

Green City Action Plan for Tbilisi – A Mere Formality?

For more information

Manana Kochladze

Project leader

CEE Bankwatch Network

manana@bankwatch.org



Tbilisi Public Transportation, July 2019

Photo: Vandana, <https://explorewithvandy.com/transportation-in-tbilisi/>

CEE Bankwatch Network's mission is to prevent environmentally and socially harmful impacts of international development finance, and to promote alternative solutions and public participation.

Learn more: bankwatch.org



The State of the Environment in Tbilisi

Tbilisi is a city of more than 1.2 million people,¹ characterized by serious environmental challenges in terms of air, water and soil pollution. It also experiences problems with urban planning and mobility. For three decades, there were almost no urban planning regulations, which led to the uncontrolled and irregular development of the city. Illegal construction flourished and investments in buildings, new suburbs and roads were prioritized over sustainability, green spaces and the safety of the city, diminishing the historical city centre and promoting gentrification.

Formerly compact, Tbilisi has become and continues to transform into a sprawling city, problematic due to the city's longitudinal development along the riverbed. The public transport system, in particular, has failed to accommodate this growth. The Metro has stopped development, the amount of buses has drastically declined, and trams² and trolleybuses were eradicated from Tbilisi streets by the end of 2006. Minibuses occupy the largest share of public transport, and the taxis have been fully deregulated. This has resulted in a significant increase in private cars (mainly second-hand ones – 91% of cars on Tbilisi streets were produced before 2007)³. By the end of 2017, around half a million cars were registered in Tbilisi⁴; according to an ADB survey, one household owns on average 0.51 vehicles.⁵

The decline in the accessibility of public transport and the increase in the number of private cars has resulted in increased congestion on the roads and creates mobility problems. Until recently, the municipality and experts were focusing on the construction and development of new roads and infrastructure to support the usage of private cars. As a consequence, the ambient air quality has dropped significantly. Since 2015, nationwide public opinion polls have shown that environmental pollution is one of the most problematic topics for the country and Tbilisi citizens. Issues related to environmental pollution, traffic, public transportation, parking, parks and green areas are increasing annually.⁶ In the 2019 public opinion poll, 57% of Georgian citizens consider air pollution as the most acute environmental problem for the citizens' life and health, and in Tbilisi this 76% of citizens considered this to be the case.⁷ Urban activism groups have arisen in response to this to fight for green areas and fresh air, the development of public transport and proper urban planning regulations.⁸

To address these issues, a number of conflicting and overlapping programs have been implemented with no cohesive strategic plan. Tbilisi has been involved in several different international groups dedicated to improving the sustainability and quality of life in the city, such as the Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy and 100 Resilient Cities. In these forums, the city has been required to develop numerous plans to address the problems it faces. Furthermore, it has been the site of several investments from international financial institutions (IFIs). Although it may seem like more attention being paid to Tbilisi's urban planning and development is a good thing, in practice, it has failed to turn the city into a greener, more sustainable place to live, despite the millions of dollars being poured in and wealth of ideas about how it should be done. The fact that there are so many different competing, overlapping plans and projects has, in reality, led to a confused situation that lacks any drive towards integrated urban planning. This case study focuses on the attempts IFIs have made to provide Tbilisi with solutions, particularly in the area of urban transport and mobility.

¹ Tbilisi City Hall, Tbilisi population by year and Estimated increase of Tbilisi population in years, 2015, <https://bit.ly/3aURps8>

² The last tram and trolley bus lines were abandoned in Tbilisi in December 2006.

³ Analytical Department of Ministry of Internal Affairs, Car Fleet 2016, <https://police.ge/files/pdf/statistika%20da%20kvlevebi/2017/autoparki-2016-5.pdf>

⁴ Grass FactCheck, 'Since 2012, the number of cars in Tbilisi has increased 2.5 times. It would not have been possible without revenue growth', Grass FactCheck, 2018, <https://factcheck.ge/ka/story/35850-2012-tslis-shemdeg-tbilisshi-avtomobilebis-raodenoba-2-5-jer-gaizarda-es-shemosavlebis-zrdis-gareshe-sheudzlebeli-iqneboda>

⁵ Nino Kvintradze, 'Where do people have most cars', Forbes Georgia, 2018, <https://forbes.ge/news/4045/Where-do-people-have-most-cars>

⁶ Laura Thornton and Koba Turmanidze, 'Public Attitudes in Georgia: Results of December 2017 survey carried out for NDI by CRRC Georgia', National Democratic Institute, 2017, https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/NDI%20poll_December%202017_ISSUES_ENG_vf.pdf

⁷ 'NDI: Air pollution top environmental concern in Georgia', OC Media, 2019, <https://oc-media.org/ndi-air-pollution-top-environmental-concern-in-georgia/>

⁸ Prathap, Nair "Tbilisi comes up for air", CityLab, 2018, <https://www.citylab.com/environment/2018/06/tbilisi-comes-up-for-air/561227/>

International Financial Institutions (IFIs) Involvement in Tbilisi Urban Mobility Issues

EBRD Tbilisi Public Bus Project (2005)

The first instance of IFI involvement in Tbilisi's urban mobility issues was in 2005, when the municipality implemented a project to reform the public transport management system. It purchased around 500 buses partially financed by the EBRD via a EUR 3.1 million credit. In addition to financing municipal buses, spare parts and workshop equipment, the project was intended to create a modern regulatory framework for public transport in Tbilisi and to support the commercialization of a municipal bus company.

However, the newly purchased, second-hand buses complied with EURO I environmental standards – not EURO II standards, as required by the EBRD's environmental policy. The EBRD's explanation for this is that it is an exception: the 'existing diesel fuel in the country does not comply with euro standards; thus buses were bought that would cause less harm than using the existing fuel'.⁹ However, despite a number of assurances from the EBRD that catalytic converters¹⁰ would be installed in the buses to reduce emissions, this never happened. In the end, the 2005 'yellow buses' reform failed both in terms of the expansion of the bus fleet and air quality, as well as in implementing the Tbilisi Public transport reform, including the Tbilisi City Sustainable Transport Management Plan.¹¹

ADB and Tbilisi Urban Mobility Improvement (2010-2017)

The second important involvement was the ADB's multi-tranche financing facility (MFF) for the Sustainable Urban Transport Investment Program (SUTIP), worth USD 300 million. The project started in 2010 and is still under implementation. The Program includes projects such as the Tbilisi Metro extension, system and ventilation rehabilitation, and the upgrade of the Rustavi-Tbilisi highway from a two-lane to a four-lane road.

In spite of recent and continued investments by City Hall to upgrade and expand the road network, including the creation of overpasses, urban highways (the Vere River and Tbilisi Rustavi Urban Road link), traffic conditions are still worsening and congestion is increasing. A traffic management system is in place, but its functionalities are not fully used. The public transport system is not attractive enough to stimulate the shift from private car to public transport, particularly in a context of fast increase in car ownership. The Tbilisi urban road network includes bottlenecks and still lacks a few road links and one or two bridges are required to better distribute the transversal traffic flows.¹²

The ADB was the first to provide technical assistance to help Tbilisi put together a sustainable transport master plan that includes priorities such as the development of the bus and metro network, as well as improved rail transit. The ADB's first mobility sustainability strategy (2015) found that additional infrastructure for automobiles was not the solution. The Tbilisi road system is already fairly developed and advanced, and mobility and road congestion problems cannot be resolved by creating more roads, fly-overs, bridges and tunnels. Rather than continuously expanding the road network, an efficient way of tackling road congestion is to develop an efficient intermodal public transport network with high quality services that will offer a tangible alternative to

⁹ Tbilisi Municipality Transport Department letter N 04/10-42 to Green Alternative, 31 May 2006.

¹⁰ At a workshop on Sustainable Urban Transport and Land Use Planning, held in Tbilisi on 18-20 October, 2006, a representative of the EBRD commented that the EBRD made an exception to the project with the hope that converters would be installed in the buses that could reduce emissions.

¹¹ CEE Bankwatch Network, 'Tbilisi Public Transport Project: Bankwatch Issue Paper, EBRD AGM 2007, Kazan, Russian Federation', *Green Alternative*, 2007, http://www.greenalt.org/webmill/data/file/Tbilisi_Transport_IP.pdf

¹² Tbilisi Sustainable Urban Transport Strategy, *Municipal Development Fund*, 2015, 54, [http://mdf.org.ge/storage/assets/file/documents%202016/murtazi/Strategic%20Paper%20Report%20PDF%20Geo\(18_03_2016\)/Strategic%20Paper%20Report%20final%20ENG.pdf](http://mdf.org.ge/storage/assets/file/documents%202016/murtazi/Strategic%20Paper%20Report%20PDF%20Geo(18_03_2016)/Strategic%20Paper%20Report%20final%20ENG.pdf)

car users. The creation of new road infrastructure should be targeted and its benefit proven through traffic modelling and economic assessment.

Nevertheless, there was quite a discrepancy between what the strategy recommended and the projects implemented in Tbilisi under the ADB SUTIP: together with Georgian Government and Municipal Development Fund, the ADB agreed to construct a 17.4 kilometre road between Tbilisi and Rustavi.

The road was considered in three major sections: Tbilisi-Ponichala, Ponichala and Ponichala-Rustavi. In violation of best international standards, the Environmental and Social Impact assessment was prepared based on the salami principle, section by section. The bank initially designated all three sections as category B projects.¹³ Later, after a complaint made to the ADB Compliance Review Panel (CRP), it was found that the Ponichala section should instead be considered a category A project.

The social impacts of the Tbilisi-Rustavi Road upgrade were quite high, with respect to both short-term, as well as long-term impacts. There were number of directly impacted buildings and houses, as well as commercial enterprises, and there were a number of people that needed to be involuntary resettled. However, the compensation was so low that people could not afford to buy a new living space of at least the same quality. The citizens living alongside the road in buildings in poor condition were also concerned that their houses could not withstand the construction works. The project does not recognize them as affected people.

Two complaints signed by 153 people in total were sent to the ADB CRP,¹⁴ and two complaints signed by 15 people were sent to Special Project Facilitator's office (OSPF).¹⁵ Both CRP as well as OSPF discovered that the project did not have public consultations, and requested the project proceed to a grievance mechanism; the CRP additionally requested additional research, and also found a number of instances of non-compliance and requested the implementation of the Action plan developed by CRP. In June 2019, the Georgian government decided to stop construction on the middle section of the road, citing the locals' protests and requests for compensation as the reason. However, two other sections of the road have already been constructed.¹⁶

Tbilisi's Green City Action Plan (GCAP)

The EBRD-supported Green City Action Plan (GCAP) entered into this already crowded space of urban planning in the fall of 2017. Approved by Tbilisi's Sakrebulo (city council), and developed with the support of the EBRD and Czech Ministry of International Affairs, the GCAP itself should be considered a step forward towards sustainability and the integration of the various issues that city experiences into solutions. The comprehensive plan includes activities for improved water and wastewater services, solid waste management, the climate resilience of buildings, urban mobility, and other energy efficiency measures, with the aim to reduce annual carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions by around 450,000 tons as well as to save around 55 million cubic meters of water per year by 2030.

¹³ Urban road projects tend to be Category B projects, which means that the EBRD has determined associated "potential adverse future environmental and/or social impacts are typically site-specific, and/or readily identified and addressed through mitigation measures. Environmental and social appraisal requirements may vary depending on the project and will be determined by the EBRD on a case-by-case basis." EBRD, "Environmental and Social Policy," 2014, 3, 9. Only the following road projects are considered Category A projects: "Construction of motorways, express roads and lines for long-distance railway traffic; airports with a basic runway length of 2,100 metres or more; new roads of four or more lanes, or realignment and/or widening of existing roads to provide four or more lanes, where such new roads, or realigned and/or widened sections of road would be 10 km or more in a continuous length." Note that the 2014 policy was relevant at the time of implementation of both projects. A new policy will be available from 2020 onwards; the definition of Category B projects remains the same.

¹⁴ Asian Development Bank Compliance Review Panel, 'Georgia: Sustainable Urban Transport Investment Program - Tranche 3: Request number 2016/1,' *Asian Development Bank Compliance Review Panel*, 2016, <http://compliance.adb.org/dir0035p.nsf/alldocs/JABM-A848U5?OpenDocument>; Asian Development Bank Compliance Review Panel, "Georgia: Sustainable Urban Transport Investment Program - Tranche 3: Request number 2016/3", *Asian Development Bank Compliance Review Panel*, 2016, <http://compliance.adb.org/dir0035p.nsf/alldocs/JABM-AFR657?OpenDocument>

¹⁵ Asian Development Bank, 'Complaints Registry by Year', *Asian Development Bank*, <https://www.adb.org/site/accountability-mechanism/problem-solving-function/complaint-registry-year>

¹⁶ 'Due to public protest Tbilisi-Rustavi Highway would not pass Ponichala', 30 June 2019, <https://reginfo.ge/people/item/15447-mosaxleobis-protestis-gamo-tbilisi-rustavis-avtobani-ponichalashi-agar-gaivilis>

In the area of urban transport, the action plan aims to reduce at least 85% of the current air pollution through the introduction of new compressed natural gas buses. The EBRD plans to finance two loans for the introduction of these energy efficient, reduced emissions buses in the first and second phases of their public transport improvement project.¹⁷

In 2016, the EBRD provided funds for the first phase of the project – an EUR 27 million sovereign loan to Georgia for on-lending to the city of Tbilisi, and an EUR 7 million capital grant from the E5P (Eastern Europe Energy Efficiency and Environment Partnership) to purchase 143 new compressed-natural-gas buses in Tbilisi. The total project costs were EUR 39 million and included grant funding for technical cooperation, such as a bus route restructuring study, gender advisory services, corporate development and stakeholders participation. This project is Tbilisi's first low-emission public transport.¹⁸ The then-mayor of Tbilisi, Mr. Davit Narmania, received the first prize award for the most innovative project for Tbilisi's environmentally friendly buses at the EBRD 2017 Annual Meeting and Business Forum in Nicosia, Cyprus.¹⁹

The second phase of the EBRD's Tbilisi Bus project started in 2019. This project will provide EUR 80 million for 'clean vehicles and the continued improvement of public transport services as a viable alternative to car based transportation in Tbilisi' with the goal of achieving green transition objectives and significant environmental benefits. The financing provided to the Ministry of Finance of Georgia will allow for the purchase of at least 200 additional CNG buses for the Tbilisi. The project will advance transportation sector reforms and the re-routing of bus services in Tbilisi, contributing to the Bank's 'well-governed' objective. Through technical cooperation, the EBRD will additionally help with technical due diligence for the bus depot, Bus Service Reform Support and Project Implementation Support, as well as to support for Gender Equality and Inclusion Urban Transport Policies.²⁰

ADB Involvement in GCAP Implementation

The ADB has also financed projects that are listed in the GCAP. The ADB's SUTIP 1 financed a new metro station at a cost of GEL 84 million, which was completed in October 2017.

The ADB was also involved in the funding and preparation of a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan (SUMP) for Tbilisi under SUTIP 5 (see above). For research on the SUMP, USD 1.5 million was paid to Rambol, RD Engineering and City Institute Georgia. The SUMP will define the city's transportation action plan for next 15 years.²¹ The work starts in September 2019 and will be finalized in July 2020.

Under the SUTIP 5, the Georgian Municipal Development Fund started the rehabilitation of the Tbilisi Metro electricity lines in tunnels and facilities, as well as ventilation systems, in 2018. The total cost of this work will be up to USD 16 million, and the repairs are expected to be finalized by June 2020.

In April 2020, as part of the post COVID-19 response, the EBRD provided EUR 65 million for Tbilisi Metro project. Additionally, EUR 10 million been provided by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) as part of the Green Cities initiative for this project. The project will finance the acquisition of 40 modern metro cars as well as the modernisation of a depot and a tunnel. Despite several attempts

¹⁷ Kasia Kukula, 'Green buses on the streets of green city Tbilisi', EBRD, 2017, <https://www.ebrd.com/news/2017/green-buses-on-the-streets-of-green-city-tbilisi.html>

¹⁸ European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 'Tbilisi Bus Project', *European Bank for Reconstruction and Development*, <https://www.ebrd.com/work-with-us/projects/psd/tbilisi-bus-project.html>

¹⁹ Agenda.ge, 'Tbilisi Mayor receives top sustainability award at annual EBRD meeting', *Agenda.ge*, 2017, <https://agenda.ge/en/news/2017/923>

²⁰ European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 'GrCF W2 – Tbilisi Bus Extension', *European Bank for Reconstruction and Development*, <https://www.ebrd.com/work-with-us/projects/psd/51207.html>

²¹ 'Meeting of the Government of the Capital', Kakha Kaladze, 2019, <http://kaladze.com/new/1250-dedaqalaqis-mtavrobis-skhdoma>

to do so, we have failed to receive additional documentation regarding the project sponsor, which would allow us to assess the project's compliance with the EBRD's standards.²²

Problems of Integration

Despite its promises, the GCAP has both failed to launch an integrated approach to urban development in Tbilisi and to become integrated into the city's urban planning more broadly. During our research for this case study, we asked Tbilisi City Hall to provide an update on the implementation of the GCAP.

The answer we received was a bit strange. The Tbilisi Municipal Legal Department answered our questions regarding the implementation of the GCAP, but only in relation to urban mobility; for more detailed answers, they referred us to the Tbilisi Transport Company.²³ According to the answers, Tbilisi City Hall had successfully followed all of the major points stipulated in the GCAP, in accordance with Progress Monitoring Plan.²⁴

However, numerous other relevant issues, such as waste, water and energy efficiency were completely ignored in their response.

This suggests that the Tbilisi Green City Action Plan has been turned into an urban mobility improvement plan, rather than the comprehensive plan for Tbilisi's future green development it is intended to be. Furthermore, although Tbilisi Municipality spends enormous amounts on public relations for its own activities, it barely mentions the GCAP in its communication with public.

The Tbilisi Municipal Legal Department also assured us that the GCAP is well integrated with the Tbilisi General Plan for Land Use of the Capital (Tbilisi Master Plan)²⁵ and the Resilience Action Plan, two documents that are central to Tbilisi's urban planning. The Master Plan, in particular, lays out the following concepts which Tbilisi should strive for: a compact city, green city, well connected city and resilient city. The "green city" concept in the Master Plan refers to an integrated approach for the improvement of environmental and recreational conditions, and within this concept, Tbilisi's natural and anthropogenic environment are considered a united, interdependent system.

However, the only areas where we can see an overlap between the GCAP and the Master Plan is in the need for development of new parks and green areas. According to the Tbilisi City Hall, it plans to develop at least seven new green parks as well as rehabilitate the already existing green areas and squares. Annex 5 of the Tbilisi Master Plan indicates the need for developing a Tbilisi Resilience Strategy in 2019 that is in line with the Master Plan. As the resilience strategy is still not publicly available, it is difficult to assess how well it has integrated the 'green city' concept.

The Tbilisi Local Economy Development Plan (2019-2020)²⁶ also argues that it is based on the major priorities defined by the GCAP, along with Tbilisi Master Plan and the Tbilisi Marketing Strategy. However, the priorities underlined by the GCAP do not match the actual priorities of the Local Economic Development Plan (part of Tbilisi's participation in the EU program Mayors for Economic Growth). Instead, the plan prioritises the development of small infrastructure for tourism and capacity building for touristic companies' staff; land and municipal property assessment to further attract investments; support for small business through start-ups or business plan design with the aim of increase sales. Investments reported thus far have gone towards crafts,

²² Loretta Martikian, 'EBRD finances modernisation of Tbilisi metro', 30 Apr 2020, <https://www.ebrd.com/news/2020/ebrd-finances-modernisation-of-tbilisi-metro.html>

²³ From Tbilisi City Hall to Green Alternative, 19 December 2019. From Tbilisi Transport Company to Green Alternative, 26 December 2019.

²⁴ 'Green City Action Plan', Tbilisi City Hall, 2017, <http://www.tbilisi.gov.ge/page/green-city?lang=en>

²⁵ The Legislative Herald of Georgia, Approval of the General Plan for Land Use of the Capital, 2019, <https://matsne.gov.ge/ka/document/view/4508064?publication=0>

²⁶ Tbilisi Municipality City Hall, 'Tbilisi Local Economic Development Plan', 2019, http://tbilisi.gov.ge/img/original/2019/2/6/Tbilisi_Local_Economic_Development_Plan_ENG.pdf.

cheese and wine production, as well as property companies. If City Hall was actually following the GGAP in its local development activities, however, it should instead prioritize sectors such as waste recycling, energy efficiency and sustainable transportation.

The GCAP project that is being implemented in Tbilisi's transport sector has also raised some concern. The GCAP stipulates that all bus fleets should be CNG and/or electric; however, in 2018 Tbilisi City Hall purchased for Tbilisi Transport Company 90 MAN 'Lion's City' A47 model 10 meter buses and 220 ISUZU 'Novocity Life' 8 metre buses that works on diesel Euro 6. The explanation given by Tbilisi City hall is that small buses were needed for some streets and districts in Tbilisi, and these buses are not produced to use CNG.

Public Participation

What might be the reason for the complete failure of all of Tbilisi's urban planning, as well as the solution? Better public information and participation. Public participation represents one of the weakest points in all processes and projects described and reviewed in this case study. In almost all cases, from 2005 until today, the public participation and consultation component is missing.

Meaningful public participation was missing in the preparation of GCAP. There was only meeting held between City Hall, experts and NGOs in premises of the Czech Republic Embassy. Public participation was also missing during the preparation of the SUMP and other SUTIP documents, as well as during the decision making processes regarding specific actions, such as what type of buses to purchase.

Public participation and consultation was better organized for the Tbilisi Master Plan, but again at the end of the process there were quite diverse opinions even among the experts and NGO community about what the terms of reference for the Master Plan were and what it was supposed to cover. There were numerous criticisms from both government officials and experts during the development process. An analysis of the articles and interviews in the press shows that the major problem was with regard to the terms of reference for the Master Plan, something that has not been widely discussed publicly. The terms of reference also bears the heritage of the previous Master Plan and the irregularities that it has drawn from it.^{27 28}

The Tbilisi City Hall Municipal Legal Department acknowledged these issues and underlined that the citizens' involvement in the implementation of different components of the GCAP is restricted to participation in quantitative and qualitative surveys, focus groups, public opinion polls, and so on. However, this needed to be followed by public hearings and presentations, both on the GCAP itself and on the terms of references for studies, draft strategies and plans for projects in the GCAP when they are implemented, as well as providing a period for commenting on the GCAP and on the projects specified within it. City Hall also explains, "The municipality has no experience of involvement of local inhabitants in participatory planning but that issue will be addressed during the preparation of the sustainable urban mobility action plan."

The process of re-routing city transport, as well as the development processes of different action plans and strategies, would benefit from more frequent presentations of findings, as well as discussions and debates with experts and CSO representatives, starting in the early stages. These initiatives will help to increase citizen ownership over decisions taken by City Hall. It sometimes sounds cynical when Tbilisi City Hall asks people through social media what colour the buses that the municipality plans to purchase should be, or what type of pavement should be on certain sections of particular roads, while important issues as the constructions of new roads and the rehabilitation of districts are not consulted with the public.

²⁷ IPress, 'Tbilisi General Plan – Unplanned misunderstanding of planned funds', *IPress*, 2018, <https://ipress.ge/new/tbilisis-generaluri-geg-3/>

²⁸ There were court case between the developers of the so-called Operational Land Master Plan of Tbilisi and Tbilisi City Hall during 2008-2016 that ended with victory of the developer company on 8 December 2016 in the high court of Georgia.

Gender Integration in Urban Mobility

Bankwatch's research on the Tbilisi GCAP and the efforts of the EBRD and City Council to make the city more sustainable and resilient shows that Tbilisi's GCAP is perceived by the government mainly as a possibility for the development of the public transport schemes in Tbilisi. On the positive side, the EBRD's efforts to establish equal employment opportunities for men and women should be underlined. It has helped to establish training courses specifically for women drivers, and 25 women have already participated in program—some of which are already working as drivers. However, the major concern shown by the research in that regard is the absolute lack of public participation, including of women, in the research and design of new modes and routes for public transport. Another matter of concern is that the projects as well as city planners have not been addressing the sexual assaults that occur in public transport. The ADB's assessment in 2015 shows that up to 45% of women report that they have experienced sexual harassment or felt harassed or uncomfortable on public transport in the previous six months, and 62.5% of respondents consider sexual harassment in public transport and its environs a matter of concern. Although a new bill was introduced in 2019 to make sexual harassment a punishable offence in Georgia, numerous activities need to be implemented by city planners and IFIs to 'include women participants in transport planning and design of future upgrade programs', as was recommended by the ADB study.

Recommendations

We recommend local authorities take the following steps to address these challenges:

- The city should provide citizens with more substantial information around the GCAP and other strategic documents, communicating clearly with citizens about the need for climate action and adaptation, and describing the ways they can result in improved quality of life. Effective communication between scientists, planners, managers and the public is essential in order to achieve the aim of making Tbilisi a “green city.”
- A policy of open public participation for the involvement of the people in city development issues is necessary for the success of urban planning and development.
- Because the city has numerous different plans under different national or international processes (Resilient Cities Initiative, Green Cities, Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy, etc.), it is important to have a unit within the City Hall that will integrate the different action plans and ensure the involvement of all stakeholders in decision making.
- IFIs should seriously consider their involvement in municipal development, and should only invest in plans and projects that are well integrated in the city's broader urban planning, and that contribute to the holistic development of the city. Funding for municipal projects should be dependent on the city making reforms to the way they conduct public participation and planning.