

THE RELEVANCE OF GLOBALISATION AND REGIONALISATION TRENDS IN EUROPE AND THEIR IMPACT ON UKRAINE'S ACCESSION NEGOTIATIONS

АКТУАЛЬНІСТЬ КОНЦЕПЦІЙ ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЇ ТА РЕГІОНАЛІЗАЦІЇ В ЄВРОПІ ТА ЇХ ВПЛИВ НА ПЕРЕГОВОРИ ПРО ВСТУП УКРАЇНИ

Makovskyy Sergiy

PhD in Political Science, Associated Professor at the Department of International Relations and Foreign Policy of Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,

e-mail: s.makovskyy@knu.ua

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5569-907X>

Androshchuk Yuri

PhD Student, Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,

e-mail: yuriiandrowork@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6585-2163>

Маковський Сергій

Кандидат політичних наук, доцент кафедри міжнародних відносин і зовнішньої політики Навчально-наукового Інституту міжнародних відносин Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка,

e-mail: s.makovskyy@knu.ua

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5569-907X>

Андрощук Юрій

аспірант Навчально-наукового інституту міжнародних відносин Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка,

e-mail: yuriiandrowork@gmail.com,

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6585-2163>

Abstract. *The article examines the interplay of globalisation and regionalisation trends in Europe as a key factor shaping the geopolitical and economic environment of the European Union and determining Ukraine's prospects in the accession process. The purpose of the study is to identify how constructive regionalisation within the EU, as opposed to alternative integration models in neighbouring regional configurations, influences the dynamics, content and conditions of Ukraine's accession negotiations. The research methodology is based on systemic and institutional approaches, a comparative analysis of regionalisation models, and elements of a case study of the EU enlargement policy and Ukraine–EU relations. The results demonstrate that the EU's model of constructive regionalisation, grounded in legally institutionalised solidarity, multilevel governance and cohesion policy instruments, generates crucial incentives and functional requirements for Ukraine's legal, institutional and regional development adaptation, which, under conditions of consistent implementation, becomes a decisive factor in the success of its integration into the European Union. The scientific novelty is manifested in substantiating the role of the EU's regionalisation model as a structural filter for Ukraine's accession prospects under conditions of intensified geopolitical competition. The practical significance lies in the possibility of using the findings to refine Ukraine's negotiation positions and public policy priorities in the field of regional development and European integration.*

Keywords: *globalisation, regionalisation, cohesion policy, structural funds, EU, Ukraine, European integration, accession negotiations, EU regional policy.*

Анотація. *У статті досліджено взаємозв'язок тенденцій глобалізації та регіоналізації в Європі як ключовий чинник формування геополітичного й економічного середовища Європейського Союзу та визначення перспектив України в процесі приєднання. Метою дослідження є з'ясування того, яким чином конструктивна регіоналізація в межах ЄС, на*

відміну від альтернативних моделей інтеграції у суміжних регіональних конфігураціях, впливає на динаміку, зміст і умови переговорів про вступ України. Методологічну основу становлять системний та інституційний підходи, порівняльний аналіз моделей регіоналізації, а також елементи case-study політики розширення ЄС та відносин Україна – ЄС. У результаті дослідження встановлено, що модель конструктивної регіоналізації ЄС, заснована на юридично інституціалізованій солідарності, багаторівневому врядуванні та інструментах політики згуртованості, формує ключові стимули та функціональні вимоги до правової, інституційної та регіональної адаптації України, що за умови послідовної реалізації стає визначальним чинником успішної інтеграції до Європейського Союзу. Наукова новизна проявляється в обґрунтуванні ролі моделі регіоналізації ЄС як структурного фільтра перспектив приєднання України в умовах посилення геополітичної конкуренції. Практичне значення полягає у можливості використання отриманих результатів для уточнення переговорних позицій України та пріоритетів державної політики у сфері регіонального розвитку та європейської інтеграції.

Ключові слова: глобалізація, регіоналізація, політика згуртованості, структурні фонди, ЄС, Україна, європейська інтеграція, переговори про вступ, регіональна політика ЄС.

Introduction. In the modern world, the processes of globalisation and regionalisation are among the most important phenomena shaping international relations, economic development, and cultural interaction. They not only determine the dynamics of global markets and the formation of political alliances, but also deeply influence people's daily lives, values, and identities. Globalisation connects distant regions of the world, accelerating the exchange of goods, information, and technologies, while regionalisation emphasises cooperation and cohesion within specific geographical areas, often as a response to the challenges and risks posed by global integration.

Understanding the historical evolution, theoretical foundations, and practical manifestations of these processes is essential for analysing the current international system. Both globalisation and regionalisation have their own trajectories, benefits, and contradictions: from the growth of trade and cultural exchange to the emergence of inequality, nationalism, and new forms of cooperation. Europe, in particular, provides a striking example of how regional integration can both complement and counterbalance globalisation, offering lessons that are highly relevant in today's turbulent geopolitical environment.

This study seeks to examine the main stages of globalisation, the theoretical approaches to regionalisation, and the interaction between these processes in the European context, with special attention to their significance for Ukraine.

The purpose of the study is to analyse the historical evolution, theoretical foundations, and contemporary dynamics of globalisation and regionalisation, with a particular focus on their interaction in the European context. Special attention is given to exploring how these processes shape integration strategies and what lessons they offer for Ukraine's path toward European cohesion and development.

Recent Literature Review. Contemporary scholarship traces an evolving interplay between globalisation and regionalisation, building on foundational accounts by Fawcett (1992), who situates regional organisations within the post-Cold War international order, and Zamagni (1995), who links "new regionalism" to development and peace agendas. Within the European case, Molchanov (2005) shows how the EU operationalises regionalism inside a globalising economy, while Kengyel (2008) assesses the added value of EU regional policy in measurable socio-economic outcomes. Molle (2008) further clarifies the meaning and limits of EU cohesion, probing whether Europe's governance architecture can withstand cyclical shocks, and Janning (2018) reviews a decade of crises to test the Union's political cohesion in practice. Policy and programme instruments are mapped through the European Commission's ERDF/TA framework (EC, n.d.), with implementation pathways illuminated by Interreg Europe (n.d.) and the URBACT network (n.d.), which together emphasise capacity-building, policy learning, and multi-level coordination. Concrete cross-border applications—such as the Euroregion Bug Interreg NEXT initiative on climate-risk prevention (2024)—demonstrate how cohesion goals translate into local resilience and environmental cooperation. Conceptually, World

Economic Forum materials provide a synthetic backbone: the explainer on globalisation (2017), the historical arc toward “Globalisation 4.0” (2019), the governance blueprint for the fourth industrial revolution (2019), and scenario planning on the “Four Futures” (2022) that frame risks of fragmentation versus deeper integration. Collectively, these sources converge on three claims: (1) regionalisation in Europe functions as a pragmatic complement to globalisation by buffering shocks and diffusing benefits; (2) cohesion policy’s value lies not only in GDP and employment effects but also in institutional learning and territorial solidarity; and (3) future effectiveness will hinge on aligning legal-financial instruments (ERDF/Interreg/URBACT) with systemic challenges identified in the global scenario literature.

Main research results.

Theoretical foundations of globalisation and regionalisation

Globalisation can be described as an abstract process of shrinking the world, which is reflected not only in the objective aspect - through new models of production, integrated financial sector and cultural homogenisation, but also in the subjective aspect - people's perception of the world (*Zamagni, 1995*).

Simply put, globalisation is the process by which people, capital and resources of all kinds can easily cross national borders. It is primarily an economic concept: the integration of markets, trade and investment minimises barriers and accelerates the flow of goods and services between countries. Equally important is cultural exchange and integration, the sharing and adoption of ideas and traditions (*World Economic Forum, 2017*).

Globalisation may seem new, but in fact it has been around for centuries, affecting our lives and presenting both challenges and unique opportunities.

The first incarnation of globalisation is associated with the emergence of long-distance trade routes that connected major civilisational centres. The Silk Roads (1st century BC–5th century AD; 13th–14th century AD) created early trans-Eurasian linkages, enabling the exchange of goods, technologies and ideas between East and West, but remained limited in scale and highly dependent on imperial control and political stability. From the 7th to 15th centuries, Islamic commercial networks by land and sea further integrated the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia, with high-value commodities such as spices driving intensifying, yet still regionally fragmented, forms of connectivity (*World Economic Forum, 2019*).

The first modern wave of globalisation is associated with the Industrial Revolution in the late 18th and 19th centuries, when technological breakthroughs in the United Kingdom and the expansion of the British Empire stimulated a sharp increase in international trade, supported by the development of railways and steamships. This integration was closely linked to colonial domination and deep social and spatial inequalities and was interrupted by the First World War and subsequent systemic crises, which significantly reduced global trade openness. The second and third waves unfolded after the Second World War under the leadership of the United States and the diffusion of new industrial and financial technologies; initially constrained by the division into competing blocs, they acquired a truly global character after the end of the Cold War, China’s accession to the WTO and the spread of digital networks, which intensified cross-border value chains and consolidated trade and capital flows as key drivers of world economic growth (*World Economic Forum, 2019*).

Globalisation 4.0 has only just begun. However, developments such as the UK's exit from the European Union, changes in US policy under the Trump administration, immigration and data protection issues, China's Belt and Road Initiative, the impact of climate change on pollution and deforestation, multi-speed integration in Europe, and the impact of automation on employment and economic development, all herald a new era of globalisation. As in previous phases, Globalisation 4.0 will be shaped by governance and technological solutions. The focus on the networked world and the digital economy, including e-commerce, digital services and 3D printing, is transforming healthcare, transport, communications and energy, requiring new policies (*World Economic Forum, 2019*).

At the same time, many people in the world, especially in the West, began to turn away from globalisation because of rising economic inequality and continuing social instability. This has led to the spread of isolationism, trade wars and immigration bans, with the result that world exports have

begun to stagnate and the concept of globalism has become increasingly unpopular (*World Economic Forum, 2019*).

Despite recent unfavourable trends in globalisation, analysts outline alternative trajectories for its next phase, ranging from scenarios of deep physical and digital integration that strengthen regional and global alliances, diversify supply chains and enhance labour and data mobility, to models of partial or full fragmentation, in which states prioritise security, technological sovereignty and control over strategic resources, thereby increasing the importance of regional configurations as key frameworks for managing interdependence (*World Economic Forum, 2019*).

This raises the question of which organisational mechanisms and policy concepts of international cooperation can mitigate the negative effects of globalisation and prevent a drift towards rigid nationalist–realist confrontation. To address it, attention is focused on regionalism and regionalisation as key frameworks for adapting to global interdependence. Regionalism and regions are multidimensional and contested categories that combine social, economic, political, cultural and historical forms of cohesion within a given geographic space and at the same time express a political vision of how cooperation in this space should be organised. In this sense, regionalism is often normatively associated with deeper cooperation and improved welfare for participating states.

Regionalisation is understood as a process of increasing integration within a region, driven by trade, investment, mobility of people and ideas, transnational networks and civil society, which may emerge both within and beyond state-led policies. These interactions generate dense interdependence and shared problem-solving frameworks, but can also challenge traditional notions of sovereignty. The objectives of regional integration range from the reduction of trade barriers to the development of common markets and the creation of multi-level institutions with joint security and regulatory competences. For a more systematic understanding of the drivers behind such cooperative arrangements, the analysis further draws on the main theoretical approaches to regional integration (*Fawcett, 1992, pp. 38-40*).

Neorealism interprets regional cooperation as a response to systemic pressures, including the end of the Cold War, decolonisation and shifting power balances, where states seek to consolidate their bargaining power and avoid dependence on stronger actors; however, it pays limited attention to domestic preferences and the autonomous role of supranational institutions. Interdependence and globalisation theory emphasises growing economic and issue-based interdependence, highlighting both the emergence of institutions beyond the regional level and the parallel incentive for states to form regional frameworks to jointly manage cross-border challenges. Neo-functionalism explains European integration through incremental spillovers from technical and sectoral cooperation to broader political integration, stressing the role of supranational institutions in managing complex interdependence, while its critics underline the underestimated role of nation states and exogenous shocks; nevertheless, its core assumption links deepening integration to functional pressures. Neoliberal institutionalism views states as rational actors that create and use institutions to reduce transaction costs, increase transparency and stabilise expectations, thereby facilitating durable regional and international cooperation. Constructivism focuses on the formation of regional identities, norms and solidarities, arguing that stable regional orders rest on shared meanings and mutual recognition, whether through dense societal exchanges or discursive processes that shape interests over time. Taken together, these approaches outline complementary systemic, functional, institutional and ideational logics that inform the analysis of regionalisation and provide a conceptual basis for assessing the European Union as a model framework for contemporary integration processes. Transition to a new European regionalism (*Fawcett, 1992, pp. 46-66*).

Transition to a new European regionalism

The shift from “old” to “new” European regionalism reflects the move from a bipolar to an increasingly multipolar and interdependent international system (*Zamagni, 1995*). In the period from the 1950s to the end of the Cold War, Western Europe—supported, inter alia, by the Marshall Plan—developed from sectoral cooperation into the European Communities and later the European Union, linking economic integration with security concerns, notably the management of German power and the containment of the Soviet threat. This trajectory, consolidated through deepening common policies and successive enlargements, turned the EU into a benchmark of institutionalised regional cooperation based on shared history, geographical proximity and dense economic interdependence,

inspiring regional projects in other parts of the world (*Fawcett, 1992, p. 23*). After 1989, the accession aspirations of Central and Eastern European states and the destabilising effects of conflicts such as the Yugoslav wars exposed the limits of the old model and prompted a continuous adaptation of European institutions and policies, as the Union sought to reconcile further enlargement, differentiated integration and identity sensitivities within a more complex regional and global environment (*Fawcett, 1992, p. 32*).

Relationships and contrasts between globalisation and regionalisation

The relationship between globalisation and European integration is ambivalent: the European Union is at once a product of globalising dynamics and a distinct model of regional governance that mitigates their disruptive effects. An integrated Europe is able to internalise external economic and political pressures while preserving regulatory autonomy, combining market openness with social, environmental and cohesion policies that temper unfettered competition and protect cultural diversity within a shared political space. Recent crises – including migration pressures, terrorist attacks, rising xenophobia and populism, demographic and environmental challenges, as well as tensions linked to eastern enlargement – have exposed vulnerabilities of this model and fuelled scepticism regarding the Union's competitiveness and cohesion in a globalised environment (*Molchanov, 2005*).

At the same time, European integration has generated instruments that operate as a structured regional response to globalisation. The development of supranational institutions such as the European Parliament and the EU judicial mechanisms has strengthened democratic accountability and rights protection beyond the nation state, while common policies – notably cohesion policy, structural funds and the Common Agricultural Policy – have contributed to reducing territorial disparities, supporting vulnerable groups and sustaining rural economies (*Molchanov, 2005*). Taken together, these mechanisms confirm the EU's role as an advanced form of regionalisation capable of managing interdependence and limiting polarisation between regions and centres.

Globalisation and regionalisation in Europe: the Ukrainian context

In the context of war, Ukraine faces a real risk of radical and extreme forms of nationalism – ethnic extremism and ultra-conservatism – that could fuel tensions between the centre and the regions and trigger destructive regionalisation and political and social fragmentation. Intensified nationalist sentiments and excessive centralisation may undermine national unity and post-war recovery. An alternative path is to avoid such extremes and pursue integration with the Western world through modern European regionalisation, which implies the inclusion of regions in a multilevel system of governance, their active participation in national development, and the implementation of European standards via regional policies and structural funds, creating a favourable framework for cooperation, development and cultural exchange.

To use these instruments effectively, their principles and mechanisms must be analysed in depth with regard to Ukraine's specific context. EU cohesion policy was developed in response to major economic and social disparities between territories, further accentuated by enlargements, and aims at real convergence of less developed regions with the EU average through faster growth of incomes, employment and opportunities, coordinated with national programmes (*Molle, 2008, pp. 282–284*). Its objectives include supporting lagging regions, promoting research, technological development and innovation, improving ICT, fostering SMEs, enabling the transition to a low-carbon and climate-resilient economy, enhancing environmental protection and sustainable transport, creating quality jobs and labour mobility, advancing social inclusion and anti-poverty measures, investing in education and lifelong learning, and strengthening public administration (*Europe: Is the System Broken, 2019, p. 20*). The main financial instrument is the system of Structural Funds based on co-financing, whereby poorer regions receive a higher share of EU support.

As an EU candidate state, Ukraine does not yet have direct access to these funds, but should already internalise their logic and use available external financial instruments to mobilise resources, ease pressure on the state budget, support employment and local resilience, and prepare institutions and communities for future use of structural funds or ad hoc access if political conditions allow. Participation in such programmes facilitates exchange of experience with European partners in governance, economic development and environmental standards, increases investment attractiveness, and builds capacity for successful cohesion policy implementation. Therefore, it is

essential not only to take part in these initiatives, but also to maximise their effectiveness as a foundation for broader access to EU funding and assistance after accession.

Where to start?

To understand this, we must look at the main programmes and forms of funding available. One example is the European Region (Euroregion), a cross-border association of municipalities and administrative units from neighbouring countries, created to promote economic, social, cultural and environmental co-operation. Ukraine has participated in such structures since 1993 as a member of Euroregions such as Carpathians, Bug, Lower Danube, Upper Prut and others. However, several of these Euroregions have faced limited effectiveness: the Carpathian Euroregion's territory proved too extensive and many planned initiatives were not implemented due to differing management approaches and lack of coordination, while Upper Prut temporarily suspended its activities during the political upheavals of the Orange Revolution. By contrast, the Dniester and Bug Euroregions have continued cooperation and launched new initiatives even during the war. This raises the question of which instruments and programmes are available to Euroregions and other cross-border groupings to obtain sustainable funding for their activities (Lepik, 2009).

A common and understandable answer to this question is the grant system. One example is the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Technical Assistance Programme (ERDF-TA), implemented on the Interreg model. The Technical Assistance Programme for Cross-Border Cooperation between Ukraine and Moldova aims to strengthen the administrative capacity of local authorities and NGOs through joint micro-projects. Its main tasks include establishing a steering committee for project selection and financing, providing technical support to applicants, assisting in the preparation of grant applications, monitoring implementation and organising training and methodological support. The programme covers the border areas of Ukraine and Moldova and finances projects up to €10,000, and in exceptional cases up to €50,000. As with most EU initiatives, it promotes social, territorial and economic cohesion, supports local communities and helps to address urgent challenges while creating conditions for sustainable regional development (*European Commission, 2025*).

The financial support provided by Cross-Border Cooperation Programmes is not only an important tool for regional development, but also a symbol of solidarity and trust from European partners. This assistance strengthens relations with the EU and confirms that the European community recognises Ukraine's prospects for membership. At the same time, such programmes link short-term aid with long-term cooperation, laying the foundations for sustainable partnerships capable of transforming entire regions. By turning the idea of support into a practical partnership, they open up new formats of interaction between Ukraine and the EU. One model that reflects these principles is Interreg.

The Interreg programme is one of the EU's key instruments for promoting cooperation between regions and countries and plays an important role in cohesion policy by supporting regional development, reducing economic disparities and strengthening social cohesion. With a budget of around €10 billion for 2021–2027, it focuses on challenges such as climate change, digital transformation and social inclusion and supports projects that cross internal EU borders and involve neighbouring countries. Since its launch in 1990 as a €1 billion initiative, Interreg has evolved into a framework for cross-border, transnational and interregional cooperation, with broader transnational formats opening new opportunities for Ukrainian regions. While security risks complicate large-scale projects in border areas, cooperation in fields such as environmental protection, education, research, energy and digital technologies remains realistic and effective even under current conditions (*Interreg Europe, 2025*).

Cooperation between Ukraine and Poland illustrates how neighbouring countries can jointly address global challenges such as climate change at the local level. The project "Volunteer fire brigades for environmental protection" provides for training of firefighters, purchase of specialised equipment and development of coordinated procedures for responding to emergencies in the border region, thereby strengthening security and demonstrating the practical benefits of cross-border cooperation in the Bug Euroregion (Euroregion Bug, 2024). Such successful examples create a solid

basis for revitalising lagging regions, improving infrastructure and generating replicable models of recovery and socio-economic development (*European Commission, 2025*).

In addition to physical cooperation through programmes, an important dimension is the exchange of experience and knowledge between regions and cities, which helps to develop effective policies and refine shared approaches. For this purpose, the Interreg platform facilitates continuous learning for policymakers and local stakeholders, providing access to a database of good practices, thematic events and expert support in addressing specific regional challenges. In this way, it strengthens regional cooperation and improves the effectiveness of development policies in the European space.

URBACT offers further opportunities for Ukrainian cities. The displacement of millions of people to western cities has increased pressure on local infrastructure, but also highlighted the need for long-term, sustainable urban planning. Within URBACT, Ukrainian cities can join European networks, access expertise and innovative tools, and develop integrated solutions tailored to their specific needs, including reconstruction, environmental sustainability, economic recovery and social cohesion. Support within the programme can be directed both to infrastructure improvements and to social initiatives, while participation in URBACT networks enables Ukrainian municipalities to share their own experience, accelerate recovery and move towards more inclusive, resilient and modern urban spaces (URBACT, 2025).

A panacea or a proven tool?

Structural funds and support programmes are not a comprehensive solution to all of Ukraine's problems. Experience of the Member States shows that even high levels of EU funding cannot replace effective economic policy and can only complement it. Without a sound institutional and legal framework, a significant share of funds risks being inefficiently used, limiting their real impact to formal or symbolic results. Countries have adopted different fund management models: some, like the Baltic States, use a centralised system with ministries as both paying and managing authorities, while others rely on more decentralised structures with specialised agencies. Despite institutional differences, examples such as Slovenia and Poland show that improved coordination and clear frameworks enhance effectiveness, indicating that Ukraine, given its unique integration context, should develop its own coherent strategy for managing EU-related instruments, tailored to national challenges and needs (*Crescenzi & Giua, 2019*).

A modernised approach would support strategic regional development planning, ensure more predictable financing and help fill budget gaps, especially for major infrastructure projects. At the same time, many effects of cohesion policy are difficult to measure solely through GDP or employment, as its added value also lies in strengthening networks, governance quality and participation of local actors in European initiatives, which enhances their visibility and influence at the European level (*World Economic Forum, 2022*).

Equally important is the link between structural and individual cohesion. Individual cohesion reflects citizens' sense of belonging to the European community, openness to cooperation and participation in joint initiatives. Such experiences increase Ukraine's attractiveness as a future member and can help demonstrate to existing EU societies that Ukrainians already share European norms and practices, thereby softening perceptions of "us" and "them". Conversely, low individual cohesion complicates implementation of EU policies, as citizens may not understand or accept the territorial distribution of support (*Janning, 2018*).

Successful implementation of cohesion policy in Ukraine would generate positive effects for both Ukraine and the EU: it would support democratic governance, increase the legitimacy of EU instruments and help counter Eurosceptic and anti-integration narratives. Against the background of growing support for nationalist and populist forces in Europe, visible success of Ukraine's cohesion-oriented reforms and projects would serve as a powerful argument in favour of pan-European solidarity and shared responsibility for stability and development. Thus, cohesion policy should be seen not only as a financial tool, but also as an integral element of Ukraine's integration path, strengthening socio-political unity, facilitating adaptation to EU standards, reducing regional disparities and reinforcing public confidence in the European future of the country.

Conclusion. In this paper we have explored the complex interrelationships between globalisation and regionalisation, in particular their impact on European integration and Ukraine's

prospects for European integration. The EU has demonstrated how to combine the preservation of national identity with active integration into the global economic system. Thanks to the EU's regional policy mechanisms, socio-economic disparities between regions are gradually being reduced, thus contributing to the stability and integrity of the EU. At the same time, the EU actively protects cultural diversity as an important element of European identity. This has enabled Member States to preserve their distinctive traditions and customs while integrating into a common economic and political space. This approach contributes to the formation of a common European identity, which is an important factor in the successful integration of new members such as Ukraine into the EU. The successful implementation of Ukraine's cohesion policy can serve as an example for other countries seeking European integration and show that the preservation of national identity and active participation in a globalised world can go hand in hand.

For Ukraine, the EU's cohesion policy is not only a means of economic support, but also an important factor in the integration process. Successful implementation of the policy will enable Ukraine to adapt to European standards, develop its regions and overcome socio-economic disparities. It will increase the confidence of Ukrainian society in the European integration process and consolidate the foundations of democracy.

In order to effectively use the opportunities offered by EU grants and programmes, Ukraine should:

1. Actively participate in cross-border cooperation programmes: for example, the Interreg programme promotes cooperation between EU regions and countries. Ukrainian regions can participate in projects aimed at solving common problems (e.g. environmental issues or infrastructure development). It is important to build partnerships with neighbouring countries to address cross-border issues. This could include joint projects to modernise transport networks, improve water quality or develop tourism infrastructure. In addition, participation in such programmes allows for the exchange of best practices and innovative solutions, thus increasing the efficiency of local administration. Active participation in cross-border co-operation schemes also helps to build trust between municipalities and contributes to a common European identity.

2. Strengthening the administrative capacity of local authorities: this can be achieved through participation in technical assistance programmes such as ERDF-TA. It is important to set up steering committees responsible for selecting and funding projects, providing technical assistance to applicants and organising educational activities.

3. Ensure exchange of experience and knowledge between regions and municipalities: platforms such as Interreg and URBACT provide lifelong learning opportunities for policy makers and local community representatives, helping to cross-check existing policy solutions against databases of good practice and seek expert advice on how to address specific regional challenges.

4. Creating a new institutional framework for the management of EU funds: The experience of other countries shows that effective management of funds requires sound institutional and legal frameworks. Ukraine needs to develop its own management strategy based on the specific challenges and needs of the country.

5. Supporting the cohesion of individual citizens: Involving citizens in joint European initiatives could increase Ukraine's attractiveness as a potential EU member. It would also make existing EU members feel that Ukrainians are already part of the European community.

Successful implementation of cohesion policy in Ukraine would have a very positive impact not only on Ukraine itself, but also on the EU as a whole. It would be an important sign of strengthening democratic values, increase the legitimacy of EU initiatives among member states, and help reduce Euroscepticism in Europe.

References:

1. Fawcett, L. (1992). *Regionalism in World Politics: Regional Organisation and International Order*. Oxford University Press.
2. Janning, J. (2018). *Crisis and cohesion in the European Union: A ten-year review*. European Council on Foreign Relations.

3. Kengyel, A. (2008). Assessing the added value of regional policies at the EU level. *Society and Economy*, 30(2), 303–322.
4. Molchanov, M. (2005). Regionalism and globalisation: The case of the European Union. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 4(3–4), 431–446.
5. Molle, W. (2008). Enhancing the efficiency of the EU funds through better coordination. *Society and Economy*, 30(2), 275–292.
6. World Economic Forum. (2017, January). *In short, what is globalisation?* Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2017/01/what-is-globalization-explainer/>
7. World Economic Forum. (2019, January). *A brief history of globalisation*. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2019/01/how-globalization-4-0-fits-into-the-history-of-globalization/>
8. World Economic Forum. (2019, April). *Globalization 4.0: Shaping a new global architecture in the era of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*.
9. European Commission. (n.d.). *EU funding and tender opportunities portal*. Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal>
10. Interreg Europe. (n.d.). *What is Interreg Europe?* Retrieved from <https://www.interregeurope.eu/what-is-interreg-europe>
11. Euroregion Bug. (2024, October 9). *Projekt OSP na straży środowiska – transgraniczne działania zapobiegające skutkom zmian klimatu dofinansowano z Programu Interreg NEXT Polska–Ukraina 2021–2027*. Retrieved from <https://euroregionbug.pl>
12. URBACT. (n.d.). *About URBACT*. Retrieved from <https://urbact.eu/who-we-are>
13. World Economic Forum. (2022, May). *Four futures of economic globalisation: Scenarios and their implications* (White Paper). Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/publications/four-futures-for-economic-globalization-scenarios-and-their-implications/>
14. Zamagni, S. (1995). Globalisation and new regionalism: Implications for development and peace. *Society and Economy in Central and Eastern Europe*, 17(5), 19–32.
15. European Commission. (n.d.). *European Territorial Cooperation (Interreg): Cross-border cooperation*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/policy/cooperation/european-territorial/cross-border_en
16. Crescenzi, R., & Giua, M. (2019, November 26). Don't blame Brussels if you don't benefit from EU Cohesion Policy! *VoxEU/CEPR Policy Portal*. Retrieved from <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/dont-blame-brussels-if-you-dont-benefit-eu-cohesion-policy>
17. Lepik, K.-L. (2009). Euroregions as mechanisms for strengthening cross-border co-operation in the Baltic Sea region. *Trames: Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 13(3), 265–284.
18. What is the EU's idea of cohesion and what is being done to achieve it? (2019, June 14). In *Europe: Is the System Broken?* (pp. 20–21).