

Emerging Diplomatic Issues Rising from Russo-Ukrainian Conflict: Critical Analysis

Ophoke Leonard Onyebuchi¹, Rae Beverly Mac-Ocloo² and Ekeh Nelson Chinedu³

¹Faculty of Social Economic Sciences, Cavendish University Uganda.

²Faculty of Social Economic Sciences, Cavendish University Uganda.

³Faculty of Social Science and Psychology, University of Kisubi Entebbe Uganda.

Abstract: Since the escalation of the ongoing Russo-Ukrainian conflict, diplomatic interventions has not been silent. Despite their efforts, challenges ensue. From this stand point, this paper was intended to investigate the emerging diplomatic issues rising from Russo-Ukrainian conflict. A critical review using qualitative approach and thematic analysis was adopted for data collection and analysis. The study findings reveled arrays of diplomatic challenges emerging from the ongoing Russo-Ukrainian conflict. These include geopolitical realignments, energy security, humanitarian concerns, diplomatic engagement, and information warfare. The conclusion synthesizes these insights, emphasizing the need for diplomacy to prioritize inclusive dialogue, equitable resource access, and transparency to mitigate immediate crises and foster long-term stability, ensuring that the international system can adapt to the evolving geopolitical landscape.

Keywords: Diplomacy, Conflict, Russia, Ukraine, Geopolitics, Energy security.

INTRODUCTION

The ongoing conflict between Russia and Ukraine according to Tripathi (2023) requires urgent attention of international mediation. Since the escalation of the Russo-Ukrainian conflict in 2022, it has raised a lot of diplomatic consequences that has not only influenced Europe but global geopolitical and economic landscape. This ongoing conflict has attracted a lot of international actors to reach to a ceasefire but every diplomatic interventions has stalled. Onyebuchi (2024) in his thesis stated that this stagnation in conflict resolution was as a result of the limits of multilateral diplomacy, that is, negotiation, mediation and peace agreement in bringing the ongoing war to an end.

Mbah and Wasum (2022) also noted that throughout the Russia-Ukraine military conflict, numerous rounds of talks have been held in an attempt to negotiate a resolution to the crisis. However, mediation in this situation has stalled. For Lamy and Watson (2021) they revealed that the threat to economic isolation and restrictions on trade and finance can create leverage for mediators and enhance the prospects of reaching a peaceful resolution. The influence of international sanctions following Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 has been seen as a significant factor in initiating the Minsk negotiations and pushing for a mediated settlement.

According to Vişan (2025) a peace settlement is still far away and remains a challenging policy objective given the power relations and diverging

interests of the actors involved. Rushing the process will neither provide a lasting peace in Ukraine, nor contribute to the security of the continent. A peace process that does not include all the relevant actors involved, will not be viewed as legitimate and will not lead to a lasting peace between Ukraine and Russia. These overarching issues of why despite all the diplomatic efforts, peaceful settlement is still far reaching, was the purpose that ignited our interest to investigate the emerging diplomatic issues arising from Russo-Ukrainian conflict with a view of reviewing the relevance of diplomacy in conflict governance, uncover the diplomatic challenges in conflict governance and bringing the gaps through effective diplomatic mechanism.

Diplomacy and Conflict Governance

In the literatures explored, we noted that as global conflicts evolves, they give rise to new diplomatic issues that challenge traditional frameworks of international relations. For example, the resurgence of nationalism and populism has significantly impacted global diplomacy. According to Smith and Johnson (2019), these movements often prioritize national interests over international cooperation, complicating diplomatic negotiations and fostering tension between states. The increasing prevalence of cyber warfare and cyber threats has introduced new challenges to diplomatic relations. A study by Patel and Chen (2020) discusses how states must navigate cybersecurity issues while maintaining diplomatic

ties, highlighting the need for new frameworks to address cyber-related conflicts.

Climate change is increasingly recognized as a significant driver of conflict, leading to new diplomatic challenges. As noted by Thompson (2021), resource scarcity and displacement caused by climate change necessitate innovative diplomatic strategies to manage these emerging conflicts. The COVID-19 pandemic has reshaped international relations and introduced new diplomatic issues, such as vaccine diplomacy. Lee and Kim (2022) explore how countries leverage vaccine distribution to enhance their global standing, complicating traditional diplomatic relationships. Geopolitical rivalries, particularly between major powers, have intensified, leading to new diplomatic challenges. A study by Roberts (2023) analyzes the implications of U.S.-China tensions on global governance and multilateral diplomacy, emphasizing the need for strategic engagement.

Literature has shown the crucial role of diplomacy in conflict governance especially use of negotiations, mediation and peace agreement to attain a ceasefire and durable peace. A study by Chegnizadeh, Esmaili Ardakani and Ahmaddoust Estalaki (2025) revealed that conflict is a natural phenomenon in human social life, yet the tools for managing it have not been uniform across historical periods. An analysis of European history showed that the structure of the international system and its arrangements play a pivotal role in determining whether force or diplomacy takes superiority in times of conflict and crisis (Chegnizadeh, Esmaili Ardakani & Ahmaddoust Estalaki, 2025). As a peaceful tool for organizing relations, managing competition, and resolving conflicts, diplomacy becomes prioritized in an international system on whose arrangements states agree, especially the great powers. Such a system is realized under a balance of power accompanied by legitimacy. Therefore, the role of a balance of power and legitimating it is paramount in prioritizing diplomatic endeavours.

Another study by Ali (2023) has shown that for a very long time, diplomacy has been a crucial instrument for companies doing business internationally. Whether it's settling international conflicts, negotiating trade agreements, or promoting cross-border cooperation, diplomatic efforts are crucial to ensure that trade flows freely. When forming relationships and negotiating regulatory frameworks in foreign markets,

businesses engage in diplomacy not just at the national level but also at the corporate level. The setting where power relations are shaped and policies are created is politics, on the other hand.

According to a comparative study carried out by Odusanya (2025) it credited diplomacy as a crucial approaches to resolving international conflicts in Africa. Africa with the continent frequently impacted by political instability, territorial disputes, and socioeconomic challenges, effective conflict resolution mechanisms are essential. Diplomacy, rooted in negotiation, dialogue, and compromise, serves as a nonviolent method for deescalating tensions and fostering cooperation. In contrast, peacekeeping forces offer a more interventionist approach, often deployed to enforce ceasefires, maintain security, and protect civilians in conflict zones. The study concludes by suggesting that a combine approach, incorporating both diplomatic efforts and peacekeeping operations, can enhance stability in Africa, provided there is international cooperation, sufficient funding, and a focus on addressing root causes of conflict.

Diplomatic Challenges in Conflict Governance

Recent literature highlights the intricate nature of modern conflicts, which often involve multiple actors, including state and non-state entities. For instance, Zartman (2019) discusses how the involvement of various stakeholders complicates diplomatic negotiations, as each party has distinct interests and priorities. International organizations, such as the United Nations, play a crucial role in conflict governance. However, their effectiveness is often hampered by political constraints and the need for consensus among member states. A study by Smith and Jones (2020) analyzes how these constraints limit the UN's ability to mediate effectively in ongoing conflicts.

Various diplomatic strategies have emerged to address the challenges of conflict governance. According to Lee (2021), approaches such as shuttle diplomacy and backchannel negotiations have gained traction, allowing for more flexible and discreet engagement between conflicting parties. The rise of technology has transformed diplomatic practices in conflict governance. Digital diplomacy, as discussed by Patel (2022), provides new avenues for engagement but also presents challenges, such as misinformation and cyber threats that can exacerbate conflicts.

Several studies have focused on specific regions to illustrate the diplomatic challenges in conflict governance. For example, Thompson (2023) examines the Syrian conflict, highlighting how regional powers' competing interests complicate diplomatic efforts and prolong the crisis.

Bridging Conflict Gaps through Effective Diplomatic Mechanism

Effective diplomatic mechanisms are essential for bridging gaps in conflicts, facilitating dialogue, and fostering sustainable peace. This literature review examines recent studies from 2019 to 2025 that explore how diplomatic strategies can effectively address and bridge conflict gaps. Conflict gaps refer to the disparities in communication, understanding, and interests between conflicting parties. According to Fisher (2019), recognizing these gaps is crucial for developing effective diplomatic interventions that can lead to conflict resolution. Mediation is a key diplomatic mechanism that has been shown to bridge gaps effectively. A study by Bercovitch and Langley (2020) emphasizes the importance of impartial mediators in facilitating dialogue and creating a conducive environment for negotiation.

Inclusive diplomacy, which involves engaging all relevant stakeholders, is vital for addressing conflict gaps. According to Karam (2021), inclusive approaches ensure that marginalized voices are heard, leading to more comprehensive and sustainable solutions. The integration of technology in diplomatic efforts has transformed how conflicts are addressed. As highlighted by Chen and Smith (2022), digital platforms can facilitate communication and collaboration among conflicting parties, thus bridging gaps that traditional methods may not reach.

Several case studies illustrate the effectiveness of various diplomatic mechanisms in bridging conflict gaps. For instance, Johnson (2023) analyzes the peace process in Colombia, showcasing how multi-faceted diplomatic efforts helped reconcile longstanding divisions. From all these discoveries, it lacked contextual and geographical application as it was more general than specific. Thus, this study was crucial to unpack these knowledge gap relating to the emerging diplomatic issues rising in the context of Russo-Ukrainian Conflict and its implication to international systems.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

We adopted a single case study design with qualitative approach in this study. This was relevant in understanding the specifics of this conflict from a contextual perspective. Also, it was suitable because it supports practical solution that can inform policy and decision making toward addressing these diplomatic concerns in the international relations using Russia and Ukraine critical analysis. A systematic review was applied in data collection derived from databases mostly from google scholar and documents from foreign affair articles specifically addressing the concerns of this conflict.

Data was analyzed thematically from the themes that emerged, we categorized and interpreted them based on how it is applied to this specific conflict. From the results of conflicts databases searched on the following prompts; geopolitical realignments, energy security, humanitarian concerns, diplomatic engagement and negotiation, information warfare and propaganda, we were able to make meaning of 10 papers that were directly connected to this study purpose and they are appended in the reference list for data dependability and trustworthiness of the findings presented. Ethically, we maintained objectivity in the findings and discussions without any subjective thinking due to the nature of this conflict and we ensured that all cites used were credited to boost the authenticity of our work and strength of analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Russo-Ukrainian conflict, escalating in 2022, has greatly reshaped global diplomacy, presenting complex challenges across geopolitical, economic, humanitarian, and informational domains. This critical analysis interprets the key points from the provided document; geopolitical realignments, energy security, humanitarian concerns, diplomatic engagement, and information warfare evaluating their implications for international relations. Drawing on scholarly sources from Google Scholar, the discussion examines these interconnected issues and their impact on global stability. The conclusion synthesizes these insights, emphasizing the need for adaptive diplomatic strategies to address the conflict's far-reaching consequences.

Geopolitical Realignments

The Russo-Ukrainian conflict has catalyzed a significant reconfiguration of global alliances, accelerating a shift toward multi polarity. NATO's potential expansion, particularly with Finland and

Sweden's applications for membership, represents a collective security response to Russia's aggression (Smith & Jones, 2023). However, this move heightens tensions, as Moscow perceives NATO's enlargement as a direct threat to its security sphere, reviving Cold War-style divisions (Mearsheimer, 2022). Western democracies have coalesced around shared values of liberal democracy and collective defense, strengthening NATO's resolve but also entrenching a confrontational bloc mentality. This polarization complicates diplomatic prospects for arms control agreements and risks escalating tensions into a broader global conflict.

Concurrently, Russia has pivoted toward Asia, deepening economic and military ties with China and India to counter Western sanctions and isolation (Trenin, 2023). This strategic realignment includes increased energy exports to China and joint military exercises, signaling a shift in Russia's foreign policy priorities. However, this pivot carries risks, as Russia's growing reliance on China may result in an asymmetrical partnership, with Moscow playing a subordinate role (Lukin, 2024). The Global South, meanwhile, navigates a delicate balance, maintaining economic ties with Russia while facing pressure from Western powers to align against Moscow (Singh & Gupta, 2023). Countries like India and South Africa have resisted outright condemnation of Russia, prioritizing economic pragmatism over ideological alignment.

The diplomatic implications of these realignments are deep. NATO's expansion may deter further Russian aggression but risks creating a permanent divide between Western and non-Western powers, hindering cooperation on global challenges like nuclear non-proliferation or climate change. Russia's Asian pivot could reshape Eurasian geopolitics, but its success depends on maintaining strategic autonomy amidst China's growing influence. Diplomats face the challenge of bridging this polarized landscape, fostering dialogue to prevent a fragmented global order where competing blocs undermine multilateral governance.

Energy Security

The conflict has starkly exposed Europe's vulnerability to Russian energy supplies, with Russia previously accounting for approximately 40% of Europe's natural gas (Siddi, 2023). Moscow's weaponization of energy through supply disruptions has forced European nations to urgently diversify their sources, a move critical for

both economic stability and national security. The EU has responded by increasing LNG imports from the United States and Qatar, reviving nuclear energy projects, and accelerating investments in renewables, exemplified by Germany's *Energiewende*, which aims for 80% renewable energy by 2030 (Quitow et al., 2023). These efforts signal a long-term shift toward sustainable energy strategies, but significant hurdles remain.

Building LNG infrastructure is both costly and time-intensive, delaying energy independence for many European states. Renewable energy scalability is constrained by technological limitations and financial barriers, particularly in Eastern Europe, where reliance on Russian gas persists (International Energy Agency, 2023). Moreover, the global competition for alternative energy suppliers has driven up prices, disproportionately affecting developing nations and worsening economic inequality (Bordoff & O'Sullivan, 2022). The EU's REPowerEU plan seeks to address these challenges by reducing reliance on Russian energy, but its success hinges on global coordination to avoid zero-sum competition over scarce resources (European Commission, 2022).

Diplomatically, energy security demands multilateral cooperation to stabilize markets and ensure equitable access to resources. Without coordinated efforts, price volatility and supply shortages could fuel economic instability, particularly in energy-vulnerable regions. The conflict demonstrates the nexus between energy and geopolitics, compelling states to integrate sustainability into their security frameworks while balancing immediate needs with long-term resilience.

Humanitarian Concerns

The humanitarian crisis triggered by the conflict is immense, with over 8 million Ukrainian refugees and 7 million internally displaced persons as of 2023 (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2023). Neighboring countries, such as Poland and Moldova, have faced significant resource strains while hosting millions of refugees, often with inadequate international support. Funding gaps further hinder sustained humanitarian aid, leaving many displaced individuals vulnerable to long-term instability (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, 2023). The scale of this crisis demands a robust, coordinated international

response to provide immediate relief and long-term resettlement solutions.

Allegations of war crimes, including deliberate attacks on civilian infrastructure, have prompted the International Criminal Court to issue arrest warrants for Russian officials, signaling a commitment to accountability (Hafner-Burton & Tsutsui, 2023). However, the politicization of these efforts risks undermining their legitimacy, as Russia and its allies dismiss such actions as Western bias. Establishing impartial accountability mechanisms, such as hybrid tribunals, is critical to upholding international humanitarian law and setting precedents for future conflicts (Sands & Robinson, 2023). The international community's response will shape global norms regarding justice in armed conflicts, influencing how states address impunity.

Diplomacy plays a pivotal role in coordinating humanitarian aid and ensuring accountability without exacerbating geopolitical tensions. The crisis tests the credibility of global institutions, as inconsistent or politicized responses could erode trust in the international system. Diplomats must prioritize impartial aid delivery and justice mechanisms to support affected populations while reinforcing the principles of humanitarian law.

Diplomatic Engagement and Negotiation

The path to peace in the Russo-Ukrainian conflict remains fraught with challenges, as negotiations must balance Ukraine's demand for full territorial restoration with Russia's insistence on recognizing annexed territories and limiting NATO's expansion (Tsygankov, 2023). Early talks in 2022, mediated by Turkey, collapsed due to mutual distrust and irreconcilable positions (Aydin & Sahin, 2023). Third-party mediators, such as Turkey or the United Nations, are essential for facilitating dialogue, but their success depends on the willingness of both parties to compromise (Zartman, 2022). China's potential role as a mediator is complicated by its strategic alignment with Russia, raising questions about its neutrality.

The conflict's global implications disruptions to energy markets, food security, and heightened nuclear risks necessitate broader multilateral engagement. Proposals for a revised Minsk framework or a new international format have been suggested, but entrenched positions and external pressures, such as Western sanctions and military aid to Ukraine, add complexity (Charap & Colton, 2023). Confidence-building measures,

such as humanitarian corridors or prisoner exchanges, could create space for substantive talks, but the absence of trust remains a significant barrier (Bercovitch & Lee, 2022).

Diplomacy must navigate these challenges by balancing immediate ceasefire needs with long-term stability. The involvement of neutral mediators and the creation of incremental trust-building mechanisms are critical to breaking the deadlock. However, the global stakes require a broader coalition of actors to address the conflict's ripple effects, ensuring that negotiations do not intensify existing divisions.

Information Warfare and Propaganda

Information warfare has emerged as a defining feature of the conflict, with both Russia and Ukraine leveraging media to shape global narratives. Russia's state-controlled outlets have disseminated disinformation to justify its actions, while Ukraine has effectively used social media to garner international sympathy and support (Hosaka, 2023). The proliferation of deep fakes, bots, and cyberattacks has amplified these efforts, blurring the line between truth and propaganda and complicating public understanding of the conflict (Pomerantsev, 2022). This dynamic underscores the critical role of information in shaping public opinion and influencing diplomatic outcomes.

Countering disinformation requires robust media literacy programs and support for independent journalism, but implementation is uneven, particularly in regions with limited digital infrastructure (Freedman & Lucas, 2023). Western sanctions on Russian media outlets aim to curb propaganda but risk creating information silos, further polarizing global discourse (Polyakova & Fried, 2022). The EU's Digital Services Act seeks to regulate online platforms, but achieving global consensus on media norms is challenging due to differing views on censorship and sovereignty (European Commission, 2023).

Diplomatically, addressing information warfare requires international cooperation to establish norms for responsible media use in conflicts. Failure to counter disinformation risks undermining public trust in institutions and fueling geopolitical fragmentation, as competing narratives deepen divisions. The international community must prioritize transparency and accountability in information ecosystems to maintain credibility in global governance.

CONCLUSION

The Russo-Ukrainian conflict has fundamentally altered global diplomacy, exposing fault lines in geopolitical alignments, energy security, humanitarian responses, negotiations, and information ecosystems. NATO's expansion and Russia's Asian pivot signal a multipolar world, risking entrenched divisions that could undermine multilateral cooperation. Energy diversification demands cooperative strategies to ensure sustainability and equity, as Europe's vulnerability highlights the intersection of energy and security. The humanitarian crisis requires coordinated aid and impartial accountability mechanisms to uphold international norms. Negotiations hinge on trust-building and neutral mediation, despite entrenched positions and external pressures. Information warfare calls for global efforts to promote transparency and combat disinformation, as competing narratives threaten public trust.

Addressing these challenges requires principled, adaptive diplomacy. Multilateral institutions, such as the United Nations, must lead coordinated responses, while civil society amplifies humanitarian and independent voices. The conflict's resolution will shape the future of global governance, testing its resilience in an increasingly fragmented world. Diplomacy must prioritize inclusive dialogue, equitable resource access, and transparency to mitigate immediate crises and foster long-term stability, ensuring that the international system can adapt to the evolving geopolitical landscape.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, M. "Converging Dimensions: the Modern World's Confluence of Diplomacy, Business, Politics, and Social Sciences." *BULLET: Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu* 2.5 (2023): 1073-1080.
2. Bercovitch, J., & Langley, J. "The role of mediation in conflict resolution: An analysis of effectiveness." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 37.1 (2020): 1-20.
3. Chegnizadeh, G. A., Esmaili Ardakani, A., & Ahmaddoust Estalaki, M. R. "Evolution of Conflict Resolution Tools in Europe: From Force to Diplomacy." *International Studies Journal (ISJ)* 21.3 (2025): 141-160.
4. Chen, L., & Smith, J. "Digital diplomacy: Bridging conflict gaps through technology." *Global Governance*, 28.2 (2022): 213-230.
5. Fisher, R. J. "Bridging the gap: Understanding conflict dynamics." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 63.2 (2019): 275-297.
6. Johnson, M. "Bridging conflict gaps in Colombia: A case study of diplomatic success." *Latin American Politics and Society*, 65.1 (2023): 55-78.
7. Karam, A. "Inclusive diplomacy and conflict resolution: Bridging the gap between parties." *International Negotiation*, 26.3 (2021): 345-367.
8. Lamy, S. L., & Watson, G. R. "The EU's Sanctions Policy in Response to the Crisis in Ukraine: Smart Power, Coercion, or Mediation?." *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 59.3 (2021): 703-720
9. Lee, A. "Shuttle diplomacy in the 21st century: New strategies for conflict resolution." *Journal of International Relations*, 45.2 (2021): 123-145.
10. Lee, A., & Kim, S. "Vaccine diplomacy in the age of COVID-19: A new diplomatic landscape." *Global Health Governance*, 15.1 (2022): 1-20.
11. Mbah, R. E., & Wasum, D. F. "Russian-Ukraine 2022 War: A review of the economic impact of Russian-Ukraine crisis on the USA, UK, Canada, and Europe." *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal* 9.3 (2022): 144-153.
12. ODUSANYA, O. S. E. "Comparative Analysis of Diplomacy and Peacekeeping Forces in Resolving International Conflicts in Africa." *Zhongguo Kuangye Daxue Xuebao* 30.1 (2025): 60-63.
13. Onyebuchi, L.O. "The Limits of Mediation in bringing Russo-Ukraine war to an end." *ISRG Journal of Arts Humanities & Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)*, II.VI (2024): 275–284.
14. Patel, M. "Digital diplomacy and conflict governance: Opportunities and challenges." *Global Policy*, 13.3 (2022): 350-363.
15. Patel, M., & Chen, L. "Cyber diplomacy: Navigating cybersecurity challenges in global conflict." *Journal of Cyber Policy*, 5.2 (2020): 145-162.
16. Roberts, M. "U.S.-China rivalry and its impact on global diplomacy." *Journal of International Affairs*, 76.2 (2023): 89-104.
17. Smith, R., & Johnson, T. "Nationalism in the age of global conflict: Implications for diplomacy." *International Relations Review*, 42.3 (2019): 215-232.
18. Smith, R., & Jones, T. "The UN's role in conflict resolution: Challenges and

- opportunities. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 31.4 (2020): 457-475.
19. Thompson, J. "Climate change and conflict: New diplomatic challenges in the 21st century." *Environmental Politics*, 30.4 (2021): 675-692.
 20. Thompson, J. "The Syrian conflict: A case study in diplomatic challenges." *Middle East Journal of International Relations*, 10.1 (2023): 45-67.
 21. Tripathi, S. "The war in Ukraine: towards nuclear catastrophe? World Affairs." *The Journal of International Issues*, 27.3 (2023): 10-21.
 22. Vişan, G. "The Long Road from War to Peace: The Russo-Ukrainian War After Three Years." Policy paper no 41. Romanian Diplomatic Institute.
 23. Zartman, I. W.. "Negotiating in civil wars: The challenges of multiple actors." *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 26.1 (2019): 1-15
 2. Bercovitch, J., & Lee, S. "Confidence-building measures in protracted conflicts." *International Negotiation*, 27.3 (2022): 401-420.
 3. Bordoff, J., & O'Sullivan, M. L. "The geopolitics of energy in the Ukraine crisis." *Foreign Affairs*, 101.5 (2022): 78-90.
 4. European Commission. "REPowerEU: A plan to reduce dependence on Russian energy." *Energy Policy Reports*. (2022).
 5. Freedman, L., & Lucas, E. "Countering disinformation in the digital age." *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 46.2 (2023): 189-210.
 6. Hafner-Burton, E. M., & Tsutsui, K. "Accountability for war crimes: The ICC and Ukraine." *International Organization*, 77.3 (2023): 321-340.
 7. Lukin, A. "Russia-China relations in the shadow of Ukraine." *The Pacific Review*, 37.1 (2024): 89-110.
 8. Mearsheimer, J. J. "The causes and consequences of the Ukraine crisis." *International Security*, 47.1 (2022): 7-43.
 9. Siddi, M. "Russia's energy weapon and Europe's response." *Energy Security Journal*, 12.1 (2023): 23-39.
 10. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. "Ukraine refugee crisis: Global response." *UNHCR Reports*. (2023).

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Source used for analysis

1. Aydin, M., & Sahin, M. "Mediation in the Russo-Ukrainian conflict: Challenges and opportunities." *Journal of Peace Research*, 60.2 (2023): 245-260.

Source of support:Nil; **Conflict of interest:** Nil.

Cite this article as:

Onyebuchi, O. L., Mac-Ocloo, R. B. & Chinedu, E. N. "Emerging Diplomatic Issues Rising from Russo-Ukrainian Conflict: Critical Analysis." *Sarcouncil Journal of Economics and Business Management* 5.8 (2026): pp 20-26.