



**Маркетинг**

УДК 339.138:364.4:351.72

DOI <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17782415>

**Transparency marketing: mechanisms for preventing corruption in  
international humanitarian aid projects**

**Volodymyr Hobela**

PhD (Economics), Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor of the Department of Management and Economic Security,  
Lviv State University of Internal Affairs,  
26 Horodotska St., Lviv, 79007, Ukraine  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7438-2329>

**Dmytro Sahaidak**

PhD Candidate  
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv, Ukraine  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-0037-5243>

**Taras Ivanyshyn**

PhD Candidate  
European University (Private Higher Educational Institution), Lviv, Ukraine  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4316-8353>

**Accepted: 14.11.2025 | Published: 30.11.2025**

**Annotation:** The article aims to provide a scientific rationale and develop a conceptual model of transparency marketing in anti-corruption management of humanitarian aid, capable of reducing corruption risks, strengthening donor trust, and ensuring the sustainability of international support for Ukraine during wartime. The



methodological foundation of the study includes system and comparative analysis, structural-logical modelling, and synthesis of international experience in humanitarian flow governance. The research incorporates practices of digital accountability, preventive and remedial control, as well as modern instruments of open data and public communication.

The findings demonstrate that existing anti-corruption mechanisms in the humanitarian domain remain fragmented and predominantly focused on oversight procedures. At the same time, it is the combination of control measures with transparency marketing—open data, dashboards, verified reporting, anti-corruption branding, and community-driven verification tools—that enables stakeholder trust-building and reduces information asymmetry. The proposed model integrates four interrelated components: preventive, remedial, communication-informational, and reputational-evaluative. It forms a closed “transparency–trust–support sustainability” loop and is accompanied by a KPI system for assessing resource traceability, reporting quality, and reputational resilience.

The results indicate that transparency marketing can function as an integrated anti-corruption mechanism within the humanitarian management system, enhancing the capacity of public and non-governmental institutions to secure donor trust and sustain external support. The proposed model not only aligns preventive, remedial, and communication tools but also establishes a holistic approach to reducing corruption risks by increasing the visibility of humanitarian processes and optimizing stakeholder engagement. Its conceptual value lies in its applicability under conditions of prolonged conflict, when reputational stability and transparency of resource flows are decisive for maintaining international partnership.

**Keywords:** marketing; international economics; humanitarian processes; economic integrity; anti-corruption mechanisms, transparency.



**Маркетинг прозорості: механізми запобігання корупції в міжнародних  
просектах гуманітарної допомоги**

**Гобела Володимир Володимирович**

кандидат економічних наук, доцент,  
доцент кафедри менеджменту та економічної безпеки  
Львівський державний університет внутрішніх справ  
79007, м. Львів, вул. Городоцька, 26.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7438-2329>

**Сагайдак Дмитро Михайлович**

аспірант  
Львівський національний університет ім. І. Франка, м. Львів, Україна

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-0037-5243>

**Іванишин Тарас Ярославович**

аспірант  
ПВНЗ «Європейський університет», м. Львів, Україна

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4316-8353>

**Анотація:** Метою статті є наукове обґрунтування та розроблення концептуальної моделі маркетингу прозорості в антикорупційному управлінні гуманітарною допомогою, здатної знизити корупційні ризики, підвищити довіру донорів та забезпечити стійкість міжнародної підтримки України у воєнний період. Методологічну основу дослідження становлять системний і порівняльний аналіз, структурно-логічне моделювання та узагальнення міжнародного досвіду управління гуманітарними потоками. У дослідження враховано практики цифрової підзвітності, превентивного та ліквідаційного контролю, а також сучасні інструменти відкритих даних і публічної комунікації.



Результати дослідження засвідчили, що існуючі антикорупційні механізми у гуманітарній сфері залишаються фрагментарними й переважно зосередженими на наглядних процедурах. Водночас саме поєднання контролю з маркетингом прозорості – відкритими даними, дашбордами, верифікованою звітністю, антикорупційним брендингом та механізмами «перевірки спільнотою» дозволяє формувати довіру стейкхолдерів і мінімізувати інформаційну асиметрію. Запропонована модель інтегрує чотири взаємопов'язані блоки: превентивний, ліквідаційний, комунікаційно-інформаційний та репутаційно-оцінювальний. Вона формує замкнений контур «прозорість – довіра – сталість підтримки», а також супроводжується системою КРІ для оцінювання відстежуваності ресурсів, якості звітності та рівня репутаційної стійкості.

Отримані результати засвідчують, що маркетинг прозорості може функціонувати як інтегрований антикорупційний механізм у системі гуманітарного управління, посилюючи спроможність державних та недержавних інституцій забезпечувати довіру донорів і стійкість зовнішньої підтримки. Запропонована модель не лише узгоджує превентивні, ліквідаційні та комунікаційні інструменти, але й формує цілісний підхід до зменшення корупційних ризиків шляхом підвищення видимості гуманітарних процесів та оптимізації взаємодії зі стейкхолдерами. Її концептуальна цінність полягає у можливості практичного застосування в умовах тривалого конфлікту, коли репутаційна стабільність і прозорість ресурсних потоків є визначальними для підтримання міжнародного партнерства.

**Ключові слова:** маркетинг; міжнародна економіка; гуманітарні процеси; економічна доброчесність; антикорупційні механізми, прозорість.

**Problem statement.** International humanitarian aid projects operate under high uncertainty, information asymmetry, and a multiplicity of stakeholders (donors, government institutions, NGOs, communities, and contractors), which increases their



vulnerability to misuse of resources and corruption risks [6; 8; 11]. Despite the implementation of anti-corruption instruments—compliance procedures, control mechanisms, and audits—practical challenges persist, including fragmented data, formalistic reporting practices, and insufficient integration of public accountability tools into the management cycle of humanitarian programs [21; 22].

Russia's full-scale invasion has sharply increased Ukraine's need for international assistance, amplifying the risk of logistical disruptions and intensifying donor expectations regarding transparency in the use of funds and material resources [9; 14]. The use of official digital platforms (UN/OCHA dashboards, UHF Data Hub) contributes to openness; however, it does not fully eliminate reputational risks nor the information asymmetry between donors and implementing actors [7].

The most problematic areas include governance “grey zones”: mixing humanitarian and dual-use goods, manipulation of localization requirements, inflated contracts, and opaque distribution practices, all of which can lead to reduced or suspended international support and contribute to a negative image of the recipient state [11; 20]. This generates critical risks for Ukraine's humanitarian security and undermines trust among cooperating parties.

Under such conditions, transparency marketing becomes increasingly relevant. It encompasses systematic communication of openness, visualization of aid flows, verified performance accounting, and integrity branding of implementing organizations—mechanisms intended to strengthen oversight and prevent abuses [12]. However, the scientific and methodological foundations for integrating transparency-oriented marketing instruments into the anti-corruption management system of humanitarian aid remain underdeveloped. Clear transparency KPIs and evidence-based assessments of their influence on stakeholder behavior are still lacking.

**Literature review.** In the scholarly discourse on international humanitarian assistance and humanitarian supply chains, increasing attention is directed to issues of integrity, risk-oriented management, and ethical conduct. Systematic analyses of



contemporary approaches to humanitarian supply chain organization indicate that their effectiveness largely depends on the transparency of information flows and the accountability of implementing actors [1]. At the same time, digitalization and technological solutions are viewed as instruments that enhance data accessibility for stakeholders, which is particularly critical in crisis environments [9].

In a broader theoretical context, Berliner D. demonstrates that the political origins of transparency shape the foundations of democratic governance and integrity control in the public sector [2]. Similarly, Bertot J., Jaeger P. and Grimes J. argue that ICT-based openness tools help create a “culture of transparency” in modern societies and can function as anti-corruption instruments [3].

Risk management in supply chains, as shown by Khan M. and Burnes B., requires hybrid approaches (such as AHP + PROMETHEE) to enable effective risk prioritization. Although their research is not focused on humanitarian systems, its methodological insights are relevant for improving transparency and decision-making under uncertainty [12]. Furthermore, Blikhar M. et al., examining the post-pandemic economy, highlight the role of integrity-oriented marketing tools and mechanisms for countering greenwashing — concepts that can be adapted to humanitarian transparency and integrity frameworks [10].

One of the key strategic challenges in humanitarian management is ensuring accountability in the distribution of foreign aid. Cifuentes-Faura J. shows that international donors increasingly adopt financial oversight models aimed at minimizing corruption risks and enhancing transparency in the allocation of resources to Ukraine during wartime [4]. The author further emphasizes that accountability is essential for maintaining donor trust, as insufficient transparency may trigger substantial reputational losses for the recipient country [5].

Transparency in humanitarian assistance is also investigated through the lens of international organizations. Frennesson L. et al. note that delegating responsibilities to local implementers may improve operational efficiency but simultaneously generate new corruption risks due to information asymmetry [7]. Complementary



findings show that localization strategies must be balanced and accompanied by clear transparency safeguards [8].

Reinsberg B. stresses that the transparency of aid agencies has become a significant indicator of their perceived effectiveness among citizens and donors, since openness directly affects trust and the ability to implement large-scale humanitarian programs [15]. Parallel evidence provided by Honig D. demonstrates that improvements in transparency contribute to better institutional performance when robust monitoring mechanisms and access-to-information frameworks are in place [11].

Another important research direction concerns the impact of the Russia–Ukraine war on global supply chains and the world economy, emphasizing growing risks of logistical disruptions, resource shortages, and the critical need for rapid international response mechanisms [13; 16]. Timofieieva L. highlights wartime corruption-related threats that may undermine the effectiveness of humanitarian support to Ukraine [17].

Additionally, the literature includes extensive analyses of aid governance through multilateral trust funds: Dietrich S. et al. argue that donor organizations increasingly use performance-based financing models, which strengthen oversight and reduce the likelihood of misappropriation [6]. At the same time, evaluations of donor-agency performance also encompass their ability to sustain transparency toward the public [14].

**Research gap.** Despite substantial scientific progress in the fields of humanitarian operations management and anti-corruption regulation, the role of preventive and response-oriented anti-corruption mechanisms in ensuring the continuity of international humanitarian support to Ukraine remains insufficiently explored. During wartime, the transparency of humanitarian resource flows directly affects donor trust and the likelihood of maintaining—or, conversely, suspending—external assistance [4]. At the same time, the academic literature highlights that reputational losses of a recipient state may be as damaging as financial



misappropriations, as they undermine future partnerships and long-term cooperation prospects [5].

Existing anti-corruption instruments in the humanitarian domain are predominantly examined through the lens of oversight, compliance, and sanctioning procedures. In contrast, transparency marketing—encompassing open data, verified reporting, integrity communication, and public visibility of processes—remains methodologically underdeveloped. Its potential as an innovative preventive mechanism capable of strengthening trust in state institutions has not been systematically assessed. Likewise, the parameters and indicators (KPI) that would allow for the measurement of transparency's contribution to reducing corruption risks and enhancing reputational resilience are largely absent from current scholarship.

Given these gaps, a critical unresolved issue is the integration of trust-building transparency practices with anti-corruption procedures in the management of international humanitarian projects. This intersection remains fragmented in existing research despite its growing importance for the sustainability of humanitarian support to Ukraine.

**Aim and objectives.** The aim of the study is to scientifically substantiate and develop a conceptual model of Transparency Marketing in Humanitarian Aid Management as an integrated system of anti-corruption mechanisms capable of reducing corruption risks, strengthening donor trust, and ensuring the sustainability of international support for Ukraine during and after the war.

The objectives of the study are to:

- ❖ analyse the specific features of humanitarian aid management in Ukraine and identify critical points at which corruption risks and reputational losses emerge;
- ❖ examine international practices of corruption prevention and response within humanitarian supply chains, with a focus on their applicability to the wartime context;



- ❖ develop a conceptual Model of Transparency Marketing in Humanitarian Aid Management as an innovative foundation for anti-corruption governance of humanitarian assistance;
- ❖ formulate a system of transparency indicators (KPI) enabling the assessment of the model's effectiveness under real operational conditions;
- ❖ propose organizational and practical recommendations for integrating the model into the activities of actors involved in humanitarian support to Ukraine.

**Results.** The transformation of humanitarian aid governance under conflict conditions brings transparency to the forefront as a key resource of trust. Within humanitarian operations, transparency functions as a fundamental principle that reduces information asymmetry and mitigates corruption risks.

Anti-corruption governance in the humanitarian sector encompasses both preventive mechanisms—such as codes of conduct, open procurement, and integrity certifications—and response mechanisms, including audits, investigations, and sanctions.

Within this context, transparency marketing performs a dual function:

- ❖ firstly, it strengthens trust among key stakeholders (donors, NGOs, communities) through integrity branding;
- ❖ secondly, it establishes barriers to corrupt practices by ensuring open data, public reporting, and high communicative visibility of processes.

This approach aligns with the conceptual assumption that “transparency → trust → effectiveness” represents the critical chain underpinning the stability of external assistance [11].

Accordingly, the theoretical foundation of this study rests on the integration of three core domains: transparency marketing, anti-corruption governance, and humanitarian logistics. This integration provides the basis for developing a model that unifies the communication dimension, institutional oversight, and logistical-organizational efficiency.



International donor systems apply multi-level oversight mechanisms to humanitarian aid flows in order to ensure integrity, traceability, and accountability in resource use. It is noteworthy that, after 2022, these mechanisms were institutionally adapted and expanded within Ukraine (Table 1).

Table 1.

**Adaptation of international anti-corruption mechanisms in Ukraine**

<b>Mechanism of international practice</b>	<b>Essence</b>	<b>Ukrainian examples</b>	<b>Effect for transparency</b>
Performance-based oversight	monitoring results instead of processes	Contracts linked to EU Programme KPIs	↓ risk of inefficient spending
Digital accountability	online dashboards and integrated data	UHF Data Hub, e-Tracking	↑ data availability for donors
Localization with control	delegating implementation to local actors	Involvement of Ukrainian NGOs in urgent operations	↑ speed, ↓ opportunism
Procurement compliance	transparent procurement	DOZORRO, Prozorro Market (for humanitarian projects)	↓ corruption risks in procurement
Public reporting & reputation	open public communication	Communication campaigns of the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Armed Forces	↑ trust and reputation security

The mechanisms presented in Table 1 illustrate that international donor systems predominantly rely on formalized control instruments such as performance-based oversight, digital accountability, transparent procurement, and regulated public communication. However, their application in Ukraine after 2022 demonstrates that, although institutional anti-corruption solutions are necessary, they do not fully address the underlying drivers of distrust—namely information asymmetry, limited process visibility, reputational vulnerability, and the absence of clear communication standards [16].

Accordingly, this study proposes expanding the traditional toolkit of anti-corruption governance by complementing it with transparency marketing—a set of



instruments that not only detect and prevent irregularities but also systematically build trust, acting as a public value proposition of humanitarian programs.

Thus, transparency marketing should be understood not merely as a communication practice but as an anti-corruption mechanism that transforms open data, verification, and reporting into a publicly visible integrity signal for donors, communities, and international partners. The adaptation of international mechanisms (Table 1) shows that classical oversight procedures alone are insufficient for minimizing corruption risks; additional instruments are required to simultaneously enhance process visibility, strengthen trust, and reduce information asymmetry. Therefore, the next section synthesizes the key transparency marketing tools that have practical relevance for humanitarian governance in Ukraine.

Key transparency marketing instruments.

1. Open data and dashboards (data storytelling): aggregated shipment counters, route maps, warehouse status information, and the share of localized procurement.

Practice: UHF-type dashboards of ministries and regional authorities; integrations with Prozorro/DOZORRO.

Effect: reduced information asymmetry; opportunities for crowd-based oversight by media and civil society organizations.

2. Anti-corruption branding (“integrity brand”): a clear integrity profile, including ISO 37001 compliance, independent external audits, public risk maps, and defined service-level agreements for responding to information requests.

Practice: integrity tagging in NGO and government reports; certification mechanisms used by international partners.

Effect: strengthened donor trust and reduced reputational risk for the state.

3. Public reporting with verification: quarterly/monthly reports with machine-readable datasets, source references, KPI summaries, and deviation/corrective action blocks.

Practice: reporting of regional and central authorities; thematic briefings; publication of data collection methodologies.



Effect: a transparent “plan → implementation → evaluation → adjustment” cycle.

4. Incident communication protocol: standardized press notes in cases of violations (who, what, at which stage, how resolved), with “red point” marking on a process map.

Practice: hotlines, Telegram bots, QR verification systems for shipments.

Effect: damage control, prevention of wider distrust, and demonstration of a functioning response mechanism.

5. Community validation: complaint channels, feedback mechanisms, photo verification of received aid, and local audit groups.

A systemic analysis of these tools shows that each plays an important—but fragmented—role: reducing information asymmetry, strengthening reputational protection, or enabling rapid response to irregularities. However, the actual anti-corruption impact emerges only when these tools operate as an interconnected system, covering prevention, incident response, communication, and reputation management. This substantiates the need for a holistic Model of Transparency Marketing in Anti-Corruption Humanitarian Governance, integrating the above instruments into four functional blocks.

1. Preventive block (risk prevention).

Objective: prevent corruption risks at early stages.

Instruments:

- open data and real-time resource tracking
- preventive audits of suppliers and NGOs
- integrity certification (ISO 37001, internal compliance)
- standardized pre-decision communication

Result: fewer opportunities for abuse in procurement and logistics.

2. Response block (risk response & accountability).

Objective: ensure rapid detection and mitigation of corruption incidents.

Instruments:



- independent audits of deviations
- crisis communication protocols
- sanctions and access restrictions for violators
- transparent complaint and community verification systems

Result: reduced impact of incidents on donor trust.

### 3. Communication and information block (data & trust communication).

Objective: convert transparency into a public value proposition.

Instruments:

- verified public reporting
- data storytelling (dashboards, shipment maps)
- visualization of business processes (risk process maps)
- integrity branding of projects or institutions

Result: transparency perceived as an advantage rather than an obligation.

### 4. Reputational and evaluation block (trust capital & continuity).

Objective: preserve the stability of international assistance.

Instruments:

- transparency indicators (KPIs)
- trust and re-financing indices
- assessment of communication impact on donor behavior
- regular external monitoring of results

Result: preservation and growth of Ukraine's reputational capital.

The proposed model of transparency marketing in anti-corruption humanitarian governance requires further operationalization through measurable indicators. For this purpose, a system of key performance indicators (KPIs) has been developed to capture the model's influence on transparency, donor trust, and the reputational resilience of international support.



Table 2.

### Operational transparency KPIs (resource control)

KPI	Metric / Formula	Target Value	Data Source
Level of traceability of deliveries	% of shipments with tracking "donor → beneficiary"	≥95%	UHF Data Hub / MIAC
Completeness of SKU accounting	share of shipments with full set of fields	≥90%	Warehouses / RMA
Incident response time	Δt "detection → public reaction"	≤48 год	Response Protocol
Part of verified batches	% of shipments verified by audit/community	≥70%	Community validation

These indicators allow you to minimize the possibility of hidden violations, but their importance is significantly enhanced by high-quality public communication of data, which necessitates the need for the next group of KPIs.

Table 3.

### Communication and information KPIs

KPI	Metric	Target	Source
Data update frequency	average update interval	≤1–3 days	dashboard
Reporting transparency	% reports in open formats	≥90%	office reporting
Viewership index	views/downloads of reports	+10%.	Analytics
Engagement index	appeals/complaints via feedback channels	stable/↑	civic tools

Effective communication of transparency results forms the basis for the reputational effect, as it is the perception of transparency by donors that determines the sustainability of humanitarian support.

Table 4.

### Reputational trust KPIs

KPI	Metric	Aim
Donor Trust Index	expert assessment (1–10)	≥8
Recurring Funding	% donors who continue their cooperation	≥80%
Reputational Resilience Index	share of positive assessments in the media and among donors	↑ every year
Reputational Incidents	number of negative events per year	→0



The overall effect of the KPI system includes:

- early detection of corruption-related irregularities;
- strengthened managerial accountability;
- prevention of disruptions in international assistance;
- accumulation of the state's reputational capital during wartime.

Accordingly, the KPI framework enables a quantitative assessment of how effectively transparency marketing reduces corruption risks while simultaneously reinforcing the trust of international partners in Ukraine.

The effectiveness of the proposed transparency marketing model is determined by its institutional integration into the governance mechanisms of humanitarian processes in Ukraine. Practical implementation requires ensuring coherence between resource tracking, communication accountability, and reputational oversight, which together allow both the reduction of corruption risks and the strengthening of donor confidence.

The model demonstrates that transparency marketing does not function as a standalone management tool but rather as an integrated system of preventive, corrective, communicative, and reputational-evaluative mechanisms. The interaction of these components forms a closed loop—"transparency → trust → continuity of support"—which facilitates not only the mitigation of corruption risks but also enhances the managerial capacity of humanitarian programs.

This synergy enables a transition from a purely conceptual framework to an assessment of its practical effectiveness—namely, the expected humanitarian impact manifested in the stability of external support, efficiency of resource distribution, and reinforcement of trust between the state, donors, and beneficiaries. Table 5 presents the expected humanitarian effects resulting from the implementation of the transparency marketing model.



Table 5.

**Expected humanitarian impact**

Indicator	Expected changes
Corruption incidents in humanitarian flows	↓ detected and especially undetected
Level of trust of donors	↑ stable growth
Volumes of humanitarian support	continuity, possible increase
Reputational stability of the state	structural strengthening

Thus, assessing the humanitarian impact of the transparency marketing model is essential for confirming its practical value. Effective integration of transparency tools and anti-corruption mechanisms should not only minimize the risk of misuse of humanitarian resources but also create conditions for sustained long-term international support.

The organizational measures outlined above provide the structural and instrumental foundation necessary for the practical implementation of the transparency marketing model, ensuring the continuity and resilience of international assistance to Ukraine. The combined theoretical and applied findings are summarized in the conclusions.

**Conclusions.** The conducted research has demonstrated that transparency in humanitarian aid management constitutes a critical determinant of the sustainability of international support for Ukraine and a central instrument for reducing corruption risks during wartime. The identified research gap revealed insufficient integration of preventive and corrective anti-corruption mechanisms with communication tools designed to build stakeholder trust. This, in turn, underscored the need to develop the conceptual model “Transparency Marketing in Humanitarian Aid Management”, in which transparency is treated as a strategic asset of humanitarian policy.

The findings confirm that transparency marketing can function as an integrated anti-corruption mechanism capable of strengthening the continuity of humanitarian flows, minimizing corruption incidents, and enhancing international trust in Ukraine. The expected humanitarian effect of the model is reflected in reduced hidden



irregularities, improved quality of accountability, and greater continuity of donor support.

Future research should focus on empirically testing the model across Ukrainian regions, refining the weighting of transparency KPIs for various types of humanitarian projects, examining behavioral determinants of donor trust, comparing the Ukrainian context with international case studies, and developing digital tools enabling automated tracking, verification, and public reporting of humanitarian resources.

### References

1. Anjomshoae A., Salleh M. R., Kunz N. Sustainable humanitarian supply chains: A systematic review. *Production Planning & Control*. 2025. Vol. 36, No. 3. P. 357–377. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2023.2273451>
2. Berliner D. The political origins of transparency. *Journal of Politics*. 2014. Vol. 76, No. 2. P. 479–491. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381613001412>
3. Bertot J. C., Jaeger P. T., Grimes J. M. Using ICTs to create a culture of transparency: E-government and social media as openness and anti-corruption tools for societies. *Government Information Quarterly*. 2010. Vol. 27, No. 3. P. 264–271. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2010.03.001>
4. Cifuentes-Faura J. Government transparency and corruption in a turbulent setting: The case of foreign aid to Ukraine. *Governance*. 2024. Vol. 37, No. 2. P. 659–670. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12835>
5. Cifuentes-Faura J. The role of accountability and transparency in government during disasters: The case of the Ukraine–Russia war. *Public Money & Management*. 2025. Vol. 45, No. 3. P. 256–265. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2023.2249959>
6. Dietrich S., Reinsberg B., Steinwand M. C. Donor bureaucratic organisation and the pursuit of performance-based aid through multilateral trust funds. *Journal of*



- International Relations and Development*. 2022. Vol. 25. P. 709–738. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-022-00259-x>
7. Frennesson L., Kembro J., de Vries H., Jahre M., Van Wassenhove L. International humanitarian organizations' perspectives on localization efforts. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 2022. Vol. 83. Article 103410. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2022.103410>
  8. Frennesson L., Kembro J., de Vries H., Jahre M., Van Wassenhove L. Localisation of logistics preparedness in international humanitarian organisations. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2021. Vol. 11, No. 1. P. 81–106. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHLSCM-07-2020-0062>
  9. Garza-Reyes J. A., et al. Technology for resilience in humanitarian and commercial supply chains during disruptions. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2025. (In press). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHLSCM-03-2024-0036>
  10. Hobela V., Blikhar M., Syrovackyi V., Maraieva U., Dudiuk V. Economic and legal measures for ensuring the economy greening in post-pandemic period. *Amazonia Investiga*. 2021. Vol. 10, No. 44. P. 252–260. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2021.44.08.24>
  11. Honig D., Lall R., Parks B. C. When does transparency improve institutional performance? Evidence from 20,000 projects in 183 countries. *American Journal of Political Science*. 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12698>
  12. Khan M., Burnes B. Supply chain risk prioritisation using a hybrid AHP and PROMETHEE approach. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 2014. Vol. 157. P. 250–261. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.07.004>
  13. Nezhyva M., Mysiuk V. War in Ukraine: challenges for the global economy. *Zovnishnia torhivlia: ekonomika, finansy, pravo*. 2022. No. 2. P. 16–25.



14. Palagashvili L., Williamson C. R. Grading foreign aid agencies: Best practices across traditional and emerging donors. *Review of Development Economics*. 2021. Vol. 25, No. 2. P. 654–676. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/rode.12747>
15. Reinsberg B., Swedlund H. How transparent are aid agencies to their citizens? *Journal of International Development*. 2023. Vol. 35, No. 7. P. 2177–2212. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3762>
16. Sarwar D., et al. The impact of the Russia–Ukraine war on global supply chains: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*. 2025. Vol. 9. Article 1648918. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1648918>
17. Timofieieva L. Proportionality in countering corruption in Ukraine in the context of war. *Journal of Illicit Economies and Development*. 2025. Vol. 6, No. 2. P. 73–88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31389/jied.234>