



CONSORTIO

**Journal of Economics,
Social Sciences,
Law and Education**



Magazine Publisher

ISSN 2956-820X

PUBLISHER

Head of the scientific council Wojciech Duranowski

Head of the editorial team Zbigniew Dąbrowski

Publication in English

First edition of the journal

CONTACT

Address: 11/49 Mazowiecka Street, 00-052 Warsaw

Foundation's website: www.zofiazamenhof.pl

Phone: + 48 604 997 656 + 48 516 398 860

E-mail address: biuro@zofiazamenhof.pl

Editorial Secretary: basia.makarewicz0524@gmail.com

Publisher's website: www.fzzpublishing.eu

Sustainable Development Goals

Copyright © 2023 by Consortio - Scientific Journal

Journal of Economics, Social Sciences, Law and Education, Editor-in-Chief Zbigniew Dąbrowski, Zofia Zamenhof Foundation, 2023

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means without the written permission of the publisher.



4

Social resilience in terms of the UN Sustainable Development Goals

Author Note

Andrii E. Lebid (Ukraine)
Mykola Nazarov (Ukraine)
Andriana Kostenko (Ukraine)
Vitalii Stepanov (Ukraine)

Andrii E. Lebid, Mykola Nazarov, Andriana Kostenko, Vitalii Stepanov, 2022

**Andrii E. Lebid, Doctor of Philosophy, Dr. Sc., Professor, Faculty of Foreign
Philology and Social Communications, Sumy State University, Ukraine**

**Mykola Nazarov, PhD in Politology, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Foreign
Philology and Social Communications, Sumy State University, Ukraine**

**Andriana Kostenko, Doctor of Politology, Professor, Faculty of Foreign
Philology and Social Communications, Sumy State University, Ukraine**

**Vitalii Stepanov, PhD in Philology, Assistant, Faculty of Foreign Philology and
Social Communications, Sumy State University, Ukraine**

Abstract

Today, there are completely new interpretations for the concepts of resilience and social resilience as a reaction to global, regional or local challenges and risks within security spheres. The issue of social resilience is getting especially urgent during social transformations: pandemics, Russian military aggression against Ukraine in economic crisis, unfinished reforms. That leads to lack of future population confidence and affects social resilience.

Study of social resilience factors in terms of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will produce some forecasts. Firstly, we can predict potential readiness of local communities for solidarity, cooperation and joint resistance to negative tendencies and risks. Secondly, we can foresee obstacles that contain the horizontal link development and the residents' influence increase to make community decisions.

Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals is a relevant tool to modernize Ukraine. As one of possible prospects to enhance this process, we should combine the UN Sustainable Development Goals with approaches to maintaining the Ukrainian national resilience. A peculiar attention must be paid to treating the concept of social resilience within the triad “individual – community – state”. In such a triangle, we can distinguish the key threats to social resilience. Their elimination directly correlates with Ukraine's realizing of the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

Methodologically, many of the seventeen UN Sustainable Development Goals determine the social resilience rise. For example, that concerns goals 3 (good health and well-being), 11 (sustainable cities and communities), 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions), etc. Therefore, in terms of the UN Sustainable Development Goals, state policies should be based on higher social resilience with corresponding indexes.

Keywords: resilience, social resilience, sustainable development goals, democratisation, institutional conflict, democratic institutes.

Introduction

Having approved the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its seventeen goals, the world confirmed a deep interest in this urgent issue. As the UN members, one hundred ninety three signing countries undertook a stable gradual growth, social integration and environmental protection. They were going to achieve it via partnership and peace.

The Agenda is a universal transforming document based on human rights observance. Actually, it is an ambitious UN plan to eliminate poverty, reduce inequality and protect Earth. The paper appeals to certain measures for people, planet and common welfare. It is aimed at stability and problem predictability.

The Agenda was adopted as a result of multi-aspect debates since the 1972 UN Human Environment Conference till the 2015 UN Sustainable Development Summit. For over 40 years, the world community has been trying to solve ecological, social and economic problems. These debates resulted in a conclusion that it is national governments who are primarily responsible for Agenda implementation.

The document is based on certain principles: universality, inclusion, equality, etc. Regardless of their income, all countries must contribute to sustainable development. The paper may be applied in any states. It concerns any context and time.

The Agenda is useful for everybody. Irrespective of location and damage, any person can be supported if a critical aid is needed. To analyse results and monitor progress, local and disaggregated data is very important.

The Agenda is formed according to interrelationship and integrity of all 17 goals. All participants should regard and implement SDGs as a single unity avoiding subjectivism. Regardless of race, sex or ethnic identity, all people are invited to participate. To secure SDGs in all countries, multi-aspect partnership is built to mobilize and share knowledge, experience, technologies and financial resources.

The Agenda comprises five main components:

- a) people;
- b) planet;
- c) welfare;
- d) peace;
- e) partnership (The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 2015).

These elements are considered via three dimensions: social integration, economic growth and environment protection. The Agenda adoption made the sustainable development idea deeper when other two components appeared: partnership and peace. Social resilience is possible only if these five elements co-work.

The state of such components provides strategic decisions for global, national and local development. To reach resilience, different socio-political, socio-economic, cultural, ecological and other consequences should be included. Besides, sustainable development policy-makers must ensure that any Agenda or SDGs activities observe partnership rules and use proper realization mechanisms.

Thus, our research is aimed at analysing social resilience factors in terms of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The study is based on assessment of unity, adaptation and overcoming factors. As social resilience indexes, they were offered by us in previous publications (Sotsialna stiiikist terytorialny khhromad, 2021).

Literature review

Within the modern science, interpretation of the resilience and social resilience concepts is quite debatable (especially, when we distinguish between “resilience” and “resistance”). Some researchers find it difficult to treat the concept of sustainable development.

From their perspective, the concept is a result of differentiation of all seventeen SDGs by at least two categories. Some of goals end in themselves, the others are used to reach further goals. In particular, the end-in-themselves SDGs comprise poverty overcoming, well-being, etc. Demographic situation (problem) is an important aspect to realise and achieve SDGs. It influences both development and resilience (Camacho, 2015).

Irrespective of SDGs positive features, some researchers believe goals do not match the self-proclaimed purpose – coordination of international efforts to overcome poverty. Ten ways of the Agenda and SDGs effect increase are proposed on the international level (including responsibility for their observance). The authors argue there is a gradual poverty fall in the world. However, they ask: “Is it a moral progress?”.

Governments must carry out all-inclusive institutional reforms to achieve SDGs (Pogge & Sengupta, 2015).

In another article, the authors continue their work. Within their analysis, the correlating things are compared: the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Several contexts for them are defined. Firstly, when we assess the present in terms of correspondence to the SDGs and MDGs, historical contrast should be focused on. In this aspect, the issue of moral significance is critical: the present life quality rather than the past one is relevant. Secondly, neither MDGs nor SDGs clearly define progress means and differentiate “responsibility zones” to succeed. All of this will make overcoming the poverty impossible because its achievement requires the authority and effort division (on the governmental and local levels). Thirdly, although the SDGs appeal to inequality reduction, this goal is considered to be realised only since 2029. Such a delay may lead to enormous death and suffering among the poor while the rich will abuse national and supernational landscapes (Pogge & Sengupta, 2016).

In their online article, Wynn M. & Jones P. state that SDGs were created to make a transition to a more resilient future till 2030. The UN has appealed all governments to achieve these ambitious goals. Meanwhile, the private sector plays an important role in this task as well.

The authors recognize different approaches of eight key industries to attain SDGs. Also, some broader issues are considered for implementing SDGs in future (Wynn& Jones, 2021).

The publication by Bexell M. & Jönsson K. concerns responsibility problems in documents on the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The authors try to research the SDGs responsibility more systematically. They define three main responsibility aspects: cause, duty and accountability. Some main SDGs papers are analysed: “Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” and “Addis Ababa Action Agenda”. In terms of these three aspects, responsibility is imposed on countries while nations must be respected. The aspects are interconnected. They should be researched further (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017).

Chapman A. studies health care tasks to observe human rights and SDGs. According to him, the UN summit documents do not provide proper approach to realise the health SDGs.

He estimates drawbacks of human right observance and their consequences for reaching the SDGs. Attention is focused on those objectives that are especially relevant for health care: children's health rights, common access to reproductive services, elimination of main health determinants, high health care scope, access to medicines (Chapman, 2017).

Fukuda-Parr S. distinguishes between the Sustainable Development Goals and the Millennium Development Goals. They differ in three implementation aspects: by purpose, by conception and by policy. Within the MDGs-to-SDGs transition, gender actualisation is very important. SDGs can solve some drawbacks of MDGs through a wider transformational approach. SDGs provide a clearer and more adequate reflection of challenges, opportunities and risks in the 21st century. They also show needs for structural changes of the world economy. In contrast to MDGs, SDGs concentrate on qualitative rather than quantitative indexes of development. Their realisation depends on supporting each goal to increase the accountability of authorities (Fukuda-Parr, 2016).

Lewin K. analyses SDGs in terms of education. The world has all opportunities to promote education separately and for sustainable development generally. Sustainable development allows teaching people and creating infrastructure with all necessary resources. Here, the issue of study motivation is critical (Lewin, 2019).

It is relevant to research SDGs implementation in local communities. In particular, Horne R. et al. analysed intersectoral partnerships to promote the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda on the local level. They studied the UN Global Compact Cities Program and urban agglomeration viability in terms of SDGs. This analysis shows efficiency of the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda as joint platforms for many groups. It is a necessary condition to promote local viability projects (Horne et al., 2020).

Filho W. et al. analysed the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It comprises measures to keep a balance between economic progress and environmental protection, to eradicate contradictions among the developed and the developing countries, to overcome poverty, etc. However, in spite of urgent need for SDGs, the authors cannot vividly understand how they will solve current and future problems of sustainable development. In their article, they consider potentials for each of seventeen SDGs to settle urgent development issues (Filho et al., 2019).

Kopnina H. researches ecology. Ecological unsustainability is caused by structural features and capitalism. Socio-economic development remains a traditional remedy for unsustainability problems. New accents of socio-economic goals are determined by SDGs. Achieving SDGs is considered not to bring the social inequality rise or economic growth.

On the contrary, there will be more unstable production and consumption while constant economic and demographic increase leads to ecological problems. To overcome the destructive unsustainability tendencies, we should include ethical approaches to the environment. It can effectively remove drawbacks of sustainable development that is mostly anthropocentric and hides unsustainability locations (Kopnina, 2016).

In her another article, Kopnina H. focuses on education relevance in terms of SDGs as a basis to adopt the “Education for Sustainable Development” and the “Education for Sustainable Development Goals” programs. Most institutions are ready to accept SDGs although there is a question if “education for sustainable development” as a future education pattern is reasonable at all. We should consider the sustainable development paradoxes via alternative education mechanisms based on global ethics, ecopedagogy, ecocentric teaching, training for sustainable development, human rights (Kopnina, 2020).

Saiz I. & Donald K. define the strong and the weak sides of SDGs in terms of human rights observance. They analyse political sensitivity of this aim and its realisation ways. It is explained how norms, standards and tools can be used to keep human rights. Also, the authors describe the monitoring role in common progress and authority accountability (Saiz & Donald, 2017).

Eskelinen T. researches political sense of SDGs, which is stated in UN or other acts. Here, utopia and governance are regarded as ideally typical approaches and analytical tools for qualitative content analysis of SDGs.

That is highly efficient in assessing the international development policies because it is characterised by excessive utopia and governance reasonability. Use of such approach to SDGs shows that utopian statements concern the humanity idea as a single subject seeking common welfare. On the other hand, SDGs are restricted to modern governance, international order and development economy projects (Eskelinen, 2021).

Gaspar D. insists on two mechanisms of SDGs formation – the procedural and organisational ones.

He studies their influence and interconnection in terms of SDGs realisation. Here, government, business and civil institutes play an important role. Key actors are united within a “aims – tasks – indexes” system. The system is considered concerning different global governance prospects via SDGs (Gasper, 2019).

Morrison-Saunders A. et al. regard impact assessment (IA) as the main tool of realising the UN Sustainable Development Goals. SDGs are applied to reach broader results than their IA for the current moment. However, there is a great convergence between IA and SDGs, which is defined through some IA dimensions: comprehensiveness, strategy, integration. The “upgraded” IA may be used to promote the SDGs achievement. Nevertheless, IA must be more comprehensive and integrated to provide the best research of SDGs and their interconnections (Morrison-Saunders et al., 2020).

Thus, sustainable development concerns all branches of public life: economy, overcoming poverty, environmental protection, human rights observance, etc. Besides, there are other implementation ways of resilience policy in terms of SDGs: gender equality (Hollida et al., 2019; Gammage et al., 2019; Hennebry et al., 2019; Koehler, 2016; Azcona & Bhatt, 2020), education (Wade, 2002; Ross, 2015; Shulla et al., 2020; Holdsworth & Thomas, 2021; Carrapatoso, 2021; Laksov, 2021), social processes (Endo & Ikeda, 2022; Boess et al, 2021; Matović & Obradović, 2022; Dusík & Bond, 2022; Al-Qudah et al., 2022), etc.

Separately, attention should be paid to works on civil security within sustainable development. These issues are considered on global, national and local levels (Harwell, 2012; Orji, 2012; Dimitrova & Petrova, 2011; Buttanri, 2017; Egwalusor, 2020).

In our research, it is relevant to investigate social resilience according to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (Metaxas & Psarropoulou, 2021; Constantinescu & Frone, 2018; Constantinescu, 2014; Pisano, 2012; Barria et al., 2019; Borie et al., 2019; Cretney, 2014; Elmqvist et al, 2019; Yamagata & Sharifi, 2018).

The combination of SDGs with national resilience is also important for interpretation. The concept of resilience was first used in the ecology sphere, critical infrastructure studies and natural sciences. Holling C. treated resilience as a system ability to absorb changes and keep functioning properly (Holling, 1973).

It was Adger N. who made the first definition of social resilience: a community ability to resist external impact on social infrastructure (Adger, 2000). The social resilience analysis establishes mechanisms of system's adapting to current, unexpected and unknown challenges. Many researchers defined social resilience as an ability to absorb changes, resist instability (Kates & Clark, 1996; Streets & Glantz, 2000).

According to Carpenter S. et al., resilience may be measured as a value of disturbance that functioning systems can resist (Carpenter et al., 2001). From the socio-ecological perspective, resilience may be regarded as a system ability to absorb disturbances and reorganise itself in case of changes to maintain the same functions, structure, identity and feedbacks (Folke, 2006). To make the resilience idea applicable for sustainable development studies, a system ability to exercise and adapt was included as a relevant factor as well (Berkes et al., 2003).

Therefore, resilience is interpreted as “a borderline object” between natural and social sciences, which secures interdisciplinary cooperation (Star, 2010). One of fundamental resilience ideas was that environmental problems cannot be solved separately from social contexts (O'Brien et al., 2009).

It is a reaction to a conservatism criticism where resilience was applied to social systems (Pelling & Manuel-Navarrete, 2011).

Lately, resilience has been reconsidered via transformation or transformability. The systems are believed to have some potential stable states or gravity pools. Together, they make its “stability landscape” (Gallopin, 2006).

All definitions of social resilience concern social subjects (individuals, organizations, communities); their abilities to resist, absorb, cope with and adapt to different ecological and public threats. As many researchers argue, the initial point for empirical studies of social resilience is the question “What is the resilience threat or risk that we examine?” (Obrist et al., 2010).

Most investigations of social resilience reveal a range of threats (Cinner et al., 2009). Other publications focus on stress factors. They can be classified into three categories.

The first group covers natural dangers and cataclysms (Rockstrom, 2004; Pearce, 2010; Braun & Aßheuer, 2011; Cashman, 2011; Haase, 2011; Lopez-Marrero & Tschakert, 2011; Frazier et al., 2010; Howe, 2011; Adger, 2005; Klocker, 2011; Biggs et al., 2012; Harte et al., 2009; McGee, 2011).

The second group comprises more long-term stress in coordination or lack of resources and environmental changeability. Applied studies deal with such issues as mangrove forest recycling (Adger, 2000; Marshall et al., 2009), desertification (Bradley & Grainger, 2004), water quality decrease (Gooch et al., 2012), etc.

The third group concerns different social changes and development problems. Here, there is research of policies and institutional alternations (Thomas & Twyman, 2005; Marshall, 2007; Lebidet et al., 2021), migration problems (Adger et al., 2002; Porter et al., 2008), local economic transformations (Bouzarovski et al., 2011; Evans, 2008), tourism (Adams, 2010), infrastructure development (Perz et al., 2010), crises (Schwarz et al., 2011), health risks (Leipert & Reuter, 2005; Hoy et al., 2008), etc.

As an ideal in the third millennium, sustainable development is a balanced conception of current needs and resources for generations. This should replace all the other development conceptions (especially, the extensive model). However, sustainable development does not mean constant improvement of conditions. In this case, it is more sensible to talk about a comprehensively balanced development.

SDGs are determined by the UN Commission on Sustainable Development separately for each country. The Commission builds a global sustainable development strategy. It analyzes possibilities and resources of various countries to define their tasks for accomplishment. Moreover, the Commission works with each country who decided to support the sustainable development paradigm.

The sustainable development conception is based on five principles for any country:

- 1) Development can be sustainable if there is a balance of needs among previous and modern generations;
- 2) Limits of natural resource use are relative. It depends on planet recovery and resource extraction safety;
- 3) Sustainable development is impossible if no basic human needs are satisfied (because poverty leads to ecological disasters);
- 4) The excessive material resource use must match ecological planet features;
- 5) Population increase must match the Earth ecosystem potential.

The UN Sustainable Development Goals determine the Millennium Development Goals. Besides, they comprise new global spheres: climate changes, economic inequality, innovations, stable consumption, peace and justice, etc.

As a country accepting the SDGs realization within a global scope, Ukraine chose sustainable development tasks concerning its needs and interests. It is done according to international acts: the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 1992), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1992), the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (Rio Declaration, 1992), the United Nations Millennium Declaration (UN Millennium Declaration, 2000), etc.

National documents deal with the social resilience enhancement, the peace and civil security promotion, the conflict and post-conflict settlement (Tsistolohorzvytku: Ukraina, 2017, p. 115). Meanwhile, rise of poor community viability is considered (Tsistolohorzvytku: Ukraina, 2017, p. 128). Other issues concern food production and agriculture upgrade to manufacture more goods, preserve ecosystems, strengthen adaptation to climate problems, improve soils gradually (Tsistolohorzvytku: Ukraina, 2017, p. 149).

As it was mentioned above, the UN Sustainable Development Goals are reasonably analysed in terms of resilience on the global, national, regional and local levels.

In literature, the term “resilience” is applied only in several contexts. The definitions differ depending on topics and research fields. The ecological branch describes resilience as an extent of ecosystem ability to absorb changes and keep functioning (Mayunga, 2007, p. 2). Resilience can also be treated as a set of adaptations to positive functionality and self-regulation in case of disturbance or after successful recovery against opposing systems or other challenges (Sonn & Fisher, 1998, p. 3). Resilience construction is a process or long-term strategy of establishing relationships in society, between political and social subjects.

In contrast to general expectations, the concept of resistance means that preventive actions do not affect, and later it concentrates on restricting any public obstacles. Resilience and resistance are different terms.

Resistance is often interpreted as a systemic ability to cope with and recover from negative stress consequences till its normal functioning is achieved (Maru, 2010). Resistance can cause stable system dysfunctions in case of changeable circumstances. Resilience is more than firmness and pain endurance. It is an ability to find internal power and resources for succeeding in a crisis setting. Resilience is the highest degree of adaptation and flexibility (Ganor & Ben-Lavy, 2003, p. 106).

People got more interested in resilience study after the 9/11 USA terrorism and disasters – tsunamis, typhoons, industrial accidents, etc. Today, world crises are urgent: Covid-19, military conflicts, hybrid warfare.

Today, there are clearer and more sensible approaches to applying the term “resilience”. For example, the UN glossary defines resilience as a system, community or society ability to absorb external impacts and recover till basic features. Simultaneously, it concerns a system adaptation and flexibility within huge transformations and outer influence.

Resilient societies succeed in reaching public welfare and returning to high social development after problem settlements. Many experts treat social resilience as an integral security component and a country’s ability to unity in case of conflicts (caused by socio-political changes or acts of violence). This idea is close to community resilience, which mostly correlates with social resilience.

Within separate communities, some interdisciplinary approaches and different theories are usually used to interpret social resilience. Wilson G. defines social resilience via the joint analysis of natural and social sciences. In environmental sciences, he relies on the socio-ecological subfield. In social sciences, the decision, transit and social capital theories are included. The conceptualisation of community resilience is made on the intersection of economic, social and ecological capitals. That compares community resilience with global indexes of strong and weak social capitals. Besides, a range of issues can be chosen to determine levels of community resilience (Wilson, 2012). Social resilience belongs to national resilience. It is defined as a country’s ability to public unity in case of conflicts caused by socio-political changes or acts of violence (Jackson & Ferris, 2012). This conception is similar to community resilience. Most studies of community resilience correlate with those of social resilience.

Ganor M. & Ben-Lavy Y. defined six key elements of community resilience:

- 1) Communication on situations, threats, risks and supports;
- 2) Local cooperation and responsibility rather than external aid expectation;
- 3) Unity via empathy and mutual assistance;
- 4) Independent resistance to crises;
- 5) Leadership (especially, on lower levels);
- 6) Faith in better future changes (Ganor & Ben-Lavy, 2003).

In many publications, social resilience is regarded as a social subject ability to cope with difficulties, adapt to challenges (on the basis of previous experience) and transform with creation of new institutions for reliability and individual welfare (Keck & Sakdapolrak, 2013).

Some researchers single out a set of four interconnected components needed for the social resilience work:

- 1) Economic development comprises volume and stock of resources, fair resource distribution, fair risks and danger sensitivity.
- 2) Social capital is obtained from social relationships. It concerns social support in case of need, unity feelings, formal or informal links between society members and their attachment to place.
- 3) Community competence includes society knowledge, skills to solve problems and abilities to cooperate. In other words, it is a collective performance. Community competence depends on critical reflection, willingness to contribute, group conflict settlement and consensus.
- 4) Communication via reliable and accurate information sources can secure efficient decision making (Norris et al., 2008).

The UNDP Ukraine experts paid a peculiar attention to the psychological and social-cultural aspects of social resilience formation (Dumky ta pohliadynaselennia, 2021). Its significance consists not only of the fact that national and social resilience is connected with attitudes, life conditions, information sphere of Ukrainian border areas. In this paper, we see that Ukrainians keep upgrading democratic institutes and national identity (irrespective of historical ties to the neighboring Russia, many migrants from the Anti-Terrorist Operation Zone, the enemy propaganda). That is relevant for social resilience consideration. Among Ukrainian researchers, there is no single view on social resilience and its elements. However, they are highly interested in such studies. In particular, specialists investigate identification mechanisms

of social resilience on national, regional and local levels. It is regarded as a requirement for community unity (Tkachuk & Natalenko, 2020, pp. 52-53).

A range of publications adjacent to social resilience focus on correlation between the national, regional and local identities. Dominance of the regional identity over the national one is discussed in the research “The Ukrainian Z Generation. Values and Guidelines” (supported by the Friedrich Ebert Fund and the New Europe Center).

The same conclusion was made by experts from the Horshenin Institute. Together with the Friedrich Ebert Fund in Ukraine and Belarus, they conducted the all-Ukrainian poll “Ukrainian Society and European Values” (Ukrainske suspilstvo, 2017).

A separate direction of social resilience studies concerns social capital features. As a mutual trust among community residents, social capital comprises constructive relationships of individuals or groups. These ties are the most valuable community resources to resist challenges and solve problems – industrial, living, public. Their constructiveness and destructiveness depend on common trust in society and community, which determines unity (Koulman, 2001).

The positive social capital presupposes constructive ties. The capital size is measured by their spread and diversity. The more spread these ties are, the more reliable mutual help and community social resilience are.

When there is a lack of sincere and altruistic trust, human relationships become hostile and suspicious. In such a way, the negative social capital appears, which leads to poverty and crimes in the communities (Fukuizama, 2008).

Generalization of the main statements

In 2015, one hundred ninety three UN members adopted a plan for welfare achievement. Within next fifteen years, these actions must be aimed at extreme poverty overcoming, inequality and injustice elimination, environmental protection. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its seventeen goals determine what all countries would like to reach. They include national governments, business, civil society and other stakeholders who cooperate for sustainable development. To implement such plan, great efforts should be made by everybody.

Ukraine also participates in the Agenda realisation. Ukrainian documents were adopted to promote sustainable development and enhance national resilience in economic, legal, civil and other branches. The 2030 Ukrainian SDGs are guidelines for drafting forecasts, programs and acts to provide a balance of economic, social and ecologic dimensions of Ukrainian sustainable development (Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy, 2019).

The 2030 Ukrainian SDGs are defined by the four criteria: fair social development, stable economic growth and employment, efficient management, ecologic balance and resilience rise (Tsilistalohorozvytku: Ukraina, 2017).

Discussion

Therefore, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its seventeen goals offer a complex approach to defining, considering and solving urgent issues or threats. The SDGs reflect neither full nor short Agenda contents. They outline the main spheres of influence to reach sustainable development. The seventeen goals should be regarded as integral elements of system configuration. They promote planet and humanity well-being.

Established as a result of negotiations, the SDGs are not perfect. However, they obviously reveal the most urgent needs of the world. Their principles and values allow achieving ambitious results.

The 2030 Agenda gives an opportunity to think critically, creatively and innovatively for development issues. To support the Agenda properly, we should inform people on SDGs more clearly. Nevertheless, these efforts themselves are insufficient for long-term changes. A successful SDGs implementation is determined by the Agenda deep learning and consideration. Having adopted the Agenda, all UNO members undertook an ambitious plan, which requires good coordination among countries, citizens, private businesses and scientists. In other words, everybody should contribute to the common resilience and sustainable development.

Reality makes people reconsider traditional ideas of threats caused by natural, technological, social or military phenomena. Reasons for new conflicts and crises must be systematically analysed to assess risks in the economic, power, cybernetic, ecological, agricultural, medical, educational and cultural branches.

Based on the Ukrainian national interests and international experience, we can launch a multi-level complex system of resilience. On the state, regional and local levels, it will promote opportunities to prevent many threats and recover from crises.

Such a system must include state and local authorities, current and new public facilities. We should secure their proper coordination, namely define duties and plans to prevent, control and overcome threats or crises. Primary, the national resilience introduction requires a corresponding legal foundation. Thus, some Ukrainian acts were adopted to regulate the resilience issue: the National Resilience Conception (Kontseptsiia zabezpechennia, 2021), the Ukrainian National Security Strategy (Stratehiia natsionalnoi bezpeky, 2020), the Information Security Strategy (Stratehiia informatsiinoi bezpeky, 2021), etc.

According to our research purpose in March-June 2021 among Ukrainian local communities (Sotsialna stiikist terytorialny khromad, 2021), we can hypothesize that social resilience is signified and determined by three of the seventeen UN Sustainable Development Goals:

- 1) Goal 3: Good health and well-being – ensuring healthy lives and promoting well-being for everybody at all ages;
- 2) Goal 11: Sustainable cities and communities – making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, sustainable;
- 3) Goal 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions – promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development; providing access to justice for everybody; building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 2015).

As it was stated above, Ukraine joined the other UN members to ensure sustainable development globally. In 2016-2017, there was a large-scale SDGs adaptation in the Ukrainian context. The 2030 Ukrainian national strategy relies on the principle “nobody must stay aside”. Each global goal was revised according to the country’s development. This work resulted in the SDGs national system. It consists of national development tasks with corresponding indexes.

Table 1: Monitoring of the SDGs achievement indexes in Ukraine. Goal 3 (Tsistolalo horozvytku: Ukraina. Monitorynhovy zvit, 2020, pp. 18-25)

Goal 3: Good health and well-being					
Index	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
3.1.1. Mother death amount per 100,000 liveborns	15.1	12.6	9.1	12.5	14.9
3.2.1. Infant mortality amount (under 5 years old) per 1,000 liveborns	9.3	8.8	8.9	8.3	8.2
3.3.1. HIV patients amount per 100,000 residents	37.0	37.0	40.6	40.8	42.6
3.3.2. Tuberculosis patients amount per 100,000 residents	55.9	54.7	51.9	50.5	60.1
3.5.1. Death probability among males (20-64 years old)	0.38943	0.38364	0.37535	0.38675	0.38088
3.5.2. Death probability among females (20-64 years old)	0.15514	0.15208	0.14696	0.15010	0.14536

Lately, Covid-19 has brought new challenges for Ukraine and the whole world. It has affected social resilience on the global, national, regional and local levels (Coronavirus Worldwide Graphs, 2022; Koronavirus v Ukraini, 2022).

Table 2: Monitoring of the SDGs achievement indexes in Ukraine. Goal 11 (Tsistoloho rozvytku: Ukraina. Monitorynhovy zvit, 2020, p. 62–64)

Goal 11: Sustainable cities and communities					
Index	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
11.2.1. Number of regions that adopted and introduced public development strategies (in %)	88	100	100	100	100
11.2.1. Number of regions that adopted and introduced public development strategies and their realization plans (in %)	64	96	100	–	–
11.4.1. Level of introduction (creation, modernisation, enhancement) of local automatic civil alert systems (in %)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.1	0.1
11.5.1. Number of pollutant emissions from stationary facilities (in % till the 2015 emission level)	100.0	107.7	90.5	87.8	86.1
11.5.2. Number of cities where average annual air concentration of main pollutants exceed average daily limits (in units)	34	34	34	35	36
11.6.1. Realisation of local development strategies to raise economy, employment, tourism, recreation, culture, local manufacture. Number of employees in tourism facilities (in persons)	54,421	55,413	58,588	62,585	–

Another parameter to check social resilience is Goal 16 – peace, justice and strong institutions.

Table 3: Monitoring of the SDGs achievement indexes in Ukraine. Goal 16 (Tsistoloho rozvytku: Ukraina. Monitorynhovy zvit, 2020, p. 73–88)

Goal 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions					
Index	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
16.1.2. Number of crime victims per 100,000 residents	965.12	1044.08	882.92	817.92	720.23
16.3.2. Number of people who apply for free legal aid (in persons)	38,303	219,981	393,228	400,478	404,030
16.7.1. Ukrainian place in the Global Competitiveness Report by its Institutions pillar	130	129	118	110	104

A significant role in this aspect is played by goal target 16.9. It consists in strengthening social resilience as well as promoting peace, civil security, conflict and post-conflict settlement.

The target includes the Social Unity and Reconciliation Index. It is measured via:

- 1) public solidarity and co-involvement feeling;
- 2) tolerance and civil responsibility;
- 3) psychosocial adaptability;
- 4) fall of negative migration trends;
- 5) readiness for discussion;
- 6) civil behavior;
- 7) relationships with government and security;
- 8) relationships with groups;
- 9) political security (Tsilistaloho rozvytku: Ukraina. Monitorynhovyi zvit, 2020, p. 86-88).

In terms of this, it is reasonable to single out tasks for Ukraine to undertake in the Sustainable Development progress (according to resilience parameters determined by Goals 3, 11 and 16):

- 1) reforming the health care system and securing complex measures to prevent, forecast, diagnose and treat diseases;
- 2) containing epidemics (including Covid-19) and providing permanent medical aid;
- 3) adopting and realizing the State Regional Development Strategy with new approaches: transition to community-oriented policies based on the local potential use;
- 4) coordinating the all-community introduction of smart development strategies;
- 5) raising connections between the strategic, spatial and budget plans;
- 6) broadening cities and communities;
- 7) increasing legal foundations of communities;
- 8) legalizing the mediation institution (Tsistoloho rozvytku: Ukraina. Dobrovilnyi natsionalnyi ohliad, 2020).

Target values of the goal 3, 11 and 16 indexes show that Ukraine tends to higher resilience and more systematic and efficient mechanism of sustainable development (Tsistoloho rozvytku: Ukraina. Natsionalna dopovid, 2017, p. 26-29, 84-87, 114-117).

Conclusion

Ukraine adheres to the values and tasks of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Since 2015, Ukraine has been reforming its socio-economic structure and democratic order.

The SDGs are integrated into Ukrainian state policies and rely on the “nobody must stay aside” principle.

By 2019, Ukraine has generally succeeded in fifteen of seventeen SDGs.

Meanwhile, the Covid-19 risks and challenges show it is important for Ukraine to reform healthcare and social security, to enhance governance coordination and professionalisation, to recover full manufacturing cycles of some goods, to digitise administration processes, to modernise distance learning, etc.

The SDGs have been driving Ukrainian changes. They offered the new values and outlook, which made Ukrainians reconsider their national development. Since accession to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Ukraine has been revising its strategic plans and socio-economic priorities.

We should further research the social resilience conception to define society's consolidated answers to different threats. To clarify social resilience criteria, Ukraine adopted a range of strategic acts. They are aimed at prioritizing resilience criteria and their implementation in Ukraine.

Social resilience is signified and determined by the three of seventeen UN Sustainable Development Goals: Goal 3 (good health and well-being), Goal 11 (sustainable cities and communities).

Goal 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions). Consequently, social resilience improvement will positively influence SDGs implementation in Ukraine, and vice versa.

References

- Adams, A. (2010). Planning for cruise ship resilience: An approach to managing cruise ship impacts in Haines, Alaska. *Coastal Management*, 38(6), pp. 654–664.
- Adger, N. (2000). Social and ecological resilience: Are they related? *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(3), 347–364.
- Adger, N., Hughes, T., Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Rockström, J. (2005). Social-ecological resilience to coastal disasters. *Science*, 309(5737), pp. 1036–1039.1.
- Adger, N., Kelly, P., Winkels, A., Huy, I., Locke, C. (2002). Migration, remittances, livelihood trajectories and social resilience. *Ambio*, (31)4, 358–366.
- Al-Qudah, A., Al-Okaily, M., Alqudah, H. (2022). The relationship between social entrepreneurship and sustainable development from economic growth perspective: 15 RCEP countries. *Journal of Sustainable Finance Investment*, 12(1), pp. 44–61.
- Azcona, G., Bhatt, A. (2020). Inequality, gender and sustainable development: Measuring feminist progress. *Gender Development*, 28(2), pp. 337–355.
- Barria, P., Cruzat, M., Cienfuegos, R., Escauriaza, G., Bonilla, C., Moris, R., Ledezma, C., Guerra, M., Rodriguez, R., Torres, A. (2019). From multi-risk evaluation to resilience planning: The case of central Chilean coastal cities. *Water*, 11(3), p. 572.
- Berkes, F., Colding, J., Folke, C. (2003). Navigating social-ecological systems. Building resilience for complexity and change. Cambridge.

- Bexell, M., Jönsson, K. (2017). Responsibility and the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. *Forum for Development Studies*, 44(1), p. 13–29.
- Biggs, D., Hall, C., Stoeckl, N. (2012). The resilience of formal and informal tourism enterprises to disasters: Reef tourism in Phuket, Thailand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(5), pp. 645–665.
- Boess, E., Lyhne, I., Davila, J., Jantzen, E., Kjellerup, U., Kørnøv, L. (2021). Using Sustainable Development Goals to develop EIA scoping practices: The case of Denmark. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 39(6), pp. 463–477.
- Borie, M., Ziervogel, G., Taylor, F.E., Millington, J.D.A., Sitas, R., Pelling, M. (2019). Mapping for resilience across city scales: An opportunity to open-up conversations for more inclusive resilience policy? *Environmental Science and Policy*, 99, 1–9.
- Bouzarovski, S., Salukvadze, J., Gentile, M. (2011). A socially resilient urban transition? The contested landscapes of apartment building extensions in two post-communist cities. *Urban Studies*, 48(13), pp. 2689–2714.
- Bradley, D., Grainger, A. (2004). Social resilience as a controlling influence on desertification in Senegal. *Land Degradation and Development*, 15(5), pp. 451–470.
- Braun, B., Abheuer, T. (2011). Floods in megacity environments: Vulnerability and coping strategies of slum dwellers in Dhaka/Bangladesh. *Natural Hazards*, 58(2), pp. 771–787.
- Buttanri, E. (2017). Sustainable development and security – the global agenda and its reflections in the OSCE. <https://www.osce.org/magazine/306696>
- Camacho, L. (2015). Sustainable Development Goals: Kinds, connections and expectations. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 11(1), 18–23.
- Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J., Bel, N. (2001). From metaphor to measurement: Resilience of what to what? *Ecosystems*, 4, pp. 765–781.
- Carrapatoso, A. (2021). Education for sustainable development and action-oriented learning at higher education institutions: Reflections on a transdisciplinary teaching project. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 17(1), pp. 12–22.
- Cashman, A. (2011). Case study of institutional and social responses to flooding: Reforming for resilience? *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 4(1), pp. 33–41.
- Chapman, A. (2017). Evaluating the health-related targets in the Sustainable Development Goals from a human rights perspective. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 21(8), pp. 1098–1113.
- Cinner, J., Auentes, M., KandriaMahazo, H. (2009). Exploring social resilience in Madagascar's marine protected areas. *Ecology and Society*, 14(1), p. 41.
- Constantinescu, A. (2014). Hypostases of resilience for sustainable development. *The Second World Congress on Resilience from Person to Society*. Timisoara.
- Constantinescu, A., Frone, S. (2018). The concept of resilience from a sustainable development perspective. *Annals of the «Constantin Brâncuși» University of Târgu Jiu. Economy Series, special issue*, pp. 168–174.
- Coronavirus Worldwide Graphs (2022), <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/worldwidegraphs/#countries-cases>
- Cretney, R. (2014). Resilience for whom? Emerging critical geographies of socio-ecological resilience. *Geography Compass*, 9, 627–640.
- Dimitrova, S., Petrova, E. (2011). Sustainable development and national security. *Review of General Management*, 13(1), 44–54.
- Dumky ta pohliadynaselennia Ukrainy v idnosno zbroyinoho konfliktu v Ukraini. Prohrama rozvytku Orhanizatsii Obiednanykh Natsii (2021), https://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/uk/home/library/democratic_governance/thoughts-andviews-of-the-population-of-ukraine.html [in Ukrainian].
- Dusík, J., Bond, A. (2022). Environmental assessments and sustainable finance frameworks: Will the EU Taxonomy change the mindset over the contribution of EIA to sustainable development? *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*. Published online: 18 Jan 2022.

- Egwalusor, R. (2020). Achieving sustainable national security and development in Nigeria through French language. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences Humanities Research*, 8(1), pp. 55–60.
- Elmqvist, T., Andersson, E., Frantzeskaki, N., McPhearson, T., Olsson, P., Gaffney, O., Takeuchi, K., Folke, C. (2019). Sustainability and resilience for transformation in the urban century. *Nature Sustainability*, 2, pp. 267–273.
- Endo, K., Ikeda, S. (2022). How can developing countries achieve sustainable development: Implications from the inclusive wealth index of ASEAN countries. *International Journal of Sustainable Development World Ecology*, 29(1), pp. 50–59.
- Eskelinen, T. (2021). Interpreting the Sustainable Development Goals through the perspectives of utopia and governance. *Forum for Development Studies*, 48(2), pp. 179–197.
- Evans, G. (2008). Transformation from Carbon Valley to Post-Carbon Society in a climate change hot spot: The coalfields of the Hunter Valley, New South Wales, Australia. *Ecology and Society*, 13(1), p. 39.
- Filho, W., Tripathi, S., Guerra, J., Giné-Garriga, R., OrlovicLovren, V., Willats, J. (2019). Using the sustainable development goals towards a better understanding of sustainability challenges. *International Journal of Sustainable Development World Ecology*, 26(2), pp. 179–190.
- Folke, C. (2006). Resilience. The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analysis. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), pp. 253–267.
- Frazier, T., Wood, N., Yarnal, B. (2010). Stakeholder perspectives on land-use strategies for adapting to climate-change-enhanced coastal hazards: Sarasota, Florida. *Applied Geography*, 30(4), pp. 506–517.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2016). From the Millennium Development Goals to the Sustainable Development Goals: Shifts in purpose, concept and politics of global goal setting for development. *Gender Development*, 24(1), pp. 43–52.
- Fukuizama, F. (2008). Sotsialnyi kapital. Nezaleznyi kulturolohichni chasopys «I», 53, pp. 89–100.
- Gallopín, G. (2006). Linkages between vulnerability, resilience and adaptive capacity. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), pp. 293–303.
- Gammage, S., Stevanovic, N. (2019). Gender, migration and care deficits: What role for the sustainable development goals? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(14), 2600–2620.
- Ganor, M., Ben-Lavy, Y. (2003). Community resilience: Lessons derived from Gilo under fire. *Journal of Jewish Communal*, 79, pp. 105–108.
- Gasper, D. (2019). The road to the Sustainable Development Goals: Building global alliances and norms. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 15(2), pp. 118–137.
- Gooch, M., Butler, J., Cullen-Unsworth, L., Rigano, D., Manning, C. (2012). Community-derived indicator domains for social resilience to water quality decline in a Great Barrier Reef catchment, Australia. *Society and Natural Resources*, 25(5), pp. 421–439.
- Haase, D. (2011). Participatory modelling of vulnerability and adaptive capacity in flood risk management. *Natural Hazards*, 67(1), pp. 77–97.
- Harte, E., Childs, I., Hastings, P. (2009). Imizamo Yethu: A case study of community resilience to fire hazard in an informal settlement Cape Town, South Africa. *Geographical Research*, 47(2), pp. 142–154.
- Harwell, J. (2012). The impacts of national security and sustainable development: A comparative study of shared protected areas. Colorado State University.
- Hennebry, J., Hari, K., Piper, N. (2019). Not without them: Realizing the sustainable development goals for women migrant workers. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(14), pp. 2621–2637.
- Holdsworth, S., Thomas, I. (2021). Competencies or capabilities in the Australian higher education landscape and its implications for the development and delivery of sustainability education. *Higher Education Research Development*, 40(7), pp. 1466–1481.
- Hollida, J., Hennebry, J., Gammage, S. (2019). Achieving the sustainable development goals: Surfacing the role for a gender analytic of migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(14), pp. 2551–2565.
- Holling, C. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4, pp. 1–23.

- Horne, R., Correia, J., Badland, H., Alderton, A., Higgs, C. (2020). From Ballarat to Bangkok: How can cross-sectoral partnerships around the Sustainable Development Goals accelerate urban liveability? *Cities Health*, 4(2), pp. 199–205.
- Howe, P. (2011). Hurricane preparedness as anticipatory adaptation: A case study of community businesses. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(2), pp. 711–720.
- Hoy, D., Southavilay, K., Chanlivong, N., Phimpachanh, C., Douangphachanh, V., Toole, M. (2008). Building capacity and community resilience to HIV: A project designed, implemented and evaluated by young Lao people. *Global Public Health*, 3(1), pp. 47–61.
- Jackson, S., Ferris, T. (2012). Infrastructure resilience: Past, present and future. *George Mason University Magazine*, 1–4.
- Kates, R., Clark, W. (1996). Environmental surprise. Expecting the unexpected. *Environment*, 38(2), pp. 6–18.
- Keck, M., Sakdapolrak, P. (2013). What is social resilience? Lessons learned and way forward. *Erdkunde*, 67(1), pp. 5–19.
- Klocker, R., Calgaro, E., Thomalla, F. (2011). Governing resilience building in Thailand's tourism dependent coastal communities: Conceptualizing stakeholder agency in social-ecological systems. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(2), pp. 481–491.
- Koehler, G. (2016). Tapping the Sustainable Development Goals for progressive gender equity and equality policy? *Gender Development*, 24(1), pp. 53–68.
- Kontseptsiia zabezpechennia natsionalnoi systemy stiikosti vid 27 veresnia 2021 roku N°479/2021. <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/4792021-40181> [in Ukrainian].
- Kopnina, H. (2016). The victims of unsustainability: A challenge to sustainable development goals. *International Journal of Sustainable Development World Ecology*, 23(2), pp. 113–121.
- Kopnina, H. (2020). Education for the future? Critical evaluation of education for sustainable development goals. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 51(4), pp. 280–291.
- Koronavirus v Ukraini. Potochnostatystyka (2022). <https://index.minfin.com.ua/ua/reference/coronavirus/ukraine> [in Ukrainian].
- Koulman, Dzh. (2001). Kapital sotsialniii chelovecheskii. *Obshchestvennie nauki i sovremennost*, 3, pp. 122–139.
- Laksov, K.B. (2021). In partnership with heads of department for sustainable educational development. *International Journal for Academic Development*. Ahead-of-print, pp. 1–13.
- Lebid, A., Nazarov, M., Shevchenko, N. (2021). Information resilience and information security as indicators of the level of development of information and media literacy. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*, 6(2), pp. 354–363.
- Leipert, B., Reuter, L. (2005). Developing resilience: How women maintain their health in northern geographically isolated settings. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(1), pp. 49–65.
- Lewin, K. (2019). The Sustainable Development Goals for education: Commonwealth perspectives and opportunities. *The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*, 108(4), pp. 367–382.
- Lopez-Marrero, T., Tschakert, P. (2011). From theory to practice: Building more resilient communities in floodprone areas. *Environment and Urbanization*, 23(1), pp. 229–249.
- Marshall, N., Marshall, P. (2007). Conceptualizing and operationalizing social resilience within commercial fisheries in northern Australia. *Ecology and Society*, 12(1), p. 1.
- Marshall, N., Marshall, P., Abdulla, A. (2009). Using social resilience and resource dependency to increase the effectiveness of marine conservation initiatives in Salum, Egypt. *Environmental Planning and Management*, 52(7), pp. 901–918.

- Maru, Y. (2010). Resilient regions: Clarity of concepts and challenges to systemic measurement. *Socio-Economics and the Environment in Discussion (SEED) Working Paper Series*, 2010-04, pp. 1–37.
- Matović, S., Obradović, S.L. (2022). Assessing socio-economic vulnerability aiming for sustainable development in Serbia. *International Journal of Sustainable Development World Ecology*, 29(1), pp. 27–38.
- Mayunga, J. (2007). Understanding and applying the concept of community disaster resilience: A capital based approach. *Summer Academy for Social Vulnerability and Resilience Building*, pp. 1–16.
- McGee, T. (2011). Public engagement in neighborhood level wildfire mitigation and preparedness: Case studies from Canada, the US and Australia. *Environmental Management*, 92(10), pp. 2524–2532.
- Metaxas, T., Psarropoulou, S. (2021). Sustainable development and resilience: A combined analysis of the cities of Rotterdam and Thessaloniki. *Urban Sci*, 5(4), p. 78.
- Morrison-Saunders, A., Sánchez, L., Retief, F., Sinclair, J., Doelle, M., Jones, M. (2020). Gearing up impact assessment as a vehicle for achieving the UN sustainable development goals. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 38(2), pp. 113–117.
- Norris, F., Stevens, S., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K., Pfefferbaum, R. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1–2), pp. 127–150.
- O'Brien, K., Hayward, B., Berkes, F. (2009). Rethinking social contracts: Building resilience in a changing climate. *Ecology and Society*, 14(2), p. 12.
- Obrist, B., Pfeiffer, C., Henley, R. (2010). Multi-layered social resilience: A new approach in mitigation research. *Progress in Development Studies*, 10(4), pp. 283–293.
- Orji, K. (2012). National security and sustainable development in Nigeria: Challenges from the Niger Delta. *African Research Review*, 6(1), pp. 198–211.
- Pearce, M., Willis, E., Wadham, B., Binks, B. (2010). Attitudes to drought in outback communities in South Australia. *Geographical Research*, 48(4), pp. 359–369.
- Pelling, M., Manuel-Navarrete, D. (2011). From resilience to transformation: The adaptive cycle in two Mexican urban centers. *Ecology and Society*, 16(2), p. 11.
- Perz, S., Cabrera, L., Carvalho, L., Castillo, J., Barnes, G. (2010). Global economic integration and local community resilience: Road paving and rural demographic change in the southwestern Amazon. *Rural Sociology*, 75(2), pp. 300–325.
- Pisano, U. (2012). Resilience and sustainable development: Theory of resilience, systems thinking and adaptive governance. *ESDN Quarterly Report* 26.
- Pogge, T., Sengupta, M. (2015). The Sustainable Development Goals: A plan for building a better world? *Journal of Global Ethics*, 11(1), pp. 56–64.
- Pogge, T., Sengupta, M. (2016). Assessing the sustainable development goals from a human rights perspective. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 32(2), pp. 83–97.
- Porter, G., Hampshire, K., Kyei, P., Adjaloo, M., Rapoo, G., Kilpatrick, K. (2008). Linkages between livelihood opportunities and refugee-host relations: Learning from the experiences of Liberian camp-based refugees in Ghana. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(2), pp. 230–252.
- Rio Declaration on environment and development, 1992.
https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_CONF.151_26_Vol.I_Declaration.pdf
- Rockstrom, J. (2004). Making the best of climatic variability: Options for upgrading rainfed farming in water scarce regions. *Water Science and Technology*, 49(7), pp. 151–156.
- Ross, H. (2015). Negotiating managerialism: Professional recognition and teachers of sustainable development education. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(3), pp. 403–416.

Saiz, I., Donald, K. (2017). Tackling inequality through the Sustainable Development Goals: Human rights in practice. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 21(8), pp. 1029–1049.

Schwarz, A., Bene, C., Bennett, G., Boso, D., Hilly, Z., Paul, C., Posala, R., Sibiti, S., Andrew, N. (2011). Vulnerability and resilience of remote rural communities to shocks and global changes: Empirical analysis from Solomon Islands. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(3), pp. 1128–1140.

SDGs-Ukraine. SDG8: Decent Work and Economic Growth. Monitoring report. Kyiv, 2019.

Shulla, K., Filho, W., Lardjane, S., Sommer, J., Borgemeister, C. (2020). Sustainable development education in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development World Ecology*, 27(5), pp. 458–468.

Sonn, C., Fisher, A. (1998). Sense of community: Community resilient responses to oppression and change. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 26(5), pp. 1–32.

Sotsialna stiikist terytorialny khromad v umova kh pandemii COVID-19. Analitichnyi zvit. Sumy: SumDU, 2021 [in Ukrainian].

Star, S. (2010). This is not a boundary object: Reflections on the origin of a concept. *Science, Technology and Human Values*, 35(5), pp. 601–617.

Stratehiia informatsiinoi bezpeky vid 28 hrudnia 2021 roku № 685/2021. <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/6852021-41069> [in Ukrainian].

Stratehiia natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy vid 14 veresnia 2020 roku № 392/2020. <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/3922020-35037> [in Ukrainian].

Streets, D., Glantz, M. (2000). Exploring the concept of climate surprise. *Global Environmental Change*, 10, pp. 97–107.

Sustainable Development Goals for the Children of Ukraine. National report. Kyiv, 2019.

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), 1992. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cbd-en.pdf>.

Thomas, D., Twyman, C. (2005). Equity and justice in climate change adaptation amongst natural resource-dependent societies. *Global Environmental Change*, 15(2), pp. 115–124.

Tkachuk, A.F., Natalenko, N.V. (2020). Mistsevidentychnist. Dliaterytorialnykhromadi ne tilky. Yuston.

Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015
. https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_70_1_E.pdf

Tsilistalo horozvytku: Ukraina. Natsionalna dopovid 2017. <https://me.gov.ua/Documents/List?lang=uk-UAid=938d9df1-5e8d-48cc-a007-be5bc60123b8tag=TSiliStalogoRozvitku>[in Ukrainian].

Tsilistalo horozvytku: Ukraina. Dobrovilny i natsionalnyi ohliad 2020. <https://ukraine.un.org/uk/151096-dobrovilnyy-natsionalnyy-ohlyad-shchodo-tsiley-staloho-rozvytku-v-ukrayini> [in Ukrainian].

Tsilistalo horozvytku: Ukraina. Monitorynhovyi zvit 2020. <https://ukraine.un.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/SDGs%20Ukraine%202020%20Monitoring%20Report%20ukr.pdf> [in Ukrainian].

Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy vid 30.09.2019 “Pro Tsilistalo horozvytku Ukrainy na period do 2030 roku”. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/722/2019#Text> [in Ukrainian].

Ukrainske suspilstvo ta yevropeiski tsinnosti. Instytut Horshenina u spivpratsi z Predstavnytstvom Fondu im. Fridrikha Eberta v Ukraini ta Bilorusi (2017). http://ukraine.fes.de/n/cms/fileadmin/upload2/JEvropeiski_cinnosti_tables_and_diagrams_MR_.pdf [in Ukrainian].

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), 1992 https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf.

UN Millennium Declaration, 2000. <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/55/2>.

- Wade, R. (2002). Sustainable development education and Curriculum 2000. *Planet*, 8(1), pp. 4–7.
- Wilson, G. (2012). *Community resilience and environmental transitions*. Routledge.
- Wynn, M., Jones, P. (2022). Industry approaches to the Sustainable Development Goals. *International Journal of Environmental Studies*, 79(1), pp. 134–148.
- Yamagata, Y., Sharifi, A. (2018). *Resilience-oriented urban planning: Theoretical and empirical insights*. Springer, Cham.



CONSORTIO

Scientific Journal