

ЖУК П.В.,

Канд. екон. наук, с.н.с.

Провідний науковий співробітник

ДУ «Інституту регіональних досліджень імені М.І. Долишнього НАН України»,

вул. Козельницька, 4, м. Львів, Україна, 79026

Тел. +032-270-70-37

E-mail: pzjuk@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-4895-7752

МЕТОДИЧНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО РЕФОРМУВАННЯ АДМІНІСТРАТИВНИХ РАЙОНІВ В УКРАЇНІ

Актуальність. зумовлена необхідністю реформування субрегіональної (районної) ланки адміністративно-територіального поділу України внаслідок формування об'єднаних територіальних громад та зміни у розподілі повноважень з місцевого самоврядування між базовим та районним рівнями. Перехід більшості повноважень з місцевого самоврядування до об'єднаних територіальних громад вніс суттєві зміни у спрямованість комунікативних зв'язків між мешканцями та органами влади на рівні району і дозволяє укрупнити районну ланку адміністративно-територіальних одиниць. Адже внаслідок реформування системи адміністративно-територіального устрою України район стає територією локалізації та функціонування органів державної виконавчої влади, а основний перелік адміністративних, освітніх, медичних, культурних та інших публічних послуг надаватиметься на базовому, а не районному рівні.

Мета та завдання. Метою статті є обґрунтування й висвітлення пропозицій щодо методичних підходів до реформування системи адміністративно-територіальних одиниць субрегіонального рівня в контексті здійснюваної в Україні реформи місцевого самоврядування та територіальної організації влади.

Результати дослідження. Здійснено аналіз застосування поняття «район» в контексті адміністративно-територіального поділу та запропоновано трактування його дефініції як адміністративно-територіальні одиниці, що входять до складу одиниць вищого рівня (Автономна Республіка Крим, області, міста зі спеціальним статусом) і є територіальною основою для організації діяльності державних органів та органів місцевого самоврядування на субрегіональному рівні. Зазначено, що до району мають відноситися усі адміністративно-територіальні одиниці базового рівня, розташовані у його межах. Запропоновано основні принципи, критерії та вимоги, якими слід керуватися при формуванні районів. Серед критеріїв та вимог виділено: демографічний потенціал території, як правило, не менше 150 й не більше 800 тисяч мешканців; транспортна доступність до адміністративного центру району від найвіддаленішого поселення – до 1,5 год. (не більше 50-60 км); реорганізація мережі районів здійснюється без змін меж областей; розташування адміністративного центру району, як правило, найближче до географічного (транспортно-географічного) центру території району; адміністративний центр району - переважно населений пункт, що володіє найвищим економічним й демографічним потенціалом, має розвинуту інфраструктуру, виконував, виконує чи може виконувати функції субрегіонального адміністративного центру.

Наведено алгоритм моделювання нових адміністративних районів як послідовність кроків: 1) виявлення субрегіональних центрів – потенційних центрів адміністративних районів (як правило, з числа міст обласного значення; 2) зона тяжіння до обласного центру радіусом до 60 км розглядається як територія адміністративного району; 3) за його межами виділення інших районів здійснюється відповідно до зон тяжіння інших потенційних центрів районів; 4) враховуються також фактори, які можуть чинити суттєвий вплив на їх функціональність, ефективність діяльності відповідних владних органів: природно-географічні, транспортні, економічні, управлінські, історичні, демографічні, інфраструктурні тощо.

Висновки. Запропоновані підходи до формування адміністративних районів, на думку автора, дають можливість оптимізувати їх мережу виходячи зі зміни функцій району в системі розподілу публічної влади. Апробація цих методичних підходів у процесі моделювання нової мережі адміністративних районів показує можливість й доцільність зменшення їх кількості у Львівській області з 20 до 7, у Івано-Франківській області з 14 до 4, в Тернопільській області з 15 до 4.

Ключові слова: адміністративно-територіальний устрій, реформування, адміністративні райони, державне управління, місцеве самоврядування.

ZHUK P.V.,

PhD. Econ. Sciences, Senior scientific researcher

Leading scientific researcher

METHODICAL APPROACHES TO THE REFORMING OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS IN UKRAINE

Topicality. *The need to reform subregional (district) level of administrative and territorial division of Ukraine is urgent as the result of forming of consolidated territorial communities and the change of liabilities division between the basic and district levels. Transition of the majority of liabilities from local governments to consolidated territorial communities has changed the nature and direction of communication links between the residents and authorities at the district level and contributes to reinforcement of district level of administrative and territorial units. Due to reforming of the system of administrative and territorial structure of Ukraine, a district becomes the territory of localization and functioning of state authorities. The major list of administrative, educational, medical, cultural and other public services will be provided at the basic rather than district levels.*

Aim and tasks. *The paper aims to substantiate and outline the suggestions regarding the methodical approaches to reforming of the system of administrative and territorial units at subregional level in the context of local governance reform and authorities' territorial organization reform conducted in Ukraine.*

Research results. *The author analyzes the use of the concept of "district" in the context of administrative and territorial division and suggests its definition as administrative and territorial unit that is included into the higher-level units (Autonomous Republic of Crimea, oblasts, cities with special status) and is the territorial foundation for organization of activity of state authorities and local governments at subregional levels. District should include all administrative and territorial units of basic level located within its boundaries. Major principles, criteria and requirements to apply while forming the districts are suggested. Among those criteria and requirements, we outline the following: demographic capacity of a territory – usually between 150 and 800 thous. residents; transport accessibility of administrative center of the district from the most remote settlement – up to 1.5 hours (not exceeding 50-60km); the network of districts is reorganized without the change of oblasts' boundaries; administrative center of a district is usually located closest to geographic (transport-geographical) center of district's territory; administrative center of a district is usually the settlement with the highest economic and demographic capacity and developed infrastructure, which performed, performs or can perform the functions of subregional administrative center.*

An algorithm of modeling of new administrative districts is presented as the consequence of steps: 1) finding subregional centers – perspective centers of administrative districts (usually out of oblast significance cities); 2) zone of gravitation to oblast center with the radius up to 60km is considered as the territory of administrative district; 3) outside its boundaries the other districts are allocated according to gravitation zones of other perspective centers of districts; 4) there are also factors that substantially impact their functionality and efficiency of relevant authorities: natural-geographical, transport, economical, managerial, historical, demographic, infrastructural, etc.

Conclusion. *In author's opinion, approaches to forming of administrative districts contribute to optimization of their network taking into account the changes in the functions of a district in the system of public authority division. Testing of these methodological approaches in the process of modeling of the new network of administrative regions shows an opportunity and reasonability of their reduction in Lvivska oblast from 20 to 7, in Ivano-Frankivska oblast from 14 to 4, in Ternopil'ska oblast from 15 to 4.*

Keywords: *administrative-territorial structure, reforming, administrative districts, public management, local governments.*

Problem statement and its connection with important scientific and practical tasks. *The changes in the system of administrative and territorial structure of Ukraine at the basic level and creation of consolidated territorial communities, which are granted most of local governance functions previously held by districts, require the review of the districts' functions in the system of public authorities. As of March 2019, there are 884 consolidated territorial communities (CTCs) in Ukraine. Furthermore, 18 out of 490 existing administrative districts (rayons in Ukrainian) are covered by CTCs. In 145 districts, consolidated territorial communities cover 50-99 % of the territory. Overall CTCs are already created in 369 districts [1].*

Transition of the range of functions in educational, healthcare, cultural areas from districts to CTCs changes their management profile. While local governance functions are significantly released, the subregional level keeps the government control functions and holds territorial divisions of central executive authorities. Existing practice shows the inefficiency of their localization within the available

districts. Forming of interdistrict structures testifies to that. Under such circumstances, keeping the available network of administrative districts contradicts the practice and does not correspond to the theory of authorities' territorial organization, which provides the hierarchy of management functions with their concentration within the relevant administrative and territorial units. Enlargement of administrative districts becomes relevant.

Analysis of recent publications on the problem. Important aspects of forming of administrative and territorial units of subregional level are outlined in the papers of scientists and experts Yu. Hanushchak [2], A. Lisovyi [3], M. Pistun [4], A. Tkachuk [5], etc. We have also analyzed some of these issues in our previous papers, in particular regarding our understanding of spatial-functional model of administrative district [6].

Allocation of previously unsolved parts of the general problem. However, methodological foundations of forming of new administrative districts require more thorough examination.

Formulation of research objectives (problem statement). The paper aims to outline and substantiate suggestions regarding the methodological approaches to reforming of the system of administrative and territorial units of subregional level in the context of ongoing reform of local governance and territorial organization of authorities in Ukraine.

An outline of the main results and their justification. A word "district" or "rayon" in Ukrainian (from lat. regio – "district, county") generally has several meanings. Geographical meaning of a district is a territory allocated by certain features. It is also a taxonomic unit in the system of territorial structure (zoning). In the context of administrative and territorial division "district" in Ukraine emerged in the course of Soviet administrative reform in 1920s. Before that administrative and territorial units of subregional level in Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the kingdom of Poland, Russian empire, Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Rzecz Pospolita), Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, West Ukrainian People's Republic and USSR were called the powiats.

The concept of administrative district is not defined in current laws and regulations. Article 133 of the Constitution of Ukraine provides that the districts in the system of administrative-territorial structure of Ukraine are administrative and territorial units of the second level (same as cities of oblast significance) and are parts of autonomous republic, oblasts or cities of state significance. Cities of oblast significance can also be divided into districts in cities, which will be the administrative units of lower level.

The Draft Law of Ukraine on the Foundations of Administrative-Territorial Structure of Ukraine registered under the № 8051 as of 22 February 2018 suggests the following interpretation:

1. District – an administrative and territorial unit of subregional level, which consists of communities with overall population over 150 thous. persons. At the territories, where the density of population is lower than the average density of population of the relevant oblast, a district can have fewer residents if the area of the district exceeds average area of districts in oblast.

2. District is the territorial foundation of organization and activity of local executive authority, territorial divisions of central executive authorities and local government of the district, including for the purposes of providing administrative, social and other services, which cannot be provided by local governments at the level of communities.

3. Administrative center of a district is determined based on historical peculiarities, geographic location and available infrastructure for location of local executive authorities, territorial divisions of central executive authorities and local government of the district [7].

We suggest considering districts as administrative-territorial units included in the units of higher level (Autonomous Republic of Crimea, oblasts, cities with special status), which are the territorial foundation for organization of activity of state authorities and local governments at subregional level. Districts should consist of administrative-territorial units of primary (basic) level – territorial communities.

Liabilities of local governance should be divided between communities and a district according to the subsidiarity principle. Local governments of districts should have only the liabilities, which are difficult to accomplish or less efficient at the basic level.

Reforming of local governance and authorities' territorial organization in Ukraine is currently changing the local governance liabilities of districts and communities, which undertake almost all local governance functions. Substantial share of 11 thous. local councils, which operated before the reform, are already included in consolidated communities and consolidation process continues. There aren't any unconsolidated community in certain districts.

In the course of CTC creation, the liabilities of districts in the sphere of local governance diminish and the opportunities to enlarge them emerge. Territorial organization of activity of state executive authorities has outgrown the existing limits. However, the range of local governance liabilities, in particular, those mentioned in Table 1, should further be attributed to district level. Meanwhile, the problem of residents' accessibility to services providers loses priority nature, because the main list of services provided by local governments will be granted in consolidated territorial communities. Activity of state executive authorities and relevant services will be concentrated at the level of district. Among them we consider territorial divisions of central executive authorities: Ministries of Internal Affairs, Defense, Social Policy, Finances, and Justice of Ukraine as well as special central authorities of state governance stipulated by the Constitution of Ukraine: General Prosecutor's Office, State Treasury Service, State Service of Ukraine on Food Safety and Consumers Protection, State Migration Service, State Employment Service, State Service of Ukraine on Geodesy, Cartography and Cadastre, State Statistical Service, State Service of Ukraine on Emergencies, State Fiscal Service, State Agency of Automobile Roads, State Architecture-Construction Inspection, National Police, Pension Fund of Ukraine.

New functions of a district should be taken into account in defining the principles, criteria and requirements, which will be the basis of reorganization and modeling of new administrative districts.

Table 1

Liabilities of local governments at the level of districts in conditions of decentralization reform

№	Sphere of activity	District level	
		List of services	Entities providing services
1.	Education	Methodological maintenance, professional training for employees in education, inspections, education in boarding schools	Boarding schools, Methodical offices
2.	Healthcare	Medical services of secondary level	Healthcare facilities of secondary medical care
3.	Culture	Maintenance of district cultural facilities (theatres, museums, etc), organization and holding of district cultural and artistic events, securing the participation in district, national and international cultural and artistic events	Aesthetic training schools, music schools, theatres, museums, libraries, other cultural facilities of district subordination
4.	Physical culture and sport	Specialized sport training, district-level events in the area of physical culture and sport, organization of participation in regional, state and international events in the area of physical culture and sport	Specialized sport schools, sport clubs
5.	Public transport	Organization of passenger transportation between territorial communities	Road transport enterprises on a competitive basis
6.	Urban planning and architecture	Planning of territorial development, maintenance of town-planning documentation, authorization procedures, architecture-construction control	Architecture division, architecture-construction control division, bureau of technical inventory
7.	Economic development and entrepreneurship	Strategic and current planning of socio-economic development, promotion of investment attraction, registration of entrepreneurship entities, management of natural resources, issue of patents, etc	Economic development division, economic development agency

Among the major principles, we consider the following:

- constitutionality, rule of law;
- efficiency of state management and local governance;
- securing the unity of state with a combination of centralization and decentralization in exercise of public power;

- territorial commonality – integrity of district's territory and its natural, geographic, historical, socio-economic integrity;
- avoiding of excessive economic, demographic, territorial imbalances between districts;
- concentration at district level of management functions and public services, which are more reasonable and efficient to be provided at subregional level rather than the level of communities or regions;
- infrastructural maintenance – availability of infrastructure necessary to perform the functions of administrative center;
- adherence to EU recommendations on Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics – NUTS;
- orientation at the capacity of metropolitan centers of subregional level as the core of enlarged administrative districts taking into account their gravitation zones.

Selection of criteria and requirements to comply with in the process of modeling of new administrative districts is very important. Among them, we consider the following ones:

- demographic capacity of a territory – usually over 150 and less than 800 thousand residents (which corresponds to the level NUTS-3); possibly lower in the regions with population density below average by the relevant oblast;
- transport accessibility of district administrative center from the most remote settlement – up to 1.5 hours (taking into account the existing condition and quality of road network – usually not exceeding 50-60km);
- district territory is somewhat different from other oblast segments in geographic, historical, economic and social aspects;
- enlargement takes place through adjoining the district, which has the perspective administrative center of new district at its territory, with the neighbouring administrative districts and their segments (indicating the specific administrative-territorial units of basic level included in the structure of new district);
- the territory of enlarged district includes all territorial communities (village, town, city councils, consolidated territorial communities) located within its boundaries;
- reorganization of districts boundaries does not change the boundaries of regions (oblasts);
- boundaries of districts are the boundaries of existing administrative-territorial units of subregional and basic levels.
- administrative center of a district is usually located the closest to the geographic (transport-geographic) center of district's territory;
- administrative center of a district is usually a settlement with the highest economic and demographic capacity, developed infrastructure and the one that performed, performs or can perform the function of subregional administrative center;
- name of a district derives from its administrative center (with some exceptions).

We see the algorithm of modeling of new administrative districts as the consequence of the steps mentioned below.

1. Analysis of regional system of settlement and finding subregional centers – perspective centers of administrative regions. As a rule, the cities of oblast significance should be considered.

2. Zone of gravitation to oblast center up to 60 km (if there are quality roads, some segments of gravitation zone can be more distant) is considered to be the territory of administrative district. Oblast centre or other settlement at the territory of a district with relevant infrastructure and transport accessibility can be the center of administrative district.

3. The territory of perspective administrative districts beyond the allocated one is modeled by gravitation zones of other perspective centers of districts in compliance with accessibility requirements mentioned in Step 2. If the territory of the modeled district has 2 or more perspective centers, the preference should be given to the one with larger population and stronger economic capacity, or the one closer to transport-geographic center of the modeled district.

4. Population of the modeled districts should be no less than 150 thousand. If a district has population density lower than average in oblast, the district can have less population. The area of such district should exceed the average area of modeled districts of oblast.

5. The factors that can impact the functionality of districts and efficiency of relevant authorities' activity should be taken into account in the process of districts modeling, in particular natural-geographic, transport, economic, management, historical, demographic, infrastructural factors, etc.

6. The region is named after its administrative center. The districts that include the territory of oblast centre can have the same name as both oblast centre and actual administrative centre of the district.

Conclusions and perspectives of further research. In conclusion, we can emphasize that application of suggested approaches to modeling of administrative districts will contribute to optimization of their network considering the changes of districts' functions in the system of public authorities division. Testing of these methodological approaches in the process of modeling of the new network of administrative districts shows the opportunity and reasonability of reduction of their number in Lvivska oblast from 20 to 7 with no less than 200 thous. residents and the area of 1.3 – 4.1 thous. sq. km.; in Ivano-Frankivska oblast from 14 to 4 with 193 – 451 thous. residents and the area of 2.4 – 4.6 thous. sq. km; in Ternopilska oblast from 15 to 4 with 155 – 431 thous. residents and the area of 3.0 – 4.0 thous. sq. km.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Моніторинг децентралізації влади та реформування місцевого самоврядування станом на 12 березня 2019 року. URL : <https://decentralization.gov.ua/news/10749>
2. Ганущак Ю. Реформа територіальної організації влади; Швейцарсько-український проект «Підтримка децентралізації в Україні – DESPRO». К. : ТОВ «Софія-А». 2014. 168 с.
3. Лісовий А. Розукрупнення областей – перший етап адміністративно-територіальної реформи. Економіст. 2008. № 8. С. 26-30.
4. Пістун М. Регіони врятує децентралізація. Урядовий кур'єр. 2014. 26.03.2014.
5. Ткачук А. Утворення ОТГ веде до руйнації районного рівня. URL : <https://galychyna.if.ua/analytic/anatoliy-tkachuk-utvorennya-otg-vede-do-ruynatsiyi-rayonnogo-rivnya/>
6. Жук П.В. Концептуальні підходи до реформування адміністративно-територіального устрою України. Територіальний розвиток та регіональна політика в Україні: актуальні проблеми, ризики та перспективи адміністративно-фінансової децентралізації. ДУ «Інститут регіональних досліджень імені М. І. Долишнього НАН України». Львів, 2017. С. 19-20.
7. Про засади адміністративно-територіального устрою України. Проект Закону України. URL : http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_1?pf3511=63508.

REFERENCES

1. Monitorynh detsentralizatsiyi vlady ta reformuvannya mistsevoho samovryaduvannya stanom na 12 bereznya 2019 roku [Monitoring of authorities decentralization and reforming of local governance as of 12 March 2019]. URL : <https://decentralization.gov.ua/news/10749> [in Ukrainian].
2. Hanushchak Yu. Reforma terytorialnoi orhanizatsiyi vlady: Shveitsarsko-ukrayinskyi proekt «Pidtrymka detsentralizatsiyi v Ukrayini – DESPRO» [Reform of authorities decentralization: Swiss-Ukrainian project “Support of decentralization in Ukraine - DESPRO”]. К. : TOV «Sofiya-A». 2014. 168 p. [in Ukrainian].
3. Lisovyi A. Rozukrupnennya oblastei – pershyi etap administratyvno-terytorialnoi reformy [Disaggregation of oblasts – the first stage of administrative-territorial reform]. Economist. 2008. № 8. P. 26-30. [in Ukrainian].
4. Pistun M. Rehiony vryatuye detsentralizatsiya [Decentralization will save regions]. Uryadovi kuryer. 2014. 26 bereznya. [in Ukrainian].
5. Tkachuk A. Utvorennya OTH vede do ruynatsiyi rayonnoho rivnya [Creation of CBCs leads to the collapse of district level]. URL : <https://galychyna.if.ua/analytic/anatoliy-tkachuk-utvorennya-otg-vede-do-ruynatsiyi-rayonnogo-rivnya/> [in Ukrainian].
6. Zhuk P. V. Kontseptualni pidhody do reformuvannya administratyvno-terytorialnoho ustroyu Ukrayiny. [Conceptual approaches to reforming of administrative and teritorial structure of Ukraine] Terytorialnyi rozvytok ta rehionalna polityka v Ukrayini: aktualni problemy, ryzyky ta perspektyvy administratyvo-finansovoyi detsentralizatsiyi. DU «Instytut rehionalnyh doslidzhen imeni M. I. Dolishnyoho NAN Ukrayiny». Lviv, 2017. P. 19-20. [in Ukrainian]
7. Proekt Zakony pro zasady administratyvno-terytorialnoho ustroyu Ukrayiny [Draft Law of Ukraine on the Foundations of Administrative and Territorial Structure of Ukraine]. URL : http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_1?pf3511=63508 [in Ukrainian].