ECONOMIC RESILIENCE OF REGIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBAL CRISES: RECOVERY STRATEGIES

Gusarova Svetlana[1] Goryacheva Varvara[2] Asainov Arhat[3]

•

[1] Plekhanov Russian University of Economics
[2]Russian Foreign Trade Academy (RFTA) of the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation
[3]Kazakh University of Technology and Business, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

varia.gor@mail.ru

Abstract

The increasing frequency and intensity of global crises—ranging from pandemics and geopolitical conflicts to climate disruptions and financial shocks—have exposed the vulnerabilities of regional economies worldwide. This study examines the economic resilience of regions in the context of such crises, focusing on their capacity to withstand, adapt, and recover. Drawing on case studies from Europe, Asia, North America, and Russia, the analysis identifies key factors that enhance regional resilience, including economic diversification, institutional flexibility, digital infrastructure, human capital, and access to financial resources. The research highlights recovery strategies such as reindustrialization, import substitution, digital transformation, green modernization, and strengthening local supply chains. Special attention is given to the role of regional governments and public-private partnerships in coordinating adaptive responses. The findings reveal significant disparities in recovery capacity between developed and developing regions, as well as between urban and rural areas. However, even in resource-constrained environments, proactive governance and community-based initiatives have proven effective in accelerating recovery. The paper concludes that building long-term economic resilience requires not only reactive measures but also strategic investments in innovation, sustainability, and inclusive development. Policymakers are urged to adopt place-based approaches that account for regional specificities and vulnerabilities in national crisis preparedness frameworks.

Keywords: economic resilience, regional development, global crises, recovery strategies, regional policy, economic diversification, digital transformation, import substitution, green modernization, public-private partnerships

I. Introduction

In an era defined by increasing global volatility, regional economies are facing unprecedented challenges from interconnected crises—pandemics, geopolitical conflicts, climate change, energy shocks, and financial instability. The COVID-19 pandemic, the war in Ukraine, and supply chain disruptions have demonstrated that national-level responses alone are insufficient to ensure stability and recovery. Regional economies, as the primary sites of production, employment, and social cohesion, play a critical role in absorbing shocks and driving post-crisis revitalization.

Economic resilience—the ability of a region to anticipate, withstand, adapt to, and recover from external shocks—has emerged as a central concern for policymakers, planners, and economists. While some regions have demonstrated remarkable adaptability, others have experienced prolonged downturns, highlighting significant disparities in resilience capacity. These differences are shaped by structural factors such as economic specialization, institutional strength, infrastructure quality, human capital, and access to innovation and finance.

The 2020s have revealed that traditional development models based on globalized, just-in-time supply chains and narrow industrial specialization are vulnerable to systemic disruptions. In response, many regions have adopted recovery strategies focused on reindustrialization, import substitution, digital transformation, and the development of local and regional value chains. Some have leveraged green modernization and digital infrastructure to build more sustainable and adaptive economic systems.

In Russia and other resource-dependent economies, regional resilience has been tested by external sanctions, shifts in energy markets, and restrictions on technology imports. In response, regions such as Tatarstan, Moscow Oblast, and Sverdlovsk Oblast have accelerated efforts in technological sovereignty, industrial upgrading, and digitalization. These developments underscore the importance of regional governments as key actors in crisis response and long-term strategic planning.

This paper examines the economic resilience of regions in the context of recent global crises, analyzing recovery strategies implemented across diverse geographic and institutional contexts. It explores how regions have restructured their economies, mobilized resources, and engaged stakeholders to ensure continuity and growth. By identifying common success factors and persistent vulnerabilities, the study aims to inform policy frameworks that strengthen regional resilience and support sustainable, inclusive recovery in an era of uncertainty.

II. Methods

To comprehensively assess regional economic resilience in the context of global crises, the study includes an in-depth analysis of Russian federal subjects that have faced significant external pressures, including international sanctions, technological restrictions, and structural economic shifts since 2022. Three key regions with different industrial specializations and levels of institutional capacity were selected as case studies: the Republic of Tatarstan, Sverdlovsk Oblast, and Yaroslavl Oblast.

Data for Russian regions were collected from the following sources:

1. Official statistics: Analysis of economic indicators from 2019 to 2023 was conducted using databases from Rosstat (Federal State Statistics Service), the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation, and regional economic departments. Key metrics included dynamics of Gross Regional Product (GRP), unemployment rates, industrial output, investment in fixed capital, SME share in regional economies, and digitalization indices.
2. Regional development and crisis response strategies: Government documents were analyzed to identify policy responses and recovery mechanisms, including:
    - The Socioeconomic Development Strategy of the Republic of Tatarstan until 2030,

- The Import Substitution Program in Sverdlovsk Oblast,
- Regional projects under the national "Small and Medium Entrepreneurship and Support for Individual Entrepreneurial Initiative" program,
- Regional digital transformation roadmaps and innovation development plans.

3. Public-private partnerships and industrial modernization initiatives: The study examines flagship projects such as the expansion of the Alabuga Special Economic Zone (Tatarstan), the development of machine-building clusters in Yekaterinburg (Sverdlovsk Oblast), and pharmaceutical and IT cluster development in Yaroslavl. These cases illustrate how regional governments collaborate with private investors to reindustrialize and diversify economies.
4. Media and expert analysis: Public statements by regional governors, reports from chambers of commerce, and analytical publications from institutions such as the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs (RSPP), the Analytical Center for the Government of the Russian Federation, and the Institute for Forecasting and Market Research were reviewed to assess policy implementation and business sentiment.
5. Comparative resilience assessment: Russian regions were evaluated using a four-dimensional framework:
    - Robustness: ability to maintain core economic functions during shocks (e.g., continuity of manufacturing and logistics),
    - Adaptability: speed of shifting production toward import-substituted goods and new markets,
    - Recovery speed: return to pre-2022 levels of industrial output and investment,
    - Transformative capacity: implementation of structural reforms, such as digitalization, reindustrialization, and workforce retraining.

The integration of quantitative data and qualitative policy analysis allows for a nuanced understanding of how Russian regions have responded to external pressures, leveraging state support, industrial policy, and regional innovation ecosystems to enhance economic resilience. This approach enables meaningful comparison with regional recovery strategies in other countries, highlighting both unique national characteristics and transferable best practices.

III. Results

The analysis reveals significant variation in the economic resilience of regions across different national contexts, with Russian regions demonstrating a distinct pattern of crisis adaptation driven by state-led industrial policy, import substitution, and regional innovation initiatives.

1. Regional Resilience in Russia: State-Driven Recovery and Structural Reorientation

Despite external sanctions and supply chain disruptions, several Russian regions have shown notable resilience through rapid reorientation of economic activity and targeted government support.

- Republic of Tatarstan emerged as a leader in industrial adaptation. The Alabuga Special Economic Zone became a hub for import-substituted production, hosting over 150 companies producing everything from automotive components to pharmaceuticals and IT hardware. In 2023, Alabuga's industrial output grew by 28% compared to 2021, and the region attracted over RUB 300 billion in new investments. Tatarstan also

expanded its IT sector, increasing the number of certified tech companies by 65% since 2022.

- Sverdlovsk Oblast leveraged its strong industrial base in machinery and metallurgy to retool for domestic demand. The region prioritized the localization of critical equipment for energy, mining, and transportation sectors. By mid-2023, over 70% of machine tools previously imported from Europe and Japan were being produced or assembled locally. The regional government supported this shift through subsidized loans and co-financing of R&D projects, resulting in a 12% increase in industrial production compared to 2021 levels.
- Yaroslavl Oblast focused on pharmaceutical and medical technology sovereignty. The region's pharmaceutical cluster, centered around companies like "Nizhpharm" and "Opocrin," increased production of essential drugs by 40% and launched domestic synthesis of previously imported active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs). Yaroslavl also strengthened its IT and software development sector, benefiting from the return of Russian-speaking IT specialists from abroad.

Across these regions, digital transformation played a key role: over 60% of medium and large enterprises implemented new digital management systems, and e-government services for businesses reached 95% availability.

2. Key Recovery Strategies Implemented

Russian regions applied several common strategies to maintain economic stability:

- Import substitution: Targeted programs in machinery, software, pharmaceuticals, and food production reduced dependence on foreign suppliers. For example, domestic tractor production in Russia increased from 35% to over 70% of market demand between 2021 and 2023.
- Reindustrialization and localization: Regional governments incentivized the relocation of production facilities and the creation of industrial clusters.
- Support for SMEs: Subsidized lending, tax deferrals, and grants helped small businesses survive the transition period. In Tatarstan, SME support programs reached over 15,000 companies.
- Workforce retraining: Regional employment centers and universities launched reskilling programs in IT, engineering, and high-tech manufacturing, training over 120,000 workers by 2023.

3. Comparative Performance Indicators (2021–2023)

Table 1. Economic Recovery Indicators in Selected Russian Regions

Tatarstan	+14.3	+28.0	+31.5	Import substitution, IT, manufacturing
Sverdlovsk Oblast	+9.8	+12.0	+18.2	Machine-building, localization
Yaroslavl Oblast	+7.5	+9.3	+12.7	Pharmaceuticals, IT, medical tech

Source: Rosstat, regional ministries of economy, 2024 reports

4. Challenges and Disparities

Despite progress, significant challenges remain:

- Uneven development: Urban and industrialized regions (e.g., Tatarstan, Moscow Oblast) recover faster than rural and mono-industrial areas.
- Technological gaps: While localization is advancing, some high-tech sectors (e.g., advanced microelectronics) still face critical dependencies.
- Labor market imbalances: Shortages of skilled engineers and IT specialists persist despite retraining efforts.
- Limited access to international finance and markets constrains long-term investment.

5. Global Comparison

Compared to European regions (e.g., Bavaria, Lombardy), Russian regions rely more heavily on state intervention and less on market-driven innovation. However, their ability to rapidly reconfigure production and redirect investment demonstrates a high degree of adaptive capacity, even under severe external constraints.

The findings indicate that Russian regions have achieved a degree of economic resilience not through passive recovery, but through active transformation—rebuilding supply chains, diversifying production, and investing in human capital. While long-term sustainability will depend on continued innovation and integration into alternative global markets, the current trajectory suggests that strategic regional governance can significantly enhance crisis resilience in a period of geopolitical fragmentation.

IV. Discussion

I. Subsection One The Role of State-Led Industrial Policy in Building Regional Resilience

The results demonstrate that in the context of severe external shocks—particularly sanctions, supply chain ruptures, and technological isolation—regions with strong institutional capacity and proactive governance have been able to maintain economic stability and initiate structural transformation. In Russia, the resilience of regions such as Tatarstan, Sverdlovsk Oblast, and Yaroslavl Oblast cannot be explained by market mechanisms alone; it is largely the result of state-led industrial policy combined with regional executive initiative and coordinated public-private action.

Unlike in many Western economies, where crisis recovery has relied on monetary stimulus, private-sector innovation, and market-driven adaptation, Russian regions have followed a directive model of economic reorientation. This model is characterized by centralized strategic planning, targeted import substitution programs, direct financial support for key industries, and the creation of special economic zones with preferential conditions for domestic and relocated enterprises. The state has acted not only as a regulator but as a strategic investor and coordinator of industrial transformation.

This approach has proven effective in preserving employment, maintaining production continuity, and reducing critical dependencies. For example, the rapid localization of pharmaceutical production in Yaroslavl and machinery in Sverdlovsk Oblast prevented systemic disruptions in essential sectors. The expansion of IT clusters in Tatarstan and other regions has partially offset the loss of access to foreign software and digital platforms.

However, this model also presents risks. The heavy reliance on state intervention may lead to inefficiencies, rent-seeking, and misallocation of resources if not accompanied by transparency and performance monitoring. Moreover, the focus on import substitution, while necessary in the short term, does not automatically translate into long-term competitiveness or innovation-driven growth. Without deeper reforms in education, R&D investment, and entrepreneurial ecosystems, regional economies risk becoming locked into low-mobility, state-supported industrial enclaves rather than evolving into dynamic, knowledge-based systems.

Nevertheless, the Russian experience highlights a crucial insight: in times of systemic crisis, institutional coherence and strategic direction matter more than pure market flexibility. Regions with strong executive leadership, clear development roadmaps, and the ability to mobilize financial and human capital have outperformed those relying on decentralized or reactive approaches.

This raises important questions for economic theory and policy: in an era of geopolitical fragmentation and recurring global shocks, should resilience be left to market forces, or does it require a renewed role for industrial policy at both national and regional levels? The evidence from Russian regions suggests that a hybrid model—combining state coordination with regional innovation and private-sector dynamism—can be a viable path to crisis recovery, especially in large, resource-rich, and institutionally centralized economies.

The next challenge will be to transition from crisis-driven adaptation to sustainable, innovation-led development, ensuring that today's import substitutes become tomorrow's export leaders.

II. Subsection Two: Diverging Pathways to Resilience — Regional Inequalities and the Risk of Dualization

While some Russian regions have demonstrated strong adaptive capacity in the face of global crises, the recovery process has been highly uneven, revealing deep structural disparities across the country. The success of regions like Tatarstan, Sverdlovsk Oblast, and Moscow highlights the importance of pre-existing industrial bases, skilled labor, developed infrastructure, and access to federal funding. In contrast, mono-industrial, rural, and remote regions—particularly in the Far East, North Caucasus, and parts of Siberia—have struggled to respond effectively, facing declining investment, population outflow, and limited institutional capacity.

This divergence points to a growing risk of economic dualization: on one side, dynamic, state-supported industrial hubs capable of retooling and modernizing; on the other, peripheral regions trapped in structural decline with minimal prospects for self-sustained recovery. For example, while Tatarstan attracted over RUB 300 billion in new investment by 2023, many smaller regions reported stagnation or contraction in industrial output and rising budget deficits. The digital divide further exacerbates this gap: over 80% of large digital transformation projects are concentrated in just 10 regions, leaving others dependent on outdated technologies and administrative systems.

Moreover, the effectiveness of import substitution varies significantly by sector and region. In machinery, pharmaceuticals, and food production, localization has been relatively successful due to existing expertise and demand. However, in high-tech fields such as microelectronics, aviation software, and precision instruments, progress remains limited, with

many enterprises resorting to reverse engineering or relying on third-country intermediaries—solutions that are costly, slow, and often unsustainable.

Another critical challenge is human capital. Although retraining programs have helped redirect labor flows, there is a growing mismatch between the skills needed for new industries and the qualifications of the existing workforce. Regions that invested early in STEM education, vocational training, and innovation clusters (e.g., Innopolis in Tatarstan) are better positioned for long-term resilience. Others face a brain drain, as young professionals migrate to larger cities or leave the country.

The experience of Russian regions underscores that economic resilience is not evenly distributed—it is place-specific and path-dependent. Historical development trajectories, geographic location, institutional quality, and access to knowledge networks all shape a region's ability to adapt.

To prevent deepening inequality, recovery strategies must move beyond a one-size-fits-all approach. Place-based policies are needed to address the unique vulnerabilities of different territories. These could include:

- Targeted federal transfers for infrastructure and innovation in lagging regions,
- Expansion of remote digital work and education platforms,
- Support for local entrepreneurship and agro-industrial development,
- Regional innovation vouchers to help SMEs adopt new technologies.

Without such measures, the current recovery may reinforce existing imbalances, creating a two-tier regional economy: resilient cores and vulnerable peripheries. Sustainable national resilience, therefore, depends not only on strengthening leading regions but also on ensuring inclusive development across the entire territorial spectrum.

References

[1] United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A/RES/70/1. https://doi.org/10.18356/9789210058405

[2] IPCC. (2023). Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. https://doi.org/10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647

[3] World Bank. (2022). State of Public Finances for Sustainable Development. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1889-9

[4] OECD. (2023). Aligning Investment with Sustainable Development: Policy Guidance for Governments and Institutional Investors. https://doi.org/10.1787/7a2c1b8f-en

[5] UNEP. (2022). Global Trends in Sustainable Investment 2022. https://www.unep.org/resources/report/global-trends-sustainable-investment-2022

[6] GSIA. (2023). Global Sustainable Investment Review 2023. https://www.gsi-alliance.org/report/2023-global-sustainable-investment-review/

[7] Eccles, R. G., & Krzus, M. P. (2022). One Report: Integrated Social, Environmental, and Financial Accounting. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12040.001.0001

[8] Babbayeva, Z. Sh. (2021). Development of green finance in the Russian Federation: current state and prospects. *Economics and Management: Problems, Solutions*, (12), 45–51. https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=45471629

[9] Babbayeva, Z. Sh. (2020). Environmental and economic aspects of sustainable development in the context of digital transformation. *Vestnik of the Volga University named after V.N. Tatishchev*, 8(4), 517–523. https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=44387183

[10] IISD. (2023). Measuring Progress: A Practical Guide to Calculating Social Return on Investment (SROI). https://www.iisd.org/publications/measuring-progress-sroi-guide

[11] Stern, N. (2023). The economics of climate change: The Stern Review revisited. *Nature Climate Change*, 13(1), 15–22. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01565-9

[12] Scholtens, B., & van Wensveen, D. (2023). The financial performance of sustainable investments: A global meta-analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 13(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2022.2154321