

РОЗДІЛ 8. ТУРИЗМ

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS OF THE REGIONAL TOURIST COMPLEX
BALANCED FUNCTIONINGСТРАТЕГІЧНІ НАПРЯМИ ЗБАЛАНСОВАНОГО ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ
РЕГІОНАЛЬНОГО ТУРИСТИЧНОГО КОМПЛЕКСУ

A comprehensive diagnosis of the regional tourist complex was carried out according to four parameters: resource, ecological, consumer, infrastructural. Diagnostics was carried out both for the Dnipropetrovsk region as a whole and for seven administrative districts. The proposed system for evaluating the balanced development of the regional tourist complex, which, in addition to the geographical differentiation of the territory of the tourist region, allows parameterizing the entire process of managing tourism development from setting goals to developing a strategy and monitoring the implementation of regional strategic programs, makes it possible to calculate an integral indicator – a comparative index of tourist potential for displaying of the synergistic effect of the interaction of the determining factors of the balanced development of tourism in the region

Key words: strategy, recreational potential, administrative districts, comparative index, balanced development.

Стаття присвячена оптимізації процесу збалансованого управління регіональним туристичним комплексом на прикладі Дніпропетровської області. Предметом дослідження є сукупність теоретичних, методичних та прикладних умов щодо комплексного забезпечення збалансованого розвитку регіонального туристичного комплексу. Методи дослідження: порівняльний аналіз, ситуаційний підхід – для узагальнення міжнародного та вітчизняного досвіду збалансованого розвитку туристичної сфери; коефіцієнтний метод, факторний аналіз – для обґрунтування складових системи збалансованих показників як інструменту проектування регіональної туристично-рекреаційної системи, метод структурно-логічного узагальнення, статистичного групування – для діагностики стану регіонального розвитку туристично-рекреаційної системи на прикладі Дніпропетровської області. Проведено комплексну діагностику регіонального туристичного комплексу за чотирма параметрами: ресурсним, екологічним, споживчим, інфраструктурним. Діагностику проведено як по Дніпропетровській області в цілому, так і по семи адміністративним районам. Запропоновано систему оцінювання збалансованості розвитку регіонального туристичного комплексу, яка, крім географічної диференціації території туристичного регіону, дозволяє параметризувати весь процес управління розвитком туризму від постановки цілей до розробки стратегії та моніторингу реалізації регіональних стратегічних програм, дає змогу розрахувати інтегральний показник – порівняльний коефіцієнт туристичного потенціалу для відображення синергетичного ефекту взаємодії визначальних факторів збалансованого розвитку туризму в регіоні. Для концентрації рекреаційних функцій та врахування екологічної, соціальної, культурної та економічної стійкості функціонування туристичних зон доведено необхідність розробки особливих режимів використання територій на основні розрахунку гранично допустимих рівнів розвитку інфраструктури. Надано практичні рекомендації щодо здійснення науково обґрунтованого управління галузевим і територіальним розвитком туризму в додатково виділених зонах, що враховує всі аспекти доступного рекреаційного потенціалу адміністративних районів.

Ключові слова: стратегія, рекреаційний потенціал, адміністративні райони, порівняльний показник, збалансований розвиток.

UDC 338.48

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/bses.86-35>**Bieloborodova Mariia**Candidate of Economic Sciences,
Department of Tourism
and Enterprise Economics,
Dnipro University of Technology**Herasymenko Tetiana**Candidate of Geological Sciences,
Department of Tourism
and Enterprise Economics,
Dnipro University of Technology**Bezuhla Liudmyla**Doctor of Economic Sciences,
Department of Tourism
and Enterprise Economics,
Dnipro University of Technology

Problem statement. Tourism as a branch of the economy allows solving a wide range of socio-economic issues: increasing the employment of the population, stimulating entrepreneurial activity, increasing the income of the population and, as a result, increasing the revenue part of the region's budget. However, tourism is not a vital human need, the need to travel arises under certain conditions, primarily related to the level of income, political situation, cultural traditions, etc.

The tourism sector, unlike a number of other sectors of the national economy, mainly depends on the availability of natural, cultural, and historical resources, which requires close attention to their condition [2]. Each region of Ukraine has tourist territories, which are determined, first of all, by the

natural resource potential and the conditions for its development. The popularity of most tourist regions is based on the cleanliness of the environment and the originality of the local culture, therefore compliance with the principles of sustainable development should lead to the rational development of the tourist business. Now, in the conditions of strategic planning for the post-war reconstruction of Ukraine, the issues of sustainable development of tourism in the regions are becoming especially urgent, because we have a unique chance to ensure the further balanced development of the natural and socio-economic systems disrupted by the full-scale invasion of the Russian Federation into Ukraine. The necessity of strategic support for the sustainable development of nature-oriented tourism in territories

without a pronounced tourist attraction is becoming a particularly promising direction at the moment [4].

Currently, almost any area has the potential to be a popular tourist destination, provided the tourism potential is properly managed. But in reality, only a small part of Ukrainian territories rationally uses existing tourist opportunities and resource advantages. Many territories have low tourist attractiveness, while the main reasons for such an unstable state of tourism development are not the absence of notable tourist attractions, but the inefficient use of the existing tourist potential.

All of the above only emphasizes the need to find new approaches to the comprehensive provision of balanced development of the regional tourist complex, which was carried out in the framework of this study on the example of the Dnipropetrovsk region within its most tourist-attractive administrative districts.

Literature analysis. The problems of the balanced development of the tourism sphere are reflected in the scientific works of foreign and domestic authors, such as: D.O. Ositnyanko and T.Yu. Prymak [12]. It should also be noted the research of I.V. Lebedev [8], L.F. Melko [11] which emphasizes the importance of the sustainable development of tourism as a factor in the development of human potential. Ecological aspects of tourism development were studied in the work of I. Mykhailiuk [10].

A number of scientists conducted research on the assessment of the tourist potential of individual regions, such as, for example, Barvinok N. [1], regarding some communities of the Kirovohrad region, Yukhnovska Yu. [15], regarding the Zaporizhzhya region, Mashika G. [9] – regarding the Carpathian region, Yu. Osievska [13], regarding the current state and problem of updating the cultural heritage of Kirovohrad Oblast. Nevertheless, the problem of sustainable development and maximally effective involvement of the natural and recreational potential of territories with a low and medium level of tourist attraction remains relevant, which led to the choice of the research topic.

Research purpose. The object of the research is the process of balanced management of the regional tourist complex on the example of the Dnipropetrovsk region. The subject of the study is a set of theoretical, methodical and applied conditions regarding the comprehensive provision of balanced development of the regional tourist complex.

Research methods: comparative analysis, situational approach – to generalize the international and domestic experience of balanced development of the tourism sphere; coefficient method, factor analysis – to substantiate the components of the system of balanced indicators as a tool for ecological design of the regional tourism and recreation system, the method of structural and logical generalization,

statistical groupings, graphic – to diagnose the state of the regional tourism system on the example of the Dnipropetrovsk region.

Main results. The area of Dnipropetrovsk region is 31,914 square kilometers, which is 5.3% of the country's territory. By area, Dnipropetrovsk region ranks second in Ukraine.

The number of districts is 7, the number of settlements is 1,501, the population is 3176978, the number of territorial communities is 86. The administrative center of the region is the city of Dnipro, located on both banks of the Dnieper and its tributaries, the Samara. The region includes 20 cities, 45 urban-type settlements, 1435 rural settlements, located in the steppe zone of Ukraine. The landscape is mostly flat. In the west of the region, the significantly dissected Dnieper upland (height up to 209 m) stretches. Its southeastern part includes spurs of the Azov Upland (up to 211 m). The central part is occupied by the Dnieper Lowland, which in the south passes into the Black Sea.

From the northwest to the southeast, the region is crossed by the Dnipro River, the basin of which includes its tributaries – Oril, Samara with Vovcha, Mokra Sura, Bazavluk, Ingulets with Saksaganny and others. There are about 1500 reservoirs and ponds with an area of over 26000 hectares in the region. In the south, the territory of the region was washed by the waters of the Kakhovsky Reservoir, which was a source of water for many settlements in the Kherson, Zaporizhzhia, and Dnipropetrovsk regions. In particular, residents of Kryvyi Rih, Marganets, Pokrov and Nikopol began to face problems with water supply. The possibility of building new aqueducts and wells for the affected regions is being considered [14]. Detailed statistical data by districts of the region are given in the Table 1.

At the end of 2023, the State Tourism Development Agency of Ukraine updated the list of tourist magnets of Ukraine, which currently includes 170 attractions from all 25 regions of Ukraine. Among the presented tourist facilities are six locations from the Dnipropetrovsk region [6]. The following were recognized as “tourist magnets” of Dnipropetrovsk region:

1. Petrikivka Museum of Ethnography in the village of Petrikivka (Dnipro district).
2. Tokiv waterfall in Apostolivsky district (Kryvorizky district).
3. Quarry of the Southern Mining and Processing Plant in Kryvyi Rih (Kryvyi Rih district).
4. Palace of Culture in Zhovtyh Vody (Kamyansky district).
5. Vilnohorsky quarry “Dnipro Maldives” (Kamyansky district).
6. Holy Trinity Cathedral in Dnipro (Dnipro district).

For a more detailed analysis of the natural and cultural potential of the region in terms of administrative districts, we will analyze the constituent elements of

Table 1

Socio-demographic indicators by district of Dnipropetrovsk region

Name	Number of territorial communities	Number of settlements	Area of territorial communities, km ²	Population of the community, population
Dniprovsky	17	234	5605,6	1 170 525
Kamianskyi	12	274	4803,4	434 898
Kryvyi Rih	15	283	5724,9	764 916
Nikopolskyi	8	130	3246,7	259 040
Novomoskovskiy	8	110	3478,2	170 496
Pavlogradskiy	7	98	2430,1	171 485
Synelnykovskiy	19	372	6625,1	205 618

Source: [14]

the region's eco-network, as well as identify the main problems and ways to solve them.

Considering the information, it can be concluded that the following areas have the highest ecotourism potential:

1) Dniprovsky district (recreational areas (RA) – 1.06 thousand hectares; nature reserve fund (NRF) – 10.23 thousand hectares);

2) Novomoskovskiy district (RA – 0.48; NRF – 18.2);

3) Kryvyi Rih district (RA – 0.39; NRF – 4.58).

Petrikivska community deserves special attention as a place of concentration of historical, ethnographic and ecological traditions of hospitality (since 2020, as a result of the administrative and territorial reform, it is part of the Dnipro district). Among the problems of the region, it should be emphasized that there are a large number of communities in the districts that do not have nature reserves at all. In terms of the number of such communities, the Dnipropetrovsk region ranks third in the anti-rating – after Odesa and Mykolaiv regions (Table 3).

We detail the objects of the nature reserve fund by administrative districts, which have the highest

attractive potential (according to DART materials), namely: Dniprovsky, Kryvorizky, Kamianskyi. Despite the fairly significant representation of the objects of the nature reserve fund in the district, it should be noted that in 5 communities they are completely absent, this requires additional regulation by the regional department of ecology.

In Kamianskyi district, 2 territorial communities do not have nature reserve fund facilities. A separate problem of the district is the situation that has developed at the uranium facilities of the Prydniprovsk Chemical Plant. The “Sukhachivske” tailings storage facility poses a potential danger to the environment and the health of the population, but today the question of restoring its safe operation is being resolved: the monitoring of the radiation and ecological condition on the territory of the tailings storage facility is carried out, its technical condition is being monitored, and the project of the system for monitoring the geotechnical condition of the dam has been developed tailings storage facilities.

As for the Kryvyi Rih District, it should be noted that industrial tourism is systematically practiced

Table 2

Components of the structural elements of the ecological network in the section of units of the administrative and territorial organization of the region

Name of the administrative district	Objects of the nature reserve fund	Wetlands	Open wetlands	Coastal protective strips	Forests and other wooded areas	Resort and health-rehabilitation areas	Recreational areas	Open lands without plant cover	Pastures, hayfields
Dniprovsky	12,118	-	1,646	23,25	33,568	0,027	0,098	2,932	50,094
Kamianskyi	10,231	2,56	7,943	24,568	38,735	0,001	1,056	5,986	57,325
Kryvyi Rih	4,589	-	0,993	29,69	21,803	0,013	0,39	10	45,963
Nikopolskyi	5,39	-	0,766	42,53	10,783	-	0,186	2,021	24,445
Novomoskovskiy	18,218	-	7,982	11,15	28,901	0,037	0,476	8,585	36,074
Pavlogradskiy	12,274	-	3,135	4	17,494	0,005	0,095	2,768	37,447
Synelnykovskiy	32,141	-	3,716	9,99	31,414	-	0,078	2,865	80,675

Source: [6]

only here. The museum of the Southern Mining and Processing Plant operates directly in Kryvyi Rih. The most interesting thing here is the interactive model of the ore extraction cycle in the quarry. Also interesting is the Petrivsky dump. It impresses with whole mountains of rocks of different shades and creates the illusion of alienness. Unfortunately, 5 territorial communities in the district do not have nature reserve facilities – this is a third of the total number of communities in the district, and they are the largest in terms of area. This requires additional regulation.

Environmental problems in the region are associated with an increased level of atmospheric air pollution. Industrial enterprises of mining and metallurgical, fuel and energy, chemical complexes and transport are the main sources of air pollution.

At the same time, in 2022, emissions of pollutants into the atmospheric air from stationary sources of pollution decreased by 7,3% compared to the previous year and amounted to 534,7 thousand tons. In addition, 20,5 million tons of carbon dioxide – the main greenhouse gas that affects climate change.

Wastewater discharge into surface water bodies in 2022 amounted to 600,386 million m³ (35,676 million m³ more than in 2020), of which: polluted – 120,326 million m³; normatively clean without treatment – 307,916 million m³; normatively cleaned – 172,144 million m³.

The issue of accumulation and disposal of industrial waste is of national importance, since most of the waste contains substances harmful to the environment and humans. Solving the problem of waste disposal means cleaning the environment of toxic substances and ballast and obtaining useful products and, as a consequence, an economic effect.

Waste recycling is of great environmental importance, as it helps to protect the environment from the negative impact of waste and ensures economical use of material and energy resources.

The territories of large cities, the territories of the development of mineral deposits, as well as the coastal zones of large reservoirs and rivers (in some areas) are strongly disturbed by landslide processes. Several areas are clearly distinguished, where landslide activity is characterized by high intensity and causes damage to the national economy. The territory of the greatest spread of landslides is the right bank of the Dnipro River and its tributaries, the Samara River basin.

Within the Dniprovsko-Orilsky nature reserve, there is a direct threat of degradation of its hydroscapes due to changes in the hydrological regime of the lakes, their silting and waterlogging. Without the implementation (permitted by the current legislation) of measures to restore native natural landscapes, this unique system will turn into a system of stagnant non-flowing shallow marshes in no later than 5–10 years, which will inevitably lead to the loss of biological diversity and, accordingly, the leading role of water land “Dnipro-Orilsk floodplain”, in the preservation of unique landscapes and individual animals of the Dnieper steppe.

The strategy is the foundation and at the same time a tool for the management and development of the tourist destination. The long-term strategies developed by the state determine the priority areas of tourism development and represent a system of ideas and measures of state management aimed at creating conditions for tourism activities and strengthening the competitiveness of territorial entities. The strategy is the basis for the development of comprehensive

Table 3

Communities of the Dnipropetrovsk region that do not have objects and territories of the nature reserve fund

Area	The name of the territorial community	Square of the territorial community (km ²)	Area	The name of the territorial community	Square of the territorial community (km ²)
Kryvyi Rih	Zelenodolska	310,4	Dniprovsky	Sviatova-sylovskaya	306,7
Kryvyi Rih	Nivotru-divska	129,3	Dniprovsky	Novopo-krovska	530,2
Kryvyi Rih	Sofiivska	667,9	Dniprovsky	Mohylivska	243,2
Kryvyi Rih	Devladvivska	408,6	Dniprovsky	Petrykivska	841,0
Kryvyi Rih	Vakulivska	285,3	Dniprovsky	Chumakivska	192,9
Kamianskyi	Zhovtovodsk	79,1	Nikopolskyi	Nikopolska	50,7
Kamianskyi	Pyatikhatska	500,3	Nikopolskyi	Pershravnevska	2,9
Pavlogradskyi	Ternivska	14,3	Nikopolskyi	Tomakivska	669,0
Pavlogradskyi	Pavlogradska	58,8	-	-	-
Territorial community without nature reserve fund			17	19,76%	5290,6

Source: [14]

tourism development programs for the medium-term perspective, long-term target programs for the development of tourism at the regional and municipal levels, long-term and short-term forecasts, budgets and legislative initiatives in the field of tourism.

A balanced tourism development strategy will help ensure sustainable growth and preserve natural and cultural resources for future generations. Involvement of all interested stakeholders and consideration of various aspects of development are key elements of success.

The development and implementation of a regionally differentiated strategy for the development of tourism in the Dnipropetrovsk region requires a strict sequence of scientific and methodological operations, set by the modern socio-economic conditions of the development of the tourist complex, constructive trends in tourism, regional priorities and limitations in the development of tourism, as well as the standard logic of a successful strategic process (in particular, regional development).

The priority of scientific support for the sustainable development of tourism in the region is the development of criteria for the functioning of regional tourist complexes – tourist zones, the creation of a system for measuring and tracking the parameters of control of regional tourism development.

Taking into account the structural complexity of tourism as a socio-economic phenomenon, a system of balanced indicators is proposed as a methodical method of parametrizing the process of strategic management of tourism development at the regional level, which takes into account the key factors, conditions, and limitations of tourism development in administrative districts and tourist zones.

The main factors determining the regional development of tourism are resource, environmental, consumer, infrastructure factors. Regional value criteria are selected as specific indicators within the above-mentioned key factors of sustainable development of tourism (KFSD). For the resource factor, it is an indicator of saturation of administrative districts with cultural and historical monuments, an indicator of the attractiveness of natural potential and attractiveness of resources. For the ecological KFSD – indicators of technogenic transformation of the territory (in particular, radioactive contamination of the territory of the region in the area of tailings of the former Prydniprovsk Chemical Plant, Kamianske) and the ecological balance of ecosystems. The consumer factor is taken into account according to the indicator of the intensity of tourist flows. The infrastructural factor includes such regional value criteria as the level of development of the hotel and transport network, catering enterprises, the entertainment and entertainment sphere, and the sanatorium and resort economy. The calculation and accounting of each of the regional value criteria

makes it possible to assess the balance of socio-economic tasks of tourism development and the preservation of its resource potential using the integral indicator of tourism potential or the coefficient of sustainable development in the administrative area [3].

The strength of the influence of the factor is determined using the integral indicator of the influence of the tourism factor, which is calculated using formula (1):

$$I_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{Q} v_j, \quad (1)$$

where I_i – integral indicator of the impact of the tourism development factor; w_j – the value of the indicator of the administrative district, expressed in the system of physical quantities; v_j – weight factor of the indicator; Q – the value of the regional factor in the same system of units [7].

The ecological assessment of the potential of administrative districts has been tested to ensure the balanced development of tourism in the Dnipropetrovsk oblast. For each administrative district, the above-mentioned KFSD indicators of resource, environmental, consumer, infrastructure factors are calculated.

For the integral expression of the interaction of the key factors of the sustainable development of tourism (the balance of the consumption of tourist resources and the preservation of the tourist potential), a comparative index of the tourist potential is proposed (formula 2):

$$P = \sum_{i=1}^n I_i k_j, \quad (2)$$

where P – comparative index of the tourist potential of the administrative district; I_i – integral indicator of the impact of the tourism factor; k_j – intensity factor.

Resource factor:

– indicator of saturation with cultural and historical sights: the number of tourist magnets according to the DART [6] classification on the territory of the district (R_1);

– indicator of attractiveness of natural potential: the ratio of recreational areas to the population of the district (R_2);

– indicator of attractiveness of resources: the ratio of resort and health resort areas to the population of the district (R_3);

Environmental factor:

– indicator of the level of environmental pollution: the number of enterprises – the largest polluters of the environment (E_1);

– indicator of protected areas: the percentage of nature reserve fund of territories from the total area of the community (E_2); the percentage of territories of communities of the district without nature reserve fund (E_3);

– indicator of greening of the territory: the percentage of territories without plant cover from the total area of the community (E_4).

Consumer factor:

– demographic indicator: population density (C_1);

– indicator of gross regional product: the percentage of GRP in the total GDP of the country (C_2) is the only one for the region.

The infrastructural factor is a point estimate of the number of indicators of the development of hospitality, transport, public catering enterprises, entertainment and entertainment, sanatorium and resort economy, sports infrastructure (I_1) – the only one for the region.

The calculation of partial factors is given in Table 4, generalized integral indicators are given in Table 5.

The analysis of the values of the comparative indices of tourist potential calculated for each administrative district makes it possible to single out the most promising administrative districts for investment in the development of tourism (P values range from 0.16 to 0.52). However, when carrying out tourist zoning of the region, it is necessary to exclude from the borders of the districts with the highest

relevant potential communities that do not have nature-protected territories.

The value of the integral indicator of the tourist potential of administrative regions, as well as the similarity of tourist resources, similar ecological parameters, the level of development of tourist infrastructure, the projection of the key territories of the eco-network of the region on the borders of communities, the characteristics of demand and supply made it possible to differentiate the territory of Dnipropetrovsk oblast with the selection of tourist zones: Kryvorizka; Pavlogradska; Northern (Kamianskyi, Dniprovsky, Novomoskovsky districts), with the exception of the Krynychansk, Magdalinovsky, Solonyansk territorial communities.

The proposed regional value criteria for the sustainable development of tourism in the planned tourist zones can be used as indicators for monitoring the ecological, social, cultural, and economic sustainability of tourist zones (Table 6). At the same time, both the integral indicators of resource, ecological, consumer and infrastructural key factors of tourism development, as well as the values of the integral indicators of the tourist potential of administrative districts are controlled.

Table 4

Calculation of partial factor indicators of the balanced system of development of the regional tourist complex

Name of the district	R_1	R_2	R_3	E_1	E_2	E_3	E_4	C_1	C_2	I_1
Dniprovsky	2	0,90	0,0009	8	0,18	0,82	0,11	0,21	0,82	0,75
Kamianskyi	2	0,23	0,0621	9	0,25	0,75	0,06	0,09	0,82	0,75
Kryvyi Rih	2	0,51	0,0170	14	0,08	0,92	0,17	0,13	0,82	0,75
Nikopolskyi	0	0,72	0,0182	3	0,17	0,83	0,06	0,08	0,82	0,75
Novomoskovskiy	0	2,79	0,2170	1	0,52	0,48	0,15	0,05	0,82	0,75
Pavlogradskiy	0	0,55	0,0292	6	0,51	0,49	0,11	0,07	0,82	0,75
Synelnykovskiy	0	0,38	0,0150	5	0,49	0,51	0,04	0,03	0,82	0,75
The weight of the factor	0,25	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,05	0,05	0,1	0,05	0,05	0,15

Source: calculated by the author

Table 5

Tourist potential of administrative districts of Dnipropetrovsk region

Area	Integral indicators				Comparative index of tourist potential of the area
	Resourceful	Ecological	Consumer	Infra-structural	
Dniprovsky	0,590	0,861	0,0515	0,1125	0,42
Kamianskyi	0,529	0,956	0,0455	0,1125	0,41
Kryvyi Rih	0,553	1,467	0,0475	0,1125	0,52
Nikopolskyi	0,074	0,356	0,042	0,1125	0,13
Novomoskovskiy	0,301	0,165	0,0435	0,1125	0,18
Pavlogradskiy	0,058	0,661	0,0445	0,1125	0,19
Synelnykovskiy	0,040	0,554	0,0425	0,1125	0,16
Coefficients of the intensity of influence of factors	0,35	0,2	0,2	0,25	-

Table 6

Directions for monitoring the operation of tourist zones

Tourist areas	Factors of balanced development of tourism			
	Resourceful	Ecological	Consumer	Infra-structural
North	+	++	–	++
Pavlogradskiy	–	–	++	–
Kryvyi Rih	–	++	++	–

Conditional marks:

- ++ system of strict control, which is carried out once a month;
- + a system of moderate control, which is carried out once every six months;
- a system of soft control carried out annually.

Source: developed by the author

The system of balanced indicators of sustainable development of tourism allows:

- to highlight the determinant factors of socio-economic development of tourism and preservation of its tourist resource potential to maintain their balance;
- to use them as a model for inventorying the resources of the tourist zone;
- to parameterize the KFSD to transfer the tasks of sustainable development to the category of working indicators of assessment and comparison;
- to calculate the value of indicators of regional value criteria of sustainable development from each group of the KFSD for each administrative district;
- to introduce and calculate an integral indicator – a comparative index of tourism potential to reflect the synergistic effect of the interaction of the determinant factors of the sustainable development of tourism in the region;
- to design administrative districts with similar indicators of the KFSD and an integral indicator – a comparative index of tourist potential – for the concentration of recreational functions and taking into account the ecological, social, cultural and economic sustainability of the functioning of tourist zones, necessary for the development of territory exploitation regimes, the calculation of maximum permissible levels of association efforts of district administrations in the development of infrastructure, creation of a tourist product and its promotion;
- to choose the optimal option of recreational influence, which does not violate the natural trend of development of tourist areas;
- to use the system as monitoring indicators for informational support of control and management of determinant factors of sustainable development of tourism in constructed tourist zones in the event that unbalanced development of tourism is detected;
- to conduct scientifically based management of the industry and territorial development of tourism in the zones (Northern, Kryvorizka, Pavlogradska),

which takes into account all aspects of the throughput potential as the sum of the maximum permissible loads of administrative districts.

Conclusions. The use of a system of balanced indicators as the main tool for the ecological design of tourist zones that function in a balanced way fully corresponds to the modern information and investment model of the development of the tourism sphere, when the most important factor is not the natural resource potential, but geo-informational and innovative investment support for the competitiveness of the tourist region on the domestic and foreign markets.

For the appropriate selection of a strategy for the balanced development of the potential of the tourism industry of the regions, it is advisable to use the methodical approach of the comprehensive assessment of the potential of the tourism industry of the regions of Ukraine by determining the importance of the indicators and substantiating the integral assessment of the balanced development of the potential of the tourism industry of the region of the country.

Assessing the potential of the tourism industry must take into account all these aspects, and requires the cooperation of various stakeholders, including the government, local authorities, civil society organizations, businesses and academic experts. Such an analysis will help determine the strengths and weaknesses of the current strategy and develop plans for the further development of tourism in Ukraine.

REFERENCES:

1. Barvinok, N. (2023) Otsinka turystychno-rekreatyivnoho potentsialu i turystychnoyi infrastruktury Hayvorons'koyi ta Zavalivs'koyi terytorial'nykh hromad Kirovohrads'koyi oblasti [Assessment of tourist and recreational potential and tourist infrastructure of Hayvoron and Zavaliv territorial communities of Kirovohrad region]. *Ekonomichni horyzonty*, vol. 2(24), pp. 4–20. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31499/2616-5236.2\(24\).2023.281149](https://doi.org/10.31499/2616-5236.2(24).2023.281149)

2. Bezuhla, L.S. (2020) Rehional'ni osoblyvosti rozvytku ekoturystychnoyi diyal'nosti v Ukraini: porivnyal'nyy analiz [Regional features of the development of ecotourism in Ukraine: a comparative analysis]. *Visnyk ekonomichnoyi nauky Ukrainy*, № 2 (39), pp. 50–57. DOI: 10.37405/1729-7206.2020.2(39).50-57. Available at: [http://www.venu-journal.org/download/2020/2\(39\)/07-Bezuhla.pdf](http://www.venu-journal.org/download/2020/2(39)/07-Bezuhla.pdf)

3. Bieloborodova, M., Yurchyshyna, L., Kozynets', A. (2021) Potentsial rozvytku ekoturizmu v rehionakh Ukrainy [Potential for the development of ecotourism in the regions of Ukraine]. *Industriya turizmu i hostynnosti v Tsentral'niy ta Skhidniy Yevropi*, vol. 3, pp. 5–11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36477/tourismhospcee-3-1>

4. Bondarenko, L.A. (2023) Doslidzhennya prohram rozvytku v rehionakh Ukrainy [Study of development programs in the regions of Ukraine]. *Industriya turizmu i hostynnosti v Tsentral'niy ta Skhidniy Yevropi*, vol. 8, pp. 5–10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/tourismhospcee-8-1>

5. Herasymenko, T.V., Reuchenko, B.M., Korostyl'ov, R.I. (2023) Vplyv turystychnoho potentsialu na sotsial'no-ekonomichnyy rozvytok m. Novomoskovs'ka Dnipropetrovs'koyi oblasti [The impact of tourism potential on the socio-economic development of the city of Novomoskovsk, Dnipropetrovsk region]. *Ukrayins'kyi zhurnal prykladnoyi ekonomiky ta tekhniki*, no. 4, pp. 44–48.

6. State Tourism Development Agency of Ukraine. Official site. Available at: <https://www.tourism.gov.ua/>

7. Karyuk, V.I. (2019) Pryvablyvist' turizmu yak skladova konkurentospromozhnosti Ukrainy [attractiveness of tourism as a component of Ukraine's competitiveness]. *Universytet ekonomiky ta prava «KROK»*, № 3 (35), pp. 46–55. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/tppe.2019.39.5>

8. Lebedyev, I.V. (2021) Rekreatsiya i turizm yak faktory rozvytku lyuds'koho potentsialu [Recreation and tourism as factors in the development of human potential]. *Visnyk sotsial'no-ekonomichnykh doslidzhen*, no. 3–4 (78–79), pp. 143–158. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33987/vsed.3-4\(78-79\).2021.143-158](https://doi.org/10.33987/vsed.3-4(78-79).2021.143-158)

9. Mashika, H.V. (2017) Turystychno-hospodars'kyu potentsial Karpat-s'koho rehionu yak dominuyucha skladova yoho efektyvnoho vykorystannya [tourism and economic potential of the Carpathian region as a dominant component of its effective use]. *Visnyk Kharkivs'koho natsional'noho universytetu imeni V.N. Karazina: zb. nauk. prats'*. Seriya: «Neolohiya – Neohrafiya – Ekolohiya», no. 46, pp. 113–121.

10. Mykhaulyuk, I. (2022) Ekolohichni aspekty rozvytku turizmu [Ecological aspects of tourism development]. *Rozvytok metodiv upravlinnya ta hospodaryuvannya na transporti*, vol. 4(81), pp. 124–131.

11. Mel'ko, L.F. (2017) Turizm u konteksti staloho rozvytku [Tourism in the context of sustainable development]. *Vcheni zapysky Universytetu «KROK»*. VNZ «Universytet ekonomiky ta prava «KROK», vol. 48, pp. 190–197.

12. Ositnyanko, D.O., Prymak, T.Yu. (2020) Vprovadzhennya pryntsypiv staloho rozvytku v turystychniy industriyi [Implementation of the principles of sustainable development in the tourism industry].

Efektivna ekonomika, vol. 1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105-2020.1.152>

13. Osiyevs'ka, Yu.S. (2022) Kul'turna spadshchyna Kirovohrads'koyi oblasti: suchasnyy stan i problemy aktualizatsiyi [Cultural heritage of the Kirovohrad region: current state and problems of actualization]. *Pytannya kul'turolohiyi*, vol. 40, pp. 242–253.

14. Prohrama rozvytku turizmu u Dnipropetrovs'koyi oblasti na 2014–2022 roky [Tourism development program in the Dnipropetrovsk region for 2014–2022]. Rishennya sesiyi oblasnoyi rady vid 20.06.2014 № 532-26/M.

15. Yukhnovs'ka, Yu.O. (2019) Kompleksnyy metod otsinky efektyvnosti potentsialu turystychnoyi haluzi [Complex method of assessing the effectiveness of the potential of the tourism industry]. *Evropskyi časopis ekonomiky a managementu. Chekhiya*, vol. 5. Iss. 2, pp. 71–78.

БІБЛІОГРАФІЧНИЙ СПИСОК:

1. Барвінок Н. Оцінка туристично-рекреаційного потенціалу і туристичної інфраструктури Гайворонської та Завалівської територіальних громад Кіровоградської області. *Економічні горизонти*. 2023. № 2(24). С. 4–20. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31499/2616-5236.2\(24\).2023.281149](https://doi.org/10.31499/2616-5236.2(24).2023.281149).

2. Bezuhla L.S. Regional Features of Ecotourism Activity Development in Ukraine: Comparative Analysis. *Visnyk ekonomichnoyi nauky Ukrainy*. 2020. № 2 (39). P. 50–57. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.37405/1729-7206.2020.2\(39\).50-57](https://doi.org/10.37405/1729-7206.2020.2(39).50-57)

3. Белобородова М., Юрчишина Л., Козинець А. Потенціал розвитку екотуризму в регіонах України. *Індустрія туризму і гостинності в Центральній та Східній Європі*. 2021. № 3. С. 5–11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36477/tourismhospcee-3-1>.

4. Бондаренко Л.А. Дослідження програм розвитку в регіонах України. *Індустрія туризму і гостинності в Центральній та Східній Європі*. 2023. № 8. С. 5–10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/tourismhospcee-8-1>

5. Герасименко Т., Реученко Б., Коростильов Р. Вплив туристичного потенціалу на соціально-економічний розвиток м. Новомосковська Дніпропетровської області. *Український журнал прикладної економіки та техніки*. 2023. № 4. С. 44–48.

6. Державне агентство розвитку туризму України. Офіційний сайт. URL: <https://www.tourism.gov.ua/>

7. Карюк В.І. Привабливість туризму як складова конкурентоспроможності України. *Університет економіки та права «КРОК»*. 2019. № 3 (35). С. 46–55. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/tppe.2019.39.5>

8. Лебедев І.В. Рекреація і туризм як фактори розвитку людського потенціалу. *Вісник соціально-економічних досліджень*. 2021. № 3–4 (78–79). С. 143–158. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33987/vsed.3-4\(78-79\).2021.143-158](https://doi.org/10.33987/vsed.3-4(78-79).2021.143-158).

9. Машіка Г.В. Туристично-господарський потенціал Карпатського регіону як домінуюча складова його ефективного використання. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В.Н. Каразіна: зб. наук. праць. Серія: «Геологія – Географія – Екологія»*. 2017. Вип. 46. С. 113–121.

10. Михайлюк І. Екологічні аспекти розвитку туризму. *Розвиток методів управління та господарювання на транспорті*. 2022. № 4(81). С. 124–131.

11. Мелько Л.Ф. Туризм у контексті сталого розвитку. *Вчені записки Університету «КРОК». ВІЗ «Університет економіки та права «КРОК»*. Вип. 48., 2017. С. 190–197.

12. Осітнянко Д.О., Примак Т.Ю. Впровадження принципів сталого розвитку в туристичній індустрії. *Ефективна економіка*. 2020. № 1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105-2020.1.152>

13. Осієвська Ю.С. Культурна спадщина Кіровоградської області: сучасний стан і проблеми актуалізації. *Питання культурології*. 2022. № 40. С. 242–253.

14. Програма розвитку туризму у Дніпропетровській області на 2014–2022 роки: Рішення сесії обласної ради від 20.06.2014 № 532-26/VI.

15. Юхновська Ю. О. Комплексний метод оцінки ефективності потенціалу туристичної галузі. *Evropský časopis ekonomiky a managementu*. Чехія, 2019. Vol. 5. Iss. 2. P. 71–78.