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Abstract. This paper analyzes the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals [SDG] in the rural territories of Russia. The sustainable development of rural territories is a problem of world significance. The importance of the discussed problem is that economically steady and socially developed rural territories are the guarantors of stability, independence, and food security of the state. Therefore, the vector of their development becomes the priority direction of national policy. The solution to this scientific problem is the formation of a new scientific direction in studies of sustainable development of rural areas by justifying the necessary conceptual basis and defining indicators of regional development following the goals of sustainable development. The authors analyze rural territories with respect to the share of product output produced by the agricultural industry in the gross regional product (GRP). The correlation, dependence, or influence of the agricultural sector on the regional economy is shown. According to the received results, 57 Russian regions can be carried to rural territories that make more than 50% of all territory. The authors analyzed indicators of sustainable development of the rural territories included in the State program “Complex development of rural territories,” according to SDG. It is shown that not all SDGs were included in the state program of development of rural territories. However, Russia is at the level of world indicators in terms of achieving these goals.
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1. Introduction
The problems of sustainable development were firstly presented by the Brundtland commission in 1987 [27]. As a consequence, the questions of sustainable development were repeatedly considered. In particular, in 1992, such problems as rational use of environmental resources and an increase in people’s welfare without damaging the subsequent generations were discussed at a UN conference on problems of the environment and development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro. The need for transition of all international communities on sustainable development was proclaimed [28]. The fact that regenerative potential in the world is excessively overloaded is hardly challenged. The natural capital becomes the limiting factor for the current and future human activity. In 2012, the Conference of the UN decided to create the Working group, which, in 2015, submitted recommendations for the definition of 17 purposes in sustainable development (SDG) and reflected them in the final document “Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” [29].
The term “sustainable development” was for the first time designated in the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development “Our Common Future under the leadership of Gro Harlem Brundtland” [27]. According to the submitted report, sustainable development represents “not a steady condition of harmony, but a process of change in which the scale of operation of resources, the direction of capital investment, orientation of technical development, and institutional changes will be coordinated with present and future requirements.” The Concept of Sustainable development arose as an economic category. Nevertheless, scientists did not come to a general opinion on this term. However, the majority agrees that it is necessary to understand the movement of society in the future based on reasonable compromises in the relationship of society, nature, and individuals as the basic principle of sustainable development among themselves. A more precise definition of the term “sustainable development” is given by O. Dreyer and V. Los. They noted that “it is the economic growth that provides satisfaction of material and spiritual needs of current and future generations when maintaining the balance of historically developed ecosystems” [2]. The experts of the World Bank identify sustainable development as the “management of the cumulative capital of society for the benefit of preservation and enhancement of human opportunities” [10]. The main polemic in world economic science concerning the Concept of Sustainable development is generally conducted in search of means of achievement of a goal (ensuring sustainable development of society with preservation of the available resources). Domestic and foreign scholars define the scientific base of studies of sustainable development.

Russia actively implements SDG, accepted by the UN General Assembly in 2015. In particular, the country cooperates with the international organizations of the UN system, works on projects of ensuring food security, modernization of infrastructure, and the solution of economic problems of developing states [1].

The most important Russian resources within sustainable development are its rural territories, which value promptly grows in conditions of globalization and strengthening of the value of natural and territorial resources. However, Russia’s modern social and economic situation in the village is marked by the collected problems interfering with its transition to sustainable development. The crisis phenomena aggravated in the rural zone from the beginning of the current reforms are not yet overcome. The country will not reach the pre-reform level of production in the agricultural sector. The tendency to reduce the resource potential of the agricultural and industrial complex [AIC] continues. The process of forming economically active rural entrepreneurship entities has not been completed. The demographic situation and an ecological situation worsen, and the social infrastructure collapses. The low-quality living environment, limited opportunities for work in the countryside, and lower (compared to the city) incomes, to a large extent, influenced the outflow of labor from the rural area [9]. The processes mentioned above resulted in increased social and economic disproportions and the emergence of depressive rural territories where many economic, social, and environmental problems are aggravated, causing general instability and disintegration of the Russian economy. At the same time, each region is guided by its own approaches to developing rural territories, often ignoring the current socio-economic situation at the region and the peculiarities of rural settlements, which slow down sustainable development and reduce the effectiveness of territory management.

2. Materials and Methods

This work analyzes the achievement of the sustainable development goals (SDGs) of rural areas of Russia.

The implementation of this goal is to solve the following tasks:

- to determine its composition for rural regions in Po SMAI;
- to set goals for sustainable rural development;
- to analyze the achievement of the SDGs by the Russian Federation.

There are many classifications of regions, such as Marinelli O. [12], Ricchieri G. [20], Toschi U. [23], Whittlesey D. [30], Fremont A. [5], Li Donni [11], Meyer J. [16]. The Strategy for Sustainable rural development of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2030 identified the presence of four
types and nine subtypes of Russian regions with different types of development, agricultural use, potential, and limitations of rural development [7]. Nevertheless, the criteria that would uniquely describe the region as rural are not found in the literature. Scholars often talk about the share of agriculture and the development of the AIC. However, its share is a very conditional criterion, especially since the regions are trying to diversify the economy.

To determine rural territories, we proposed to rank regions by the share of agricultural products (total) in GRP. The value of the correlation coefficient between the arrays of the gross regional product (million rubles) and the production of agriculture (total, million rubles) in regions shows dependence or, more precisely, the impact of the agricultural sector on the region’s economy. If this influence is considerable, then we can say that these regions are more rural.

3. Results

For ensuring the safety of social and economic potential and stable improvement of quality and standard of living of the rural population, Russia accepted several documents: “The strategy of sustainable development of rural territories of the Russian Federation until 2030” [7], the Concept of Sustainable development of rural territories of the Russian Federation until 2020 approved by order of the Government of the Russian Federation (November 30, 2010 No. 2136-r) [6], the state program of the Russian Federation “Complex development of rural territories” approved by the Russian Federation Government (May 31, 2019 No. 696) [8].

Researches of a perspective of sustainable development of rural territories of Russia in the scientific environment can be reduced to two directions:

- steady development with bright ecological orientation;
- the rural development connected with social orientation and the complexity of the development of rural areas.

The first direction is presented mainly by the ecologists emphasizing resource restrictions, connected with the limitation of mineral raw materials and interaction between the anthroposystem, biosphere, and their interference. From a position of these scientists, “sustainable development is such a development which impact on the environment remain within the economic capacity of the biosphere so that the natural basis for reproduction of human life does not collapse” [24].

Within the second area, the village’s social development is considered an important element of its sustainable development, on the one hand. On the other hand, it is considered a significant factor in determining rural areas’ sustainable development. The importance of the raised issues is expounded in the articles of L. A. Tretyakova [4], I. N. Merenkov, V. N. Pertseva [14], M. V. Dronova [13], et al. All the opinions of scientists on the Concept of “sustainable development of rural areas” more or less affect the concepts of “sustainable development,” “regularity and continuity of changes,” “efficiency gains,” “maintaining of growth,” etc. The scientific research of A. V. Merzlov [15], L. A. Ovchintseva [18], A. A. Nikonov [19], and some other scientists allow elaborating on “The strategy of sustainable development of rural areas of the Russian Federation till 2030.”

The Federal State Statistics Service (Rosstat) holds several events for collecting and submission of official statistical information on indicators of achievements of Russian SDG according to the international standards. In cooperation with the ministries and departments, the territorial authority of Rosstat of the Rostov region developed the draft of the list of national indicators of SDG. To realize 167 problems of all sustainable development goals, this list contains 364 indicators, including 70 (19%) indicators with the level of aggregation of official statistical information on territorial subjects of the Russian Federation [21]. As for rural territories, a part of the problems of sustainable development is implemented through state programs. The indicators of the State program “Complex development of rural territories” are presented in table 1.
Table 1. The classification of indicators of the State Program of the Russian Federation “Complex development of rural territories” following the SDGs.

| Sustainable Development Goal                                      | Indicators and their serial numbers                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Goal 2.** End hunger, achieve food security, improve nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture. | 2. The area of reclaimed land put into operation due to reconstruction, technical re-equipment, and construction of new reclamation systems for general and individual use.  
4. The involvement in the turnover of retired agricultural land through cultural and technical measures.  
6. The prevention of the retirement of reclaimed land from agricultural turnover due to the reconstruction, technical re-equipment, and construction of objects of the reclamation complex of state property of the Russian Federation (increasing total by 2018).  
7. The protection of land from water erosion, flooding due to reconstruction, technical re-equipment, and construction of land reclamation facilities of the state property of the Russian Federation (cumulative total by 2018).  
30. The number of local initiatives implemented by citizens living in rural areas who received grant support. |
| **Goal 3.** Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for citizens of all ages. | 18. Commissioning of paramedic and midwifery centers and (or) offices of general practitioners.  
19. Increase in the rural population provided by paramedic and midwifery centers (offices of general practitioners) (cumulative total).  
20. Commissioning of flat sports facilities.  
21. Increase in the rural population provided with flat sports facilities (cumulative total).  
22. Commissioning of cultural and leisure institutions.  
23. Increase in the rural population provided by cultural and leisure institutions (cumulative). |
| **Goal 4.** Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning. | 16. Commissioning of general education organizations.  
17. Reduction in the number of students in general education organizations in an emergency state in rural areas (increasing total).  
31. The number of implemented measures to promote and popularize achievements in the field of rural development. |
| **Goal 6.** Ensure access to water and sanitation                  | 9. Bringing state hydraulic structures into safe operating conditions.  
11. The reduction of the Russian Federation’s share of state property in the total volume of reclamation systems and separately located hydraulic structures (decreasing total).  
12. Commissioning of state-owned land reclamation facilities in the Russian Federation.  
24. Commissioning of gas distribution networks.  
25. The level of gasification of residential buildings (apartments) with network gas in rural areas.  
26. The commissioning of the local water supply.  
27. The level of provision of rural population with drinking water. |
| **Goal 8.** Promote sustained, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment, and decent work. | 1. The increase in crop production on agricultural land (on a cumulative total).  
32. The number of jobs created in rural areas. |
Goal 9. Create a robust infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization, and foster innovation.

28. Commissioning of paved public roads leading from the network of public roads to the nearest socially significant objects of rural localities and objects of production and processing of agricultural products.
29. The number of localities located in rural areas where projects were implemented for the integrated development of housing development sites.

Goal 11. Ensure the openness, security, resilience, and sustainability of cities and localities.

13. The introduction (purchase) of housing for citizens living in rural areas (annually).
14. The reduction of the total number of families in need of improved housing conditions in rural areas (cumulative total).
15. The reduction in the number of young families and young professionals in need of better housing conditions in rural areas (cumulative).

Goal 15. Protect, restore, and promote sustainable use of land ecosystems, manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, and halt the loss of biological diversity.

3. The protection and conservation of agricultural land from wind erosion and desertification through agroforestry and phytomelioration activities.
5. The protection of land from water erosion, flooding through flood control measures, clearing of reclamation channels, and significant repairs of reclamation facilities and technical equipment of operational organizations.

Goal 17. Strengthen the means to achieve sustainable development and enhance the global partnership for sustainable development.

8. The number of research results and development and experimental works of an innovative nature in the reclamation complex.
10. Preserving existing and creating new high-tech jobs for agricultural producers by increasing the productivity of existing ones and involving new agricultural land in turnover.

Source: [8, 26].

The data in the table indicate that, despite the significance of the activities described in the program, the eight goals of sustainable development are not represented by indicators.

Simultaneously, domestic and international experts note that, in the struggle to achieve the SDGs, Russia has achieved the greatest successes in the fight against hunger (Goal 2) and poverty (Goal 1), providing quality education (Goal 4), using modern and clean sources of energy (Goal 7), promoting employment (Goal 8), building sustainable cities and towns (Goal 11), and fighting climate change (Goal 13) [29].

A rating for 2018 based on indicators of gross regional product and agricultural output was compiled to determine the number of Russian regions that can be classified as rural territories (table 2) [17]. The ranking of regions by the volume of agricultural production in all categories of farms showed that the first 20 regions of Russia produce 66.6% of the volume of agricultural production, which is 4.1% of the total gross regional product. If we compare this indicator for all regions, it is 6.9%. The data in table 2 confirm that the volume of agricultural production is a significant share in the GRP. However, the criteria by which the region can be attributed to rural territories are not described in the literature. For example, the statistics show that of all the regions, the Krasnodar Krai produces the largest amount of agricultural products (in millions of rubles). It takes the first place in the rating. The Tambov region produced agricultural products in the amount of 3 times less than the Krasnodar Krai. However, it should be noted that the share in the gross regional product of the Krasnodar Krai ranks 25th, and the Tambov region is in the first place. The difference in the share of agricultural products in these two regions is 15%. What is important is not absolute or relative indicators per se, but the relationship between the GRP (rub million), the volume of agricultural output (rub million), and their impact on each other. The correlation calculation for the entire sample shows no connection between these indicators (the correlation coefficient value is 0.06). The top 10 regions ranked by the share of agricultural output in the region’s GRP show a very strong correlation, with a correlation coefficient of 0.98. The correlation
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In other words, 57 regions in Russia can be classified as rural territories. The share of agricultural products in GRP is from 12% to 42%. If the correlation coefficient is from 0.8 to 0.9, we can say that there is a strong connection to agriculture. Therefore, 23 regions with a share of GRP agricultural products from 6% to 11% fall into this category. In other words, 57 regions in Russia can be classified as rural territories.

Table 2. The rating of Russian regions, ranked by the share of agricultural products produced as part of the gross regional product in 2018.

| Region                          | Gross regional product in 2017, million rubles | Agricultural products – total, million rubles | Rating by share of agricultural products in GRP, % | The share of agricultural products in GRP, % | Correlation coefficient |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Tambov Region                   | 300,553.7                                      | 127,308                                     | 1                                                | 42                                          | -                      |
| Republic of Kalmykia            | 66,511.6                                       | 26,559                                      | 2                                                | 40                                          | 1.00                   |
| Karachay-Cherkess Republic      | 74,670.6                                       | 29,513                                      | 3                                                | 40                                          | 1.00                   |
| Kursk region                    | 387,577.2                                      | 146,703                                     | 4                                                | 38                                          | 1.00                   |
| Kabardino-Balkar Republic       | 138,489.2                                      | 49,385                                      | 5                                                | 36                                          | 0.99                   |
| Oryol Region                    | 214,310                                        | 72,247                                      | 6                                                | 34                                          | 0.99                   |
| Belgorod region                 | 785,646.7                                      | 257,038                                     | 7                                                | 33                                          | 0.99                   |
| Republic of Mordovia            | 213,287.8                                      | 63,662                                      | 8                                                | 30                                          | 0.99                   |
| Stavropol Krai                  | 665,422.4                                      | 195,858                                     | 9                                                | 29                                          | 0.99                   |
| Bryansk region                  | 307,708.4                                      | 85,146                                      | 10                                               | 28                                          | 0.98                   |
| Altai Republic                  | 44,571.9                                       | 11,700                                      | 11                                               | 26                                          | 0.98                   |
| Altai Krai                      | 508,756                                        | 131,825                                     | 12                                               | 26                                          | 0.98                   |
| Mari El Republic                | 169,478.5                                      | 43,262                                      | 13                                               | 26                                          | 0.98                   |
| Voronezh region                 | 865,222.7                                      | 219,151                                     | 14                                               | 25                                          | 0.97                   |
| Pskov region                    | 151,607.4                                      | 36,929                                      | 15                                               | 24                                          | 0.97                   |
| Lipetsk region                  | 497,981                                        | 119,304                                     | 16                                               | 24                                          | 0.97                   |
| Penza region                    | 365,173                                        | 82,455                                      | 17                                               | 23                                          | 0.96                   |
| Republic of Adygea              | 99,405.9                                       | 21,899                                      | 18                                               | 22                                          | 0.96                   |
| Republic of Dagestan            | 623,392.6                                      | 124,371                                     | 19                                               | 20                                          | 0.95                   |
| Saratov region                  | 669,091.7                                      | 129,175                                     | 20                                               | 19                                          | 0.93                   |
| Rostov region                   | 1,347,142.8                                    | 255,129                                     | 21                                               | 19                                          | 0.93                   |
| Republic of North Ossetia-Alania| 128,221.6                                      | 24,198                                      | 22                                               | 19                                          | 0.93                   |
| Republic of Ingushetia          | 55,614.3                                       | 10,392                                      | 23                                               | 19                                          | 0.93                   |
| Amur region                     | 266,055.8                                      | 47,637                                      | 24                                               | 18                                          | 0.93                   |
| Krasnodar Krai                  | 2,225,917.7                                    | 382,468                                     | 25                                               | 17                                          | 0.94                   |
| Volgograd region                | 771,441.2                                      | 128,275                                     | 26                                               | 17                                          | 0.94                   |
| Ryazan region                   | 360,573.1                                      | 56,895                                      | 27                                               | 16                                          | 0.94                   |
| Omsk region                     | 651,044.7                                      | 94,097                                      | 28                                               | 14                                          | 0.93                   |
| Chuvash Republic                | 270,634.6                                      | 37,468                                      | 29                                               | 14                                          | 0.93                   |
| Kirov region                    | 307,306.6                                      | 41,226                                      | 30                                               | 13                                          | 0.93                   |
| Orenburg region                 | 823,091.7                                      | 107,971                                     | 31                                               | 13                                          | 0.92                   |
| Republic of Crimea              | 359,110.4                                      | 43,841                                      | 32                                               | 12                                          | 0.92                   |
| Tula region                     | 555,941.9                                      | 65,785                                      | 33                                               | 12                                          | 0.91                   |
| Udmurt Republic                 | 556,190.5                                      | 64,539                                      | 34                                               | 12                                          | 0.91                   |
| Republic of Bashkortostan       | 1,396,411.2                                    | 157,486                                     | 35                                               | 11                                          | 0.89                   |
| Jewish Autonomous Region        | 52640.9                                        | 5,772                                       | 36                                               | 11                                          | 0.89                   |
Let us analyze the indicators of sustainable development goals oriented to rural areas. To assess Russia’s achievement of the SDGs in agriculture, we use the information presented on the platform of the International Database of SDG Indicators, which provides access to data collected through the UN system in the preparation of the Secretary-General’s annual report “Progress towards Sustainable Development Goals” [22].

Let us analyze the indicators of sustainable development goals oriented to rural areas.

| Region                          | Population | Intensive | Productivity | Profitability | Sustainability |
|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Republic of Tatarstan           | 2,114,176.1| 226,034   | 37           | 11            | 0.87           |
| Kaluga region                  | 417,065    | 43,851    | 38           | 11            | 0.86           |
| Tyva Republic                  | 59,094.8   | 6,141     | 39           | 10            | 0.87           |
| Astrakhan region               | 420,961.1  | 43,707    | 40           | 10            | 0.87           |
| Tver region                    | 384,036.5  | 38,927    | 41           | 10            | 0.86           |
| Novgorod region                | 269,357.3  | 25,982    | 42           | 10            | 0.86           |
| Kostroma region                | 165,857.6  | 15,929    | 43           | 10            | 0.86           |
| Leningrad region               | 965,826.5  | 91,717    | 44           | 9             | 0.86           |
| Chelyabinsk region             | 1,348,564.7| 119,417   | 45           | 9             | 0.84           |
| Ivanovo region                 | 185,846.8  | 160,85    | 46           | 9             | 0.84           |
| Smolensk region                | 281,852.6  | 24,147    | 47           | 9             | 0.84           |
| Kaliningrad region             | 417,445.6  | 34,739    | 48           | 8             | 0.84           |
| Republic of Buryatia           | 201,559.8  | 16,214    | 49           | 8             | 0.84           |
| Zabaykalsky Krai               | 300,651.1  | 22,904    | 50           | 8             | 0.84           |
| Vladimir region                | 415,569.1  | 29,651    | 51           | 7             | 0.84           |
| Novosibirsk region             | 1,140,863  | 80,192    | 52           | 7             | 0.82           |
| Yaroslavl region               | 510,631.5  | 34,072    | 53           | 7             | 0.82           |
| The Republic of Khakassia      | 207,579.1  | 13,824    | 54           | 7             | 0.82           |
| Samara region                  | 1,349,866.4| 88,976    | 55           | 7             | 0.80           |
| Tomsk region                   | 511,025.1  | 30,728    | 56           | 6             | 0.80           |
| Vologda region                 | 508,256.1  | 29,255    | 57           | 6             | 0.80           |
| Nizhny Novgorod region         | 1,260,219.6| 67,560    | 58           | 5             | 0.77           |
| Irkutsk region                 | 1,192,080.3| 63,549    | 59           | 5             | 0.76           |
| Primorsky region               | 777,833.5  | 39,963    | 60           | 5             | 0.75           |
| Kemerovo region                | 1,058,113.6| 46,912    | 61           | 4             | 0.73           |
| Krasnoyarsk Krai               | 1,882,315.9| 77,914    | 62           | 4             | 0.69           |
| Kamchatka region               | 201,643.7  | 8,249     | 63           | 4             | 0.69           |
| Sverdlovsk region              | 2,142,514.3| 84,960    | 64           | 4             | 0.65           |
| Perm Krai                      | 1,191,101.5| 44,193    | 65           | 4             | 0.64           |
| Sevastopol                     | 71,388.1   | 2,061     | 66           | 3             | 0.64           |
| Moscow region                  | 3,802,953.2| 108,423   | 67           | 3             | 0.55           |
| Sakha (Yakutia) Republic       | 916,578.6  | 25,781    | 68           | 3             | 0.54           |
| Khabarovsk region              | 665,988.2  | 17,099    | 69           | 3             | 0.54           |
| Kurgan region                  | 2,008,682  | 39,511    | 70           | 2             | 0.51           |
| Chukotka Autonomous Okrug      | 68,729     | 1,334     | 71           | 2             | 0.51           |
| Republic of Karelia             | 252,717.4  | 4,498     | 72           | 2             | 0.52           |
| Republic of Komi                | 574,376.7  | 10,156    | 73           | 2             | 0.52           |
| Magadan region                 | 157,626.4  | 2,723     | 74           | 2             | 0.52           |
| Republic of Chechyna            | 1,189,122  | 27,778    | 75           | 2             | 0.50           |
| Arkhangelsk region              | 743,562.8  | 11,017    | 76           | 1             | 0.49           |
| Sakhalin region                 | 771,224.2  | 11,147    | 77           | 1             | 0.49           |
| Tyumen region                  | 6,985,994.8| 77,793    | 78           | 1             | 0.34           |
| Ulyanovsk region                | 3,406,392  | 37,868    | 79           | 1             | 0.31           |
| Murmansk region                 | 445,795.1  | 1,823     | 80           | 0             | 0.31           |
| Moscow                         | 15,724,909.7| 7,308    | 81           | 0             | 0.08           |
| Saint Petersburg               | 3,866,402.3| 0         | 82           | 0             | 0.06           |

Source: Federal State Statistics Service [3].
Goal 2: Zero Hunger. Indicator 2.a.1 – The agriculture orientation index for government expenditures. One of the main tasks to achieve this goal is to increase investment, including enhanced international cooperation in rural infrastructure, agricultural research, the extension of services, technology development, and plant and livestock gene banks to enhance agricultural productive capacity.

An Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) greater than 1 reflects a higher share of government spending in the agriculture sector than the sector’s share in overall GDP. An AOI of less than 1 reflects a lower share of government spending in the agricultural sector than the sector’s share in overall GDP [25]. An AOI of 1 reflects neutrality in a government’s orientation to the agriculture sector. The AOI is a currency-free measure. It allows for a cross-country comparison with agricultural sectors of different sizes through viewing government expenditures into agriculture relative to the size of the country’s agricultural sector. Figure 1 presents the world data and the data of the Russian Federation on this indicator from 2001 to 2017.

**Figure 1.** The agriculture orientation index for government expenditures. *Source:* UN SDG Indicators [25].

Goal 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for citizens of all ages.

Indicator 3.8.1 – Coverage of essential health services (defined as the average coverage of essential services based on tracer interventions that include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases, service capacity, and access among the general and the most disadvantaged population). The indicator is an index reported on a unitless scale of 0 to 100, which is computed as the geometric mean of 14 tracer indicators of health service coverage (figure 2).

**Figure 2.** The coverage of essential health services. *Source:* UN SDG Indicators [25].
Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.

Indicator 4.2.2: The participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex. The indicator measures children’s exposure to organized learning activities the year before the start of primary school. A high value of the indicator shows a high degree of participation in organized learning immediately before the official entrance age to primary education. The participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age) for both sexes is shown in figure 3.

![Figure 3](image_url)  
**Figure 3.** The participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), both sex.  
*Source: UN SDG Indicators [25].*

Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all. Target 6.1: By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water. Indicator 6.1.1: The proportion of the population using safely managed drinking water services. The proportion of the population using safely managed drinking water services is currently being measured by the proportion of the population using an improved basic drinking water source, which is located on-premises, available when needed, and free of fecal (and priority chemical) contamination. ‘Improved’ drinking water sources include piped water (dwelling, yard, or plot), public taps or standpipes, boreholes or tubewells, protected dug wells, protected springs, packaged water, delivered water, and rainwater. The proportion of the population using safe drinking water management services in all areas is shown in figure 4.

![Figure 4](image_url)  
**Figure 4.** The proportion of the population using safely managed drinking water services by all areas (UN SDG Indicators).  
*Source: UN SDG Indicators [25].*

4. Conclusion

Thus, in Russia, more than 50% of the territories have a pronounced rural orientation. In this regard, the sustainable development of rural areas is an urgent task for Russia.
The data shown in figures 1–4 show that Russia is at the level of world indicators to achieve sustainable development goals. However, many indicators are not registered in the system of statistics and relevant ministries and departments for assessing the achievement of the SDGs. The socio-economic development of the Russian Federation’s economy is impossible without considering territorial features, particularly the strengths and weaknesses of regional economic systems, and favorable and negative trends in regional development. This is due to the presence of significant differentiation in the provision of necessary economic and social resources. At the regional level, issues of the reproduction of productive forces are resolved, socio-economic development projects are implemented, critical social needs of the population are met, and indicators of regional economic development are the criteria for determining the level of its sustainable development following the sustainable development goals.
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