

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2025-79-189>

UDC 330.322.2

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF TRANSPORT INTEGRATION BETWEEN THE EU AND THE EASTERN PARTNERSHIP: A CASE ANALYSIS

ЕКОНОМІЧНІ ЕФЕКТИ ТРАНСПОРТНОЇ ІНТЕГРАЦІЇ ЄС І СХІДНОГО ПАРТНЕРСТВА: KEYС-АНАЛІЗ

Khainas Roman

Assistant of the Department of Business Administration,
Marketing and Management,
State Higher Educational Institution «Uzhhorod National University»
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8414-3509>

Хайнас Роман Михайлович

Державний вищий навчальний заклад
«Ужгородський національний університет»

The relevance of this research is driven by the growing importance of transport integration, which is one of the key factors in the economic development of the Eastern Partnership countries and in establishing regional cooperation between them and the European Union. This process contributes to increasing the mobility of goods, services, and people, reducing logistics costs, expanding access to the markets of friendly neighboring countries in the East, and stimulating investment in domestic transport infrastructure. The aim of the article is to study the real and potential economic effects of transport integration between the EU and the Eastern Partnership. In the context of integrating EU transport systems, it has been established that the economic effects of integration are distributed asymmetrically among the Eastern Partnership member states. The phenomenon of asymmetry arises due to differences in these countries' levels of participation in integration processes, varying capacities for modernizing transport infrastructure, the presence of direct transit routes, as well as political, institutional, and economic barriers.

Keywords: transit and logistics corridors, logistics costs, alternative logistics routes, harmonization of standards and regulations, partner countries.

Актуальність дослідження зумовлена зростанням значущості транспортної інтеграції, що є одним із ключових чинників економічного розвитку країн Східного партнерства та налагодження регіональної співпраці між ними і Європейським Союзом. Цей процес сприяє підвищенню мобільності товарів, послуг і населення, зниженню логістичних витрат, розширенню доступу до ринків дружніх країн-сусідів на сході та стимулюванню інвестицій у вітчизняну транспортну інфраструктуру. Метою статті є вивчення реальних та потенційних економічних ефектів транспортної інтеграції ЄС і Східного партнерства. У контексті інтеграції транспортних систем ЄС встановлено, що економічні ефекти від інтеграції розподіляються асиметрично між державами учасницями Східного партнерства. Явище асиметричності виникає через різний рівень залученості таких країн до інтеграційних процесів, різні можливості модернізації транспортної інфраструктури, наявність прямих транзитних маршрутів, а також політичні, інституційні та економічні бар'єри. Кейс-аналіз показав, що країни з активною інтеграцією – ті, що мають тісну співпрацю з ЄС, адаптують європейські стандарти, модернізують транспортну інфраструктуру та беруть участь у спільних програмах – отримують значно більші та швидші економічні вигоди. До них належить зростання інвестицій, покращення логістики, прискорення транзитних потоків та розширення доступу до ринків ЄС. Кейс-аналіз показав, що країни з обмеженою інтеграцією – у зв'язку з політичними конфліктами, географічною віддаленістю, слабкими інституціями або економічними бар'єрами – відчувають повільніше, менш відчутне або обмежене проявлення економічних ефектів. Це означає, що одна й та сама політика чи програма приносить різні економічні вигоди для різних країн залежно від рівня їхньої участі, готовності до інтеграції та національного контексту розвитку. Таким чином, асиметричність економічних ефектів транспортної інтеграції ЄС і Східного партнерства підкреслює необхідність диференційованого підходу до розвитку транспортної політики, фінансування та підтримки інфраструктурних ініціатив у різних країнах регіону. Перспективи подальших досліджень полягають у кількісному оцінюванні асиметричних економічних ефектів транспортної інтеграції на рівні окремих країн Східного партнерства та аналізі впливу геополітичних, інституційних і фінансових факторів на їхню максимізацію.

Ключові слова: транзитні і логістичні коридори, логістичні витрати, альтернативні логістичні маршрути, гармонізація стандартів і правил, країни-партнери.

Problem statement. The relevance of this research is determined by the increasing importance of transport integration, which is a key factor in the economic development of the Eastern Partnership countries and in establishing regional cooperation between them and the European Union. This process contributes to enhancing the mobility of goods, services, and people, reducing logistics costs, expanding access to the markets of friendly neighboring countries in the East, and stimulating investment in domestic transport infrastructure.

One of the priority areas of this interaction is transport integration, which involves: connecting the Eastern Partnership countries to the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T); developing transit and logistics corridors between the EU and partner countries; implementing infrastructure projects under programs such as EU4Transport, Connecting Europe Facility, and the Eastern Partnership Transport Panel; as well as harmonizing technical standards, safety regulations, and environmental requirements.

An active process of transport integration is currently underway between the European Union and the Eastern Partnership countries, already yielding noticeable economic benefits. At the same time, following Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, the structure and dynamics of this process have undergone significant changes – particularly, the reorientation of transport flows, the increased role of alternative logistics routes (through Poland, Romania, and the Baltic ports), and the heightened strategic importance of transit cooperation with the EU for Ukraine and several other Eastern Partnership countries.

Overall, the economic effects of transport integration between the European Union and the Eastern Partnership countries show a positive trend; however, the scale and intensity of these effects vary significantly among individual partner countries. In some cases – particularly for Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia – the potential benefits of integration may be considerably higher due to their geostrategic location, transit potential, and more active participation in TEN-T projects. At the same time, for other Eastern Partnership states (Armenia, Azerbaijan), the economic outcomes remain limited, highlighting the need for a deeper case-based analysis of regional differences and influencing factors.

Analysis of research and publications. The problems and specific features of transport integration between the EU and the Eastern Partnership countries have been systematically examined in the studies of Rabinovich M. [6-7],

Tsebeko O., Shumska M.-T. [8], Kvasha S. M., Faichuk O. M., and Faichuk O. V. [2]. In particular, these scholars have made a significant contribution by thoroughly addressing both theoretical and practical aspects of transport integration between the European Union and the Eastern Partnership countries, identifying key barriers to the harmonization of transport policies, and formulating recommendations for adapting national strategies to European standards. Furthermore, Rabinovich M. [6-7] has conducted a detailed analysis of the impact of regulatory, institutional, and infrastructural factors on the effectiveness of integration processes, outlined prospects for the development of a common transport space, and examined mechanisms for its implementation in the context of the European integration course.

Identification of previously unresolved aspects of the overall problem. At the same time, the issue of assessing the real and potential economic effects of transport integration between the EU and the Eastern Partnership countries has remained insufficiently addressed by scholars. Without analyzing these economic effects, it is difficult to determine the extent to which transport integration contributes to economic growth, trade development, or the enhancement of the competitiveness of the Eastern Partnership countries. A limited understanding of the economic consequences also prevents governments and regional institutions from making well-grounded decisions regarding infrastructure investments and setting integration priorities.

Formulation of the article's objectives. Accordingly, this article aims to study the real and potential economic effects of transport integration between the EU and the Eastern Partnership. The study employs a case study approach as the main research method, which involves an in-depth examination of a specific case or group of cases to understand, explain, and evaluate a particular phenomenon. In applied research on the economic effects of transport integration, the case study method allows for:

1. Examining specific countries or projects – for example, the integration of Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova into the European transport network.
2. Assessing the practical economic consequences – such as changes in revenues, investments, and other indicators.
3. Highlighting differences between research subjects – for instance, the asymmetry of effects among different Eastern Partnership countries.

4. Identifying the causes and mechanisms of these effects through the analysis of transit potential, infrastructure modernization, integration into TEN-T, and institutional factors.

The paper main body. Within the framework of the study, attention was focused on analyzing the economic consequences of transport integration, examined through the prism of direct and indirect effects arising from the interaction of transport systems, infrastructure, regulatory frameworks, and logistics processes between the European Union and the Eastern Partnership countries, which currently include Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine. Until 2021, Belarus was also part of this initiative; however, following the events of 2020 related to large-scale repressions against civil society and its subsequent support of Russia's aggression against Ukraine, the European Union suspended Belarus's political participation in the Eastern Partnership, maintaining only limited technical contacts – primarily to support Belarusian civil society outside the country [1].

In theory, these effects are manifested in measurable changes in various economic indicators. In particular, the indicators can be conditionally divided into several groups: macroeconomic effects, microeconomic effects, and institutional and structural effects.

The macroeconomic effects of transport integration between the EU and the Eastern Partnership are characterized by a set of diverse systemic changes in national economies resulting from the deepening of transport and logistics links between the European Union and the Eastern Partnership countries. They are manifested through [2; 6-7]:

- An increase in the volume of foreign trade between the EU and partner countries due to improved transport accessibility and reduced logistics costs.
- Growth in transit revenues and tax receipts resulting from more intensive use of transport corridors and the expansion of transit services.
- Stimulation of economic growth and employment in the transport sector and related industries (construction, logistics, vehicle manufacturing).
- Attraction of foreign direct investment (FDI) for the modernization of transport infrastructure, ports, logistics hubs, and border crossings.

Taken together, these factors contribute to strengthening regional economic integration, enhancing the competitiveness of national

economies, and increasing the role of the transport sector as a driver of trade and investment flows.

Microeconomic effects of transport integration between the EU and the Eastern Partnership are usually considered as changes in the activities of individual enterprises and business structures that arise as a result of improved transport accessibility, integration of logistics networks, and harmonization of standards between the European Union and the Eastern Partnership countries. They manifest themselves through [6; 8]:

- Reduction of logistics and transaction costs for enterprises, achieved through route optimization, reduction of transportation time, and integration of information systems.
 - Shorter delivery times for goods, which increase the efficiency of supply chain management and enable faster response to changes in demand.
 - Enhanced competitiveness of exporters and transport-logistics companies, due to access to more efficient corridors and the reduction of barriers to international trade.
 - Expanded business access to EU markets, opening new opportunities for exports and the development of partnership networks.
- Taken together, these effects contribute to improving the efficiency of the private sector, increasing productivity and the competitive advantages of enterprises, as well as strengthening the economic interaction of regional markets.

Institutional and structural effects of transport integration between the EU and the Eastern Partnership refer to changes in the organizational, regulatory, and infrastructural spheres that arise as a result of coordinated transport policies, joint development of logistics corridors, and modernization of infrastructure between the European Union and the Eastern Partnership countries. They manifest themselves through [6-7]:

- Harmonization of transport standards and regulations, ensuring compatibility of technical norms, transport safety, and regulatory efficiency.
- Formation of joint transport corridors and logistics clusters, which promote the integration of transport networks and enhance the region's transit potential.
- Strengthening of energy and infrastructure security, achieved through route diversification, development of alternative modes of transport, and modernization of critical transport facilities.

– Enhancement of the region's integration potential overall, reflected in deeper economic cooperation, increased regional interdependence, and greater resilience of transport and logistics systems.

Taken together, institutional and structural effects create a stable foundation for developing the economic benefits of integration, enhance the efficiency and reliability of the transport system, and establish the basis for further regional cooperation.

At the same time, in the context of the EU and the Eastern Partnership, these effects are less detailed and structured. Moreover, they have an asymmetric nature. In this context (the EU and the Eastern Partnership), this means that the outcomes of integration into the European transport area are distributed unevenly among countries:

– Countries that are more actively integrated (those with closer cooperation with the EU, adoption of standards, infrastructure development, and participation in joint programs [3]) receive greater and faster economic benefits – for example, increased investment, improved logistics, and access to the EU market.

– Countries that are less involved in integration processes (due to political conflicts, geographical remoteness, weak institutions, or economic barriers [3; 7]) experience slower, less tangible, or limited effects.

Asymmetry thus refers to inequality in outcomes – a single policy or program yields different benefits for different countries, depending on their level of participation, readiness, and development context.

In particular, for countries that are actively integrating into the European transport area – notably Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova – the economic benefits are more tangible. This can be explained by several factors [3; 6]:

– Increased transit potential due to their location along key transport corridors connecting the EU with the Eastern Partnership regions and Asia.

– Modernization of transport infrastructure, including the repair and construction of roads, railway lines, and port complexes, which enhances capacity and reduces logistics costs.

– Integration into the TEN-T network, which provides access to European funding programs and ensures the alignment of technical standards with EU norms.

When these factors manifest systematically, they generate numerous economic effects, demonstrating that transport integration serves

as a powerful driver of economic development in these countries (see Table 1).

In Ukraine, projects are being implemented to modernize key transport hubs, ensuring the efficient functioning of transport corridors, increasing the speed and reliability of shipments, and consequently generating tangible economic benefits. For example, in 2022–2024, Ukraine earned \$0.8–1 billion per year from hydrocarbon transit to the EU, despite a reduction in supply volumes.

Georgia actively generates revenue from the development of transport corridors, particularly the “Silk Road.” In 2023, revenues from cargo handling amounted to approximately \$66 million, representing a 42.1% increase compared to 2022. These revenues are generated through transit fees, including GEL 200 for each freight vehicle crossing the Georgian border.

Moldova is also actively investing in the modernization of transport infrastructure, including the reconstruction of the Bălți–Vălcineț–Ungheni and Chișinău–Canar railway sections, as well as the development of logistics corridors that integrate the country into Europe's transport system. In 2024, revenues from cargo handling in Moldova amounted to approximately \$1.1 million, reflecting the growth of transit potential and the effectiveness of infrastructure investments.

Moreover, in the future, the impact of these factors can be further enhanced, which will amplify the integrated effects. For example, in Ukraine, the opening of the first railway line with European track gauge standards between Chop and Uzhhorod in September 2025 supports integration with the EU. Additionally, after the end of hostilities, Ukrainian Black Sea ports and railway routes through Georgia could become key nodes for transporting goods from the EU to the Caucasus, Central Asia, and China.

In Georgia, the further development of the “Silk Road” and the modernization of the ports of Batumi and Poti will contribute to increased transit volumes and attract international transport operators. Furthermore, the integration of railway lines and logistics hubs in Moldova, Ukraine, and Georgia with European standards will increase capacity and reliability of transport. This will promote growth in logistics service revenues and strengthen the role of these countries as regional transport hubs.

For other Eastern Partnership countries – notably Armenia and Azerbaijan – the economic effects of transport integration are less pronounced. This can be explained by several factors:

- Limited participation in European transport programs due to restricted access to funding and technical support from the EU under initiatives such as TEN-T, the Connecting Europe Facility, and other programs;
 - Lack of direct transit routes, resulting from a limited number of transport corridors directly

connected to the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T);

 - Geopolitical barriers, arising from involvement in territorial conflicts, limited cooperation with neighboring countries, and reliance on alternative transit routes outside the EU;

Table 1

Features of the impact of factors stimulating the formation of economic effects in countries actively integrating into the European transport area

| Factors of influence | General principles determining the impact of factors | Results of the impact of factors influencing economic effects |
|---|--|--|
| Growth of transit potential | Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova occupy a strategic geographical position on key transport corridors connecting the EU with the Eastern Partnership regions and Asia. | This ensures an increase in transit volumes, the development of multimodal logistics routes, and the involvement of international transport operators. |
| Modernization of transport infrastructure | Integration processes stimulate the repair and construction of roads, railway lines, and port complexes. | This enhances capacity and reduces logistics costs. |
| Integration into the TEN-T network | Inclusion of the countries' transport infrastructure in the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T). | This provides access to European funding programs, allows the harmonization of technical standards, and ensures compliance with EU regulations. |

Source: compiled by the authors based on [3; 5-6]

Table 2

Features of the impact of factors that hinder the formation of economic effects in countries less engaged in integration processes

| Factors of influence | General principles determining the impact of factors | Results of the impact of factors influencing economic effects |
|--|--|--|
| Limited participation in European transport programs | Armenia and Azerbaijan have limited access to funding and technical support from the EU under programs such as TEN-T, the Connecting Europe Facility, and other initiatives. | This reduces opportunities for the modernization of transport infrastructure, the development of transit corridors, and the integration of national networks with European standards. |
| Lack of direct transit routes integrated into TEN-T | Armenia and Azerbaijan have a limited number of transport corridors directly connected to the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T). | This limits the potential for efficient cargo transit within the European transport area, restricting delivery speed, capacity, and the competitiveness of transport companies.* |
| Geopolitical and institutional barriers | For Armenia and Azerbaijan, the development of transport integration is complicated by political and institutional constraints.** | This restrains the development of transit potential, the attraction of investment, and the integration of transport systems into European networks, thereby limiting the economic benefits available to these countries. |

Note

*The lack of such direct routes also reduces the attractiveness of these countries for international carriers and investors, significantly lowering the potential economic benefits of integration.

** Geopolitical factors include territorial conflicts, limited cooperation with neighboring countries, and reliance on alternative transit routes outside the EU. Institutional barriers are reflected in insufficient harmonization of national legislation with European standards, low regulatory coordination, and limited efficiency in managing transport infrastructure.

Source: compiled by the authors based on [2; 4; 6]

– Institutional barriers, stemming from insufficient harmonization of national legislation with European standards, regulatory inconsistencies, and limited efficiency in transport infrastructure management.

When these factors manifest systematically (see Table 2), they hinder the development of transit potential, the attraction of investment, and the effective integration of transport infrastructure into the European network.

Accordingly, countries less engaged in integration processes receive smaller benefits from integration compared to those actively participating in EU projects (integrating into the European transport area), as further illustrated by the data in Table 3.

Based on the above, it is evident that the observed asymmetry of economic effects

arises from the differing levels of countries' engagement in integration processes, which shapes varying opportunities for transport infrastructure modernization, differing availability and development of direct transit routes, as well as political, institutional, and economic barriers [3-4].

This means that the same policy or program generates different economic benefits for different countries, depending on their level of participation, readiness for integration, and national development context.

Conclusions. In the context of integrating EU transport systems, it has been established that the economic effects of integration are distributed asymmetrically among the Eastern Partnership countries. This asymmetry arises from differing levels of engagement in integration processes,

Table 3

Illustration of the asymmetric nature of the economic effects of transport integration between the EU and the Eastern Partnership

| Countries actively integrating into the European transport area | | | Countries less engaged in integration processes | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Country | Effect | Manifestation of the effect | Country | Effect | Manifestation of the effect |
| Ukraine | Increased trade volumes with the EU | In 2024, imports of goods to the EU amounted to 7.7 million tons (+13% compared to 2021), and exports reached 7.6 million tons (+11%)* | Armenia, Azerbaijan | Limited participation in European transport programs | Limited access to funding and technical support from the EU |
| | Infrastructure modernization | Opening of the first railway line with European track gauge standards, contributing to increased freight volumes. | | Lack of direct transit routes | Limited number of transport corridors directly connected to TEN-T |
| | EU financial support | The EU provided nearly €600 million for the restoration of transport networks | | Political and institutional constraints | Restrained development of transit potential and integration of transport systems into European networks |
| Georgia | Growth of exports to the EU | In 2024, exports of goods from Georgia to the EU increased by 20.1% compared to the previous year, reaching €4.3 billion | | | |
| | Enhanced competitiveness | Development of new logistics routes and reduction of transportation costs | | | |
| Moldova | Modernization of railway infrastructure | Modernization of the main railway line connecting Moldova with Romania | | | |

Source: compiled by the authors based on [3-4; 7-8]

varying opportunities for transport infrastructure modernization, the presence of direct transit routes, as well as political, institutional, and economic barriers.

Case analysis shows that countries with active integration – those maintaining close cooperation with the EU, adopting European standards, modernizing transport infrastructure, and participating in joint programs – achieve significantly greater and faster economic benefits. These include increased investment, improved logistics, accelerated transit flows, and expanded access to EU markets.

Conversely, countries with limited integration – due to political conflicts, geographic remoteness, weak institutions, or economic barriers – experience slower, less tangible, or restricted economic effects.

This indicates that the same policy or program generates different economic benefits for different countries, depending on their level of participation, readiness for integration, and national development context. Thus, the asymmetry of economic effects from EU–Eastern Partnership transport integration underscores the need for a differentiated approach to transport policy development, funding, and support for infrastructure initiatives across the region.

Future research prospects include quantitatively assessing the asymmetric economic effects of transport integration at the level of individual Eastern Partnership countries and analyzing the impact of geopolitical, institutional, and financial factors on their maximization.

REFERENCES:

1. Deutsche Welle (2021) Bilorus' vykhodyty zi "Skhidnoho partnerstva" cherez sanktsiyi YES [Belarus is withdrawing from the Eastern Partnership due to EU sanctions]. Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20210628192306/https://www.dw.com/uk/bilorus-vykhodyt-zi-skhidnoho-partnerstva-cherez-sanktsii-yes/a-58081197> (дата звернення: 29.08.2025)
2. Kvasha S. M., Faychuk O. M., Faychuk O. V. (2019), Yevropeys'ka ekonomichna intehtratsiya [European Economic Integration]. Kyiv: NUBiP. Available at: <https://dglb.nubip.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/480625c2-1853-4a1d-b657-74c203ebafd6/content>. (accessed August 29, 2025)
3. Kopyka V.V., Makovsky S.O., Myronova M.A. (2022) Yevropeys'kyy soyuz u minlyvomu sviti: monohrafiya [The European Union in a Changing World], Kyiv: O. Zen. 219 p. (in Ukrainian)
4. Polishchuk I. V., Tkachuk S. R. (2023) Intehtratsiya hlobal'nykh transportnykh tendentsiy YES v Ukrayini: aktualizatsiya normatyvno-pravovoyi bazy [Integration of global transport trends of the EU in Ukraine: updating the regulatory framework]. *Yurydychnyy visnyk*, no. 68, pp. 44-50.
5. Posokhov I. Dyuzhev V., Gusarova D. (2024) Ponyattya ekonomichnoyi intehtratsiyi ta yiyi osnovni kharakterystyky [The concept of economic integration and its main characteristics]. *Ekonomika, finansy, pravo*, no. 6. <https://doi.org/10.37634/efp.2024.6.5>.
6. Rabinovych M. (2021) Skhidne partnerstvo yak initsiatyva rozvytku pislya perehlyadu prohramy u 2015 rotsi: dosyahnennya, vyklyky ta perspektyvy [Eastern Partnership as a Development Initiative after the 2015 Review: Achievements, Challenges and Prospects]. Departament publichnoyi polityky ta vryaduvannya, Kyiv's'ka shkola ekonomiky, 31 p. (in Ukrainian)
7. Rabinovych M. (2019) EU's Development Policy vis-à-vis Ukraine after the Euromaidan: Securitisation, State-Building and Integration. *East European Politics*, no. 35(3), pp. 332-250.
8. Tsebenko O., Shumska M.-T. (2023) Klyuchovi vyklyky ta zahrozy rozvytku initsiatyvy yes «skhidne partnerstvo» [Key challenges and threats to the development of the EU initiative "Eastern Partnership"]. *Mizhnarodni vidnosyny suspil'ni komunikatsiyi ta rehional'ni studiyi*, no. 2(16). pp. 63-77.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ:

1. Білорусь виходить зі "Східного партнерства" через санкції ЄС. Deutsche Welle. 2021. URL: <https://web.archive.org/web/20210628192306/https://www.dw.com/uk/bilorus-vykhodyt-zi-skhidnoho-partnerstva-cherez-sanktsii-yes/a-58081197> (дата звернення: 29.08.2025)
2. Кваша С. М., Файчук О. М., Файчук О. В. Європейська економічна інтеграція: навчальний посібник. Київ : НУБіП, 2019. URL: <https://dglb.nubip.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/480625c2-1853-4a1d-b657-74c203ebafd6/content>. (дата звернення: 29.08.2025)
3. Копійка В.В., Маковський С.О., Миронова М.А. Європейський союз у мінливому світі: монографія. Київ : О. Зень, 2022. 219 с.

4. Поліщук І. В., Ткачук С. Р. Інтеграція глобальних транспортних тенденцій ЄС в Україні: актуалізація нормативно-правової бази. *Юридичний вісник*. 2023. № 68. С. 44-50.
5. Посохов І. Дюжев В., Гусарова Д. Поняття економічної інтеграції та її основні характеристики. *Економіка, фінанси, право*. 2024. № 6. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.37634/efp.2024.6.5>.
6. Рабінович М. Східне партнерство як ініціатива розвитку після перегляду програми у 2015 році: досягнення, виклики та перспективи. Департамент публічної політики та врядування, Київська школа економіки. 2021. 31 с.
7. Rabinovych M. EU's Development Policy vis-à-vis Ukraine after the Euromaidan: Securitisation, State-Building and Integration. *East European Politics*. 2019. № 35(3). P. 332-250.
8. Цебенко О., Шумська М.,-Т. Ключові виклики та загрози розвитку ініціативи єс «східне партнерство», *Міжнародні відносини суспільні комунікації та регіональні студії*. 2023. № 2 (16). С. 63-77.