UDC 338.48:005.21:502.131.1
DOI: 10.60022/3(6)-01S

Obolentseva Larysa
Doctor of Science (Economics)
Professor of Department of World Politics, Diplomacy and Travel Business
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine
Оболенцева Лариса Володимирівна
доктор економічних наук
професор кафедри світової політики, дипломатії та туристичного бізнесу
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, Україна
ORCID: 0000-0001-7085-6902

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OF POST-WAR TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE RECOVERY BASED ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND SLOW TOURISM

Abstract. *The article examines post-war recovery of tourism infrastructure as a managed process of sustainable territorial development rather than only as the rebuilding of damaged facilities. The relevance of the study for Ukraine is determined by the uneven return of tourism activity, which will depend on safety, infrastructure readiness, institutional capacity, environmental vulnerability and the attitude of local communities. The article argues that a simple return to pre-war tourism growth models may create additional risks for destinations that have not yet restored their social, ecological and managerial stability. Slow tourism is considered as a strategic approach that supports gradual reopening, longer stays, local consumption, careful interpretation of places and a more balanced relationship between visitors and residents. The proposed management logic connects post-war recovery, a policy matrix and a system of indicators. The policy matrix includes access regulation, advance booking, local tourism fees, seasonality management, local slow routes, community participation and monitoring. The practical value of the study lies in offering a framework that can be adapted by local authorities, destination management organizations and territorial communities while preparing post-war tourism recovery strategies.*

Keywords: *strategic management, post-war recovery, tourism infrastructure, sustainable development, slow tourism, policy matrix, resilience.*

СТРАТЕГІЧНЕ УПРАВЛІННЯ ПОВОЄННИМ ВІДНОВЛЕННЯМ ТУРИСТИЧНОЇ ІНФРАСТРУКТУРИ НА ЗАСАДАХ СТАЛОГО РОЗВИТКУ ТА ПОВІЛЬНОГО ТУРИЗМУ

Анотація. *У статті досліджено повоєнне відновлення туристичної інфраструктури як керований процес сталого територіального розвитку, а не лише як відбудову пошкоджених об'єктів чи механічне відновлення довоєнних туристичних потоків. Актуальність теми зумовлена тим, що для України повернення туристичної активності після війни відбуватиметься нерівномірно й залежатиме від безпекових, соціальних, інфраструктурних, екологічних та управлінських чинників. Обґрунтовано, що швидке відновлення туризму, орієнтоване переважно на зростання кількості відвідувачів, може створити додаткові ризики для дестинацій, які ще не відновили соціальну, екологічну та інституційну стійкість.*

Доведено доцільність використання slow tourism як стратегічного підходу до повоєнного розвитку туристичних дестинацій. З цієї точки зору, slow tourism розглядається не лише як окремий туристичний продукт, а як управлінська логіка, що забезпечує поступове відкриття територій, регулювання інтенсивності відвідувань, підтримку локального бізнесу, довше перебування туристів, глибшу інтерпретацію культурної та природної спадщини, а також збалансовану взаємодію між відвідувачами й місцевими громадами.

Методологічну основу дослідження становлять системний підхід, структурно-логічний аналіз,

концептуальне моделювання та KPI-орієнтоване оцінювання. Запропонована управлінська логіка поєднує повоєнне відновлення, матрицю політик і систему показників результативності. Матриця політик охоплює регулювання доступу, попереднє бронювання, місцеві туристичні збори, управління сезонністю, розвиток локальних slow-маршрутів, участь громади та моніторинг. Окрему увагу приділено показникам, які дозволяють оцінювати економічну корисність туризму для громади, соціальну прийнятність, екологічне навантаження, якість туристичного досвіду та спроможність управління дестинацією.

Наукова цінність статті полягає в трактуванні повоєнного відновлення туризму як поетапної трансформації дестинаційної системи, а не як повернення до попередніх моделей туристичного зростання. Практичне значення дослідження полягає у можливості адаптації запропонованого підходу органами місцевого самоврядування, організаціями управління дестинаціями та територіальними громадами під час розроблення стратегій повоєнного відновлення туризму, регіональних програм розвитку та планів управління туристичними дестинаціями.

Ключові слова: *стратегічне управління, повоєнне відновлення, туристична інфраструктура, сталий розвиток, повільний туризм, матриця політик, стійкість дестинацій.*

Formulation of the problem. The recovery of tourism infrastructure after war is usually associated with what can be seen and counted first: roads, accommodation facilities, tourist information centres, trails, signs, digital maps, booking systems and service points. This view is understandable, because damaged physical facilities are the most visible barrier to the return of tourism activity. Yet in post-war territories, tourism infrastructure is more than a set of restored objects. It also includes safety rules, institutional coordination, route management, service culture, environmental restrictions, communication with residents and the trust that makes a destination socially acceptable for visitors and for the host community.

For Ukrainian destinations, this issue is not abstract. Some territories will be able to reopen selected routes or cultural sites relatively quickly, whereas others will need a much longer period to restore basic safety, transport accessibility and local confidence. Even within one region, the readiness of a city route, a nature trail, a memorial site, a rural guest house and a museum may differ substantially. Therefore, tourism recovery cannot be treated as one uniform process with identical solutions for all destinations.

A narrow reconstruction-oriented approach may rebuild certain facilities but leave deeper vulnerabilities unresolved. These vulnerabilities include excessive dependence on seasonal demand, weak monitoring of visitor flows, insufficient reinvestment in maintenance, uneven distribution of tourism benefits, limited participation of residents and fragmented responsibility among stakeholders. In post-war conditions, such problems become sharper. Communities may face limited budgets, local businesses may work with reduced staff, natural areas may be more sensitive to pressure, and residents may have mixed expectations regarding the return of visitors.

The most risky scenario is a rapid restart of tourism based mainly on the growth of visitor numbers. At first, this may seem useful: small businesses receive customers, employment begins to recover, local budgets get additional revenues and the destination demonstrates signs of revival. However, uncontrolled growth can overload partially restored routes, increase pressure on natural and cultural sites, create conflicts over public space and reduce the quality of the visitor experience. In such a case, tourism does not strengthen recovery; it becomes another source of tension.

For this reason, post-war tourism needs a different management logic. The central question is not how to attract the maximum possible number of visitors. It is how to organize tourism so that it remains safe, acceptable for residents, useful for the local economy and compatible with environmental limits. Local authorities and destination organizations therefore have to work not only with promotion, but also with the sequence of reopening, carrying capacity, access regulation, visitor communication, community feedback and reinvestment of tourism revenues into the destination.

Slow tourism is relevant in this context because it shifts attention from quantity to quality. It encourages longer stays, local consumption, walking and cycling routes, cultural interpretation, personal contact with place and respect for the rhythm of the community. In peaceful conditions, slow tourism is often presented as an alternative to mass tourism. In post-war conditions, its role can be broader: it can serve as a management principle that helps destinations reopen carefully and avoid premature growth.

The problem addressed in this article is the lack of an integrated framework that connects post-war tourism infrastructure recovery with practical governance instruments and measurable sustainability outcomes. Sustainable development is often declared in recovery strategies, but it is not always translated into concrete decisions: who regulates access, how visitor flows are monitored, how maintenance is financed, how residents participate and how success is evaluated. This gap determines the need to substantiate a managed model of

tourism recovery based on slow tourism, a policy matrix and a system of indicators.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The theoretical basis of the article is formed by studies on resilience, sustainable development, crisis recovery and tourism governance. Prayag emphasizes that tourism resilience should be considered at several levels: organizations, destinations, tourists and institutions [1]. This position is important for post-war recovery because the readiness of an individual hotel, museum or tour operator is not sufficient. A destination can function only when infrastructure, safety rules, local authorities, businesses, residents and demand are coordinated.

Research on organizational and regional resilience also confirms that recovery is not a simple return to the previous state. Jang, Park and Choi show that different organizational resources play different roles during crises, while Orchiston, Prayag and Brown emphasize planning, cooperation and innovation in the tourism sector [2; 3]. Martin and Sunley, as well as Boschma, develop the regional perspective and argue that resilient territories are able not only to absorb shocks, but also to create new development trajectories [4; 5]. This idea is directly relevant for Ukraine, where the restoration of tourism cannot mean mechanical reproduction of pre-war models.

A wider conceptual foundation is provided by studies of social-ecological systems. Walker, Holling, Carpenter and Kinzig distinguish between resilience, adaptability and transformability [6]. Folke and co-authors argue that the economy and society should be considered within the limits of the biosphere, not outside them [7]. For tourism, this means that recovery strategies have to take into account ecological capacity, landscape sensitivity, resource use and the long-term value of natural and cultural heritage.

The literature on sustainable tourism shows that the concept is widely accepted but difficult to implement consistently. Sharpley draws attention to the gap between the attractiveness of sustainable tourism as an idea and the complexity of translating it into policy and business practice [8]. This gap is especially visible in post-war recovery. Strategic documents may use the language of resilience, inclusion and environmental responsibility, while practical decisions may still be driven by short-term economic expectations or the desire to demonstrate quick results.

Post-crisis and post-disaster tourism studies have also become highly relevant. Brouder interprets the COVID-19 pandemic as a moment that opened opportunities for rethinking tourism development models [9]. Lew, Cheer, Haywood, Brouder and Salazar point out that global crises change mobility, borders, risk perception and the social meaning of travel [10]. These conclusions are useful for the post-war context because war changes not only infrastructure and demand, but also the ethical meaning of visiting affected territories.

Recent studies directly addressing disaster-affected and post-conflict regions strengthen the governance argument. Zhang, Lv and Sarker identify adaptive governance, stakeholder coordination and monitoring as important factors in tourism recovery after disasters [11]. Tymoshenko and co-authors consider the post-conflict revival of tourism in Ukraine through community-based and sustainable development perspectives [12]. Pathirana, Bigby, Scott and Gardiner, using the case of Jaffna in Sri Lanka, show that post-war tourism development depends on sequencing, institutional arrangements and social acceptance rather than on physical reconstruction alone [13].

Taken together, these studies show that tourism recovery has to be understood as a coordinated and adaptive process. However, they do not provide a sufficiently integrated framework that combines post-war infrastructure recovery, slow tourism, policy instruments and measurable indicators. Some works focus on resilience, others on sustainability, community participation or crisis recovery. The practical question of how local authorities can transform reconstruction into a managed process of sustainable destination development remains insufficiently developed. This article responds to that need by proposing a structured model of strategic management for post-war tourism infrastructure recovery.

The purposes of the article. The purpose of the article is to substantiate a model of strategic management for post-war tourism infrastructure recovery based on the principles of sustainable development and slow tourism, with emphasis on phased reopening, community benefits, environmental limitations and measurable recovery outcomes.

The achievement of this purpose involves the following research tasks: to identify the limitations of traditional tourism recovery approaches focused mainly on the rapid growth of visitor flows; to justify slow tourism as a strategic model for post-war destinations; to develop a policy matrix for managing access, financing, seasonality and local routes; to propose a system of indicators for assessing economic, social, environmental and governance effects of recovery; and to define practical conditions for implementing the model at the level of territorial communities and destinations.

Methodological approach. The study is based on a conceptual and analytical methodology. It does not aim to measure the current performance of a specific destination, because reliable post-war tourism statistics remain incomplete for many territories, and the security situation may change significantly over time. Instead, the article develops an applied management framework that can later be adapted to the empirical conditions

of a particular community, region or destination.

The systems approach is used to interpret tourism infrastructure as a multi-component destination system. This system includes physical assets, natural and cultural resources, transport accessibility, accommodation, information channels, booking tools, safety rules, local businesses, public authorities, residents and visitors. Such an approach is necessary because the recovery of one element does not automatically mean the recovery of the whole destination.

The structural-functional approach makes it possible to distinguish the main functions of tourism infrastructure in the recovery period. It provides economic support for local businesses and employment, creates conditions for social interaction and community representation, ensures access to natural and cultural resources, and requires institutional coordination. These functions are interdependent. For example, a route may be physically restored, but without safety rules, interpretation, maintenance funding and local support it will not become part of sustainable recovery.

Conceptual modelling is applied to connect three blocks: post-war recovery, the policy matrix and slow tourism. The first block reflects the initial need to restore safety, accessibility and minimum service conditions. The second block translates sustainability principles into governance instruments. The third block describes the desired direction of recovery, where tourism develops through low-impact mobility, local value creation, longer stays and meaningful visitor experience. The model is built as a sequence of management decisions rather than as a static scheme.

The indicator approach is used to make sustainable recovery measurable. The proposed KPIs are grouped according to economic viability, social acceptability, environmental limits, governance capacity, quality of visitor experience and contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals. The indicators are intended to be understandable for local authorities and destination management organizations, which is especially important in conditions of limited administrative and financial capacity.

Table 1 presents the methodological logic of the study.

The main material presentation. Post-war tourism infrastructure recovery is a management process with several interconnected levels. At the first level, it concerns the restoration of minimum destination functionality: safe routes, access to sites, emergency information, basic services, communication with visitors and conditions for local entrepreneurship. At the second level, it requires governance mechanisms that prevent uncontrolled flows and clarify responsibility. At the third level, recovery has to create a new quality of tourism development that strengthens territorial resilience instead of reproducing former weaknesses.

Table 1

Methodological logic of the study

Research task	Analytical instrument	Expected applied result
Identify the risks of traditional recovery approaches	Critical analysis of post-crisis tourism recovery and resilience literature	Clarification of why growth-oriented recovery may be unsafe or ineffective for fragile destinations
Substantiate slow tourism as a recovery model	Interpretation of slow tourism through sustainability, community participation and resilience	Explanation of slow tourism as a strategic approach, not only as a niche tourism product
Develop a governance mechanism for recovery	Policy matrix combining access regulation, fees, seasonality tools, local routes and monitoring	A set of instruments that can be adapted to different stages of territorial recovery
Make sustainable recovery measurable	Grouping of KPIs by economic, social, environmental and governance dimensions	Practical indicators for monitoring the quality of recovery
Define implementation conditions	Structural-logical generalization of stakeholder roles and management stages	Recommendations for local authorities, destination managers, businesses and communities

Source: developed by the author

The traditional recovery model usually gives priority to the rapid return of tourist flows. This model may be understandable in mature destinations with stable infrastructure, predictable demand and strong institutions. For post-war territories, however, it contains serious risks. A destination may appear accessible but still need route verification, emergency planning, clear visitor information and coordination with security authorities. Restored facilities may not be ready for high demand, especially if maintenance funding is uncertain. Residents may welcome tourism as a source of income, but they may also feel fatigue or dissatisfaction if visitor interests are placed above community needs.

In Ukraine, such risks may appear in different types of destinations. Natural areas may need restrictions because trails, forests, water bodies or protected landscapes require careful inspection and maintenance. Cultural and memorial places may require ethical rules of interpretation. Urban destinations may face the

problem of uneven visitor concentration in restored central areas, while peripheral neighbourhoods remain outside economic benefits. Rural communities may have local hospitality potential, but lack the institutional capacity to manage promotion, booking, quality control and safety communication.

Slow tourism offers a more cautious and more community-oriented path. It does not require immediate mass demand. It can develop through walking and cycling routes, local gastronomy, crafts, small museums, cultural interpretation, nature-based activities, memorial routes, educational visits and rural hospitality. These products can be created gradually, often using existing local resources and small-scale investment. They encourage longer stays and deeper visitor engagement, which may be more useful for the local economy than short, concentrated and poorly managed visits.

The difference between traditional recovery logic and slow-tourism-based recovery logic is presented in table 2.

Table 2

Comparison of traditional and slow-tourism-based post-war recovery models

Comparison criterion	Traditional recovery logic	Slow-tourism-based recovery logic
Main priority	Quick return of tourist flows and visible economic activity	Gradual reopening of the destination with attention to safety, community interests and resource limits
Understanding of success	Number of visitors, occupancy rates and total revenue	Longer stays, local income retention, resident support, environmental stability and quality of experience
Infrastructure focus	Large facilities, high-capacity services and rapid promotion of attractions	Low-impact routes, interpretation, small service points, digital information and adaptive use of local resources
Role of the community	The community mainly provides services or hosts visitors	The community participates in planning, route design, control of effects and distribution of benefits
Main risks	Overload of fragile infrastructure, spatial concentration and social tension	Slower economic effect, need for coordination and continuous monitoring
Management requirements	Marketing, investment attraction and general reconstruction	Carrying capacity, access rules, booking tools, local fees, monitoring and public reporting

Source: developed by the author

The practical transition from recovery to sustainable tourism development requires a policy matrix. In this article, the policy matrix is understood as a set of coordinated instruments that translate the principles of sustainable and slow tourism into operational decisions. It connects strategic goals with everyday management: who may visit, when visits are allowed, how many visitors are acceptable, how revenues are reinvested and how communities participate in decision-making.

The matrix approach is useful because post-war territories are not homogeneous. Some areas may have serious damage and high security risks. Others may be relatively safe but institutionally weak. Some destinations may be located near sensitive ecosystems. Others may need urgent support for local businesses. Therefore, one universal model of recovery would be ineffective. The policy matrix allows different instruments to be combined depending on the stage of recovery, the capacity of the destination and the expectations of residents.

The main instruments of the policy matrix are presented in table 3.

Table 3

Policy matrix for managing post-war tourism infrastructure recovery

Instrument	Content of the instrument	Expected management effect
M1. Quotas and advance booking	Visitor limits for sensitive sites, route registration, time slots and controlled access through digital or administrative tools	Lower risk of overload, better safety control and clearer understanding of destination capacity
M2. Local tourism fee or targeted access payment	Allocation of part of visitor payments to trails, signage, toilets, waste management, environmental protection and small service facilities	Creation of a local financial source for maintenance and greater transparency of recovery financing
M3. Seasonality management	Promotion of off-season events, weekday visits, thematic routes and distributed calendars	Reduction of peak pressure and more stable income for local businesses
M4. Local slow tourism routes	Walking, cycling, gastronomic, cultural, memorial, nature-based and craft routes based on local identity	Involvement of residents and entrepreneurs, stronger authenticity and localization of benefits
M5. Community participation	Public consultations, route co-design, cooperation with NGOs, cultural institutions, guides and local businesses	Higher legitimacy of tourism decisions and lower risk of conflict between visitors and residents
M6. Monitoring and public reporting	Regular tracking of visits, route condition, use of fees, resident attitudes, environmental risks and tourist satisfaction	Evidence-based correction of decisions and strengthening of trust in destination governance

Source: developed by the author

The instruments of the policy matrix should not be used separately. Their value appears when they work together. For communities with high security risks, the first recovery package may include route verification, quotas, advance registration and a limited number of guided routes. For destinations at the medium stage of recovery, it may be reasonable to combine quotas, local tourism fees, slow routes and basic monitoring. For relatively stable territories, the priority may shift towards product diversification, seasonality management and deeper community participation.

The financial dimension deserves special attention. Local tourism fees should not be treated simply as an additional payment for visitors. If they are transparent and targeted, they may become a practical mechanism for maintaining infrastructure and protecting natural or cultural sites. However, this instrument will be accepted only when residents, businesses and visitors see a clear connection between collected funds and visible improvements. Public reporting on the use of these funds is therefore not a formal detail, but a condition of trust.

The allocation of responsibility is equally important. Local authorities approve access rules, carrying capacity limits and the use of revenues. Destination management organizations or municipal tourism units administer booking systems, collect data and prepare reports. Businesses develop services, participate in quality standards and support local routes. Residents and community organizations help identify acceptable forms of tourism, sensitive places and possible conflicts. Environmental and cultural institutions define limits and provide interpretation.

Table 4 summarizes the roles of the main stakeholders.

Table 4

Stakeholder roles in the implementation of the slow-tourism recovery model

Stakeholder group	Main responsibilities	Contribution to sustainable recovery
Local authorities	Approval of recovery priorities, safety requirements, access rules, local fees and reporting procedures	Provide legitimacy, coordination and connection between tourism recovery and wider territorial development
Destination management organizations / municipal tourism units	Administration of booking tools, data collection, route coordination, visitor information and monitoring	Transform strategic goals into daily destination management practice
Local businesses	Development of accommodation, food, guiding, transport, craft, wellness and cultural services connected with slow routes	Generate local income and employment while diversifying the tourism offer
Residents and community initiatives	Participation in consultations, route design, protection of local identity and feedback on tourism impacts	Ensure social acceptance and prevent tourism decisions from being detached from community needs
Environmental and cultural institutions	Assessment of sensitive sites, heritage interpretation, environmental education and control of resource use	Protect natural and cultural capital as the basis of long-term destination competitiveness
Visitors	Compliance with access rules, responsible consumption, use of local services and respect for community norms	Support the shift from passive consumption to responsible interaction with the destination

Source: developed by the author

The transformation of post-war recovery into sustainable destination development needs a phased sequence. A destination should not move directly from reconstruction to broad market promotion. Readiness assessment, controlled opening, localization of benefits, environmental stabilization and only then sustainable scaling create a safer trajectory. Such sequencing protects the destination from premature growth and gradually strengthens governance capacity.

The proposed stages are presented in table 5. They should be understood not only as chronological steps, but also as management thresholds. If a community has not confirmed safety, accessibility and basic monitoring, intensive tourism promotion is premature. If resident dissatisfaction increases, the destination should return to consultation and correction rather than expand visitor flows. If environmental pressure grows, access regulation should be strengthened before new marketing campaigns are launched.

Table 5

Stages of transforming post-war tourism recovery into sustainable destination development

Stage	Main management actions	Control indicators	SDG link
1. Initial recovery	Restoration of basic infrastructure, safety checks, identification of priority sites, minimum services and emergency information	Share of restored facilities; safety status of routes; accessibility of basic services; availability of visitor information	SDG 8, SDG 11
2. Controlled opening	Launch of limited visits, quotas, advance booking, information support and testing of selected routes	Daily visitor capacity; share of booked visits; number of capacity-exceeding days; incidents or complaints	SDG 11, SDG 12
3. Localization of benefits	Involvement of local entrepreneurs, farms, guides, crafts, food producers, cultural institutions and community initiatives	Share of local businesses in tourism services; tourist expenditure retained locally; tourism-related jobs created	SDG 8, SDG 12
4. Environmental stabilization	Development of low-impact routes, ecosystem protection, waste control, restricted access to sensitive areas and visitor education	Share of regulated eco-routes; reinvestment in environmental measures; condition of natural sites; number of violations	SDG 13, SDG 15
5. Sustainable scaling	Expansion of tourism activity after safety, quality, environmental and social acceptance thresholds have been reached	Average length of stay; resident satisfaction; tourist satisfaction; stability of local tourism revenues	SDG 8, SDG 11, SDG 15

Source: developed by the author

The proposed approach also changes the understanding of efficiency. In mass tourism, efficiency is often measured by the number of tourists, occupancy or total revenue. In post-war recovery based on slow tourism, such indicators are not enough. Growth is positive only when it does not undermine safety, community acceptance, infrastructure capacity or environmental stability. Therefore, the KPI system has to include not only economic indicators, but also social, environmental and governance indicators.

The KPI system must remain realistic for local use. It should not require overly complex data collection at the initial stage, because many communities will not have sufficient administrative capacity. Some indicators can be collected through administrative records, such as the number of visits, fee revenues, restored facilities or registered routes. Others require short surveys, for example resident satisfaction or visitor experience. Environmental indicators may be collected through route inspections, protected area reports or municipal monitoring.

Table 6 presents a structured KPI system for assessing post-war tourism infrastructure recovery based on slow tourism.

Table 6

KPI system for assessing post-war tourism infrastructure recovery based on slow tourism

Assessment block	Key indicators	Management purpose
Economic viability	Share of local businesses in tourism services; number of tourism-related jobs; average length of stay; tourist expenditure within the community; share of revenues retained locally	To assess whether tourism supports the local economy without reducing recovery to mass visitor growth
Social acceptability	Resident satisfaction with tourism; number of complaints; participation of residents in consultations; availability of inclusive routes; balance between visitor and community needs	To control the social legitimacy of tourism recovery and prevent conflicts over public space and local priorities
Environmental limits	Daily carrying capacity of sensitive sites; share of regulated eco-routes; number of environmental violations; waste collection indicators; investment in ecosystem protection	To prevent degradation of natural resources and ensure that tourism remains within ecological limits
Governance capacity	Availability of booking or registration systems; frequency of monitoring reports; transparency of tourism fee use; number of stakeholder meetings; use of data in decisions	To assess whether destination governance can manage tourism flows and correct decisions in time
Quality of visitor experience	Tourist satisfaction; share of repeat visits; evaluation of route interpretation; average length of stay; use of local services and products	To measure the qualitative value of tourism and support the shift from short consumption to meaningful experience
Contribution to SDGs	Alignment with SDG 8, 11, 12, 13 and 15; existence of SDG-linked local tourism goals; inclusion of indicators in recovery strategies	To connect local recovery decisions with broader sustainable development priorities

Source: developed by the author

The indicators presented in table 6 show that the quality of recovery cannot be measured by one variable. An increase in visitors may be positive if it is accompanied by longer stays, local spending, resident support and controlled environmental pressure. The same increase may be negative if it creates congestion, damages

natural sites or does not generate local benefits. Therefore, indicators should be interpreted as a system. Management decisions need correction when one group of indicators improves at the expense of another.

In the context of slow tourism, the quality of visitor experience becomes an important management category. A visitor who stays longer, uses local services, follows access rules and understands the meaning of the place may bring more value than several short-term visitors who overload the route and spend little locally. This does not mean that destinations should artificially limit all demand. Rather, they should shape demand through route design, interpretation, booking rules and communication that encourage responsible behaviour.

The model also influences investment priorities. In the first stages of recovery, large capital-intensive projects may not always be the most appropriate solution. More flexible investments in trail safety, signage, digital maps, interpretation, guide training, small service points, waste management and community-based products may produce faster and more sustainable effects. These investments correspond to the logic of slow tourism and can be expanded later if the destination demonstrates readiness.

An additional advantage of the proposed management logic is its compatibility with European approaches to sustainable territorial development. The emphasis on community participation, responsible resource use, climate-sensitive mobility, transparency and measurable indicators corresponds to the wider logic of SDGs, ESG-oriented governance and green recovery. For Ukraine, this is important not only for tourism policy, but also for integration into European development standards and practices of territorial management.

At the same time, the model has limitations. It is conceptual and requires empirical testing in specific communities with different levels of damage, tourism potential and institutional capacity. The proposed indicators may also need adaptation depending on data availability. Some destinations may be able to calculate a detailed sustainability index, while others may begin with a small set of basic indicators. This flexibility is not a weakness. On the contrary, it makes the approach more practical for post-war conditions.

Thus, strategic management of post-war tourism infrastructure recovery based on slow tourism relies on four connected principles: phased opening of territories, priority of safety and community acceptance, localization of economic benefits and measurability of outcomes. Together, these principles allow local authorities to move from the reconstruction of separate facilities to the formation of a more resilient tourism system.

Conclusions. The study shows that post-war tourism infrastructure recovery is not limited to rebuilding damaged facilities or restarting pre-war tourist flows. In territories affected by war, tourism becomes part of a wider recovery agenda. It can support local businesses, create jobs, restore the symbolic value of places, strengthen community identity and contribute to the country's international positioning. At the same time, these effects are possible only when tourism development is managed carefully and does not create new pressure on communities, infrastructure or natural resources.

The traditional growth-oriented approach is not sufficient for destinations that still face security risks, incomplete infrastructure readiness, social vulnerability and environmental sensitivity. The desire to demonstrate a quick revival may lead to premature promotion, concentration of visitors in a few accessible areas and weak control over tourism impacts. For this reason, post-war tourism governance should focus not only on attracting visitors, but also on defining the conditions under which tourism activity can safely and responsibly resume.

Slow tourism offers a useful strategic orientation for such conditions. Its value lies not in the rejection of tourism growth, but in changing its sequence and quality. Longer stays, local routes, interpretation of heritage, responsible mobility and stronger links with local businesses allow destinations to recover gradually. In this sense, slow tourism can be considered not only as a tourism product, but also as a governance approach that helps balance economic revival with social acceptance and environmental limits.

The proposed policy matrix translates this approach into practical instruments: quotas and advance booking, local tourism fees, seasonality management, slow routes, community participation and monitoring. These instruments are flexible and may be combined differently depending on the level of damage, security conditions, institutional capacity and local priorities. Their coordinated use can help communities avoid uncontrolled visitor growth, create a source of maintenance funding and increase trust in tourism decisions.

The KPI system proposed in the article makes sustainable recovery more measurable. It combines economic, social, environmental, governance and visitor-experience indicators. This allows destination managers to assess not only the scale of tourism activity, but also its usefulness for the community, its acceptance by residents, its environmental consequences and the quality of management. The connection with the Sustainable Development Goals gives the model a broader strategic orientation and makes it relevant for local and regional recovery programs.

The practical significance of the study lies in the possibility of applying the proposed framework in tourism recovery strategies of territorial communities, regional tourism programs and destination management plans. For Ukrainian territories, such an approach may help avoid premature mass promotion and support a

more careful sequence of reopening, local benefit creation and environmental protection. Further research should focus on testing the model in specific Ukrainian destinations, developing an integral index of post-war tourism recovery and assessing how slow-tourism instruments influence resident attitudes, local business development and environmental pressure over time.

References

1. Prayag, G. (2020). Time for reset? COVID-19 and tourism resilience. Tourism *Review International*, 24(2-3), 179-184. https://doi.org/10.3727/154427220X15926147793595

2. Jang, S., Park, J. S., & Choi, Y. T. (2022). Organizational resource and resilience in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 93, 103322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103322

3. Orchiston, C., Prayag, G., & Brown, C. (2016). Organizational resilience in the tourism sector. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 56, 145-148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.002

4. Martin, R., & Sunley, P. (2015). On the notion of regional economic resilience: Conceptualization and explanation. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 15(1), 1-42. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbu015

5. Boschma, R. (2015). Towards an evolutionary perspective on regional resilience. *Regional Studies*, 49(5), 733-751. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2014.959481

6. Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), 5. https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss2/art5/

7. Folke, C., Biggs, R., Norström, A. V., Reyers, B., & Rockström, J. (2016). Social-ecological resilience and biosphere-based sustainability science. *Ecology and Society*, 21(3), 41. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08748-210341

8. Sharpley, R. (2020). Tourism, sustainable development and the theoretical divide: 20 years on. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(11), 1932-1946. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1779732

9. Brouder, P. (2020). Reset redux: Possible evolutionary pathways towards the transformation of tourism in a COVID-19 world. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 484-490. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1760928

10. Lew, A. A., Cheer, J. M., Haywood, M., Brouder, P., & Salazar, N. B. (2020). Visions of travel after global crisis. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 455-466. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1770326

11. Zhang, F., Lv, Y., & Sarker, M. N. I. (2024). Resilience and recovery: A systematic review of tourism governance strategies in disaster-affected regions. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 103, 104350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2024.104350

12. Tymoshenko, T., Opanashchuk, Y., Yurchenko, K., Illiashenko, I., & Bogoslavets, O. (2024). Post-conflict revival of tourism: Sustainable models for communities and regions in Ukraine. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 7, 2024spe032. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2024spe032

13. Pathirana, M. T., Bigby, B. C., Scott, N., & Gardiner, S. (2024). Tourism development opportunities in post-war: A case of Jaffna, Sri Lanka. *Tourism Cases*, tourism202400069. https://doi.org/10.1079/tourism.2024.0069

Отримано: 14.04.2026
Прийнято до публікації: 15.05.2026
Опубліковано: 16.05.2026