Russian Enterprises in the Spring of 2022: Adapting to the New Wave of Sanctions and Views on the ESG Agenda
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Abstract—The article analyzes the results obtained by a regular survey of Russian enterprises in the real sector conducted by the Institute of Economic Forecasting, Russian Academy of Sciences. The consequences of economic sanctions against Russia for enterprises are assessed. The views of enterprises on the desirable measures of anticrisis policy aimed at countering sanctions are outlined. Methods for adaptation to sanctions that are applied by the enterprises themselves are described. The opinion expressed by enterprises about the role of the state in the economy is presented. The situation with the investment activity of enterprises is considered. Data on the purchases of Russian and foreign equipment are given, as well as comparative assessments of the quality of this equipment. The views of Russian enterprises on the relevance of the climate agenda are presented, as well as their attitude to the ESG principles. The share of Russian enterprises that publish financial statements on risks associated with climate change as well as nonfinancial statements in the field of sustainable development is estimated. The proportion of enterprises that set themselves the goal of reducing their carbon footprint is revealed.
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A sharp change in the geopolitical situation in February 2022 led to a new wave of sanctions against Russia. The scale of the sanctions was unprecedented and affected almost all sectors of the Russian economy. On the one hand, Western countries completely banned or significantly restricted the import of various types of machinery and equipment as well as raw materials and components into Russia. On the other hand, many export deliveries from Russia to Western countries were completely or partially blocked. In addition, a wide range of financial sanctions were introduced, from the freezing of half of Russia’s gold and foreign exchange reserves, which is extremely controversial from the viewpoint of international law, to the disconnection of leading Russian banks from the SWIFT payment system. Secondary sanctions have also been stepped up, such as creating problems for banks and third-country companies wishing to work with Russian counterparties.

At the beginning of the geopolitical crisis, many observers assumed that due to Western sanctions, the fall in Russia’s GDP by the end of 2022 would be from 9 to 22% [1–3]. The real decline was not so dramatic but still quite substantial. As early as in April 2022, a negative trend was observed for a number of macroeconomic indicators. Thus, for example, according to the Institute of Economic Forecasting RAS (IEF RAS), Russia’s GDP growth in April 2022 was −1.7% compared to April 2021 and −4.5% compared to March 2021 (seasonally adjusted) [4]. At the same time, the Russian authorities managed to quickly stabilize the ruble exchange rate, returning it to precrisis levels, to stop the inflationary surge, and to avoid panic in the banking system and the consumer market.

A survey of Russian enterprises conducted by IEF RAS in April—May 2022 also confirmed the duality of the situation. On the one hand, sanctions have created serious economic problems. In particular, 2—3 months after the imposition of sanctions, the proportion of respondents affected by them was 59.20% (Table 1). On the other hand, this is less than 2—3 months after the start of the 2020 crisis associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, when the proportion of affected respondents was 73.60% [5]. In other words, the crisis associated with sanctions is still less overwhelming.

At the same time, the majority of surveyed enterprises expected certain problems related to sanctions. Thirty-eight percent of respondents believed that...
Answers to the question: “Did your enterprise suffer from sanctions related to the situation in Ukraine?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period       | Yes   | No   | No, but it might get hurt in future |
|--------------|-------|------|------------------------------------|
| April–May 2022 | 59.20 | 18.50 | 22.30                              |

The consequences of sanctions would be exclusively negative; another 32.60% believed that the consequences would be both negative and positive. At the same time, a small proportion of enterprises were more optimistic as 5.40% of respondents assumed that the sanctions would not have any special consequences for their activities, and another 2.30% hoped only for positive consequences (Table 2).

Among the most acute problems caused by sanctions, 67.40% of enterprises most often named difficulties in obtaining imported raw materials and components; 62.00% named a rise in prices within the country; 44.20%, increased overall uncertainty in the economy; 40.30%, a rise in the cost of imports; and 38.80% cited a fall in effective demand within Russia (Table 3). It should also be noted that Russian enterprises were almost unconcerned about the difficulties in attracting foreign investors. Only 1.60% of respondents mentioned this problem. Apparently, this state of affairs means that the dependence of the Russian economy on foreign financing has become minimal. In the current situation, Russian enterprises are interested in foreign investors as in a source of high technology and advanced equipment but not as a source of money.

Adapting to the crisis phenomena that were generated by the sanctions, enterprises most often launched a search for alternative suppliers that could replace the departing Western partners within Russia itself; this was 69.70% of the responses. At the same time, 36.10% of respondents began to look for new suppliers outside of Russia. Unfortunately, as in the course of previous crises, a significant part of the surveyed enterprises—36.90%—reduced their investment costs for the sake of anticrisis adaptation. Such a massive reduction in investment is always unfavorable from the viewpoint of long-term development. At the same time, 14.80% of enterprises reported that, on the contrary, they launched the processes of production modernization as an anticrisis measure. In addition, it should be noted that enterprises took other measures of active adaptation. In particular, 31.10% of respondents reported on the search for new sales markets, and 21.30% reported on the launch of new types of products (Table 4).

The speed and effectiveness of enterprises’ adaptation to the problems caused by sanctions largely depends on the content of the state’s anticrisis policy. From the viewpoint of Russian enterprises, in the situation that developed in the spring of 2022, the most important actions of the authorities were as follows: 55.80% of responses cited limiting the growth in prices for fuel, energy, and transportation services; 52.70%, the reduction of the tax burden on manufacturers; 42.60%, financial support for manufacturers who have launched the production of import-substituting products; 39.50%, supporting demand in the economy through the growth of public procurement, payments of subsidies to the population, etc.; and 38.80%, a sharp expansion in the sphere of concessional lending (Table 5). In other words, according to enterprises, the anticrisis policy of the state should be both large-scale and very diverse.

As is often the case during crises, there have been certain shifts in the views of enterprises on the role of the state in the economy [6]. In this regard, it should be noted that the current crisis boosted the popularity of two extreme viewpoints. For example, the share of those who support a complete rejection of state intervention in the economy increased from 9.20% in 2020 to 14.60% in 2022, reaching the highest level for the entire period of the surveys. At the same time, the share of those advocating stronger direct state participation in the economy also increased — from 9.20% in 2020 to 16.30% in 2022. However, the number of those supporting a more active role played by the state in the economy among Russian enterprises is still significantly higher than that of those who favor weakening of the state role. While the total proportion of respondents who, to one degree or another, were in favor of reducing the role of the state in the economy was 30.90% in the spring of 2022, the total share of supporters of increasing this role was 61.80% (Table 6). However, at the same time, most enterprises considered the state to be a less effective owner than private owners (Table 7). In this regard, it can be assumed that in the course of emerging from the crises, the share of proponents of active state participation among the Russian enterprises will gradually decrease.

As expected, the investment activity of Russian enterprises in the context of the sanctions crisis has generally declined. While in 2020, 59.40% of the sur-
### Table 3. Answers to the question: “What problems related to economic sanctions against Russia are the most acute for your company?” (sum of answers > 100%)

| Period          | Difficulties in obtaining imported raw materials and components, the need to replace them | A serious rise in the cost of imports | Reduced opportunities for exporting our products | Sagging solvent demand within Russia | Rising prices within the country | Rise in the cost of credit | Difficulties in attracting foreign investors | Restrictions on technology imports and a slowdown in technological modernization | Increasing overall economic uncertainty | Other |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------|
| April–May 2022 | 67.4                                                                                            | 40.3                                | 17.1                                      | 38.8                               | 62.0                              | 32.6            | 1.6                                         | 22.5                                            | 44.2                                         | 3.1    |

### Table 4. Answers to the question: “What measures is your company taking to counter the ‘sanctions-related’ crisis?” (sum of answers > 100%)

| Period          | The search for new suppliers abroad was started | The search for new suppliers in Russia was started | Investment costs have been reduced | Staff costs were reduced (layoffs, cuts in wages, social package, etc.) | The output of some products was discontinued | The output of new products was launched | The search for new markets was started | Actions were initiated in order to restructure production for the future (repairs, modernization, etc.) | Other |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------|
| April–May 2022 | 36.10                                         | 69.70                                            | 36.90                           | 11.50                                            | 14.80                           | 21.30                           | 31.10                           | 14.80                                            | 3.30   |

### Table 5. Answers to the question: “What measures to counter economic sanctions, in your opinion, should the Russian authorities take?” (sum of answers > 100%)

| Period          | Reduce the tax burden on manufacturers | Reduce the tax burden of the population | Support demand in the economy (due to the growth of public procurement, payment of subsidies to the population, etc.) | Reduce bureaucratic burden (checks, reports, certificates, etc.) | Strengthen the fight against corruption | Significantly expand the scope of concessional lending | Launch large infrastructure and industrial projects | Provide financial support for enterprises that have launched the production of import-substituting products | Create alternative payment systems to service import and export transactions | Other |
|----------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------|
| April–May 2022 | 52.70                                   | 18.60                                   | 39.50                                                                                                             | 55.80                                                        | 45.70                                        | 23.30                                           | 38.80                                           | 35.70                                            | 42.60                                          | 25.60   | 4.70  |
veyed enterprises were engaged in the implementation of investment projects at the time of the survey, and in 2021 it was 52.94%, in 2022 there were only 50.40% of those (Table 8). However, while in the case of current investment projects, the decline in activity turned out to be relatively small, in relation to investment plans for the future, one can speak of a dramatic failure.

While in 2020, 42.50% of respondents reported their intention to launch new investment projects within 1–2 years, and in 2021 it was 46.71%, in 2022 this share fell to 26.60% (Table 9). This is the lowest level of investment optimism since 2000. Apparently, this state of affairs is associated with a very high degree of uncertainty about the economic future. In this regard, it is no coincidence that the share of answers "difficult to say"—50.70%—also turned out to be the highest for the entire period of the surveys.

Investment problems of Russian enterprises in the context of sanctions are largely associated with a high dependence on the purchase of imported equipment [7–10]. In 2022, new machinery and equipment manufactured abroad were purchased more often than Russian machinery and equipment (Table 10). At the same time, the vast majority of respondents note that

---

### Table 6. Answers to the question: “What role should the state play in the Russian economy in the next few years?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period               | Completely refrain from interfering in economic life and only monitor observance of laws by all economic agents | Maintain a certain impact on economic life, but compared with today its role should decrease | Current degree of state participation is close to optimal, so there is no need for any special change | Step up the domestic economic policy by expanding the range of instruments and applying mainly indirect methods of economic regulation | Step up the state’s direct participation in economic life and actively intervene in economic practice |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| February–March 2005  | 6.94                                                                                           | 19.08                                                                           | 2.89                                                                                            | 57.22                                                                           | 13.87                                                                           |
| February–March 2007  | 2.52                                                                                           | 20.13                                                                           | 5.66                                                                                            | 61.00                                                                           | 10.69                                                                           |
| February–March 2010  | 6.02                                                                                           | 14.46                                                                           | 6.63                                                                                            | 53.01                                                                           | 19.88                                                                           |
| April–May 2012       | 6.08                                                                                           | 22.30                                                                           | 8.11                                                                                            | 47.30                                                                           | 16.21                                                                           |
| April–May 2014       | 6.25                                                                                           | 14.38                                                                           | 7.50                                                                                            | 48.75                                                                           | 23.12                                                                           |
| April–May 2016       | 9.09                                                                                           | 13.64                                                                           | 6.49                                                                                            | 47.40                                                                           | 23.38                                                                           |
| April–May 2018       | 6.40                                                                                           | 19.20                                                                           | 8.80                                                                                            | 46.40                                                                           | 19.20                                                                           |
| April–May 2020       | 9.20                                                                                           | 22.30                                                                           | 11.50                                                                           | 47.70                                                                           | 9.20                                                                           |
| April–May 2022       | 14.60                                                                                           | 16.30                                                                           | 7.30                                                                                            | 45.50                                                                           | 16.30                                                                           |

### Table 7. Answers to the question: “Could you please formulate your attitude towards the state as the owner of enterprises?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period               | In Russia, under any circumstances, the state is undoubtedly less effective owner than private owners | State is at present a less efficient owner than private owners, but it due to low qualification of Russian officials and insufficient control over their activities | The state is an ordinary owner neither better nor worse than the rest | In modern conditions, the state is a more efficient owner than private owners; at least the state more focused on solving problems of enterprises and production growth |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| February–March 2005  | 18.54                                                                                           | 53.94                                                                           | 16.85                                                                                            | 10.67                                                                           |
| February–March 2007  | 22.01                                                                                           | 54.72                                                                           | 15.09                                                                                            | 8.17                                                                           |
| February–March 2010  | 18.18                                                                                           | 45.45                                                                           | 20.00                                                                                            | 16.37                                                                           |
| April–May 2012       | 20.55                                                                                           | 54.11                                                                           | 10.27                                                                                            | 15.07                                                                           |
| April–May 2014       | 13.84                                                                                           | 48.42                                                                           | 20.13                                                                                            | 17.61                                                                           |
| April–May 2016       | 18.59                                                                                           | 42.95                                                                           | 17.95                                                                                            | 20.51                                                                           |
| April–May 2018       | 13.49                                                                                           | 36.51                                                                           | 26.98                                                                                            | 23.02                                                                           |
| April–May 2020       | 15.80                                                                                           | 47.40                                                                           | 23.30                                                                                            | 13.50                                                                           |
| April–May 2022       | 30.60                                                                                           | 27.30                                                                           | 20.60                                                                                            | 21.50                                                                           |
there is either no Russian equipment that would not be inferior in quality to imported counterparts at all or it is very scarce (Table 11).

Nevertheless, one can note certain positive shifts in the enterprises’ assessing the quality of Russian equipment. Thus, for instance, when answering a question about the dynamics in the quality of Russian machinery and equipment, the share of those who believe that this quality has improved in most cases increased from 7.26% in 2020 to 20.50% in 2022.

The share of respondents who believe that the quality of Russian equipment has improved in some cases also rose, from 33.06% in 2020 to 38.50% in 2022 (Table 12). In addition, the proportion of those who believe that the gap in quality between Russian and foreign equipment is narrowing has increased. In 2022, this share reached 24.60% and for the second time in the survey period exceeded the share of those holding the opinion that the quality gap continues to widen (Table 13). At the same time, it is clear that, despite the gradual improvement in the situation with the quantity and quality of Russian engineering products, the problems caused by restrictions on the import of equipment from Western countries can be named among the most acute for most Russian enterprises.

Arguably, another consequence of the current crisis may be some weakening of the overall shortage of labor resources in the Russian economy. While in November–December 2021 this deficit worsened so much that 49.00% of surveyed enterprises reported a shortage of labor resources, in the spring of 2022 the share of such answers fell to 33.60%. At the same time, the share of respondents who indicated an excess of labor resources increased from 0.70% at the end of 2021 to 5.50% in the spring of 2022 (Table 14). Nevertheless, in general, the shortage of labor in the Russian economy remains significant, which is why enterprises, adapting to the crisis, cut investment costs much more often than personnel costs (Table 14).

### Table 8. Answers to the question: “Does your enterprise currently implement any industrial investment projects?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period          | Yes   | No   |
|-----------------|-------|------|
| April–May 2012  | 54.11 | 45.89|
| April–May 2013  | 62.58 | 37.42|
| April–May 2014  | 58.75 | 41.25|
| April–May 2015  | 48.39 | 51.61|
| April–May 2016  | 44.87 | 55.13|
| April–May 2017  | 54.05 | 45.95|
| April–May 2018  | 49.57 | 50.43|
| April–May 2019  | 53.74 | 46.26|
| April–May 2020  | 59.40 | 40.60|
| April–May 2021  | 52.94 | 47.46|
| April–May 2022  | 50.40 | 49.60|

### Table 9. Answers to the question: “Will your enterprise start implementing industrial investment projects in the next 1–2 years?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period          | Yes   | No   | It’s hard to say |
|-----------------|-------|------|------------------|
| April–May 2012  | 47.59 | 18.62| 33.79            |
| April–May 2013  | 56.49 | 11.69| 31.82            |
| April–May 2014  | 52.20 | 14.47| 33.33            |
| April–May 2015  | 33.99 | 15.69| 50.32            |
| April–May 2016  | 35.06 | 16.88| 45.06            |
| April–May 2017  | 41.10 | 13.70| 45.20            |
| April–May 2018  | 46.96 | 19.13| 33.91            |
| April–May 2019  | 43.15 | 19.18| 37.67            |
| April–May 2020  | 42.50 | 14.90| 42.50            |
| April–May 2021  | 46.71 | 13.82| 39.47            |
| April–May 2022  | 26.60 | 22.70| 50.70            |

### Table 10. Answers to the question: “What machines and equipment has your company purchased over the past 2–3 years?” (sum of answers > 100%)

| Period          | Russian-made, new | Russian-made, used | Produced in the CIS countries, new | Produced in the CIS countries, used | Produced in foreign countries, new | Produced in foreign countries, used |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| October–December 2011 | 64.19              | 17.57             | 10.81                             | 1.35                              | 68.92                             | 11.49                             |
| April–May 2013   | 47.97              | 13.51             | 11.49                             | 0.68                              | 70.27                             | 11.49                             |
| November–December 2014 | 56.72              | 17.16             | 13.43                             | 2.99                              | 64.18                             | 10.45                             |
| April–May 2016   | 50.00              | 14.08             | 11.27                             | 2.82                              | 63.38                             | 11.27                             |
| November–December 2017 | 67.83              | 15.38             | 11.89                             | 2.10                              | 53.85                             | 9.79                              |
| April–May 2019   | 53.68              | 20.59             | 12.50                             | 2.94                              | 58.09                             | 8.09                              |
| November–December 2020 | 53.96              | 15.11             | 9.35                              | 0.72                              | 51.80                             | 9.35                              |
| April–May 2022   | 60.30              | 14.70             | 12.90                             | 4.30                              | 69.00                             | 12.90                             |
In the new Russian realities, the relevance of the sustainable development agenda has become problematic. Some experts have begun to voice the opinion that many aspects of sustainable development have lost relevance for Russia, in particular, those related to climate change and carbon regulation. Thus, the current attitude of real sector enterprises towards sustainable development issues, including the ESG agenda, has become another subject of study in the current survey.

Postpandemic sanctions, according to enterprises, will have a negative impact on their transition to sustainable development: 88% of respondents confirmed this to one degree or another (Table 15).

During postpandemic sanctions, 78.90% of respondents did not publish nonfinancial reporting. Among those who published it, the majority were large-scale enterprises, most often representing the manufacturing industry. Enterprises publish reports on sustainability, corporate social responsibility, environmental performance, and greenhouse gas emissions. There is also a noticeable share of those planning to publish such reports in the future, almost 10% of the surveyed enterprises (Table 16).

The climate agenda turned out to be of little relevance for Russian enterprises: 94.30% of respondents did not publish reports on financial risks associated with climate change (Table 17). Among those who planned to publish such reports were medium and large enterprises from manufacturing industries, as well as enterprises from the tourism sector (tourist centers and tour agencies).

Low concern about the climate agenda is also evident from the answers to the question about the goal to reduce the carbon footprint: 88% of the surveyed enterprises did not consider this goal relevant (Table 18).

Those who answered in the affirmative, however, most often include enterprises from the manufacturing industry, namely, foundries, cardboard and pulp manufacturers, manufacturers of machinery and equipment, manufacturers of petroleum products, as well as construction and installation companies. All these respondents have in common both the fact that they are large enterprises and the fact that they, due to the specifics of their activities, can make a significant contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Most often, these companies are leaders in the field of social and environmental policy in their industries and make significant investments in the field of environmental management.

However, many of those who do not set a goal to reduce their carbon footprint now admitted that the decarbonization agenda may affect them in the future: 52.90% of respondents found it difficult to unambiguously answer the question about the possible impact of carbon regulation on their business (Table 19).

In recent years, large corporations, banks and governments of developed countries, as well as international economic organizations of the United Nations, have been actively introducing ESG principles into

| Period                         | Yes, and quite a few | Yes, but very few | None |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------|
| October–December 2011         | 6.34                | 54.93            | 38.73|
| April–May 2013                | 6.08                | 50.00            | 43.92|
| November–December 2014        | 3.85                | 53.08            | 43.07|
| April–May 2016                | 10.42               | 58.33            | 31.25|
| November–December 2017        | 12.75               | 50.34            | 36.91|
| April–May 2019                | 14.71               | 47.06            | 38.23|
| November–December 2020        | 11.81               | 50.39            | 37.80|
| April–May 2022                | 14.00               | 55.40            | 30.60|

| Period                         | Yes, in most cases the quality has improved | For some types of equipment the quality has improved, for others it has remained at the same level | Generally, the quality remained at the same level | Generally, the quality has deteriorated |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| October–December 2011         | 6.62                                        | 38.24                                           | 48.53                                        | 6.62                                     |
| April–May 2013                | 7.59                                        | 31.03                                           | 46.21                                        | 15.17                                    |
| November–December 2014        | 8.80                                        | 31.20                                           | 56.00                                        | 4.00                                     |
| April–May 2016                | 7.91                                        | 35.25                                           | 53.24                                        | 3.60                                     |
| November–December 2017        | 18.12                                       | 33.33                                           | 43.48                                        | 5.07                                     |
| April–May 2019                | 10.69                                       | 33.59                                           | 48.85                                        | 6.87                                     |
| November–December 2020        | 7.26                                        | 33.06                                           | 52.42                                        | 7.26                                     |
| April–May 2022                | 20.50                                       | 38.50                                           | 37.60                                        | 3.40                                     |
In this connection, the question of the attitude adopted by Russian enterprises towards this agenda, especially in modern conditions, has also become the subject of research. The results of the survey show that among the surveyed enterprises, the ESG agenda is perceived as more in demand than the climate one. In contrast to the situation with the climate agenda, in this case, the proportion of those who consider the ESG principles relevant turned out to be noticeably higher. Thirty-five point five percent of respondents adhered to the principles of ESG as inherent in the development of their enterprise. However, the proportion of those unfamiliar with these principles also turned out to be quite noticeable, 41.90% (Table 20).

Among the principles of ESG, the most popular are social and environmental ones. In 81.50% of cases,
the respondents were engaged in improving corporate culture and social protection (labor protection, providing professional training, industrial safety, etc.), as well as participating in social policy in the area where the company operates (Table 21). In 67.70% of cases, enterprises took measures to protect the environment (greening of production, safe disposal of waste, increasing the energy efficiency of production, reducing material consumption, reforestation, etc.).

The principle of corporate governance is less popular. In only 23.10% of cases, was the adherence to the principles of business policy noted. These principles are enshrined in the “Social Charter of Russian Business” and require compliance with international standards (ISO 14001, etc.), external audit, various types of reporting, including nonfinancial. Enterprises that follow the principle of corporate governance include in their ESG strategies such sustainable development factors as the optimal distribution of powers within companies, an effective board of directors and management, transparent relations with shareholders and investors, etc.

Enterprises that take into account ESG principles in their strategy most often derive from this such benefits as an overall increase in operational efficiency, an improvement in the moral climate and improvement of corporate ethics, as well as maintaining the image and business reputation of the company and the opportunity to emphasize its leading position in the industry (Fig. 1). Such effects as an increase in the investment attractiveness of the company for foreign investors and an improvement in the company’s position in ESG indices and ratings were felt mainly by large and superlarge enterprises engaged in international trading operations.

In the light of current events, the climate agenda and other issues of sustainable development in modern Russian conditions may undergo significant changes: development programs are being adjusted and the timing of their implementation is being shifted. It is expedient for Russia to focus on protecting the interests of the national economy by actively developing the legal and institutional infrastructure that should provide business with incentives to reduce carbon intensity and increase production efficiency [12].

The issues of climate challenges will remain in the focus of the world community, which means that Russia should not abandon them. The sustainable development agenda and the ESG concept will be truly relevant for our country, since the solution of related issues is necessary and important for the territories, the public, and business. However, at present, as the results of the survey show, sanctions have a negative impact on the processes associated with implementing the principles of sustainable development in enterprises.

**MAIN CONCLUSIONS OF THE SURVEY.**

1. The economic crisis in Russia caused by economic sanctions imposed by Western countries turned out to be massive but less significant than expected at the beginning of events and during the crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Russian enterprises, adapting to the sanctions, began to act very quickly, using both passive (reducing investments and personnel costs) and active (search for new suppliers and new markets, launching new products and launching modernization measures) methods of adaptation.

---

**Table 16.** Answers to the question: “Does your company publish nonfinancial reports (in the field of sustainable development, social reports, environmental reports, integrated reports)?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period         | Yes     | No      | We do not publish such reports, but we plan to publish them in the future |
|----------------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| April–May 2022 | 11.40   | 78.90   | 9.70                                                                      |

**Table 17.** Answers to the question: “Does your business publish reports on financial risks associated with climate change?” (sum of answers=100%)

| Period         | Yes     | No      | We do not publish such reports, but we plan to publish them in the future |
|----------------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| April–May 2022 | 0.80    | 94.30   | 4.90                                                                      |

**Table 18.** Answers to the question: “Does your business have a goal to reduce its carbon footprint?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period         | Yes     | No, we do not consider this relevant |
|----------------|---------|------------------------------------|
| April–May 2022 | 12.00   | 88.00                              |

**Table 19.** Answers to the question: “Can carbon regulation (imposing a cross-border carbon tax on products) affect your business in the future?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period         | Yes     | No     | It’s hard to say |
|----------------|---------|--------|-----------------|
| April–May 2022 | 13.20   | 33.90  | 52.90           |

**Table 20.** Answers to the question: “Do you follow the principles of ESG in the development strategy of your enterprise (ESG—Environmental, Social, Governance — these are the three parameters in accordance with which companies ensure sustainable development)?” (sum of answers = 100%)

| Period         | Yes     | No     | Unaware of ESG principles |
|----------------|---------|--------|---------------------------|
| April–May 2022 | 35.50   | 22.60  | 41.90                     |
3. Businesses believe that the Russian authorities should actively oppose sanctions by reducing the tax and bureaucratic burden on manufacturers, limiting prices for energy resources and transport, expanding the scope of concessional lending, supporting domestic demand, etc.

4. According to enterprises, there have been some positive changes in the quality of Russian machinery and equipment. However, in general, lagging in quality behind foreign analogs remains significant, and, therefore, the dependence of Russian manufacturers on advanced imported equipment remains high.

5. Climate change issues were of little concern to Russian enterprises. These issues are mainly addressed by those whose activities are directly related to the risks of climate change and a high carbon footprint.

6. In general, the practice of reporting on financial risks associated with climate change is not widespread among the surveyed enterprises. With nonfinancial sustainability reporting, the situation looks a little better, but still the share of those who publish it is small.

7. The majority of respondents did not perceive the concept of ESG as a tool for long-term competitive advantage. Due to this, the share of enterprises that follow the ESG principles and benefit from it is still small. Their priorities include the social and labor sphere and environmental regulation. So far, less attention has been paid to the quality of corporate governance as one of the components of the ESG agenda.

| Period          | Environmental principle: we take measures to protect the environment (greening production, safe disposal of waste, increasing the share of recycling, increasing the energy efficiency of production, and reducing material consumption, reforestation, etc.) | Social principle: we improve corporate culture and social protection (labor protection, professional development, balance in the personnel structure, industrial safety, etc.), and also participate in social policy in the territory of the company’s presence | Corporate Governance Principle: we follow the principles of business policy enshrined in the “Social Charter of Russian Business,” the company’s divisions comply with international standards (ISO 14001, etc.), we increase the number of independent directors in the board of directors, conduct an external audit, carry out various types of reporting, including nonfinancial reporting, etc. | Other measures |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| April–May 2022  | 67.70                                                                                                                         | 81.50                                                                                                                         | 23.10                                                                                                                                   | 1.50 |

![Fig. 1. Answers to the question: “If your company takes into account ESG factors in its activities, what benefits does it receive?” (sum of answers >100%).](image)
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