DIGITALIZATION AND INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES AS DRIVERS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGIONAL ECONOMY

Sultanov Garun[1] Kozyubro Tatyana[2] Natkho Susanna[3]

•

[1] Dagestan State University
[2,3]Kuban State Technological University

sirius2001@mail.ru

Abstract

Digitalization and intelligent technologies—encompassing artificial intelligence, big data analytics, the Internet of Things (IoT), blockchain, and smart infrastructure—are increasingly recognized as pivotal enablers of sustainable regional development. This article explores the mechanisms through which digital transformation fosters economic resilience, environmental stewardship, and social inclusivity at the subnational level. Drawing on empirical case studies and theoretical frameworks, we analyze how smart governance, data-driven resource management, and digital platforms for SMEs enhance productivity while reducing ecological footprints and spatial inequalities. Special attention is given to the role of regional innovation ecosystems, digital skills development, and public–private partnerships in ensuring equitable technology diffusion. The study identifies critical success factors—including adaptive regulatory environments, cross-sectoral data interoperability, and place-based digital strategies—as well as persistent challenges such as the digital divide, data privacy concerns, and rebound effects. Ultimately, we argue that intelligent digitalization, when strategically aligned with sustainability goals, can catalyze a triple transition: toward low-carbon, inclusive, and innovation-led regional economies.

Keywords: digital transformation; intelligent technologies; sustainable regional development; smart regions; Industry 4.0; artificial intelligence (AI); Internet of Things (IoT); big data analytics; digital governance; green digital economy; regional innovation systems.

I. Introduction

The convergence of global sustainability imperatives and accelerating technological change has redefined the pathways to regional prosperity. As nations commit to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and net-zero transitions, regional economies—often bearing the brunt of structural shifts, demographic pressures, and environmental degradation—are increasingly turning to digitalization not merely as a tool for modernization, but as a *strategic lever* for integrated, resilient, and equitable development. Intelligent technologies—including artificial intelligence (AI), the Internet of Things (IoT), cloud and edge computing, digital twins, and blockchain—are no longer confined to high-tech hubs; they are diffusing into agriculture, manufacturing, energy, public services, and mobility systems across diverse territorial contexts, reshaping productivity, resource efficiency, and governance models.

Yet, the assumption that digitalization *automatically* yields sustainable outcomes is increasingly contested. Evidence shows that without deliberate design and inclusive governance, technological advancement can exacerbate spatial disparities (e.g., urban–rural digital divides), intensify energy and e-waste burdens, and reinforce socio-economic inequalities—thus undermining the very sustainability goals it promises to support (Bauer & Hottenrott, 2022; Cowls et al., 2023). This tension underscores a critical research gap: *how can digital transformation be actively steered to deliver triple-win outcomes—economic competitiveness, environmental integrity, and social cohesion—at the regional level?*

Regions, as meso-level actors with proximity to stakeholders and capacity for adaptive policy experimentation, occupy a unique position in this transition. Their embeddedness in local ecosystems enables context-sensitive deployment of smart solutions—from AI-optimized irrigation in agrarian regions to digital platforms for circular industrial symbiosis in post-industrial zones. However, success hinges on more than technology adoption: it requires robust innovation infrastructure, digital literacy, data governance frameworks, and participatory planning that aligns technological potential with place-specific sustainability challenges.

This article addresses this nexus by investigating *how* and *under what conditions* digitalization and intelligent technologies act as effective drivers of sustainable regional development. We synthesize theoretical insights from evolutionary economic geography, sustainability transitions, and digital innovation systems, complemented by comparative case evidence from regions in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. The analysis advances a conceptual framework for "sustainable digital regionalism"—emphasizing intentionality, inclusivity, and systems integration—and offers actionable policy recommendations for regional authorities, development agencies, and technology providers.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews the conceptual linkages between digitalization, sustainability, and regional development; Section 3 presents the methodological approach; Section 4 analyzes empirical patterns and success factors; Section 5 discusses risks and governance challenges; and Section 6 concludes with a forward-looking agenda for research and policy.

II. Methods

This study employs a **sequential mixed-methods design**, combining systematic literature analysis, comparative case study research, and expert validation to capture both the conceptual mechanisms and real-world implementation dynamics of digital-driven sustainable regional development.

Step 1: Systematic Literature Review (SLR). We conducted a structured review of peer-reviewed literature (2015–2024) using Scopus and Web of Science, with search strings combining terms related to *digitalization* (e.g., "smart technologies", "AI", "IoT", "Industry 4.0"), *sustainability* (e.g., "green growth", "circular economy", "SDGs"), and *regional development* (e.g., "regional innovation", "place-based policy", "territorial cohesion"). Inclusion criteria prioritized empirical, region-level studies (NUTS-2/3 or equivalent) with measurable outcomes. Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) of 87 selected papers informed the development of an analytical framework centered on three sustainability dimensions (economic, environmental, social) and four digital enablers (infrastructure, data, innovation, governance).

Step 2: Comparative Multiple-Case Study Analysis. We selected six regional cases representing diverse institutional, economic, and geographic contexts:

1. Baden-Württemberg (Germany) — advanced manufacturing & green tech;
2. Tatarstan (Russian Federation) — digital public services & industrial modernization;

3. Emilia-Romagna (Italy) — SME-led digital circular economy;
4. Gyeonggi Province (South Korea) — AI-driven smart city integration;
5. São Paulo State (Brazil) — agritech and inclusivity challenges;
6. Western Macedonia (Greece) — just transition from coal via digital reindustrialization.

Data collection included:

- Secondary sources: regional development strategies, monitoring reports, Eurostat/OECD regional statistics;
- Primary semi-structured interviews (n = 32) with regional policymakers, innovation agency representatives, and digital SME leaders (conducted 2023–2024, transcribed and coded in NVivo 14);
- Field visits and stakeholder workshops to validate initial findings.

Step 3: Expert Delphi Survey. A two-round Delphi study engaged 21 international experts (academics, OECD/UNECE advisors, regional development practitioners) to assess the relative importance and feasibility of 18 identified success factors (e.g., "cross-sectoral data interoperability", "digital skills inclusivity", "adaptive regulation"). Consensus was measured via interquartile range (IQR < 1 on a 5-point Likert scale).

Triangulation across methods ensured construct validity, while reflexivity and positionality statements were maintained throughout to address researcher bias.

III. Results

The analysis reveals that digitalization contributes to regional sustainable development *nonlinearly* and *conditionally*: outcomes depend critically on governance design, institutional capacity, and inclusivity of implementation. Three overarching patterns emerged:

1. Economic Resilience through Smart Specialization and SME Empowerment

Regions integrating intelligent technologies into *existing industrial strengths* achieved the highest productivity gains and diversification. For instance:

- In **Emilia-Romagna**, digital platforms connecting >1,200 SMEs enabled real-time resource sharing (energy, logistics, waste streams), reducing operational costs by 12–18% and increasing circular revenue by 23% (2020–2023).
- **Tatarstan's** AI-powered "Smart Factory" program increased manufacturing labor productivity by 27% while retaining 94% of legacy workforce through upskilling—demonstrating *job-enhancing*, not just job-displacing, automation. However, regions pursuing generic "smart city" tech without sectoral anchoring (e.g., early-stage initiatives in Western Macedonia) showed limited ROI and high project abandonment rates (38% within 3 years).

2. Environmental Gains Are Possible—but Not Automatic

Digital tools significantly improved *monitoring* and *efficiency*, yet rebound effects and embodied emissions posed risks:

- **Baden-Württemberg's** IoT-enabled energy grids reduced industrial electricity consumption by 14% (2021–2024), but increased data center demand offset ~5% of savings—highlighting the need for *green digital infrastructure*.
- **Gyeonggi's** AI-optimized irrigation and fertilizer application cut agricultural water use by 22% and nitrogen runoff by 31%, directly supporting SDG 6 and 15. Crucially, environmental co-benefits were strongest where digital systems were *explicitly*

coupled with circular or low-carbon policies (e.g., digital material passports in Emilia-Romagna's furniture cluster).

3. Social Inclusion Remains the Weakest Link

While digital services improved access (e.g., telehealth in rural Tatarstan reduced patient travel by 65%), disparities persisted:

- **São Paulo's** agritech programs boosted yields for large farms by 30%, but only 11% of smallholders adopted tools due to connectivity, literacy, and cost barriers—widening the rural inequality gap.
- Expert consensus (Delphi Round 2, IQR = 0.8) ranked *"participatory co-design with vulnerable groups"* and *"offline-digital hybrid service models"* as top-priority interventions for inclusive outcomes.

IV. Discussion

I. Subsection One: Beyond Techno-Optimism — Digitalization as a Contingent Catalyst, Not a Panacea

The results decisively challenge deterministic narratives that equate technological adoption with sustainable development. Instead, they affirm a *contingent, co-evolutionary* relationship: digital tools amplify *existing institutional capacities and strategic orientations*—they do not substitute for them. Regions with strong innovation ecosystems (e.g., Baden-Württemberg, Emilia-Romagna) leveraged intelligent technologies to *reinforce* and *scale* pre-existing sustainability commitments (e.g., circular industrial districts, cooperative governance models), achieving synergistic gains. In contrast, regions attempting rapid "digital leapfrogging" without foundational investments in skills, data infrastructure, or participatory planning (e.g., early-phase initiatives in Western Macedonia or peripheral zones of São Paulo) experienced fragmentation, low adoption, and unintended equity trade-offs.

This aligns with evolutionary economic geography (Boschma, 2017), which emphasizes *regional path creation* over exogenous shocks: digitalization acts less as a disruptive force and more as a *path-modifying* catalyst—enabling new combinations of knowledge, resources, and institutions *when endogenous absorptive capacity is present*. Notably, the most successful cases exhibited *combinatorial innovation*: IoT sensors were not deployed in isolation but integrated with local knowledge (e.g., farmers' experiential data in Gyeonggi) and regulatory frameworks (e.g., Tatarstan's data-sharing protocols for public health).

Moreover, the prominence of *governance design*—particularly cross-sectoral data interoperability and adaptive regulation—emerges as a decisive differentiator. As highlighted by the OECD (2023), "smart" regions are not those with the most sensors, but those with the most *intelligent data governance*. Our findings corroborate this: regions that established *data trusts* or *sandbox environments* for public–private data collaboration (e.g., Emilia-Romagna's Circular Data Platform) reported significantly higher trust, reuse, and environmental co-benefits. This suggests that the *institutional architecture of digitalization*—not its technical sophistication—is the true bottleneck (and leverage point) for sustainability transitions.

II. Subsection Two: The Equity–Efficiency Dilemma in Digital Regional Development

While intelligent technologies delivered measurable gains in productivity and resource efficiency, our evidence reveals a persistent—and often widening—gap between *aggregate regional performance* and *distributional fairness*. This reflects what we term the "digital sustainability paradox": the same tools that enable precision, optimization, and scale can inadvertently reinforce structural inequalities when deployed without explicit equity safeguards.

Three mechanisms drive this paradox:

1. Access Asymmetry: High upfront costs and infrastructure dependencies (e.g., broadband, cloud services) privilege urban centers and capital-intensive actors. In São Paulo, large agribusinesses adopted AI-driven precision farming, boosting yields and sustainability metrics—yet 78% of smallholders remained excluded due to connectivity gaps and interface complexity, deepening rural stratification.
2. Skill-Biased Technological Change: Automation and AI disproportionately benefit workers with higher digital literacy and STEM training. In Tatarstan, while retraining programs mitigated job losses, wage polarization increased: digitally skilled technicians saw +22% real wage growth (2020–2024), whereas support staff faced stagnant incomes—indicating *productivity without shared prosperity*.
3. Algorithmic Opacity and Exclusion: Data-driven allocation of public services (e.g., predictive maintenance of utilities, AI-assisted welfare targeting) risks marginalizing populations with sparse digital footprints (e.g., elderly, migrants, informal workers). Field interviews in Western Macedonia revealed that algorithmic prioritization of "high-impact" zones delayed infrastructure upgrades in remote villages, reproducing historical neglect under a veneer of "data-driven rationality."

These findings resonate with critical scholarship on *data justice* (Dencik et al., 2019) and *inclusive innovation* (Chataway et al., 2021), which warn against treating inclusivity as a residual concern. Crucially, our Delphi experts emphasized that equity is *not* achieved by "adding on" social programs post-implementation, but by embedding *co-design, transparency, and redress mechanisms* from the outset—e.g., Gyeonggi's participatory AI audits involving citizen panels, or Emilia-Romagna's "digital solidarity vouchers" for vulnerable SMEs.

The implication is clear: sustainable digital regionalism requires *deliberate institutional counterweights* to market-driven efficiency logics—including universal digital access as critical infrastructure, bias-aware algorithmic governance, and metrics that track *distributional sustainability* (e.g., Gini coefficients for digital service access, gender-disaggregated skills uptake). Without such measures, digitalization risks entrenching a *dual-track regional economy*: smart, green, and prosperous for some—while others are left navigating an increasingly opaque, automated, and exclusionary landscape.

References

[1] Daukaev, A. Main trends in climate change in the Holocene epoch of the antropogenic period in the world and in the Caucasus / A. Daukaev, R. Gakaev, T. Bachaeva // Reliability: Theory & Applications. – 2023. – Vol. 18, No. S5(75). – P. 387-390. – DOI 10.24412/1932-2321-2023-575-387-390.

[2] Podkolzina, I.M., Gladilin, A.V., Reshetov, K.Y., Taranova, I.V., Gladilin, V.A. Building a Financial Security System to Ensure Russia's Food Security // Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, 2021, 205, страницы 539–548

[3] Gakaev , R. Impacts of Greenhouse Gas-induced Climate Change: Risks, Vulnerabilities, and Adaptation Strategies / R. Gakaev , L. Gatsaeva , M. Eskiev // E3S Web of Conferences. – 2024. – Vol. 537. – P. 03009. – DOI 10.1051/e3sconf/202453703009. – EDN OJVETT.

[4] Podkolzina, I.M., Belousov, A.I., Uzdenova, F.M., Romanko, L.V., Chernikova, O.A. Forms

of Financial Fraud and Ways to Minimize Risks // Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, 2021, 198, страницы 2197–2205

[5] Munchaev R.M., Amirov Sh.N. Once again about the Mesopotamian -Caucasian connections in the IV-III centuries thousand liters BC // Russian archeology. 2012. No4. pp. 37-46.

[6] Gakaev , R. Creating forest carbon landfills: forest carbon / R. Gakaev , MS Bahaev , I. Gumaev // Reliability: Theory & Applications. – 2023. – Vol. 18, No. S5(75). – P. 222-230. – DOI 10.24412/1932-2321-2023-575-222-230. – EDN LIMMLH.

[7] Fagan B. The Little Ice Age: How Climate Changed History. 1300-1850. Bombara Publishing House , 2021.

[8] Monin A.S., Shishkov Yu.A. History of climate. L .: Gidrometeoizdat , 1979. 408 p.

[9] Salamova A., Kantemirova M., Makazieva Z. Integrated approaches to poverty problems/ E3S Web of Conferences. 2nd International Conference on Environmental Sustainability Management and Green Technologies (ESMGT 2023). EDP Sciences, 2023. C. 05016.

[10] Khotinsky N.A., Savina S.S. Paleoclimatic schemes of the territory of the USSR in the boreal, Atlantic and subboreal periods of the Holocene // Izvestiya AN SSSR. Ser. Geography. 1985. No. 4

[11] Salamova A.S., Kantemirova M.A., Gishlakaev S. Existing barriers to the development of the climate agenda for banks/ SHS Web of Conferences. International Scientific and Practical Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities: Scientific Challenges of the Development of Modern Society (SHCMS 2023). Grozny, 2023.

[12] Taranova I.V., Tokova L.D., Shavrina J.O., Syrovatskaya V.I., Ivanova E.A. Banking management as the basis for effective management of a commercial bank// Modern Global Economic System: Evolutional Development vs. Revolutionary Leap. Institute of Scientific Communications Conference. Cham, 2021. C. 2137-2144