

РОЗДІЛ 2 МЕХАНІЗМИ ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ

UDC 351:327.7;165

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51547/ppp.dp.ua/2021.6.4>

Drahomyretska Nataliia Mykhailivna,

Doctor of Public Administration, Professor,

Professor at the Department of Humanities and Socio-Political Sciences,

Odessa Regional Institute for Public Administration of the National Academy
of Administration under the President of Ukraine

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5713-6724

Romanenko Yevhen Oleksandrovykh,

Doctor of Public Administration, Professor,

Vice Rector for Scientific Affairs,

National Aviation University

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2285-0543

Chukut Svitlana Anatoliivna,

Doctor of Public Administration, Professor,

Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Management,

National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9829-0218

Sazykina Tetiana Pavlivna,

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,

Odessa National Maritime University

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2707-4785

PROBLEMS OF INTERPRETATION “SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT” IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION OF UKRAINE: CONCEPTS, TRANSLATION, COMMUNICATION

ПРОБЛЕМИ ТЛУМАЧЕННЯ «СТАЛОГО РОЗВИТКУ» В ДЕРЖАВНОМУ УПРАВЛІННІ УКРАЇНИ: ПОНЯТТЯ, ПЕРЕКЛАД, КОМУНІКАЦІЯ

This paper summarizes the arguments and counterarguments within the scientific discussion on the interpretation of the notion of “sustainable development” in Ukrainian policy documents, which bases on the understanding of this concept in political circles, its translation from English into Ukrainian, giving it its own meaning, which does not always reflect the results of scientific research. The main purpose of the research is review of on the notion of “sustainable development” and understanding of its meaning in the activities of governments, the experience of which are introduced in Ukraine and comparison with Ukrainian scientific thought and practice. The difference in the interpretation of this concept leads to differences in the practical implementation of sustainable development, in particular in involving the population, building partnerships and communications and in the using modern opportunities of e-government. The relevance of the decision of this scientific problem is that narrow understanding of sustainable development in Ukrainian science and practice leads to the impossibility of full implementation of the experience of foreign countries, the lack of state strategic documents on sustainable development and the information gap between Ukraine and other countries. The research period is 2017-2020. The object of research is the Voluntary National Reviews of countries whose experience is being implemented in Ukraine. The research empirically confirms and theoretically proves that in Ukrainian science, in particular public administration, and politics, it is necessary to re-evaluate the existing scientific and applied approaches to sustainable development, and to develop new areas of research,

which can be applied in the practice of public administration. The existing polysemy of the concept “sustainable development” causes cognitive dissonance leading to a lack of a clear strategy and sustainable development goals, constant change of its vectors for sustainable development.

Key words: *public administration and public management, the notion of “sustainable development”, conceptual and terminological apparatus, National Voluntary Reports on Sustainable Development, translation of notions.*

У цій роботі узагальнено аргументи та контраргументи в рамках наукової дискусії щодо тлумачення поняття «сталий розвиток» в українських політичних документах, що ґрунтується на розумінні цього поняття в політичних колах, його перекладі з англійської мови українською, наданні йому власного значення, яке не завжди відображає результати наукових досліджень. Основною метою дослідження є розгляд поняття «сталий розвиток», розуміння його значення в діяльності урядів, досвід яких запроваджується в Україні, та порівняння з українською науковою думкою та практикою. Різниця в трактуванні цього поняття призводить до розбіжностей у практичній реалізації сталого розвитку, зокрема в залученні населення, побудові партнерських стосунків та комунікацій та використанні сучасних можливостей електронного урядування. Актуальність вирішення наукової проблеми полягає в тому, що вузьке розуміння сталого розвитку в українській науці та практиці призводить до неможливості повного впровадження досвіду зарубіжних країн, відсутності державних стратегічних документів зі сталого розвитку та інформаційного розриву між Україною та іншими країнами. Період дослідження – 2017–2020 роки. Об'єктом дослідження є добровільні національні огляди країн, досвід яких впроваджується в Україні. Дослідження емпірично підтверджує та теоретично доводить, що в українській науці, зокрема в державному управлінні та політиці, необхідно переоцінити науково-прикладні підходи до сталого розвитку та розробити нові напрями досліджень, які можна застосувати в практиці державного управління. Наявна багатозначність поняття «сталий розвиток» викликає когнітивний дисонанс, що веде до відсутності чіткої стратегії та цілей сталого розвитку, постійної зміни його векторів сталого розвитку.

Ключові слова: *публічне управління та адміністрування, поняття «сталий розвиток», понятійно-термінологічний апарат, Національні добровільні звіти щодо сталого розвитку, переклад понять.*

Literature review. The dynamics of the notion “sustainable development” is considered by researchers from different positions and in different scientific works. We drew attention to some of them which already contain analysis, systematization and classification of processes of scientific recognition of the notion “sustainable development”. Researchers (Nuno and Ornelas, 2017) distinguish several scientific concepts and demonstrate the dynamics of their development and consider them the basis for the definition of sustainable development [1]. Particular attention is paid to the relationship between different economic theories and their impact on sustainable development by identifying the most appropriate strategies to achieve it. It is a combination of two basic concepts: economics and sustainable development. There are some studies on the impact of management theory and management practice on society and on the environment and the sustainability of future, and sustainable social development (Gladwin et al., 1995) [2]. The relationship between economic, social and environmental sustainability is seen as an alternative approach to the existing concepts of urban sustainability (Basiago, 1999), which involves community planning [3]. The issue of sustainability is also considered from the standpoint of revealing its meaning with elements of physics, engineering, ecology, jurisprudence, economics, social politics (Cabezas and Fath, 2002) [4]. Other researchers demonstrate the dynamics of the notion

“sustainable development” since the 80s of the 20th century (Jabareen, 2008) and give the following views of scientists on the definition “sustainable development” [5]. The concept of sustainable development is considered (Mulder and Van Den Bergh, 2001) [6] as a dominant concept in the study of the interaction between the economy and the biophysical environment and as a generally accepted goal of environmental policy. Theoretical and practical modeling is defined as important for understanding sustainable development. Specialists (Counsell and Haughton, 2006) [7] consider sustainable development of the region through planning and finding new planning tools which involves clarifying stress points, assessing sustainability, rather than providing a range of solutions. There are publications (Enders, 2014) [8] in which the thought dominates about the need and importance of developing a theory of sustainable development, which should include a wide range of issues, including history, politics, management, complex systems, economics, philosophy. Opinion of researchers (Urteaga, 2011) [10] draws attention to the interpretation of sustainable development, in particular as an alternative development of social progress and the distribution of wealth around the world, which is a common issue for all states, but has a difference depending on cultural diversity and recognition by states of their own path of development of society and the environment. We paid

attention to the publication in which the researcher (Emas, 2015) focuses on the work of the public administration system which can work clearly and well as long as it does not collide with such a highly integrated notion as “sustainable development”, because sustainable development requires integration of economic, environmental and social goals, and requires the elimination of fragmentation in development decisions. There are publications in which it is ascertained, that the idea of development in the modern sense did not exist until the second half of the twentieth century (Harris, 2019) [10].

There are different opinions about sustainable development in the Ukrainian scientific thought. They are mostly grounded on researches of foreign scientists and the definition of “sustainable development” is used in the sense of the notions defined at the UN conferences in 1992–2002. Dynamics of formation of the notion «sustainable development” is considered from this period and it is these definitions that are used in interpreting the concept of sustainable development. We divide all Ukrainian studies of sustainable development into several groups: those that cover the history of formation and development of the concept of sustainable development; those related to the role of public administration in the sustainable development of the state; those related to the sustainable development of various industries (education, economics, medicine, agro-industry, etc.). The issue of sustainable development has been considered for many years within the practical activities of public administration. There were attempts to emphasize the meaning of the term “sustainable development” and find its analogue in the Ukrainian language, and make a correct translation of the definitions which were adopted at a number of UN conferences in 1992–2002 (Derkach, 2009) [11]. It was noted, that the concept of sustainable development is gradually displacing all existing worldview ideologies and has prospects to become an ideology not only of the XXI century, but also the entire third millennium. Modern scientific researches (Grechko and Volok, 2018) [12] cover in more detail the definition of “sustainable development” in translation into Ukrainian, indicating the interpretation in other states, and in translations from other languages. Other researchers (Sokil, 2016) [13] highlight the great variability and ambiguity of the notion «sustainable development”. The formation of the notion “sustainable development” was considered by scientists (Novikova et. al., 2012) [14] in the same sense and with the same almost periodization, as well as in foreign scientific sources with emphasis on the existing views in

Ukraine. The concept of sustainable development (Smyrnova and Mykhailiuta, 2018) [15] has been analyzed as a reflection and provision of solutions to the contradictions of society for a recent years. Researchers emphasize the existence of different approaches to interpreting the meaning of sustainable development. However, the definitions taken at the UN international conferences in 1987, 1992, 2000 and 2002 are used (Smyrnova and Mykhailiuta, 2018 [15]; Bobrovska 2016 [16]). The definition of “sustainable development” is mostly an interpretation of the views of foreign scientists given in the previous section of this article, with emphasis on those scientific fields in which research is conducted. One cannot disagree with the opinion of researchers that Ukrainian scientists define the notion “sustainable development” depending on aspects of research and the field of science.

Some of the scientists’ opinions were interesting for our study and we agree with them, in particular regarding: reevaluation of dominant values and directions of social development; profound structural changes in management and new methods of work; debatability of sustainable development targets in Ukraine (Marushevskiy et al., 2017) [17]; low level of implementation of the methodology of sustainable development in the field of public administration, as well as the lack of strategic planning for the transition to sustainable development (Molokanova, 2018) [18]; lack in Ukraine of the concept of sustainable development and a comprehensive methodology for the formation, evaluation and control of sustainable development (Lazarieva and Roshchenko, 2019) [19]; low level of sustainable development of Ukraine in comparison with many countries including the post-socialist area (Lazarieva and Roshchenko, 2019 [19]; Grygoruk and Fedorova, 2015 [20]); development of the notion “sustainable development” and understanding its multifaceted meaning (Kravchenko and Antoshchenkova, 2019). [21]. Scientists (Buryk, 2017) [22] consider that the basis of conceptual approaches to the state regulation of sustainable development in Ukraine is the transition of Ukraine to the model of sustainable development, caused by ill-considered policies for economic and social reforms. They recognize, that the term “sustainable economic development” is most often used in the sense stable and balanced growth due to the internal balance of the economic system. Investment and innovation indicators are considered criteria for sustainable development. Conceptual bases of formation of sustainable development of Ukraine are correlated not with the formation of theoretical foundations and the possibility of their implementation in practice,

but with the requirements of resource economic activity, protection and preservation of natural resource potential, with the efforts of the international and scientific community in the development of economic principles of sustainable development, with monitoring and support of the sustainable development plan, and with state regulation through fiscal instruments, etc. Ensuring sustainable development of territories in Ukraine is also studied from other points of view, namely: functioning of the economic complex of the state while ensuring the satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual needs of the population (Kviatkovska, 2013) [23]; management of sustainable development of the country and its regions in the legislative, organization and civil aspects (Omarov, 2014) [24]; use of methods of scientific abstractions and analogies to study the practice and issues of functioning of territories (Demianiuk, 2017) [25]; identification of mechanisms for the formation of sustainable development; formation of a dynamic model of sustainable development of the territorial community as a task of optimal management (Pidubna, 2017) [26].

Scientists (Horokhovets, et. al., 2017) [27] ask the following question: whether Ukraine will be able to achieve the goals of sustainable development at all, as the existence of sustainable development goals in strategic and program documents of Ukraine “does not guarantee that they will be fully implemented in Ukraine” (Institute of Socio-Economic Research, 2017). [28]. Such publications are aimed at the practice of public administration.

Views related to the “communication gap” attracted our attention in the context of barriers to understanding common opportunities in achieving sustainable development (Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future, 1987 [29]; Beder, 1994 [30]; Wu et al., 2018 [31]; Vergragt, 2006 [32]; Nolin, 2010 [33]), as this problem is practically not paid attention to in Ukrainian science and practice of public administration, especially in the context of explaining to the general public the meaning, content and mission of sustainable development, as well as their involvement in the process of sustainable development and a sense of responsibility for all sustainable development processes. This is especially relevant in the context of the introduction of e-government and its impact on achieving the goals of sustainable development.

Methodology and research methods. The research methodology was based on the choice of key senses to compare and contrast the scientific understanding of the definition of “sustainable development” in

foreign countries and in Ukraine, which influences the formation of strategic views in the field of public administration of Ukraine, developing strategies and ways to achieve the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. Decision making and cognitive dissonance, as well as communicative competence as definitions of the psychological science, which are used in the Ukrainian science of public administration, were the basis for the choice of research methods.

Difficulties in conducting the study were caused by the lack of an identifier for the notion “sustainable development”. It is used in various sciences both to describe processes, and to describe the results, and is measured by the definition of a notion in a particular area. This notion is used in the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals in the context of global statistics data collection and is measured by indicators. This notion is used in the practice of public administration and is measured by the number of organizational structures or advisory bodies, etc. to obtain a certain socio-economic or social result. This notion is also used for political purposes and is measured by the level of social effect due to the interest of the population. This situation complicates the process of quantitative research because the polysemy of the notion “sustainable development” leads to the emergence of new broader issues in the study, which are difficult to express in quantitative terms.

The introduction of a new sense of the notion “sustainable development” in Ukrainian science and practice of public administration requires rethinking its sense, significance and context. In fact, the paradigm of sustainable development is changing as in the development of the system of concepts by which it is characterized, and in the establishment of identifiers. Accordingly, the contextual meanings of scientific concepts and terms which move from the old system of definitions to the new as well as the context of application of these concepts in the practice of public administration (in the sense of the environment or sphere to which this notion is applied; for what or for what it is used) have important significance.

We used the method of direct comparison without defining a standard for its implementation, as there is no general scientific and political understanding of the meaning and contexts of the notion “sustainable development” both in the world science and in Ukraine in particular. The lack of a common standard, the polysemy of the notion “sustainable development” complicate the choice and formulation of the standard. The interpretation of the notion “sustainable development” used in the Sustainable Development Goals 2030 was not taken as a basis, because it defines the scope of the notion and is

individual for different states and is used to determine indicators of sustainable development. Building the dynamics of the notion “sustainable development” in the Ukrainian practice of public administration on the basis of scientific research is difficult as there are different legal and analytical documents, in which the information is presented unsystematically and there are no identical indicators.

Identification became the basis of the comparison process. It was conducted from the standpoint of establishing identity based on the coincidence of semantic features which were grouped by key phrases. Key phrases were chosen on a contextual basis. Some key indicators which are problematic for understanding sustainable development in Ukraine and building a systematic work to achieve it, was taken for comparison. Complete content-analysis is difficult conduct in order to select the key phrases, because there are different paradigms of sustainable development. Some of them are a continuation of research of previous periods, which complicates the comparison process. The identifier for comparison was the scientific concepts that characterize sustainable development.

Results. The analysis of the Voluntary National Reviews on Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals of different states and Ukraine demonstrated a decrease of the level of activity in this direction in Ukraine. Thirdly, incorrect translations and use of the meaning of terms, accepted by foreign scientists, caused some dissonance. Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals is considered at the state level as: a demonstration of statistical data in accordance with generally accepted indicators; understanding of investment stability, market development, etc. is an understanding of sustainable development at the business level; stability in work and growth of well-being is an understanding of sustainable development at the community level. Data from many projects conducted in Ukraine demonstrate the presence of such dissonance. The goals of sustainable development were interpreted in accordance with certain views and attitudes which was reflected in the choice of different regions of Ukraine for different Goals which they considered most appropriate for themselves and the state (Walker, 2017 [34]; The Sustainable Development Goals in Ukraine, 2017 [35]). Some districts have developed sustainable development programs in the framework of international projects (Somych, 2020 [36]; Strategy for sustainable development of the Myrhorod subregion, 2018 [37]; Sustainable Development Program of Sumy Region, 2018–2022 [38]; Strategy of sustainable development of Domanivka united territorial community of Myko-

layiv region, 2018 [39]). The issues of improving communications were actively considered in the context of the development of the Strategy for Sustainable Development of the Automated System of Municipal Statistics by the Association of Ukrainian Cities (A strategy for sustainable development of ASMS 2018 [40]) to improve the monitoring of the level of achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Business representatives were also involved in solving 17 tasks of the Sustainable Development Goals and reported on their sustainable development which was understood in several aspects: achieving economic results, social investment, environmental safety of production (Obolon Corporation Sustainability Report, 2015 [41]); working places creation and promotion of small and medium business development (Sustainable development report «Nova Poshta», 2018, 2019 [42, 43]); growing of the business environment and increase of financial literacy of the population (Sustainable development FUIB, 2019 [44]). However, the introduction of e-government to achieve the goals of sustainable development was left out of consideration in particular regarding the provision of the qualitative available electronic services and involving citizens in the management of decision-making processes, and the development of smart-cities for supporting resilient, sustainable and livable societies, “smart technologies for creating daily touchpoints, making both huge and small impacts across all sectors and all walks of life” (UN E-GOVERNMENT SURVEYS, 2020 [45]). The main result, which is being defined in the context of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, is the reforming.

In addition, a dissonance arose in the understanding of the forms of involvement of the population for the independent organization of their activities as there is a lack of public associations and NGOs of socio-economic orientation, which are able to develop new forms of management such as social entrepreneurship and social businesses, etc. Most public associations in Ukraine are political, cultural and sports oriented (Civil society of Ukraine: figures and facts, 2018 [46]; Yablonskyi et. al., 2018 [47]). It leads to the fact that the public can effectively influence the authorities in a political sense but not in the socio-economic sphere. All this causes a situation when only the partnership of the state with businesses develops and there are no understanding and the need to form public-civil partnerships in the field of socio-economic development of the state. In fact, the total load falls on central public and local government authorities without effective involvement of the population. Given that lowering of unemployment and increasing of employment is one of the indicators

there appears a dissonance in managerial interaction and communication between public authorities too.

We focus attention on the expediency of determining the context of using the notion “sustainable development”, as an extension of its semantic individual senses reduces activity in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals due to the formation of a number of dissonances, the presence of which is not taken into account in the indicators of sustainable development assessment.

The dissonance between the contexts of application of the notion “sustainable development” in the Ukrainian practice of public administration is investigated by comparing the contexts of the use of the concept “sustainable development” from the Voluntary National Review of the States 2018–2020, whose experience is introduced in Ukraine or considered useful for Ukraine. As Ukraine submitted

the first Voluntary National Review in 2020 and did not file in previous years, for comparison was taken the National Report “Sustainable Development Goals: Ukraine” 2017. Comparison of scientific concepts, which are the basis for the formation of the content and meaning of sustainable development in the practice of public administration of Ukraine and countries, whose experience is implemented in Ukraine, or used as a model, conducted on the basis of an analysis of the Voluntary National Review of such states as well as the Voluntary National Report of Ukraine 2020 and the National Review of Ukraine 2017 (Table 1), where there are indicated the concepts, which are used to determine the content of sustainable development for the state.

The dissonance between the contexts of application of the notion «sustainable development” in

Table 1

Application of scientific concepts of sustainable development in the Ukrainian practice of public administration

Voluntary National Review of States	Scientific concepts of sustainable development in the Voluntary National Reports of States	Scientific concepts of sustainable development in the Voluntary National Review of Ukraine 2020 and in the National Report of Ukraine 2017
Australia’s Voluntary National Review, 2018 [48]	Partnerships	–
Bulgaria’s Voluntary National Review, 2020 [49]	Partnerships (in terms of active participation); (has no direct link, manual selection from the text)	–
Canada’s Voluntary National Review, 2018 [50]	Partnerships (a new type of partnership is formed)	–
Denmark’s Voluntary National Review, 2017 [51]	Partnerships	–
Estonia’s Voluntary National Review, 2016, 2020 [52]	Partnerships	–
France’s Voluntary National Review, 2016 [53]	Partnerships	–
Germany’s Voluntary National Review, 2016 [54]	Partnerships and responsibility	–
Latvia’s Voluntary National Review, 2018 [55]	Sustainable development of human capital (no direct link, manual sampling from the text)	–
Lithuania’s Voluntary National Review, 2018 [56]	Partnerships	–
Netherlands’s Voluntary National Review, 2017 [57]	Partnerships	–
Poland’s Voluntary National Review, 2018 [58]	Partnerships, participation	–
Romania’s Voluntary National Review, 2018 [59]	Partnerships; The concept of sustainable development, developed by the Romanian scientists Nicolae Georgescu-Roegen 1971	–
Sweden’s Voluntary National Review, 2017 [60]	Partnerships and interactions	–
Switzerland’s Voluntary National Review, 2018 [61]	Partnerships	–
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland’s Voluntary National Review, 2019 [62]	Partnerships and needs; changing views on development that relate both to concepts and actions	–

Source: Authors’ own analysis Dragomyretska

the Ukrainian practice of public administration is investigated by comparing the contexts of the use of the concept “sustainable development” from the Voluntary National Reviews of the States 2018–2020, whose experience is introduced in Ukraine or

considered useful for Ukraine. As Ukraine submitted the first Voluntary National Review in 2020 and did not file in previous years, for comparison was taken the National Report “Sustainable Development Goals: Ukraine” 2017 (Table 2).

Table 2

Contexts of application of the notion “sustainable development” in the Voluntary National Reports of Ukraine and states whose experience is introduced or taken as a model for Ukraine

Voluntary National Review of States	Context of the application of the notion of “sustainable development” in the Voluntary National Review of States whose experience is introduced or taken as a model	The context of the application of the notion of “sustainable development” in Ukraine’s National Baseline Report 2017 and Ukraine’s Voluntary National Review 2020
Australia’s Voluntary National Review, 2018	vital activity of society, strong just and cohesive society; long-term global prosperity, stability, productivity; awareness raising	<i>Ukraine’s National Baseline Report, 2017</i> : measuring social progress in general and improving the system of national statistics. <i>Ukraine’s Voluntary National Review, 2020</i> : Sustainable development goals are integrated into public policy; a monitoring system has been developed [63]
Bulgaria’s Voluntary National Review, 2020	accelerated economic development; reduction of inequality; awareness raising	same as above
Canada’s Voluntary National Review, 2018	opportunity to build a more prosperous and sustainable future with a balanced and integrated achievement of economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainable development; reducing socio-economic gaps that exist between different groups	same as above
Denmark’s Voluntary National Review, 2017	preservation and continuation of long-standing traditions of finding solutions that are sustainable in the long run; allocation of development priorities	same as above
Estonia’s Voluntary National Review, 2020 [64]	maintaining the viability of the Estonian socio-cultural space; economic growth; awareness raising	same as above
Estonia’s Voluntary National Review, 2016	Wide application of information and communication technologies in the framework of cooperation and development (e-government, public-private partnership, etc.); awareness and strengthening of sustainable development measures	same as above
France’s Voluntary National Review, 2016	overall vision, integrated approach and participation of non-governmental actors in setting priorities for action; guidelines for public policy in the field of sustainable development; helping key actors achieve sustainable development; recognition by citizens, local authorities, trade unions, business, NGOs of the Sustainable Development Goals; awareness raising	same as above
Germany’s Voluntary National Review, 2016	quality of life; social cohesion; international responsibility; public recognition; involvement of civil society actors in the dialogue to promote global sustainable development	<i>Ukraine’s Voluntary National Review, 2020</i> : Sustainable development goals are integrated into public policy [65]
Latvia’s Voluntary National Review, 2018	development planning; coherent and transparent policy; ensuring the sustainability of strategic resources (human, nature, culture, digital capital, finance)	<i>Ukraine’s National Baseline Report, 2017</i> : development planning; determining the directions of the country’s development in the long run. <i>Ukraine’s Voluntary National Review, 2020</i> : same as above

Continuation of Table 2

1	2	3
Continuation of Lithuania's Voluntary National Review, 2018	cooperation development; ensuring coherence in achieving the goals of sustainable development; integration of economic development and solving social problems	<i>Ukraine's National Baseline Report, 2017: development planning; improving the system of national statistics.</i> <i>Ukraine's Voluntary National Review, 2020: same as above</i>
Netherlands's Voluntary National Review, 2017	joint work between sectors and national borders as a tradition; coalition building; transforming approaches to sustainable development and long-term planning; awareness raising; ensuring broad participation and cooperation	<i>Ukraine's National Baseline Report, 2017: development planning; determining the directions of the country's development in the long run; improving the system of national statistics; monitoring.</i> <i>Ukraine's Voluntary National Review, 2020: same as above</i>
Poland's Voluntary National Review, 2018	a new model of national development, increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the state and its institutions; cooperation; partnership; joint responsibility of state structures, business and citizens; complicity; launching a new type of partnership	<i>Ukraine's National Baseline Report, 2017: determining the directions of the country's development in the long run; improving the system of national statistics.</i> <i>Ukraine's Voluntary National Review, 2020: same as above</i>
Romania's Voluntary National Review, 2018	rational perspective for promotion as a nation; continuation of the ancient traditions of a sustainable and viable society based on traditions and natural capital	<i>Ukraine's Voluntary National Review, 2020: same as above</i>
Sweden's Voluntary National Review, 2017	development of the social model as a modern sustainable state of general welfare; readiness for change; use of resources in the public, private and civil sectors; social partnership; consistency; awareness	<i>Ukraine's National Baseline Report, 2017: development planning; determining the directions of the country's development in the long run; improving the system of national statistics.</i> <i>Ukraine's Voluntary National Review, 2020: same as above</i>
Switzerland's Voluntary National Review, 2018	comprehensive monitoring; the existence of an advanced stage in achieving sustainable development and a number of tasks performed; people should benefit from the prosperity of the state	<i>Ukraine's National Baseline Report, 2017: improving the system of national statistics; monitoring.</i> <i>Ukraine's Voluntary National Review, 2020: same as above</i>
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland's Voluntary National Review, 2019	all spheres of life; changing views on development, both in terms of concepts and actions; maintaining the relationship between the vision of sustainable development and reality and specific people; community strength	<i>Ukraine's National Baseline Report, 2017: improving the system of national statistics.</i> <i>Ukraine's Voluntary National Review, 2020: same as above</i>
		<i>Ukraine's National Baseline Report, 2017: integration of efforts (it's difficult to correlate due to different content)</i> <i>Ukraine's Voluntary National Review, 2020: approximation of people's living standards to the average European level (as a goal – it is difficult to correlate)</i>

Source: Authors' own analysis Dragomyretska

An analysis of the terms provided in scientific sources was conducted to determine the understanding of the meaning and significance of the concept “sustainable development” in Ukrainian science (Table 3).

It is noted in the Agenda 2030 that “the spread of information and communications technology and global interconnectedness have great potential to accelerate human progress to bridge the digital divide

and to develop knowledge societies, as does scientific and technological innovation across areas as diverse as medicine and energy”. An analysis of the UN e-government development reports for 2016 and 2018 was done to identify current trends in the implementation of e-government in the context of achieving the goals of sustainable development as a communicative component and differences views in Ukraine (Table 4).

Table 3

Sustainable development as defined in Ukrainian science of Public Administration

Scientific source	Contents of the definition	The meaning of the concept “sustainable development”
Encyclopedia of Public Administration 8 volumes, 2011 (Kyiv) [66]	There is no definition. There is only a description of the history of the appearance of this notion without definition. It is seen as a certain process.	–
Public Administration, Dictionary of terms, 2018 (Kyiv) [67]		

Source: Authors' own analysis Sazykina

Table 4

Current trends in the implementation of e-government to achieve sustainable development goal

The need to develop new policies to achieve sustainable development regarding:	Direction of e-government implementation	Ways to achieve sustainable development
poverty eradication	electronic services, reducing the digital gap	Priority is given to the provision of electronic services in health care, education, water supply and sanitation, infrastructure and utilities, which contribute to supporting the development and improvement of the quality of life.
creating equal opportunities for everybody	digital gap reduction, electronic services, electronic participation	Improving digital literacy, reducing the cost of access to the Internet and mobile devices, simplicity and ease of use of ICT
support for vulnerable groups	electronic services for vulnerable groups	Internet access, convenience and ease of obtaining services, friendly interface adapted to the needs of people with special needs
land development and planning	open data, smart-cities	Smart planning and land taking using smart technologies (technologies of Internet opportunities, artificial intelligence, a set of various data)
economical development	electronic services, electronic participation	Adherence to the principle of “no one left behind”, the availability and convenience of obtaining electronic services for citizens and businesses, proper legal regulation of electronic interaction, introduction of digital technologies, use of large and open data, development of digital market
promoting intellectual growth	e-participation, smart-cities	Development of smart-cities, increase of digital literacy, creation of living laboratories for exchange of experience, involvement of citizens in the process of making and taking managerial decisions, establishing partnerships between citizens, businesses and governmental institutions
prevention of environmental pollution	smart-cities, open data	Application of Internet capabilities and artificial intelligence systems for the development of a smart environment in the context of building smart-cities
conservation of energy, resources and water	smart-cities, open data	Application of Internet technologies and artificial intelligence systems for the development of a smart environment in the context of building smart-cities
ensuring reliable operation of domestic urban public transport	smart-cities, open data, e-participation, e-services	Application of Internet capabilities and artificial intelligence systems for the development of smart mobility, smart parking, etc. in the context of building smart-cities
eco-projects and alternative energy	Smart-cities, e-services, open data	Application of Internet capabilities and artificial intelligence systems for the development of a smart environment in the context of building smart-cities

Source: Authors' own analysis Chukut

Conclusions. Analysis of the studied theoretical literature of foreign authors on the history of development and the formation of the notion “sustainable development” demonstrated the expansion of the context of its use and a large number of values with which it is expressed, which creates its modern semantic structure. The notion “sustainable development” has become polysemous since

the 2000s of the 21st century and the expansion of its polysemy has been continuing up to this day. Expansion of spheres, in which this notion is used, has taken place accordingly. Polysemy of the notion and a wide range of areas, in which the notion “sustainable development” is used, has led to the formation of dissonance in understanding the meaning of sustainable development

and the context of its use. Correlation of the context of using the notion “sustainable development” in Ukrainian science compared with foreign studies demonstrated the presence of polysemy and the use of the views of foreign researchers.

Two types of definitions are used to characterize sustainable development, in particular: definitions adopted at international events; definitions provided in foreign studies. There is a mixture of the notions “stable development” and “sustainable development”, which are used as synonyms. There are tendencies to politicize and ideologize the notion “sustainable development” in research, which is proposed to be transferred to the practice of public administration despite the opinions of foreign colleagues regarding the falsity of such a path. The comparison showed that interpretations used in Ukrainian science are inherent in foreign science in 1987 in terms of the concepts of needs, 1992 in terms of the concept of sustainable development, 2001 in terms of practical and theoretical modeling of sustainable development. Opinions on the feasibility of developing a theory of sustainable development and the formation of a scientific concept of sustainable development coincide. In fact, scientific understanding of the notion “sustainable development” is extensive and in a narrow sense is transferred to the study of various branches of Ukrainian science. Understanding sustainable development in terms of partnership concepts (the use of which in the characterization of sustainable development by foreign researchers correlate with 2014) or the concept of alternative development (the use of which in the characterization of sustainable development by foreign researchers correlate with 2011) does not happen. Links to other concepts or their critical thinking is absent.

Dissonance arises between attempts to combine the industrial model of sustainable development and a new paradigm of sustainable development concerning the willingness of the population to actively support a particular development strategy and take part in it, and be responsible for it what is often called “social mobilization”. The lack of a clear conceptual framework for sustainable development is a consequence of such dissonance. It is reflected in Ukraine’s National Baseline Report 2017 and Ukraine’s Voluntary National Review

2020. Comparison of the selected conceptual bases of understanding sustainable development from these documents and from the Voluntary National Review of States, whose experience is introduced in Ukraine or used as a model, showed the absence of such bases in the documents of Ukraine. Herewith, almost all states have adopted the partnership paradigm. Dissonance is revealed in contrast to the paradigms of sustainable development of these states and Ukraine.

This situation is exacerbated by the fact that the notions “sustainable development” and “sustainable development” are understood as synonyms as all basic documents and scientific views are translated from English into Ukrainian. The lack of a paradigm of sustainable development in science and politics leads to cognitive dissonance and a return to traditional and stereotypical managerial actions in spite of a desire to reform and bring about change. Lack of partnership paradigm in the aspect of sustainable development and understanding it as a conceptual basis for sustainable development was due to the unrecognized role of communication in public administration on sustainable development, involvement of the population in these processes. A holistic approach to solving problems of social, economic and environmental orientation, which directly affect digital inclusion, are also worth applying. The analysis also showed another context of cognitive dissonance, namely effective implementation of e-government as a modern communicative part, which contributes to the goals of sustainable development: providing quality available electronic services; reducing the digital and taking into account the needs of the most vulnerable; active involvement of citizens in the process of making and taking managerial decisions; development of smart-cities and application of smart solutions to solve environmental problems, energy efficiency, mobility, resource savings; avoiding cyber threats and misuse of personal data.

Making important decisions and the process of forming sustainable development in the context of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals depend on understanding the meanings of notions and categories used by scientists and politicians. It is the understanding of senses and meanings that answers the question: what it is for and what it gives.

REFERENCES:

1. Nuno, M.L., Ornelas, M. The Influence of Economic Theories on Sustainable Development. Master thesis. Porto: Catholic University [in Portuguese]. 2017. URL: <https://repositorio.ucp.pt/bitstream/10400.14/23613/1/Tese.pdf> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
2. Gladwin, T.N., Kennelly, J.J., Krause, T.-S. Shifting Paradigms for Sustainable Development: Implications for Management Theory and Research. *Academy of Management*. 1995. № 4. Vols 20. P. 874–907. URL: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e1a6/fb6476f22e8794912e9f3d614377a3c88dd0.pdf> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).

3. Basiago, A.D. Economic, social, and environmental sustainability in development theory and urban planning practice. *The Environmentalist*. 1999. № 19. P. 145–161. URL: <https://www.amherst.edu/system/files/media/0972/fulltext.pdf> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
4. Cabezas, H., Fath, B.D. Towards a theory of sustainable systems. *Fluid Phase Equilibria*/2002. № 194–197. P. 3–14. URL: <http://www.homepages.ucl.ac.uk/~ucessjb/S3%20Reading/cabezas%20and%20fath%2002.pdf> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
5. Jabareen, Y. A new conceptual framework for sustainable development. *Environ Dev Sustain*. 2008. № 10. P. 179–192. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227033081_A_New_Conceptual_Framework_for_Sustainable_Development (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
6. Mulder, P., Cjm, Van Den Bergh, Jerome. Evolutionary Economic Theories of Sustainable Development. *Growth and Change*. 2011. Vol. 32. P. 110–134. URL: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/15469644.pdf>; http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/content/BPL/Images/Journal_Samples/GROW0017-4815~32~1~147/152.PDF (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
7. Counsell, D., Haughton, G. Sustainable development in regional planning: The search for new tools and renewed legitimacy. *Geoforum*. 2006. 6. Vol. 37. P. 921–931. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2006.02.001>; <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718506000315> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
8. Enders, J.C. Abstract to book *Theories of Sustainable Development*. London. 2014. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269669746_Theories_of_Sustainable_Development (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
9. Urteaga, E. The Alternative Theories of Sustainable Development. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*. 2011. № 55. URL: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/3606701/2.pdf> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
10. Harris, J.M. G-DAE Working Paper No. 00-04: “Basic Principles of Sustainable Development”. USA: Global Development and Environment Institute, Tufts University. 2000. URL: <https://sites.tufts.edu/gdae/files/2019/10/00-04Harris-BasicPrinciplesSD.pdf> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
11. Деркач М.І. Концепт сталого розвитку як домінанта ідеологія людської цивілізації у XXI ст.: Комітет з питань бюджету Верховної Ради України. *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету*. 2009. Вип. 3/1. С. 185–191.
12. Гречко А.В., Волок О.О. Сутність категорії «сталий розвиток». *Сучасні проблеми економіки і підприємництва*. 2018. Випуск 22. С. 14–20. URL: <http://sb-keip.kpi.ua/article/view/135130> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
13. Сокіл О.Г. Концептуальні основи сталого розвитку в економічних та облікових теоріях. *Ефективна економіка*. 2016. № 10. URL: <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=5194> (дата звернення 20.01.2021).
14. Новікова О.Ф., Амоша О.І., Антонюк В.П. та ін. Сталый розвиток промислового регіону: соціальні аспекти : монографія / НАН України, Інститут економіки промисловості. Донецьк, 2012. 534 с. URL: https://iie.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/monografiyi/2012/2012_mono_Novikova_Amosha_Antonyuk.pdf (дата звернення 28.01.2021).
15. Смирнова І.І., Михайлюта Є.І. Сталый розвитку в Україні: теоретичні аспекти. *Економічний вісник Донбасу*. 2018. № 1(51). С. 10–14.
16. Бобровська О.Ю. Сталый розвиток регіонів України: проблеми і шляхи їх розв’язання. *Публічне адміністрування: теорія та практика*. 2016. Вип. 1(15). URL: [http://www.dridu.dp.ua/zbirnik/2016-01\(15\)/index.html](http://www.dridu.dp.ua/zbirnik/2016-01(15)/index.html); [http://www.dridu.dp.ua/zbirnik/2016-01\(15\)/15.pdf](http://www.dridu.dp.ua/zbirnik/2016-01(15)/15.pdf) (дата звернення 28.01.2021).
17. Марушевський Г., Тимочко Т., Руденко Л. Стратегія сталого розвитку України до 2030 року: розробка і шлях до визнання. *Світогляд*. 2017. 1(63). С. 20–25.
18. Молоканова В.М. Моніторинг практичної реалізації стратегії сталого розвитку в Україні. *Аспекти публічного управління*. 2018. Т. 6. № 11–12. С. 85–92.
19. Лазарева О.В., Рощенко В.А. Розвиток екологічної складової сталого розвитку економіки України. *Інвестиції: практика та досвід*. 2019. № 8. С. 19–22.
20. Григоруک П.М., Федорова Т.Ю. Національні та регіональні особливості сталого розвитку України. *Економіка: реалії часу. Проблемні питання економіки України та її регіонів*. 2015. № 1. С. 25–29.
21. Кравченко Ю.М., Антощенкова В.В. Фактори сталого розвитку економіки аграрного сектору. *Вісник Харківського національного технічного університету сільського господарства імені Петра Василенка*. 2019. Вип. 200 «Економічні науки». С. 174–183.
22. Бурик З.М. Концептуальні підходи до державного регулювання сталого розвитку в Україні. *Актуальні проблеми державного управління*. 2017. № 2(52). С. 45–52.
23. Квятковська Л.А. Реалізація принципів концепції сталого розвитку в діяльності підприємства. *Вісник соціально-економічних досліджень*. 2013. Вип. 1(48). С. 85–89.
24. Омаров Ш.А.О. Науково-практичні аспекти впровадження концепції сталого розвитку: зарубіжний і вітчизняний досвід. *Проблеми економіки*. 2014. № 4. С. 61–67.
25. Дем’янюк А.В. Сучасні підходи до забезпечення сталого розвитку територій в Україні. *Гроші, фінанси і кредит*. 2017. Вип. 13. С. 1083–1087.
26. Піддубна О.О. Динамічна модель сталого розвитку територіальної громади. *Причорномоські економічні студії*. 2017. Вип. 13-1. С. 187–190.

27. Гороховець С.В., Жаліло Я.А., Ковалівська С.В., Максютя А.А. та ін. Аналіз державних стратегічних документів України щодо врахування адаптованих для України Цілей Сталого Розвитку до 2030 року. Аналітична доповідь. Київ : Інститут суспільно- економічних досліджень, 2017. 84 с.
28. Інститут соціально-економічних досліджень: Чи досягне Україна Цілей сталого розвитку? 2017. URL: <https://iser.org.ua/analitika/chi-dosiagne-ukrayina-tsilei-stalogo-rozvitku> (дата звернення 30.01.2021).
29. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. Towards Sustainable Development. Transmitted to the General Assembly as an Annex to document A/42/427 – Development and International Co-operation: Environment. (Vols. 1–2). Paper presented of the Conference of NGOs. Geneva. Switzerland. June 1987. URL: <http://www.congo-education.net/> ; <http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-02.htm> (дата звернення 30.01.2021).
30. Beder S. The Role of Technology in Sustainable Development. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*. 1994. № 13(4). P. 14–19. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/3226564_The_Role_of_Technology_in_Sustainable_Development (дата звернення 10.02.2021).
31. Wu J., Guo S., Huang H., Liu W. Information and Communications Technologies for Sustainable Development Goals: State-of-the-Art, Needs and Perspectives. *Computers and Society*. 2018. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1802.09345.pdf> (дата звернення 10.02.2021).
32. Vergragt Ph.J. How Technology Could Contribute to a Sustainable World. Boston: Tellus Institute. 2006. URL: https://greattransition.org/archives/papers/How_Technology_Could_Contribute_to_a%20Sustainable_World.pdf (дата звернення 10.02.2021).
33. Nolin J. Sustainable information and information science. *Information research*. 2010. № 2. VOL. 15. URL: <http://informationr.net/ir/15-2/paper431.html> (дата звернення 10.02.2021).
34. Walker N. Sustainable development goals are everyone’s business. 2017. URL: <https://www.prostir.ua/?focus=nil-voker-tsili-staloho-rozvytku-tse-sprava-kozhnoho> (дата звернення 10.02.2021).
35. How the UN is supporting The Sustainable Development Goals in Ukraine: Sait United Nations in Ukraine. 2017. URL: <https://ukraine.un.org/en/sdgs> (дата звернення 10.02.2021).
36. Сьомич М.І. Миргородський субрегіон як об’єкт місцевого самоврядування. *Державне управління: удосконалення та розвиток*. 2020. № 2. URL: http://www.du.nauka.com.ua/pdf/2_2020/3.pdf (дата звернення 10.02.2021).
37. Стратегія сталого розвитку Миргородського субрегіону до 2028 р. URL: <http://myrgorod.pl.ua/files/images/Economika/Strategiya/strategiya.pdf> (дата звернення 5.02.2021).
38. Програма сталого розвитку туризму в Сумській області 2018–2022 роки. URL: http://sm.gov.ua/images/docs/turizm/17-session-37_7-skl.pdf (дата звернення 5.02.2021).
39. Стратегія сталого розвитку Доманівської об’єднаної територіальної громади Миколаївської області на 2018–2026 роки. URL: <https://domanivska-gromada.gov.ua/strategiya-stalogo-rozvitku-domanivskoi-ob%E2%80%99ednanoi-teritorialnoi-gromadi-mikolaiivskoi-oblasti-na-2018-%E2%80%932026-roki-1521720761/>; <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IXkTYI4u7eR-AB2LOIZgyat0wLxswNmz/view> (дата звернення 5.02.2021).
40. Асоціація міст України: Розробляється стратегія сталого розвитку АСМС. 6 червня 2018 р. URL: <https://auc.org.ua/novyna/rozroblyayetsya-strategiya-stalogo-rozvytku-asms> (дата звернення 5.02.2021).
41. Звіт зі сталого розвитку корпорації «Оболонь» за 2015 рік. URL: <http://obolon.kiev.ua/ua/corporate-responsibility/social-reporting> (дата звернення 5.02.2021).
42. Sustainable development report «Nova Poshta». (2018). URL: https://novaposhta.ua/uploads/misc/doc/NOVA_POSHTA_CSR_report_2018_ENG.pdf (дата звернення 5.02.2021).
43. Sustainable development report «Nova Poshta». (2019). URL: https://novaposhta.ua/zvit_zi_stalogo_rozvitku_2019_en (дата звернення 5.02.2021).
44. Sustainable development FUIB. (2019). URL: <https://about.pumb.ua/en/growth> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).
45. UN E-GOVERNMENT SURVEYS. (2020). URL: <https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Reports/UN-E-Government-Survey-2020> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).
46. Громадянське суспільство України: цифри і факти. 13.04.2018. URL: <https://www.prostir.ua/?news=hromadyanske-suspilstvo-ukrajiny-tsyfry-i-fakty> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).
47. Яблонський В.М., Андріученко Т.В., Бекешкіна І.Е. та ін. Громадянське суспільство України: сучасні практики та виклики розвитку. Аналіт. доповідь. Київ : НІСД, 2018. 128 с.
48. Australia’s Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 9–18 July 2018. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/australia> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).
49. Bulgaria’s Voluntary National Review. Paper presented for the High-level Political Forum under the auspices of ECOSOC. 7–16 July 2020. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=30022&nr=2052&menu=3170> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).
50. Canada’s Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 9–18 July 2018. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=30022&nr=1049&menu=3170> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).
51. Denmark’s Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 10–19 July 2017. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=30022&nr=378&menu=3170> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

52. Estonia's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development 2016 – Ensuring that no one is left behind. 11–20 July 2016. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/estonia> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

53. France's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development 2016 – Ensuring that no one is left behind. 11–20 July 2016. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/france> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

54. Germany's Voluntary National Review. (2016). Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development 2016 – Ensuring that no one is left behind. 11–20 July 2016. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/germany> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

55. Latvia's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 9–18 July 2018. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/latvia> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

56. Lithuania's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 9–18 July 2018. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/lithuania> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

57. Netherlands's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 10–19 July 2017. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/netherlands> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

58. Poland's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 9–18 July 2018. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=30022&nr=804&menu=3170> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

59. Romania's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 9–18 July 2018. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/romania> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

60. Sweden's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 10–19 July 2017. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/sweden> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

61. Switzerland's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented of the High-level Political Forum. 9–18 July 2018. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/switzerland> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

62. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented for the High-level Political Forum under the auspices of ECOSOC. 9–18 July 2019. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/unitedkingdom> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

63. Ukraine's National Baseline Report. Sustainable Development Goals: Ukraine. Paper presented of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine at the press conference of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. 15 September 2017. Kyiv. URL: <https://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/library/sustainable-development-report/sustainable-development-goals--2017-baseline-national-report.html> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

64. Estonia's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented for the High-level Political Forum under the auspices of ECOSOC. 7-16 July 2020. New York. URL: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=30022&nr=68&menu=3170> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

65. Ukraine's Voluntary National Review. Paper presented at the Regional Forum on sustainable for the unece region. 19 March 2020. Geneva. URL: <https://www.unecsc.org/rfsd.html> (дата звернення 12.02.2021).

66. Енциклопедія державного управління [Текст] : у 8 т. / наук.-ред. кол. : Ю.В. Ковбасюк Е 644 (голова) [та ін.] ; Національна академія державного управління при Президентові України. Київ : НАДУ, 2011. Т. 8 : Публічне врядування / наук.-ред. кол. : В.С. Загорський (голова), С.О. Телешун (співголова) [та ін.] ; Львівський регіональний інститут державного управління Національна академія державного управління при Президентові України. Львів : ЛРІДУ НАДУ, 2011. 630 с.

67. Енциклопедичний словник з державного управління / уклад. : Ю.П. Сурмін, В.Д. Бакуменко, А.М. Михненко та ін. ; за ред. Ю.В. Ковбасюка, В.П. Трошинського, Ю.П. Сурміна. Київ : НАДУ, 2010. 820 с.