

UDC: 342.9:351.83

DOI 10.35433/ISSN2410-3748-2025-2(37)-7

Khayuk Maksym
Master of Public Administration, Postgraduate Student,
Department of Law and Public Administration
Ivan Franko Zhytomyr State University

ORGANIZATIONAL AND LEGAL MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTING STATE POLICY IN THE SPHERE OF LABOR PROTECTION IN UKRAINE

The article provides a comprehensive analysis of the organizational and legal mechanisms for implementing state occupational safety policy in Ukraine. The study examines occupational safety in both its broad and narrow interpretations. From a broad perspective, occupational safety is defined as a comprehensive system of legal norms regulating the entire spectrum of social relations in the sphere of employment. The narrow interpretation focuses specifically on normative restrictions regarding the employment of certain worker categories, representing a specialized legal regime within occupational safety regulation.

The study identifies several fundamental characteristics of occupational safety. The social dimension prioritizes human life and health as supreme social values within the labor process, establishing worker protection as a cornerstone of state social policy. The economic aspect entails the employer's responsibility to provide proper working conditions, creating an environment where both employee welfare and broader state economic interests are optimized. The legal dimension manifests through explicit regulatory guarantees for preserving workers' life and health, formally established in normative acts. The supervisory-control function enables state verification of employer compliance through specially authorized bodies. Furthermore, occupational safety demonstrates interdisciplinary connections with sociology, safety engineering, ecology, labor hygiene and physiology, psychology, engineering psychology, technical aesthetics, and related fields.

The implementation of state policy in occupational safety is framed by a system of specific principles. These include: the primacy of workers' life and health; full employer responsibility for establishing proper, safe, and healthy working conditions; enhancement of industrial safety through comprehensive technical oversight of production processes, technologies, and products, alongside state support for enterprises in creating safe work environments; integrated solutions based on national, sectoral, and regional programs aligned with socioeconomic policies, scientific advancements, and environmental protection; social protection of workers with full compensation for occupational injuries and diseases; uniform safety standards for all enterprises regardless of ownership or activity type; adaptation of labor processes to workers' physiological and psychological capacities; and economic management methods, including state funding and voluntary contributions for safety measures.

Keywords: *organizational-legal mechanisms, state policy, occupational safety (broad/narrow interpretation), labor, work activity, occupational health and safety, institutional framework, legal regulation of labor protection.*

ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНО-ПРАВОВІ МЕХАНІЗМИ РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ ДЕРЖАВНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ У СФЕРІ ОХОРОНИ ПРАЦІ В УКРАЇНІ

У статті проаналізовано організаційно-правові механізми реалізації державної політики у сфері охорони праці в Україні. Розглянуто охорону праці у широкому та вузькому розумінні. Зазначено, що у широкому значенні, під охороною праці розуміють сукупність правових норм, що регулюють увесь комплекс суспільних відносин у сфері застосування праці. До них належать норми, що забороняють працівників, – розглядають як поняття охорони праці у вузькому значенні. Виділено основні ознаки охорони праці: соціальна – ставлення до людини, її життя та здоров'я як до найвищої соціальної цінності у процесі виконання останньою трудової діяльності повинно сприйматися як один із фундаментальних напрямів соціальної політики держави; економічна – полягає у забезпеченні роботодавцем належних та безпечних умов праці, за яких найбільш ефективно будуть реалізовуватися економічні інтереси працівника, а отже, і держави в цілому; правова – гарантії забезпечення збереження життя і здоров'я працівника прямо передбачені нормативно - правовими актами, встановлюються й утверджуються ними; контрольно-наглядова – держава створює ряд вимог до роботодавця щодо забезпечення останнім належних умов праці і перевіряє їх виконання через спеціально уповноважені на те органи; зв'язок з іншими науками (соціологія, безпека життєдіяльності, екологія, гігієна й фізіологія праці, психологія, інженерна психологія, технічна естетика тощо). Окреслено, що реалізація державної політики у сфері охорону праці відбувається через систему конкретних обумовлених принципів, а саме: пріоритету життя і здоров'я працівників, повної відповідальності роботодавця за створення належних, безпечних і здорових умов праці; підвищення рівня промислової безпеки шляхом забезпечення суцільного технічного контролю за станом виробництв, технологій та продукції, а також сприяння підприємствам у створенні безпечних та нешкідливих умов праці; комплексного розв'язання завдань охорони праці на основі загальнодержавної, галузевих, регіональних програм з цього питання та з урахуванням інших напрямів економічної і соціальної політики, досягнень у галузі науки і техніки та охорони довкілля; соціального захисту працівників, повного відшкодування шкоди особам, які потерпіли від нещасних випадків на виробництві та професійних захворювань; встановлення єдиних вимог з охорони праці для всіх підприємств та суб'єктів підприємницької діяльності незалежно від форм власності та видів діяльності; адаптації трудових процесів до можливостей працівника з урахуванням його здоров'я та психологічного стану; використання економічних методів управління охороною праці, участі держави у фінансуванні заходів щодо охорони праці, залучення добровільних внесків та інших надходжень на ці цілі, отримання яких не суперечить законодавству тощо.

Ключові слова: *організаційно-правові механізми, державна політика охорони праці у широкому та вузькому розумінні, праця, трудова діяльність, охорона праці, безпека праці, інституційне забезпечення охорони праці, правове забезпечення охорони праці.*

Problem Statement. Labor represents not merely a fundamental sphere of societal activity but the very cornerstone of human existence. As the basis for individual livelihood and social organization, work directly shapes the formation and evolution of social relations. Consequently, the paramount obligation of any democratic state lies in establishing optimal conditions for productive labor while ensuring its comprehensive protection. This imperative necessitates developing effective mechanisms that safeguard workers' wellbeing while maintaining economic productivity, creating a crucial intersection between social welfare and economic policy where state intervention becomes both justified and essential.

According to International Labour Organization estimates, workplace accidents and occupational diseases claim approximately 2 million lives annually, with associated economic costs exceeding \$1.25 trillion USD. ILO statistical data reveals that 4% of global GDP is lost due to workplace incidents and professional illnesses. Worldwide, 270 million occupational accidents and 160 million cases of occupational diseases occur each year.

These global occupational safety challenges are intrinsically linked to economic globalization processes. Intensified competitive pressure frequently leads employers to compromise safety standards, viewing injury prevention and worker health protection not as integral quality management components but as impediments to cost reduction. Outdated equipment prohibited in many developed countries floods markets in economically vulnerable nations and free trade zones where occupational safety and health regulations typically remain underdeveloped.

This situation particularly affects Ukraine, where accidents, injuries and occupational diseases result in annual economic losses exceeding 1 billion UAH, highlighting the urgent need for comprehensive occupational safety reforms aligned with international standards.

Ukraine's contemporary societal development necessitates innovative approaches specifically tailored to establish working conditions and safety standards that prioritize human welfare. This evolving paradigm elevates the strategic

importance of enhancing the occupational safety and health management framework as a fundamental component of the nation's socioeconomic advancement. The transformation demands systematic modernization of regulatory mechanisms, implementation of evidence-based safety protocols, and integration of international best practices to address existing structural deficiencies. Such comprehensive reforms are essential not only for protecting workforce wellbeing but also for strengthening economic competitiveness and aligning with European governance standards in the post-industrial era.

Literature Review and Research Context. The scholarly discourse on state social policy, particularly regarding labor relations, workforce potential, working conditions, and occupational safety, has been significantly advanced by numerous Ukrainian researchers. Notable contributions include the works of M. Bilinska, D. Bohynia, N. Boretska, V. Hoshovska, O. Hrishnova, H. Danylyshyn, T. Zaiets, A. Kolot, M. Kravchenko, E. Libanova, O. Makarova, V. Novikov, V. Onikienko, M. Orlaty, O. Petroie, A. Revenko, V. Skuratovskyi, V. Steshenko, V. Tropina, V. Troshchynskyi, V. Cherenko, N. Yarosh, among other distinguished scholars. Their collective research provides a comprehensive foundation for understanding the complex interplay between labor protection frameworks and socioeconomic development, establishing critical theoretical and methodological approaches that inform contemporary analysis in this field.

Various dimensions of enhancing working conditions and occupational safety as catalysts for improving societal production efficiency have been systematically examined by prominent Ukrainian scholars. Significant contributions to understanding state policy mechanisms in this domain have been made by A. Amosha, G. Gogitashvili, V. Dzhihyrej, V. Zhydetskyi, A. Kutyrikin, L. Kerb, L. Lohacheva, N. Lukianchenko, O. Martiakova, I. Mytsenko, O. Novikova, K. Tkachuk, S. Tkachuk, L. Shaulska, V. Shulha, among other distinguished researchers. Their collective investigations have established crucial theoretical foundations for analyzing the interconnection between occupational safety systems and economic productivity.

This study aims to conduct a comprehensive analysis of organizational and legal mechanisms implementing state occupational safety policy, while systematically examining the pathways for their effective implementation within Ukraine's socioeconomic context. The investigation seeks to identify optimal regulatory frameworks and institutional arrangements that can simultaneously ensure worker protection and enhance production efficiency.

Presentation of the main material. The institutional architecture for executing state occupational safety policy in Ukraine encompasses a multi-level governance structure founded upon constitutional provisions and specialized legislation. The legal foundation incorporates the Constitution of Ukraine, the Law "On Occupational Safety," the Law "On Mandatory State Social Insurance," and the Labor Code, establishing comprehensive regulatory parameters for workplace safety standards.

The implementation mechanism operates through a coordinated system involving the Cabinet of Ministers, central executive authorities, and local administration bodies. This integrated approach combines multiple functional components: establishing legal norms and safety standards; monitoring regulatory compliance through systematic oversight; and implementing organizational measures at enterprise level, including specialized safety training programs and workplace instruction protocols. The framework creates a continuous cycle of normative regulation, practical implementation, and systematic verification that characterizes Ukraine's contemporary occupational safety management system.

The formulation and execution of state occupational safety policy fundamentally relies on its institutional infrastructure. This framework operates through specifically designated entities that collectively ensure policy implementation. According to Ukraine's foundational legislation "On Occupational Safety," the institutional landscape comprises precisely defined stakeholders responsible for implementing comprehensive protective measures. These entities guarantee the application of integrated legal, socioeconomic, organizational-technical, sanitary-hygienic, and therapeutic-preventive interventions specifically

designed to preserve human life, health, and working capacity during employment activities [1].

The institutional architecture establishes a multi-stakeholder approach where designated entities assume complementary responsibilities in creating systematic protective mechanisms throughout the employment lifecycle, reflecting the comprehensive nature of modern occupational safety management.

Scholarly discourse presents diverse conceptual approaches to defining occupational safety stakeholders. V. Prokopenko characterizes these entities as a collective body of authorized institutions and officials responsible for establishing normal and safe technical and sanitary-hygienic conditions for all workers during direct work processes [2, p. 247]. Alternatively, H. Honcharova defines occupational safety stakeholders as entities mandated to implement and enforce comprehensive legal norms and regulations that create safe working conditions in production environments. This conceptualization emphasizes their role in preventing occupational injuries and diseases while regulating supervision and compliance monitoring through active participation of labor collectives and trade unions [3, p. 5].

These theoretical approaches reflect the evolving understanding of stakeholder responsibilities, ranging from technical safety provision to comprehensive regulatory implementation involving social partnership models. The scholarly divergence highlights the multidimensional nature of occupational safety governance, incorporating both institutional authority and participatory mechanisms in creating effective workplace protection systems.

Consequently, occupational safety stakeholders emerge as distinct entities within labor relations, operating under specific legal mandates that confer unique regulatory authority. This institutional architecture traces its genesis to the development of structured employment relationships, where protective elements became inherent to employer-employee dynamics. The systematic evolution of workplace safety mechanisms correlates directly with industrial expansion and the

corresponding proliferation of hazardous production technologies, which necessitated establishing formal supervisory structures.

The institutionalization process accelerated during intensive industrialization periods, when technological innovations introduced unprecedented occupational hazards, thereby compelling systemic regulatory responses. This historical progression illustrates occupational safety's transformation from ad-hoc protective measures into comprehensive institutional frameworks, mirroring evolving societal expectations regarding worker welfare and corporate responsibility during industrial development phases. The emergence of specialized safety stakeholders thus represents a fundamental adaptation to changing production paradigms and growing recognition of human capital value within economic systems.

Scholars tracing the evolution of occupational safety in Ukrainian lands identify the emergence of systematic supervisory activities with the 1719 establishment of the Berg-Kollegia (Mining Collegium) by Peter I. As the central administrative body for industrial management within the Russian Empire, this institution operated under normative regulations including the Berg-Privilegia (1719) and Berg-Reglament (1739). These foundational documents, alongside defining administrative procedures, specifically enumerated the rights and obligations of private industrialists and factory owners regarding working conditions [4].

This institutional development represents a crucial transition from informal workplace practices to formally regulated labor relations, establishing precedent for state intervention in industrial safety matters. The Berg-Kollegia's regulatory framework, while primarily focused on mining operations, created important administrative precedents for subsequent occupational safety legislation through its systematic approach to governing employer responsibilities in hazardous industries.

Following Ukraine's independence, January 1993 marked a pivotal institutional development with the establishment of the State Committee of Ukraine for Labor Safety Supervision (Derzhnagliadokhoronpratsi) through reorganization of the State Mining Supervision Authority. This institutional transformation initiated

the systematic development of Ukraine's national occupational safety management system. The foundational legal framework was formalized on May 4, 1993, through Cabinet of Ministers Resolution No. 328, which approved the Statute governing the State Committee's operations and mandate.

This institutional arrangement established a specialized supervisory architecture where nuclear and radiation safety, fire protection oversight, and workforce health protection remained distributed among other central executive authorities, creating a multifaceted governance structure for occupational risk management. The differentiation of supervisory responsibilities reflected both technical specialization requirements and the complex legacy of post-Soviet administrative reorganization, while simultaneously addressing emerging national safety priorities during Ukraine's formative independence period.

The territorial administrations of Derzhnagliadokhoronpratsi established self-financing operational units responsible for equipment diagnostics, project expertise, product licensing and certification, along with specialist training and qualification programs. These technical centers primarily executed delegated supervisory functions concerning the technical condition of facilities, structures, and installations, specifically conducting:

- technical assessment of project documentation for construction, reconstruction, and technological upgrades of production facilities;
- evaluation of machinery, equipment, and manufacturing means compliance with occupational safety regulations;
- certification of collective and individual worker protection equipment;
- validation of new technologies and hazardous substances against safety standards;
- technical inspection of boilers, pressure vessels, and other high-risk equipment;
- issuance of expert assessments for proposed regulatory documents [5].

This decentralized operational model enabled specialized technical oversight while maintaining centralized regulatory authority, creating an integrated system for

safety standardization across Ukraine's industrial sectors during the post-independence transition period.

Since 1994, Ukraine has systematically developed comprehensive occupational safety programs at national, sectoral, regional, and enterprise levels. These initiatives established foundational improvements across multiple dimensions of the occupational safety management system, including: structural enhancements to state safety governance mechanisms, implementation of economic management approaches, resolution of organizational, scientific, and regulatory framework challenges

The program implementation yielded significant technological advancements, including: development of previously unavailable worker protection equipment, creation of monitoring systems for working conditions and emergency situations, establishment of a unified automated occupational safety information infrastructure.

The administrative reform of July 25, 1997, marked a significant organizational transition through Presidential Decree No. 705/97, which transferred Derzhnagliadokhoronpratsi to the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy while maintaining its status as a central executive authority. This reorganization reflected evolving governance approaches while preserving institutional expertise during Ukraine's transitional administrative restructuring period.

The structural transformation within the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy led to the establishment of the State Department for Labor Safety Supervision, simultaneously dissolving the previous Derzhnagliadokhoronprati. This administrative reorganization culminated in the Presidential Decree that reconstituted the State Committee of Ukraine for Labor Safety Supervision, reinstating it as a central executive authority based on the departmental framework. Notably, this institutional restructuring maintained operational continuity, as the Committee's fundamental mandates and jurisdictional authorities remained substantially unchanged throughout this transitional period [6].

This phase demonstrates the dynamic evolution of Ukraine's occupational safety governance structure, where administrative reorganization served to optimize

institutional placement while preserving core regulatory functions. The preservation of established competencies during structural changes reflects the enduring priority of maintaining effective safety oversight mechanisms despite ongoing governmental reforms.

The year 2007 marked a significant expansion of the Committee's jurisdiction to include conducting technical investigations into the circumstances and causes of accidents related to domestic gas utilization. This functional broadening demonstrated the evolving nature of safety oversight responsibilities beyond traditional industrial settings.

Subsequent administrative reorganization in 2010, through the restructuring of the Ministry of Emergency Situations and Chernobyl Consequences Protection, led to the establishment of the State Service for Mining Supervision and Industrial Safety. This newly formed institution inherited the comprehensive regulatory functions previously exercised by the abolished State Committee of Ukraine for Industrial Safety, Labor Protection, and Mining Supervision, consolidating these critical oversight responsibilities within a unified administrative framework.

In September 2014, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine adopted Resolution "On Optimization of the System of Central Executive Authorities," which mandated the creation of the State Labor Service of Ukraine. This institutional restructuring was achieved through the merger of the State Labor Inspection and the State Service for Mining Supervision and Industrial Safety. The newly established Service assumed comprehensive responsibilities for implementing state policy previously carried out by the abolished agencies (excluding functions related to subsoil protection), while additionally incorporating new mandates in occupational hygiene and radiation protection, specifically: implementation of state policy in occupational hygiene, conducting dosimetric monitoring of workplaces, monitoring radiation exposure doses among workers [7].

This consolidation represented a significant streamlining of Ukraine's occupational safety governance, creating a unified regulatory body with expanded

technical capabilities for addressing both traditional and emerging workplace hazards.

The Cabinet of Ministers Resolution No. 100 of February 11, 2015, "On the Establishment of Territorial Bodies of the State Labor Service and Recognition as Void of Certain Resolutions of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine," mandated the creation of public legal entities as territorial divisions of the State Labor Service. This administrative reorganization was achieved through the consolidation of regional offices previously operating under the State Service for Mining Supervision and Industrial Safety and the State Labor Inspection.

The newly established territorial bodies function as legal successors, inheriting all rights and obligations previously held by the regional divisions of both the State Service for Mining Supervision and Industrial Safety and the State Labor Service. This structural integration at the regional level completed the comprehensive reorganization of Ukraine's occupational safety governance framework, ensuring operational continuity while establishing a unified supervisory presence across all administrative territories.

Effective September 30, 2015, a significant administrative transfer occurred whereby the regulatory functions of the State Mining Supervision Authority (excluding subsoil protection responsibilities) were integrated into the State Labor Service. This consolidation established the State Labor Service as the primary regulatory body responsible for organizing and implementing state supervision (control) over compliance with legislation and regulatory instruments concerning:

1. Industrial safety standards and occupational health requirements
2. Safe work practices by legal entities and individuals utilizing hired labor
3. Safety protocols for handling industrial explosive materials
4. Safe disposal procedures for conventional ammunition, rocket fuel, and military explosives
5. Pipeline transportation safety and natural gas market operations
6. Activities involving high-risk facilities and potentially hazardous installations.

This functional integration created a unified regulatory framework for managing both traditional workplace safety and specialized industrial hazards, significantly expanding the Service's jurisdiction while maintaining specialized technical oversight capabilities across multiple high-risk sectors.

The presented analysis substantiates that the establishment of occupational safety supervisory institutions has undergone progressive development through an extended historical continuum. Parallel evolutionary patterns characterize the corresponding normative-legal framework supporting these regulatory activities. As evidenced by the documented transitions, the most intensive period of institutional transformations occurred during Ukraine's independence era, reflecting an ongoing search for optimal public administration structures capable of effectively executing occupational safety governance functions.

This persistent institutional restructuring demonstrates the dynamic nature of regulatory system development in response to changing socioeconomic conditions and evolving governance paradigms. The continuous administrative adaptations reveal fundamental challenges in balancing specialized technical oversight with comprehensive safety governance, while simultaneously addressing emerging workplace hazards within an increasingly complex economic environment.

A defining characteristic of occupational safety stakeholders is their exclusive capacity to participate in protective legal relations solely through authorization established by specific regulatory instruments. This juridical particularity finds confirmation in the comprehensive legal framework governing this domain, particularly through Ukraine's specialized legislation including:

- The Law of Ukraine "On Occupational Safety," which applies universally to all legal entities and individuals utilizing hired labor, along with all workers
- The Labor Code of Ukraine
- The Law of Ukraine "On Mandatory State Social Insurance against Industrial Accidents and Occupational Diseases Resulting in Disability"

These foundational legal instruments systematically delineate the respective rights and obligations of occupational safety participants while establishing specific liability mechanisms for violations of statutory requirements. The legislative framework creates a closed system of authorized actors whose participatory legitimacy derives exclusively from normative prescriptions, thereby ensuring regulatory consistency while preventing arbitrary intervention in occupational safety governance.

A defining operational characteristic of occupational safety entities is their requirement for continuous monitoring of workplace processes. Articles 38-39 of Ukraine's Law "On Occupational Safety" specifically enumerate the relevant supervisory entities along with their corresponding rights and obligations within the occupational safety domain [1]. These supervisory competencies manifest through multiple operational dimensions:

Continuous surveillance of regulated entities' activities

Authority to intervene in ongoing operations of labor relations participants

Capacity to initiate legal proceedings for labor law violations

Comprehensive evaluation of supervised entities considering both legal compliance and operational appropriateness [8]

This multifunctional authority framework establishes occupational safety entities as dynamic regulatory actors with both preventive and corrective capabilities, enabling them to maintain persistent oversight while simultaneously addressing emergent safety concerns through graduated enforcement mechanisms.

Having elucidated the conceptual parameters and distinctive characteristics of occupational safety entities, it becomes methodologically appropriate to establish their systematic classification. The analysis reveals a formally recognized though legislatively uncoded taxonomy comprising five primary categories:

1. Employers – bearing fundamental responsibility for workplace safety implementation
2. Enterprise Occupational Safety Services – operational units executing daily safety protocols

3. Enterprise Occupational Safety Committees – participatory bodies facilitating employee involvement
4. State Occupational Safety Management Authorities – including the Cabinet of Ministers, specialized industrial safety services, central ministries, and regional administrations
5. State Occupational Safety Supervision and Control Bodies – comprising specialized executive authorities responsible for:
 - General occupational safety policy implementation
 - Nuclear and radiation safety oversight
 - Fire and technological safety compliance monitoring
 - Sanitary and epidemiological welfare enforcement [9, Arts. 13, 15, 16, 31, 38]

This hierarchical classification reflects the multi-level governance structure of occupational safety regulation, distributing responsibilities across operational, enterprise, and governmental levels while maintaining specialized technical oversight through dedicated supervisory institutions.

Scholarly synthesis reveals a three-tiered structure of occupational safety stakeholders. At the state level, regulatory functions are distributed between governmental management authorities – including the Cabinet of Ministers, State Labor Service, specialized ministries and local administrations – and specialized supervisory institutions comprising the State Labor Service, Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate, Emergency Service, and Sanitary-Epidemiological Service.

Enterprise-level implementation involves proprietary management through business owners or their authorized representatives, supported by specialized occupational safety departments, participatory safety committees, and operational leadership from departmental supervisors.

Civil society participation encompasses individual workers as direct safety participants, collective representation through trade unions or worker-designated safety representatives, and specifically designated personnel such as labor

collective-appointed safety commissioners. This integrated framework establishes complementary oversight mechanisms across governmental, organizational, and societal dimensions, creating a comprehensive system of shared responsibility for workplace safety.

The analysis reveals that the State Labor Service exercises authority in implementing state policy across multiple domains, with occupational safety representing a core functional area. Examination of the Service's principal responsibilities demonstrates its comprehensive mandate in occupational protection, specifically through:

The Service formulates and executes state policy regarding industrial safety, occupational health, and workplace hygiene standards. It provides integrated management of occupational safety and industrial security at the national level, establishing unified approaches to risk mitigation. Furthermore, the Service maintains state regulatory oversight and supervisory control over operations involving high-risk facilities, ensuring compliance with specialized safety protocols for hazardous industrial activities.

This functional scope positions the State Labor Service as the central coordinating institution for occupational safety governance, bridging policy development with practical implementation across diverse economic sectors while maintaining specialized oversight capabilities for particularly dangerous industrial operations.

The comprehensive mandate of local state administrations within this domain encompasses multiple strategic directions, specifically including the following fundamental responsibilities:

First, these authorities systematically ensure the implementation of national legislative frameworks and the practical execution of state policy initiatives in occupational safety and health. Second, they develop comprehensive regional programs aimed at enhancing workplace safety standards, improving industrial hygiene parameters, and optimizing the production environment. This programming is formulated through collaborative governance mechanisms involving social

partners, particularly trade union representatives and the Social Insurance Fund of Ukraine, and is strategically integrated into broader regional socioeconomic and cultural development initiatives.

Furthermore, local administrations establish robust mechanisms for social protection of employees, with particular attention to workers engaged in hazardous occupations and dangerous working conditions. This includes implementing systematic measures to conduct workplace certification procedures verifying compliance with occupational safety regulations. Additionally, these bodies propose and facilitate the creation of regional and municipal emergency rescue services designed to serve respective territories and communal property facilities.

Finally, local state administrations maintain continuous supervisory control to ensure business entities consistently adhere to normative legal requirements governing occupational safety, thereby creating sustainable conditions for safe economic activities within their jurisdictions.

To effectively execute these mandated functions, local state administrations establish specialized structural units dedicated to occupational safety, which operate in accordance with model regulations formally approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. Alternatively, administrations may delegate the implementation of these critical responsibilities to an existing structural division or assign them to designated officials within the relevant governmental bodies, thereby ensuring the integration of occupational safety management into their institutional framework.

Within their legally defined competence, local self-government bodies exercise significant authority in the domain of occupational safety through two primary mechanisms. First, they formally approve targeted regional programs specifically designed to enhance safety standards, improve working conditions, and optimize the industrial environment. These programmatic initiatives are systematically integrated into comprehensive regional development strategies encompassing socioeconomic and cultural dimensions. Second, local councils hold decision-making authority regarding the establishment of municipal emergency

rescue services, which provide critical response capabilities for designated territories and communal property infrastructure [3-7].

This structured approach enables local authorities to address occupational safety through both preventive measures, embedded within broader development planning, and responsive mechanisms, ensuring adequate emergency preparedness for their constituencies.

Conclusions. Thus, the institutional framework for state occupational safety policy comprises a multi-level system of entities, each endowed with distinct mandates, competencies, rights, and obligations as defined by administrative law. The ongoing reform of this governance structure and public administration mechanisms is expected to yield significant optimization through several key dimensions: the elimination of redundant supervisory functions and streamlining of regulatory bodies; enhanced incorporation of market-based regulatory instruments; and functional consolidation of inspectorates based on overlapping jurisdictions, regulated entities, and control domains.

REFERENCES

1. Pro okhoronu pratsi: Zakon Ukrainy vid 14 zhovtnia 1992 roku [On Labor Protection: Law of Ukraine of October 14, 1992]. (1992). Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2694-12> [in Ukrainian].
2. Prokopenko, V. I. (2000). *Trudove pravo Ukrainy* [Labor Law of Ukraine] (2nd ed.). Kharkiv: Konsum [in Ukrainian].
3. Honcharova, G. S. (1995). *Okhorona pratsi* [Labor Protection]. Kharkiv: KhHI "NUA" [in Ukrainian].
4. Troshchynskyi, V. P., Kravchenko, M. V., Petroie, O. M., & Yarosh, N. P. (2016). Sotsialna i humanitarna polityka v Ukraini v umovakh suchasnykh vyklykiv [Social and humanitarian policy in Ukraine under modern challenges]. *Derzhavne upravlinnia: teoriia ta praktyka*, 2, 32-44 [in Ukrainian].
5. Prylypko, S. M., & Yaroshenko, O. M. (2009). *Trudove pravo Ukrainy* [Labor Law of Ukraine] (2nd ed.). Kharkiv: FINN [in Ukrainian].

6. Skurativskiy, V. A., & Troshchynskiy, V. P. (Eds.). (2009). *Upravlinnia sotsialnym i humanitarnym rozvytkom* [Management of Social and Humanitarian Development] (Pt. 1). Kyiv: NADU [in Ukrainian].
7. Tkachuk, K. N., Filipchuk, A. S., Zerkalov, D. V., Polukarov, O. I., Polukarov, Yu. O., & Kruzhylo, O. Ye. (2014). *Orhanizatsiia nahliadovoi diialnosti v haluzi okhorony pratsi* [Organization of Supervisory Activities in the Field of Labor Protection]. Kyiv: NTUU "KPI" [in Ukrainian].
8. Lavriv, O. Ya. (2007). *Systema pryntsyviv trudovoho prava Ukrainy* [The System of Principles of Labor Law of Ukraine]. (Extended abstract of candidate's thesis). Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].
9. Konstytutsiia Ukrainy, pryiniata na piatii sesii Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy 28 chervnia 1996 roku (zi zminamy) [The Constitution of Ukraine, adopted on June 28, 1996 (with amendments)]. (1996). Retrieved from <http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua> [in Ukrainian].
10. Handziuk, M. P. (Ed.). (2008). *Osnovy okhorony pratsi* [Fundamentals of Labor Protection] (4th ed.). Kyiv: Karavela [in Ukrainian].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 05.11.2025