication, which manifest themselves against the backdrop of inconsistency of activity of disparate structures, which in aggregate not only complicates, but also makes it impossible to achieve the set goals).

Thus, the main threats for the implementation of strategic priorities are: lack of relevant managers and leaders; lack of proper administrative skills; weak risk management; complexity,

size and ambition of transformations; fragmentation and non-coordination of actions; excessive concentration on selection of methods and process, incompleteness of activity. And the main reason for the unpopularity of strategic transformations is the need to direct significant resources over a long period of time and delay in end results, which collectively leads to negative public perceptions. In essence, these threats are inherent not only for national administration practice, but the archetypes available in Ukraine significantly increase and exacerbate the negative manifestations of some of them.

Therefore, Ukraine's aspiration to sustainable development on the basis of competitiveness, along with other, urgently needs to reform the public administration system on scientifically grounded, methodologically tested principles. As well as the development and introduction of new approaches to the use of human, economic and natural resources, and other potential of the state, which would provide a qualitatively new standard of living for Ukrainian citizens, which is the subject of further scientific research.

REFERENCES

1. Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy Pro strategiyu stalogo rozvytku "Ukraina – 2020" № 5/2015 vid 12 sichnya 2015 r. [Decree of the President of Ukraine About the Strategy of Sustainable Development "Ukraine 2020" № 5/2015 dated January 12, 2015]. www.president.gov.ua. Retrieved from: <http://www.president.gov.ua/documents/18688.html?PrintVersion> [in Ukrainian].
2. Rozporyadzhennya Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy pro shvalennya koncepcii

- reformuvannya mistseвого samovry-
aduvannya ta terytorialnoi organizacii
vlady v Ukraini vid 1 kvitnya 2014 r.
№ 333-r. [Order of the Cabinet of
Ministers of Ukraine On Approving
the Concept of Reforming of Local
Self-Government and Territorial Or-
ganization of Power in Ukraine dated
April 1, 2014 № 333-p.]. zakon4.rada.
gov.ua. Retrieved from: <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/333-2014-%D1%80/conv> [in Ukrainian].
3. Postanova Kabinetu Ministriv
Ukrainy Pro zatverdzhennya der-
zhavnoi strategii regionalnogo rozvyt-
ku na period do 2020 roku vid 6 ser-
pnya 2014 roku № 385 [Resolution of
the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on
Approval of the State Strategy for Re-
gional Development for the period up
to 2020 dated August 6, 2014 № 385].
zakon0.rada.gov.ua. Retrieved from:
[http://zakon0.rada.gov.ua/laws/
show/385-2014-%D0%BF](http://zakon0.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/385-2014-%D0%BF) [in Ukrai-
nian].
 4. Analitychna dopovid do Schorich-
nogo Poslannya Prezidenta Ukrainy
do Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy “Pro
vnutrishnye ta zovnishnye stanovische
Ukrainy v 2018 rotsi” [An analytical
report to the Annual Address of the
President of Ukraine to the Verkhovna
Rada of Ukraine “About the Internal
and External Situation of Ukraine in
2018”] (2018) Kyiv. NISD [in Ukrai-
nian].
 5. *Sauer C., Gemino A. and Reich B. H.*
(2007): “The Impact of Size and Vo-
latility on IT Project Performance:
Studying the factors influencing pro-
ject risk” Communication of the ACM,
November, Vol. 50, № 11. [in English].
 6. *Fishenden J. and Thompson M.* (2012):
“Digital Government, Open Archi-
tecture, and Innovation: Why Public
Sector IT Will Never Be The Same
Again”, Journal of Public Administra-
tion, Research and Theory, 6, 1–28.
pdfs.semanticscholar.org Retrieved
from: [https://pdfs.semanticscholar.
org/8a2e/d5323b049323bcba64f4c-
44cfaebc5046c20.pdf](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8a2e/d5323b049323bcba64f4c-44cfaebc5046c20.pdf) [in English].
 7. *Lesyk O.* (2016) Archetypy ta ix rol u
rozvytku vitchyznyanoi modeli der-
zhavnogo upravlinnya. [Archetypes
and their role in the development
of the national public administra-
tion model.] Archetypika i derzhavne
upravlinnya: vyklyky ta ryzyky
suspilnoi transformacii. — Archetype
and Public Administration: Challen-
ges and Risks of Social Transforma-
tion, 39–49 [in Ukrainian].
 8. *Fedorenko N. P.* (1974) Metodologi-
cheskie problemy sovershenstvova-
niya upravleniya ekonomikoj [Me-
thodological problems of improving
the management of the economy]. Vo-
prosy filosofii — Questions of philoso-
phy, 6, 3–15. [in Russian].
 9. Otsinka gromadyanamy situacij
v krajin, stavlennya do suspilnyh
instytutiv, elektoralni oriyentacii. re-
zultaty sotsiologichnogo doslidzhe-
nnya. Doslidzhennya provedene
sotsiologichnoyu sluzhboyu Tsentru
Razumkova z 21 po 26 bereznia 2019
roku. [Assessment by citizens of the
situation in the country, attitudes to-
wards social institutions, electoral
orientation. Results of sociological
research. The research was conduc-
ted by the sociological service of the
Razumkov Center from March 21 to
March 26, 2019.]. razumkov.org.ua.
Retrieved from: [razumkov.org.ua/.../
otsinka-hromadianamy-sytuatsii-v-
kraini-stavlennia-do-suspilnyk...](http://razumkov.org.ua/.../otsinka-hromadianamy-sytuatsii-v-kraini-stavlennia-do-suspilnyk...) [in
Ukrainian].
 10. Onovlennya regionalnyh strategij zad-
lya zabezpechennya stabilnogo rozvyt-
ku: analitichna zapyska. Nacionalnyj
instytut strategichnyh doslidzhen
[Updating of regional strategies for
sustainable development: analytical
note. National Institute for Strategic

- Studies]. www.niss.gov.ua. Retrieved from: http://www.niss.gov.ua/content/articles/files/region_strategy-26d31.pdf [in Ukrainian].
11. Rishennya Vinnytskoi miskoi rady pro Strategiyu rozvytku "Vinnytsya 2020" vid 30.08.2013 roku № 1405 [The decision of the Vinnytsa City Council about Development Strategy "Vinnytsya 2020" dated August 30, 2013, No. 1405.]. www.vmr.gov.ua. Retrieved from: <http://www.vmr.gov.ua/Docs/default.aspx> [in Ukrainian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Про Стратегію сталого розвитку "Україна – 2020": указ Президента України № 5/2015 від 12 січня 2015 р. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.president.gov.ua/documents/18688.html?PrintVersion>
2. Про схвалення Концепції реформування місцевого самоврядування та територіальної організації влади в Україні: розпорядження Кабінету Міністрів України від 1 квітня 2014 р. № 333-р. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/333-2014-%D1%80/conv>
3. Про затвердження Державної стратегії регіонального розвитку на період до 2020 року / Постанова Кабінету Міністрів України від 6 серпня 2014 року № 385 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://zakon0.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/385-2014-%D0%BF>
4. Аналітична доповідь до Щорічного Послання Президента України до Верховної Ради України "Про внутрішнє та зовнішнє становище України в 2018 році". – К., 2018. – 1316 с.
5. *Sauer C., Gemino A. and Reich B. H.* (2007): "The Impact of Size and Volatility on IT Project Performance: Studying the factors influencing project risk" Communication of the ACM, November 2007, Vol. 50, № 11.
6. *Fishenden J. and Thompson M.* (2012): "Digital Government, Open Architecture, and Innovation: Why Public Sector IT Will Never Be The Same Again", accepted for publication in Journal of Public Administration, Research and Theory, 2012.
7. *Лесик О.* Архетипи та їх роль у розвитку вітчизняної моделі державного управління. Архетипіка і державне управління: виклики та ризики суспільної трансформації. – 2016. – С. 39–49.
8. *Федоренко Н. П.* Методологические проблемы совершенствования управления экономикой // Вопросы философии. – 1974. – № 6. – С. 3–15.
9. Оцінка громадянами ситуації в країні, ставлення до суспільних інститутів, електоральні орієнтації. Результати соціологічного дослідження. Дослідження проведене соціологічною службою Центру Разумкова з 21 по 26 березня 2019 р. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: razumkov.org.ua/.../otsinkahromadianamy-sytuatsii-v-kraini-stavlennia-do-suspilnyk...
10. Оновлення регіональних стратегій задля забезпечення стабільного розвитку: аналітична записка / Нац. ін-т стратегічних досліджень [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://www.niss.gov.ua/content/articles/files/region_strategy-26d31.pdf
11. Стратегія розвитку "Вінниця 2020". Рішення Вінницької міської ради від 30.08.2013 р. № 1405 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.vmr.gov.ua/Docs/default.aspx>