



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**Wi** **WINROCK**  
INTERNATIONAL  
GEORGIA

## ENHANCING CAPACITY FOR LOW EMISSION DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES (EC-LEDS) CLEAN ENERGY PROGRAM

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT NO. 114-A-13-00008

# REPORT ON UPDATED LIST OF POTENTIAL MUNICIPALITIES ACCORDING TO SELECTION CRITERIA



OCTOBER 2015

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Winrock International in cooperation with Sustainable Development Center "Remissia"

ENHANCING CAPACITY FOR LOW EMISSION DEVELOPMENT  
STRATEGIES (EC-LEDS) CLEAN ENERGY PROGRAM

# REPORT ON UPDATED LIST OF POTENTIAL MUNICIPALITIES ACCORDING TO SELECTION CRITERIA

October 2015

## **DISCLAIMER**

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

EC-LEDS would like to acknowledge the support provided by representatives of Akhaltsikhe, Batumi, Bolnisi, Gori, Kazbegi, Kutaisi, Mtskheta, Poti, Rustavi, Tbilisi, Telavi City, Telavi, Tianeti and Zugdidi Municipalities who contributed their time and efforts to provide data and information needed to update the list of potential SEAP municipalities.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Acknowledgements ..... iii

Executive Summary ..... 1

Background Information..... 2

    Objective..... 2

List Update Methodology ..... 3

    Results..... 5

Conclusions..... 14

ANNEX I ..... 15

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The current report presents an updated list of 14 Georgian Self-Governing cities and Municipalities that are signatories of Covenant of Mayors (CoM). EC-LEDS identified three cities/municipalities from the top 10 cities on the list to be considered for support in developing and/or updating Sustainable Energy Action Plans (SEAPs) in year 3 of the program. Preparation of SEAPs is the first step to be undertaken by the municipalities after joining CoM.

Information gathered through questionnaires, individual meetings, phone/email consultations and informal communication was analyzed and used to update the tables under 8 different criteria developed by EC-LEDS in year one. Information was gathered from 14 municipalities over one month period, namely Akhaltsikhe, Batumi, Bolnisi, Gori, Kazbegi, Kutaisi, Mtskheta, Poti, Rustavi, Tbilisi, Telavi City, Telavi, Tianeti and Zugdidi Municipalities.

Although the municipalities were not able to provide us with complete information needed for a full-scale update of the tables (i.e. energy consumption for 2012, 2013, 2014) the provided data and insights, intentions and motivation revealed during individual meetings was sufficient to update rankings and revise the list of top 10 municipalities.

Based on the data analysis, EC-LEDS recommends supporting the City of Mtskheta, Bolnisi and Telavi municipality during year 3 of the program.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

As stated in previous report, 2014 turned out to be a transformational year for the self-governing units of Georgia – on February 5, 2014 on the third and final hearing the Parliament of Georgia approved a new Local Self-Government Code<sup>1</sup>, which brought about certain changes in the current local self-government system. The Code combines several legislative acts regulating self-governance, in particular:

- The Organic Law of Georgia on the Local Self-Government;
- The Law of Georgia on the State Supervision over Activities of Local Authorities;
- The Law of Georgia on the Capital of Georgia - Tbilisi;
- The Law of Georgia on the Property of a Self-Governing Unit.

According to the new Code, the number of so called self-governing cities was increased from 5 to 12 by means of granting the self-governing status to 7 additional cities - Telavi, Ozurgeti, Zugdidi, Ambrolauri, Gori, Mtskheta and Akhaltsikhe. The change of the status implies the change in mandate, rights and responsibilities of above-mentioned cities making them more independent from the central government in a decision-making process. More precisely, Paragraph 2 of the Article 2 of the Code defines the concept of self-government in the following way – “The local self-government entity is a municipality. The municipality represents an inhabited locality (self-governing town) or an association of inhabited localities (self-governing community), which has its administrative boundaries, representative and executive authorities of the elected local self-government (hereinafter-municipal authorities), has its own property, budget, incomes and is an independent legal entity of public law.”<sup>2</sup>

In addition to revised legal framework, local self-government elections were held on June 15, 2014 resulting in institutional and administrative changes within self-governing entities, including introducing new people on high-level decision-making as well as technical positions.

Both of the above-mentioned processes have had direct or indirect impact on updating the list of potential municipalities<sup>3</sup> considered for SEAP support that was developed in year 1 and updated in year 2 based on the criteria developed by EC-LEDS and agreed with USAID. On the one hand, working with self-governing cities increases the opportunities to move forward with SEAP development and implementation process as they become more independent from the central government and therefore, are able to make decisions in a more efficient and timely manner. On the other hand, changes in management and human resources created a risk of losing existing momentum and interest within the municipalities to be part of, or get involved, in the CoM process. However, the second year of project implementation showed that interest from municipalities was increasing. Consultations started in 2014 continue in 2015 and, as a result, at the time being there are 13 CoM signatories in Georgia (cities and municipalities). Details of ongoing processes are described below.

## OBJECTIVE

The main objective of this report is to update the list of municipalities identified for SEAP preparation support according to the criteria agreed with USAID as defined in the “Establishment of selection criteria, evaluation of municipalities against these criteria and prioritization of ten (10) municipalities for support in preparation of SEAPs (Sustainable Energy Action Plan)” report. In addition to the agreed

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://matsne.gov.ge/index.php?option=com\\_ldmssearch&view=docView&id=2244429](https://matsne.gov.ge/index.php?option=com_ldmssearch&view=docView&id=2244429);  
<http://www.civil.ge/files/files/2013/LocalSelfGovernance-bill.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Unofficial translation at <http://www.civil.ge/files/files/2013/LocalSelfGovernance-bill.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Within presented report, the Municipality refers to self-governing entity, including self-governing city

criteria, additional circumstances were taken into consideration for making the final recommendations regarding the top ten municipalities prioritized for support by EC-LEDS program during the period of 2013-2016.

## LIST UPDATE METHODOLOGY

To ensure consistency and objectivity in revising the list of municipalities, information was updated for the established criteria and municipalities were re-ranked accordingly. Some of the information needed for the criteria evaluation was updated through group and/or individual meetings as well as email/phone communication with the municipality representatives (criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5), while others needed additional work, such as data gathering, etc. by the municipalities and therefore, took more time to be completed (criteria 2, 6, 7 and 8).

In order to update the list of the top ten municipalities, individual working meetings were organized with the municipalities of Bolnisi, Kazbegi, Poti, Mtskheta, Tianeti, Telavi with the purpose of confirming their interest in being part of the CoM process and readiness and willingness to work on their respective SEAPs. Workshops conducted in Batumi and Mtskheta-Mtianeti regional office for representatives of various municipalities were used as opportunities to have meetings with the Municipalities in formal, as well as informal setting to discuss political as well as technical details of the CoM and SEAP preparation processes; all potential Municipalities have been contacted by phone/email with the request to provide the data and information needed to update the rankings and prioritize the list of partner municipalities.

As mentioned above, the following 8 criteria together with weights for each criteria were established to prioritize municipalities for receiving program support in SEAP preparation (see Annex I for detailed description of the criteria).

N	Selection Criteria	Weight of Criteria
1	CoM Signatory city/municipality or strong intention to join COM	10
2	Increase in GHG emissions caused by economic or population growth for the past three years	7
3	Willingness of a municipality to address emissions through facilitation and implementation of energy efficiency improvements	8
4	Willingness of a municipality to work with the EC-LEDS program (yes/no). ,	This criterion does not participate in multi-criteria assessment and has only filter function. If the municipality is not clearly willing to cooperate, it is unlikely EC-LEDS will commit any effort to work with them.
5	Willingness of the municipality to contribute with human resources especially ensuring	9

	implementation and monitoring of SEAP	
6	Annual expenditure in a municipality for infrastructure improvements/construction.	10
7	Total population within the municipality	5
8	Annual energy consumption in municipality (if known)	4

Based on the above-listed criteria the final table of multi-criteria analysis for selection of SEAP municipalities was updated in the second report prepared in year 2:

Municipality	Criteria 1 (10)	Criteria 2 (7)	Criteria 3 (8)	Criteria 5 (9)	Criteria 6 (10)	Criteria 7 (5)	Criteria 8 (4)	Total scores	Rank
Akhalsikhe	50	9	40	45	140	10		294	9
Batumi	150	14	120	135	150	60		629	1
Gori	150	0	120	135	130	55		590	2
Khashuri	0	0	0	0	70	25		95	13
Kutaisi	150	10	120	135	100	65		580	3
Ozurgeti	0	4	0	0	0	45		49	14
Mtskheta-Mtianeti	50	4	40	45	80	15		234	10
Poti	150	6	80	135	120	5		496	6
Rustavi	150	11	120	135	0	50		466	7
Sagarejo	50	8	40	0	110	20		228	11
Tbilisi	150	13	120	135	90	60		568	4
Telavi	150	12	120	135	60	30		507	5
Zestafoni	50	5	40	45	0	40		180	12
Zugdidi	150	7	120	135	0	35		447	8

## RESULTS

The information provided by the Municipalities to EC-LEDS allows us to update and re-rank the tables under each criterion to certain extent.

The information gathered through already prepared SEAPs, individual meetings and/or phone/email communication with the Municipalities is summarized below in a narrative part of the report, which is followed by updated tables on different criteria. The conclusions are drawn based on data provided by the municipalities and respective findings. It should also be mentioned that instead of 15 municipalities (among them some were only potential signatories) considered for 2014-2015 only 14 CoM signatory municipalities are considered in this report for 2015-2016. Hence, three new signatories – Bolnisi, Telavi and Tianeti substitute four municipalities -Khashuri, Ozurgeti, Sagarejo and Zestafoni who have not signed onto CoM yet.

### 1 – Akhaltsikhe

In October 29, 2014, the City of Akhaltsikhe joined the CoM. Despite the fact that Akhaltsikhe was not on the list of municipalities prioritized for support in year 2, EC-LEDS decided and obtained USAID approval to substitute Poti by Akhaltsikhe. Details why Poti was dropped are available below under the description of cities' status in the CoM process. Criteria for selection of Akhaltsikhe was very high interest, sense of responsibility and ownership demonstrated by the municipality during the selection process. EC-LEDS prepared Akhaltsikhe SEAP and project proposal that are currently being reviewed by different divisions of the City Hall and the City Council. **The City Hall of Akhaltsikhe stays committed to fulfill its obligations under the CoM and implement concrete measures supporting SEAP.**

### 2 – Batumi

Batumi SEAP was approved by the City Council on March 27, 2014 and submitted to the CoM. The document is already approved by the EU Joint Research Center<sup>4</sup> (JRC). **The Municipality remains very much committed and interested to implement the Action Plan, meet commitments undertaken under the CoM and continue collaboration with EC-LEDS program.**

### 3 – Bolnisi

Bolnisi signed CoM in March 2015 and is committed to developing SEAP. Bolnisi is a municipality (not a city) with agriculture being its major economic sector. Because infrastructure and economic sectors of cities and municipalities differ significantly in Georgia, different approach and methodology should be applied in case of Bolnisi and other similar municipalities (Kazbegi, Telavi and Tianeti). **During the surveys and interviews conducted for selection process, the municipality of Bolnisi demonstrated high commitment to fulfilling its obligations under the CoM.**

### 4 – Gori

In July 2012, Gori Municipality signed CoM. At that time, the City Gori was part of a municipality. In 2013, Gori municipality submitted SEAP to the CoM but when the received comments were still being reviewed in 2014, the City of Gori became a self-governing city and respectively an official legal successor of CoM membership. New SEAP for the city of Gori was prepared by EC-LEDS and approved by the City Council on July 3, 2015. The document was submitted to the CoM and is currently being

---

<sup>4</sup> Joint Research Center of EU responsible for SEAPs approval

reviewed for approval by JRC. **The Municipality of Gori also stays committed to fulfill its obligations under the CoM and implement concrete measures supporting SEAP.**

#### **5 – Kazbegi**

Kazbegi municipality signed CoM in February 2015 and is very much interested to prepare SEAP. Similar to Bolnisi, Kazbegi is also a municipality in the high mountainous region with agriculture being the major sector of its economy. As it was already mentioned in case of Bolnisi because the infrastructure and economy sectors of cities and municipalities have significant differences in Georgia, different approaches and methodologies should be applied to each. In addition, special condition of this municipality is that they are supplied with free natural gas paid by central budget and unfortunately, energy efficiency is not considered in this process at all. **In general, Kazbegi municipality has expressed willingness to be supported in SEAP preparation and implement EE measures, especially in NG supply sector, but during this last survey they were not responsive enough, which was reflected in the criterion 1.**

#### **6 – Kutaisi**

Kutaisi SEAP was prepared and approved by the City Council on November 26, 2014. The document was submitted to the CoM and approved by JRC. **Municipality of Kutaisi stays committed to fulfill its obligations under the CoM and implement concrete measures supporting SEAP.**

#### **7 - Mtskheta**

The City of Mtskheta signed the CoM in May 2015. Mtskheta became a self-governing city in 2014. **During the surveys and interviews conducted for selection process, the City Hall of Mtskheta demonstrated high commitment to fulfill its obligations under the CoM**

#### **8 – Poti**

The city of Poti signed CoM in 2012. Though the Poty City Government claimed its interest to be a part of CoM process several times in the past, the reality showed that they were nor ready or committed to preparing SEAP and were subsequently dropped from the list of CoM signatories. In Y2, EC-LEDS recommended to support Poti and started preparation process, but as the process went on it became clear that the city was not committed to fulfilling its CoM obligations. In October 2015 representative of Poti Municipality - Mr. Sulkhan Tolordava, Head of Economy Development Department informed EC-LEDS on their interest to re-join the CoM process and receive support, but EC-LEDS has yet to receive an official document from Poti. In addition, Poti has been removed from the list of signatories by CoM. Considering all of the above, EC-LEDS can not, at this stage, recommend to prioritize Poti for receiving assistance in year 3, despite the city's fast-growing economy and high energy intensity.

#### **9 – Rustavi**

Rustavi City Council approved its SEAP on 31 October 2012. It was submitted to the CoM and approved by the EU JRC after revision of initial document based on the comments provided by the JRC. Rustavi SEAP was not prepared by EC-LEDS and methodology used is different (fixed base year). However, representative of Rustavi City Hall responsible for SEAP confirmed that they would need support in SEAP monitoring and updating the document at a later stage. **Once they find out, the deadlines for monitoring and update for Rustavi SEAP from the CoM office, EC-LEDS will discuss technical details and the possibility to support the Rustavi Municipality in preparation of the Monitoring Report and update of the SEAP document.**

#### **10 – Tbilisi**

Tbilisi City Council approved its first SEAP prepared by Remissia on 26 March 2011. The document was submitted and approved by the EU JRC. In 2015, SEAP Monitoring Report was prepared. In parallel, the 2011 SEAP was updated and both of these documents are currently being reviewed for approval by the City Hall. **The Municipality remains very much committed and interested to implement the**

**Action Plan, meet commitments undertaken under the CoM and continue collaboration with EC-LEDS program.**

**11- Telavi**

Telavi as a municipality together with city of Telavi signed CoM in March 2014. In 2014, the City of Telavi became a self-Governing city and an official legal successor of CoM membership. Later, in January 2015, the municipality of Telavi also signed the CoM and is very much committed and interested to have SEAP. Telavi municipality has agriculture as major economy sector. Because infrastructure and economy sectors of cities and municipalities have significant differences in Georgia different approach and methodology should be applied in case of Telavi similar to Kazbegi, Bolnisi and Tianeti. **During the surveys and interviews conducted for selection process, the municipality of Telavi demonstrated high commitment to fulfill its obligations under the CoM.**

**12- Telavi City**

SEAP for the city of Telavi was elaborated by EC-LEDS and approved by the City Council in 2015. Submission tables and other documents are being prepared and will be submitted to the CoM in the coming two weeks. **The Telavi City Hall stays committed to fulfill its obligations under CoM and implement concrete measures supporting SEAP.**

**13 - Tianeti**

Tianeti municipality signed CoM in January 2015 and is very much interested to have SEAP. Tianeti is a municipality with agriculture and forestry being major sector of its economy. Because infrastructure and economy sectors of cities and municipalities have significant differences in Georgia different approaches and methodologies should be applied in case of Tianeti. Tianeti also declared the municipality as “green region”. **During the surveys and interviews conducted for selection process, the municipality of Tianeti demonstrated high commitment to fulfill its obligations under the CoM.**

**14- Zugdidi**

Zugdidi SEAP was prepared and submitted to CoM. **The Municipality remains very much committed and interested to implement the Action Plan, meet commitments undertaken under the CoM and continue collaboration with EC-LEDS program**

- **Criterion 1 (weight 10) -CoM Signatory city/municipality or strong intention to join COM**

Municipality	Scores
C. Akhaltsikhe	150
C. Batumi	150
Bolnisi	150
C. Gori	150
Kazbegi	50
C. Kutaisi	150
C. Mtskheta	150
C. Poti	50

C. Rustavi	150
C. Tbilisi	150
Telavi	150
C. Telavi	150
Tianeti	150
Zugdidi	150

**Criterion 2 (weight 7) - Increase in GHG emissions caused by economic or population growth for the past three years.**

Municipality	Population (Thousand)			CO <sub>2</sub>			Combination			Average Rate of change	rank
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014		
Akhaltikhe City Hall	20.5	20.4	20.5	2.08	2.18	2.29	42.64	44.47	46.95	2.15	6
Batumi City Hall	147.8	160.6	153.3	2.36	2.47	2.60	348.81	396.68	398.58	24.89	13
Bolnisi	78.7	78.7	78.9	2.08	2.18	2.29	163.70	171.57	180.68	8.40	11
Gori City Hall	50.4	50.4	50.5	2.08	2.18	2.29	104.83	109.87	115.65	5.41	8
Kazbegi	4.9	4.9	3.7	2.08	2.18	2.29	10.19	10.68	8.47	-0.86	4
Kutaisi City Hall	196.6	196.7	149.0	2.36	2.47	2.60	463.98	485.85	387.40	-38.29	1
Mtskheta	57.4	57.4	55.7	2.08	2.18	2.29	31.20	32.70	34.35	1.58	5
Poti City Hall	47.8	47.8	41.7	2.36	2.47	2.60	112.81	118.07	108.42	-2.19	3
Rustavi City Hall	122.5	122.7	124.6	2.08	2.18	2.29	254.80	267.49	285.33	15.27	12
Tbilisi City Hall	1172.0	1173.2	1116.4	2.36	2.47	2.60	2765.92	2897.31	2902.64	68.36	14
Telavi	71.0	70.8	58.5	2.08	2.18	2.29	104.00	109.00	115.65	5.82	9
Telavi City Hall	21.5	21.5	21.5	2.08	2.18	2.29	44.72	46.87	49.24	2.26	7
Tianeti	13.0	12.9	9.4	2.08	2.18	2.29	27.04	28.12	21.53	-2.76	2
Zugdidi City Hall	76.7	75.1	74.8	2.36	2.47	2.60	181.01	185.50	194.48	6.73	10

Per capita emission in **Georgia** for the last three years<sup>5</sup>

Years	tCO <sub>2</sub> (from energy sector)	tCO <sub>2</sub> (from energy sector and non-energy waste)
2012	2.08	2.36
2013	2.08	2.36
2014	2.08	2.36

- **Criterion 3 (weight 8) - Willingness of a municipality to address emissions through facilitation and implementation of energy efficiency improvements**

**And**

- **Criterion 5 (weight 9) - Willingness of the municipality to contribute with human resources especially ensuring implementation and monitoring of SEAP**

Municipality	Criteria 3 (8)	Criteria 5 (9)
C. Akhaltsikhe	100	90
C. Batumi	150	135
Bolnisi	50	45
C. Gori	150	90
Kazbegi	50	45
C. Kutaisi	100	100
C. Mtskheta	50	45
C. Poti	0	0
C. Rustavi	150	90

<sup>5</sup> Per capita emissions for the years 2012, 2013 and 2014 are calculated based on 2011 GHG National Inventory available at the time of report preparation. Two different options are calculated: for cities not including waste sector in their SEAPs (column 1) and for cities including waste sector in their SEAPs (column 2). Annual increment is calculated from the BAU scenario developed for LEDS as far as these years are not yet assessed based on real statistic. Comparison with per capita emission calculated in already existing SEAPs for the years 2012 and 2014 showed that SEAP data are lower; however, it does not have any material impact on ranging the municipalities considered.

C. Tbilisi	150	135
Telavi	100	135
C. Telavi	100	90
Tianeti	100	45
Zugdidi	150	90

➤ **Criterion 6 (weight 10) - Annual expenditure in a municipality for infrastructure improvements/construction.**

Municipality	Budget share (%) used for infrastructure development	Criteria 6 (10)		Scores
	2014			
		6.1	6.2	
C. Akhaltsikhe	85	1	9	90
C. Batumi	70	1	8	80
Bolnisi	10	0	0	0
C. Gori	40	1	3	30
Kazbegi	10	0	0	0
C. Kutaisi	45	1	6	60
C. Mtskheta	41	1	5	50
C. Poti	21	0	0	0
C. Rustavi	30	1	1	10
C. Tbilisi	37	1	2	20
Telavi	40	1	4	40
C. Telavi	52	1	7	70

Tianeti	10	0	0	0
Zugdidi	21	0	0	0

➤ **Criterion 7 (weight 5) - Total population within the municipality**

This criterion is ranked in the range of 1-14 in relation to 2014 - year population data.

Municipalities	Population (Th. Person)			Rank	Scores
	2012	2013	2014		
C. Akhaltsikhe	20.50	20.40	20.50	4	20
C. Batumi	147.80	160.60	153.30	13	65
Bolnisi	78.70	78.70	78.90	10	50
C. Gori	50.40	50.40	50.50	7	35
Kazbegi	4.90	4.90	3.70	1	5
C. Kutaisi	196.60	196.70	149.00	12	60
C. Mtskheta	15.00	15.00	15.00	3	15
C. Poti	47.80	47.80	41.70	6	30
C. Rustavi	122.50	122.70	124.60	11	55
C. Tbilisi	1172.00	1173.00	1116.40	14	70
Telavi	50.00	50.00	50.50	8	40
C. Telavi	21.50	21.50	21.50	5	25
Tianeti	13.00	12.90	9.40	2	10
Zugdidi	76.70	75.10	74.80	9	45

➤ **Criterion 8 (weight 4) - Annual energy consumption in municipality (if known)**

Municipality	2011	2012	2012	Criteria 8 (4)		Rank	Total scores
				8.1	8.2		
	TJ	TJ	TJ	8.1	8.2		
C. Akhaltsikhe	518.26	456.40	451.71	1	-33.27	11	44
C. Batumi	6968.36	6866.21	7064.03	1	47.84	7	28
Bolnisi	713.02	668.54	721.83	1	4.41	9	36
C. Gori	767.32	0.00	0.00	0	-383.66	14	56
Kazbegi	995.04	1066.38	1137.65	1	71.31	6	24
C. Kutaisi	2340.38	10176.60	2103.46	1	-118.46	12	48
C. Mtskheta	538.53	612.24	885.34	1	173.40	4	16
C. Poti	1104.29	910.49	742.28	1	-181.01	13	52
C. Rustavi	1677.39	2230.38	4175.71	1	1249.16	2	8
C. Tbilisi	14666.42	21214.38	25602.62	1	5468.10	1	4
Telavi	905.83	1267.86	1260.81	1	177.49	3	12
C. Telavi	173.02	202.20	433.40	1	130.19	5	20
Tianeti	71.46	103.10	99.60	1	14.07	8	32
Zugdidi	575.19	565.58	568.38	1	-3.41	10	40

**Final table of multi-criteria analysis for selection of SEAP municipalities**

Municipality	Criteria 1 (10)	Criteria 2 (7)	Criteria 3 (8)	Criteria 5 (9)	Criteria 6 (10)	Criteria 7 (5)	Criteria 8 (4)	Total scores	Rank
C. Akhaltsikhe	150	42.00	100	90	90	20	16	50.8	8
C. Batumi	150	91.00	150	135	80	65	32	70.3	1
Bolnisi	150	77.00	50	45	0	50	24	39.6	10
C. Gori	150	56.00	150	90	30	35	4	51.5	7

Kazbegi	50	28.00	50	45	0	5	36	21.4	13
C. Kutaisi	150	7.00	100	100	60	60	12	48.9	9
C. Mtskheta	150	35.00	50	45	50	15	44	38.9	11
C. Poti	50	21.00	0	0	0	30	8	10.9	14
C. Rustavi	150	84.00	150	90	10	55	52	59.1	3
C. Tbilisi	150	98.00	150	135	20	70	56	67.9	2
Telavi	150	63.00	100	135	40	40	48	57.6	4
C. Telavi	150	49.00	100	90	70	25	40	52.4	6
Tianeti	150	14.00	100	45	0	10	28	34.7	12
Zugdidi	150	70.00	150	90	0	45	20	52.5	5

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on information gathered from the Municipalities through individual meetings, phone/ email communication, data provided by them, analyzed and ranked according to agreed criteria the following top 10 municipalities have been identified for potential support from the EC-LEDS project:

- 1. Batumi -70.3 (supported)**
- 2. Tbilisi – 67.9 (supported)**
- 3. Telavi -57.6**
- 4. Zugdidi -52.5 (supported)**
- 5. Telavi C- 52.4 (supported)**
- 6. Gori -51.5 (supported)**
- 7. Akhaltsikhe -50.8 (supported)**
- 8. Kutaisi -48.9 (supported)**
- 9. Bolnisi -39.6**
- 10. Mtskheta City -38.9**

As mentioned above all these municipalities and cities are CoM signatories. Out of these ten municipalities, EC-LEDS already supported 7 municipalities (Batumi, Akhaltsikhe, Tbilisi, Telavi C., Gori, Kutaisi and Zugdidi) to prepare SEAPs. Rustavi was supported by other donors in SEAP preparation and they have not requested support in monitoring yet, therefore it is excluded from the list. EC-LEDS recommends the following three municipalities from the top ten to be supported in year 3: Bolnisi, Telavi and the city of Mtskheta.

Two more municipalities Kazbegi and Tianeti are also very much interested to get SEAPs. During the survey, Tianeti has demonstrated high commitment to the process and accurately provided all required data and information. In case of availability of additional resources, these two municipalities should be supported as the first priority.

## ANNEX 1

**Criterion 1 (weight 10)** -CoM Signatory city/municipality or strong intention to join COM

1. CoM Signatory -15 (1)
2. Strong intention to sign CoM confirmed by written document-10 (2/3)
3. Strong intention to sign CoM is confirmed verbally-5 (1/3)
4. Strong intention to join CoM is not expressed-0 (0)

**Criterion 2 (weight 7)** - Increase in GHG emissions caused by economic or population growth for the past three years. Annual per capita GHGs emission calculated for the last three years (2.9 in 2009, 2.8 in 2010 and 3.2 in 2011) is multiplied by population of the municipality in the same years.

**Criterion 3 (weight 8)** - Willingness of a municipality to address emissions through facilitation and implementation of energy efficiency improvements

1. Municipality has the initiative to implement EE measures- 15
2. Municipality has willingness to address emissions through facilitation and implementation of energy efficiency improvements confirmed in writing -10
3. Municipality has willingness to address emissions through facilitation and implementation of energy efficiency improvements confirmed verbally -5
4. Municipality does not have any willingness to address emissions through facilitation and implementation of energy efficiency improvements 0

**Criterion 4** – Willingness of a municipality to work with the EC-LEDS program (yes/no). If the municipality is not clearly willing to cooperate, it is unlikely EC-LEDS will commit any effort to work with them.

**Criterion 5 (weight 9)** - Willingness of the municipality to contribute with human resources especially ensuring implementation and monitoring of SEAP

1. Human resources are already allocated and engaged -15
2. Municipality confirmed in writing readiness to contribute human resources—10
3. Municipality confirmed verbally readiness to contribute human resources—5
4. Municipality is not ready (lack of financial resources or understanding of importance of the issue) to contribute human resources -0

**Criterion 6 (weight 10)** - Annual expenditure in a municipality for infrastructure improvements/construction.

First, the municipalities are filtered using sub-criteria 6.1, % of budget spent on infrastructure. If budget share for infrastructure is less than 30% for self-governing city or less than 20% for municipality, then the criterion 6.1 equals 0. When 6.1 is 0 then a 0 is also assigned for sub-criterion 6.2. The remaining cities with 1 in sub-criterion 6.1 are ranked according to their contribution to infrastructure development, measured by the percentage of their budget allocated to infrastructure.

**Criterion 7 (weight 5)**-Total population within the municipality  
Municipalities are ranked 1-14 according to their population in 2014.

**Criterion 8 (weight 4)** - Annual energy consumption in municipality (if known)

This criterion is similar to criteria 2 and 6, since answers are first pre-filtered. Those municipalities where the energy consumptions is not known receive a “0” for 8.1 and 8.2; those which have energy consumption are then ranked according to the growth rate of their energy use for the past three years (2012, 2013, and 2014).