DOI: 10.52950/SS.2025.14.1.002

ENHANCING REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN GEORGIA: INTEGRATING FUNCTIONAL SPATIAL PLANNING AND LAND USE MODELING FOR SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH

MARIAM JIBUTI

Abstract:

Regional development represents a fundamental pillar of economic growth, territorial cohesion, and sustainable resource management. As Georgia continues to navigate economic and political transitions, spatial-territorial planning emerges as a strategic tool for fostering balanced regional development and minimizing socio-economic disparities. This study examines the role of functional spatial planning in regional economic sustainability by conducting a comparative analysis of planning methodologies implemented in four EU member states—Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Sweden. The research explores the theoretical underpinnings of spatial zoning, evaluates the effectiveness of various land-use planning strategies, and assesses economic incentives for regional development. Additionally, the study integrates qualitative methods, including expert interviews and stakeholder surveys, to provide policy recommendations tailored to Georgia's specific development context. The findings suggest that adopting an integrated spatial planning framework, leveraging data-driven land-use modeling, and implementing sustainability-oriented economic incentives can significantly enhance Georgia's regional economic resilience.
This research was supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG) [grant number: YS-24-308]

Keywords:

Regional Development, Planning Models, Sustainable Development

JEL Classification: R11, O21, Q01

Authors:

MARIAM JIBUTI, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia, Email: Mariami.Jibuti382@eab.tsu.edu.ge

Citation:

MARIAM JIBUTI (2025). Enhancing Regional Development in Georgia: Integrating Functional Spatial Planning and Land Use Modeling for Sustainable Economic Growth. International Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. XIV.(1), pp. 23-34., 10.52950/SS.2025.14.1.002

1. Introduction

Regional economic development has become a critical area of focus for policymakers worldwide, particularly in countries undergoing socio-economic transformation. The importance of structured spatial-territorial planning lies in its ability to allocate land resources efficiently, enhance regional competitiveness, and promote sustainable growth. In the case of Georgia, regional development faces multiple challenges, including uneven economic distribution, inadequate infrastructure in rural areas, and weak institutional frameworks governing land use planning (Chanturidze & Narmania, 2020).

As Georgia aspires to align its policies with European Union (EU) standards, it is imperative to examine and integrate best practices in functional spatial planning. EU member states have developed advanced models of spatial governance that emphasize polycentric development, territorial cohesion, and smart specialization. This study aims to analyze the methodologies employed by Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Sweden in defining and managing functional spatial zones. Furthermore, it explores the role of targeted economic incentives in promoting sustainable regional development and discusses how these approaches can be adapted to the Georgian context.

This research is structured into several key components. First, the literature review presents an in-depth examination of theoretical frameworks that underpin functional spatial planning. Second, a comparative analysis highlights the diverse methodologies and policies implemented across selected EU countries. Third, the study examines economic policies and incentives that have been instrumental in fostering regional development within functional zones. The research methodology incorporates a mixed-method approach, including desk research, expert interviews, and stakeholder surveys, ensuring a comprehensive analysis. The findings contribute to the formulation of policy recommendations aimed at enhancing Georgia’s regional development strategies.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Foundations of Functional Spatial Planning

The concept of functional spatial planning is deeply rooted in economic geography and regional science. Theories such as Christaller’s Central Place Theory (1933) and Lösch’s Economic Location Theory (1954) provide foundational insights into how spatial structures influence economic interactions (Christaller, 1933; Lösch, 1954). Christaller’s model emphasizes hierarchical settlement structures where central places serve as economic hubs, while Lösch’s theory focuses on optimizing spatial arrangements to maximize economic efficiency.

In modern spatial planning, scholars emphasize the significance of polycentric development, which promotes multiple interconnected urban centers rather than a single dominant metropolitan area (Camagni & Capello, 2019). This approach fosters balanced regional development by reducing economic disparities between core and peripheral regions. Moreover, the territorial cohesion framework, as outlined in the EU’s Territorial Agenda 2030, advocates for the integration of economic, social, and environmental policies to create resilient and inclusive regional economies (ESPON, 2020).

Another critical concept in functional spatial planning is the smart specialization strategy (S3), which involves tailoring regional policies to leverage existing strengths and innovation potential (McCann & Ortega-Argilés, 2015). This approach aligns with sustainability goals by promoting sector-specific development within functional zones, ensuring resource efficiency, and fostering economic diversification.

2.2 Comparative Analysis of Functional Spatial Planning in Selected EU Countries

Functional spatial planning in the European Union (EU) serves as a multidimensional policy instrument aimed at fostering territorial cohesion, sustainable economic development, and institutional decentralization. Drawing upon the EU's *Territorial Agenda 2030*, most member states align their planning strategies with the overarching objectives of spatial equity, environmental resilience, and place-based innovation. This section provides a comparative evaluation of selected EU countries—Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Sweden—highlighting their respective models, instruments, and policy innovations in functional spatial planning.

Germany: Integrated Spatial Planning and Regional Cohesion. Germany employs a multi-level spatial planning system that integrates federal, state, and municipal governance structures (Fürst, 2021). The Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung (Guiding Principles for Spatial Development) provide a strategic vision for regional growth, emphasizing sustainability, economic diversification, and spatial justice (BBSR, 2020).

A key policy initiative in Germany's regional development strategy is the "Growth and Innovation Regions" (WIR!) Program, which allocates targeted financial support to economically weaker regions, enabling them to develop innovation-driven economies (German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, 2021).

What distinguishes Germany is its polycentric approach, in which multiple urban centers are empowered as regional hubs, mitigating overconcentration in major cities. This promotes balanced spatial development, especially through formalized intergovernmental coordination and integrated land use strategies.

France: Territorial Cohesion and Spatial Decentralization. France has long been a pioneer in territorial cohesion policies, integrating spatial planning with economic development objectives. The Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale (SCoT) serves as a framework for coordinating urban planning across municipalities, ensuring spatial equity and sustainable land use management (Allain, 2019).

A notable feature of France's functional spatial planning is the Contrats de Plan État-Région (CPER), which facilitates multi-year agreements between the state and regional governments to finance infrastructure projects and innovation hubs in designated functional zones (Medeiros, 2020).

France's model reflects a deliberate shift toward decentralization and subsidiarity, empowering regional entities while maintaining state oversight. Moreover, the alignment of planning tools with regional competitiveness frameworks enhances policy coherence.

The Netherlands: Land Use Efficiency and Environmental Integration. The Netherlands has implemented one of the most integrated spatial planning models in Europe, balancing economic growth with environmental sustainability. The Randstad Model is a prime example of polycentric spatial development, wherein major cities such as Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, and Utrecht function as interconnected economic centers (Needham, 2016).

The Dutch Omgevingswet (Environmental Planning Act) promotes sustainable spatial planning by integrating land use regulations with climate resilience strategies (Albrechts et al., 2019). The Netherlands also exemplifies the principles of the circular economy in spatial policy—integrating energy transition, mobility, and digital infrastructure into regional plans. This model shows how environmental governance and spatial development can be mutually reinforcing.

Sweden: Sustainable Regional Growth Strategies. Sweden's Regional Growth Strategies (RGS) emphasize place-based economic development, leveraging regional strengths to foster innovation and resilience (Eliasson, 2021). Swedish planning policies prioritize green infrastructure, renewable energy integration, and digital transformation as core elements of functional zoning (Hedlund & Lundholm, 2018).

One of the key policy instruments in Sweden's spatial planning system is the Swedish Planning and Building Act, which decentralizes planning authority to municipalities, ensuring locally tailored development strategies (Hedlund & Lundholm, 2018).

What sets Sweden apart is its strong tradition of participatory planning and consensus-building, supported by robust data infrastructures and long-term foresight. This enhances transparency and local ownership of regional policy outcomes.

Comparative Synthesis

A critical comparative analysis of the selected EU countries—Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Sweden—reveals both convergence and divergence in their approaches to functional spatial planning, shaped by distinct institutional traditions, governance structures, and territorial policy priorities. Despite differences in administrative frameworks and planning cultures, these countries demonstrate a shared commitment to the core principles enshrined in the *EU Territorial Agenda 2030*, including polycentric development, territorial cohesion, sustainability, and integrated governance.

Germany and the Netherlands exemplify spatial planning systems grounded in polycentricity and formalized multi-level governance. Germany's federal structure allows for strong horizontal and vertical coordination between the Bund (federal government), Länder (states), and municipalities, with the *Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung* serving as an overarching strategic framework. The Netherlands, although unitary, achieves comparable coordination through a legally embedded tradition of consensual planning and negotiated policy instruments, such as the *Structuurvisie* and the recently enacted *Omgevingswet*, which integrate environmental and spatial governance in a singular legislative framework. In both contexts, spatial planning is not merely regulatory but operates as a strategic tool for economic modernization and climate adaptation, supporting functional regions through infrastructure investment and innovation ecosystems.

In contrast, France emphasizes territorial cohesion through decentralization and contractual governance. The *Contrats de Plan État-Région* exemplify France's hybrid planning model, wherein the central government maintains a strong steering role, but policy implementation is territorially delegated through binding agreements with regional authorities. France's planning regime reflects the principle of subsidiarity in a centralized administrative context, attempting to reconcile national priorities with regional autonomy. The integration of spatial planning with innovation strategies under the SCoT framework positions French regions to tailor development policies to localized socio-economic conditions while aligning with national growth imperatives.

Sweden represents a normatively distinct planning model, characterized by its high degree of decentralization, procedural openness, and ecological modernism. Swedish municipalities enjoy extensive autonomy in spatial decision-making, facilitated by the *Planning and Building Act*, and are supported by national guidelines that emphasize sustainability, inclusivity, and digital governance. Sweden's planning ethos reflects a deeply embedded culture of participatory democracy and territorial equity, where spatial planning is seen as a community-driven, forward-looking practice rather than a top-down instrument of economic engineering.

While all four models prioritize sustainability and innovation, their methods of integrating these objectives differ. Germany and the Netherlands leverage formal planning hierarchies and infrastructure-driven regionalism; France blends contractualism with centralized funding mechanisms; Sweden fosters bottom-up, actor-centric spatial development. Moreover, whereas Germany and France emphasize territorial balance to address economic disparities among lagging regions, Sweden and the Netherlands emphasize resilience and adaptive capacity, investing in green infrastructure and circular economy models to future-proof their spatial strategies.

From an institutionalist perspective, these models reveal the importance of governance capacity, policy coherence, and territorial subsidiarity in operationalizing functional spatial planning. The synthesis underscores that effective regional development requires not only technically sound land-use frameworks but also context-sensitive governance arrangements that align economic, environmental, and social objectives across spatial scales. For Georgia, which is undergoing spatial decentralization and regional policy reforms, these international models provide a plurality of pathways for integrating spatial planning with sustainable economic development, particularly in underdeveloped and peripheral regions.

2.3 Georgian Perspectives and Broader International Literature

In the context of Georgia, spatial development planning remains a complex yet underutilized tool for achieving regional economic convergence. Georgian scholars have emphasized the critical role of spatial policy in addressing regional imbalances, institutional fragmentation, and economic underperformance in peripheral regions. *Papava (2017), Keshelashvili (2024)* highlight that regional disparities in Georgia are not merely a consequence of geographic determinism, but reflect deep-rooted institutional and policy failures that hinder the efficient distribution of capital and labor. Similarly, *Kharaishvili and Gechbaia (2021)* argue that the absence of functional zoning mechanisms continues to exacerbate developmental inequalities across Georgian regions and that spatially targeted economic policies are essential for achieving balanced territorial cohesion.

Functional spatial planning, when informed by robust land-use modeling and participatory governance, has the potential to transform regional policy into a driver of inclusive growth. According to *Kharaishvili et al. (2021)*, targeted rural land-use planning can foster sustainable agriculture, tourism, and renewable energy projects, thereby diversifying the economic base of lagging regions. This is especially relevant in mountainous and border areas of Georgia, which are often neglected in national investment schemes.

International perspectives support these claims. *Abosede and Onakoya (2013)* emphasize the importance of entrepreneurship and spatial decentralization for inclusive regional development. Likewise, *Barbosa, Drach, and Corbella (2014)* advocate for aligning spatial policy with long-term sustainability objectives, stressing that growth must be decoupled from ecological degradation. The *Penta Helix model* proposed by *Widowati et al. (2019)* offers an integrative framework where academia, government, civil society, private sector, and media collaboratively shape land use and regional policy, which is especially adaptable to Georgia's multi-actor development landscape.

Moreover, addressing institutional weaknesses is paramount. *Ajulor (2018)* underlines how policy fragmentation impedes the implementation of spatial strategies across African contexts—insights that resonate with Georgia's ongoing decentralization reforms. When spatial planning is designed inclusively and enforced effectively, it can serve as a lever for bottom-up development, particularly in regions historically sidelined by top-down economic programs.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Approach and Design

This study employs a mixed-method research approach to ensure a comprehensive analysis of functional spatial planning and its implications for regional economic development. By integrating qualitative and quantitative methodologies, the research is structured into three phases. The first phase consists of desk research, focusing on a detailed examination of theoretical and policy frameworks regarding functional zoning and land use planning. This phase includes an extensive review of academic literature, reports from international organizations, and national policies in selected EU countries. The second phase involves a comparative case study analysis of Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Sweden. The objective is to identify commonalities and variations in their approaches to spatial planning, economic incentives, and sustainability policies. The third phase incorporates empirical research, consisting of expert interviews and stakeholder surveys conducted in Georgia. This multi-stage approach ensures that the research captures both theoretical perspectives and practical experiences, allowing for the formulation of well-grounded policy recommendations.

3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

The study draws upon multiple sources of data to enhance its analytical depth. The desk research component relies on peer-reviewed articles, official government publications, and reports from institutions such as the European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON) and the European Commission's Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy. This foundational research informs the comparative case study analysis, which examines

governance structures, zoning methodologies, and economic development policies in each selected EU country.

To complement secondary data, the research incorporates primary data collection through in-depth interviews with urban planners, policymakers, and economic development experts. These interviews explore key themes, including the challenges of spatial planning in Georgia, best practices from European models, and opportunities for adapting functional zoning strategies to the Georgian context. Additionally, a structured stakeholder survey is administered to representatives from local governments, business associations, and regional development agencies. The survey focuses on perceptions of existing land-use policies, the effectiveness of economic incentives, and the potential benefits of adopting a more structured functional zoning framework.

The data analysis process involves qualitative content analysis for interview transcripts and thematic coding to identify recurring patterns and insights. Quantitative survey responses are analyzed using descriptive statistics, providing a clearer understanding of stakeholder preferences and priorities. The combination of these analytical methods ensures that the study presents both empirical evidence and policy-oriented insights.

4. Conclusion, Policy Recommendations, and Future Directions

4.1 Key Findings and Policy Implications

The findings of this study underscore the significant role that functional spatial planning plays in fostering balanced regional development. Case studies from Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Sweden illustrate that well-structured zoning policies, when embedded in coherent policy systems, coupled with targeted economic incentives, contribute to regional economic growth, investment attraction, spatial integration, and environmental sustainability. These countries demonstrate that a well-coordinated, multi-level governance approach enhances spatial efficiency, strengthens inter-regional linkages, and helps mitigate socio-economic disparities through territorially anchored development policies.

Moreover, these EU experiences highlight that spatial planning cannot operate in isolation—it must be institutionalized within broader economic development frameworks, supported by legal mandates, and sustained by strong political commitment at multiple governance levels. The success of polycentric models such as the Randstad in the Netherlands and the WIR! Program in Germany also illustrate the importance of spatially-targeted innovation strategies and tailored fiscal mechanisms that empower functional economic regions.

For Georgia, several key challenges have been identified through expert interviews and stakeholder surveys. Institutional fragmentation, outdated land-use policies, and limited capacity for data-driven planning emerge as primary obstacles to implementing effective functional zoning. The lack of an integrated national spatial planning framework has resulted in uncoordinated urbanization, inefficient land allocation, and increasing disparities between urban and rural regions. In practice, many local governments lack the institutional mandates, financial autonomy, and professional expertise to manage long-term spatial planning processes effectively (Keshelashvili, 2024).

Additionally, while economic incentives exist in some sectors—particularly agriculture and small enterprise development—their scope, design, and long-term impact remain limited, failing to drive structural transformation or attract sustained investment outside of urban centers. These constraints highlight a pressing need for a comprehensive national approach that links spatial functionality to economic competitiveness and territorial equity.

Consequently, Georgia's future regional development must transition from fragmented sectoral initiatives toward an integrated functional spatial planning model. This includes the institutionalization of clear spatial hierarchies, functional zoning schemes, and multi-scalar planning instruments aligned with socio-economic priorities and ecological constraints.

4.2 Strengthening Economic Incentives for Functional Zones

A major takeaway from the EU case studies is the effectiveness of economic incentives in stimulating development within designated functional zones. Countries like Germany and France have successfully employed investment grants, tax relief measures, and strategic infrastructure funding programs to encourage business expansion, technological innovation, and labor market revitalization in targeted lagging regions.

These incentives are not generic; they are spatially differentiated and strategically aligned with regional potentials—whether in green tech, manufacturing, or services—and are complemented by institutional support, such as business incubators, regional development agencies, and monitoring bodies. Such incentive ecosystems have proven essential in overcoming regional development traps and generating spatially balanced growth.

Georgia could benefit from adopting similar instruments, particularly in sectors with high growth potential such as renewable energy, logistics corridors, digital services, and agro-industrial development. One potential reform is the introduction of Special Economic Zones (SEZs) that offer preferential tax regimes, streamlined regulatory procedures, and customized support services for firms operating in strategic regional clusters.

Additionally, the Georgian government could expand and regionalize its existing support programs to target local businesses and cooperatives that align with functional planning goals—such as sustainable agriculture, value chain development, and cultural tourism in secondary cities. Programs to encourage the adoption of green technologies, energy efficiency, and digital infrastructure in underdeveloped areas would complement these efforts.

Furthermore, promoting public-private partnerships (PPPs) in regional development projects would attract additional investment while reducing financial burdens on the state. Georgia can draw from the Netherlands' experience with PPP-based spatial contracts, in which the private sector contributes to infrastructure or urban regeneration projects in return for access to development rights or shared revenues.

To be effective, however, such reforms must be nested within transparent governance frameworks, linked to performance indicators, and monitored through spatial impact assessments.

4.3 Integrating Sustainability in Spatial Planning

A critical aspect of modern spatial planning is the integration of sustainability principles into economic development policies. The Netherlands and Sweden have demonstrated the benefits of climate-resilient zoning, circular economy models, and renewable energy corridors in improving regional resilience, economic diversification, and ecological protection.

In particular, Sweden's emphasis on local-scale energy transition projects, and the Netherlands' integration of spatial planning with water management and biodiversity corridors, serve as models for how sustainability can be structurally embedded in land-use planning systems.

Georgia has significant potential to implement similar strategies, particularly in regions vulnerable to climate change and land degradation. By incorporating green infrastructure, ecosystem-based zoning, and energy-efficient urban design principles, Georgia can create environmentally resilient economic zones that foster long-term prosperity, reduce vulnerability, and align with international climate obligations.

At the policy level, this requires mainstreaming Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs), and climate risk models into spatial planning frameworks at both national and local levels. Incentivizing nature-based solutions (NBS), such as forest buffers, wetland restoration, or green corridors between urban and rural areas, would also provide co-benefits in climate mitigation, biodiversity conservation, and public health.

Moreover, international donors and technical partners such as the EU, GIZ, and UNDP have existing programs that Georgia can align with to build institutional capacity in sustainable spatial governance. By linking sustainability and spatial planning, Georgia can advance a holistic vision of territorial development that moves beyond short-term economic gains toward long-term resilience and intergenerational equity.

4.4 Future Research Directions

While this study provides a comprehensive framework for functional spatial planning, future research should delve deeper into empirical case studies of pilot zoning projects in Georgia—particularly those in rural and peri-urban regions. Impact evaluations of these projects, based on spatial econometric methods or scenario modeling, would generate valuable data on how land-use policy translates into investment flows, employment shifts, or environmental gains.

A quantitative assessment of different economic incentives—tax relief, grants, public investment ratios—could provide further insights into their effectiveness in attracting capital and generating localized growth. Spatial modeling tools, such as agent-based simulation or GIS-integrated AI systems, should be tested in Georgian regions to improve predictive capacity in land use scenarios, mobility planning, and regional clustering.

Additionally, future studies should explore the social and institutional dimensions of spatial planning. Community engagement, procedural equity, and transparency mechanisms remain underdeveloped in Georgia's current system. Comparative analysis of participatory planning models in Sweden or France may offer replicable practices for inclusive governance at the municipal level.

Finally, interdisciplinary research is essential. Functional spatial planning lies at the intersection of economics, geography, political science, and environmental studies. The design of viable policy instruments in Georgia must draw on this cross-sectoral knowledge base, ensuring that spatial planning serves not only territorial efficiency, but also democratic legitimacy and sustainable development.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG) [grant number: YS-24-308]

References

Abosede, A.J. and Onakoya, A.B. (2013) *Entrepreneurship, economic development and inclusive growth*. International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities. Available at: https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=44bcec9670e646d071b87c8f158de73f19916e1d

Ajulor, O.V. (2018) *The challenges of policy implementation in Africa and sustainable development goals*. International Journal of Social Sciences. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323073300_THE_CHALLENGES_OF_POLICY_IMPLEMENTATION_IN_AFRICA_AND_SUSTAINABLE_DEVELOPMENT_GOALS

Albrechts, L., Balducci, A. and Hillier, J. (2019) *Planning Theory: From Knowledge to Action*. London: Routledge.

Allain, R. (2019) 'Territorial cohesion and planning policy in France', *European Planning Studies*, 27(6), pp. 987–1003.

Barbosa, G.S., Drach, P.R. and Corbella, O.D. (2014) *A conceptual review of the terms sustainable development and sustainability*. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), pp. 1–15. Available at: https://www.iises.net/download/Soubory/soubory-puvodni/pp-01-15_ijossV3N2.pdf

BBSR (Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs, and Spatial Development) (2020) *Spatial Development in Germany*. Bonn: BBSR.

Camagni, R. and Capello, R. (2019) 'The role of territorial capital in regional development', *Journal of Economic Geography*, 19(5), pp. 881–908.

Chanturidze, T. and Narmania, D. (2020) 'Challenges in Georgia's regional development: Analyzing spatial planning policies', *Caucasus Journal of Economic Policy*, 12(3), pp. 67–82.

Christaller, W. (1933) *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*. Jena: Gustav Fischer.

Eliasson, K. (2021) 'Regional growth strategies in Sweden: Smart specialization and innovation clusters', *Scandinavian Journal of Regional Studies*, 13(4), pp. 112–130.

ESPON (2020) *Territorial Agenda 2030: A Future for All Places*. Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observatory Network.

European Commission (2021) *The European Green Deal*. Brussels: European Commission.

Faludi, A. (2018) 'The future of spatial planning in Europe: Towards a new paradigm?', *Town Planning Review*, 89(4), pp. 365–388.

Fürst, D. (2021) 'Integrated spatial planning in Germany: Policy frameworks and implementation strategies', *Regional Studies*, 55(8), pp. 1323–1340.

German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2021) *Regional Innovation and Growth Program: Policy Implementation Report*. Berlin: BMWi.

Hedlund, M. and Lundholm, E. (2018) 'Decentralization and regional planning in Sweden: A historical perspective', *Nordic Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 15(2), pp. 201–225.

Keshelashvili, G. (2024) 'The role of business in achieving sustainable development and need of changes in managerial attitude: The case of Georgia'. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Economics, Finance, and Business, Vienna*. Available at: https://iises.net/proceedings/international-conference-on-economics-finance-and-business-vienna-2024/table-of-content/detail?article=the-role-of-business-in-achieving-sustainable-development-and-need-of-changes-in-managerial-attitude-the-case-of-georgia

Kharaishvili, E. and Gechbaia, B. (2021) *Challenges of sustainable and equal development of regions in Georgia*. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 258, 11007. Available at: https://www.e3s-conferences.org/articles/e3sconf/pdf/2021/56/e3sconf_icsf2021_11007.pdf

Kharaishvili, E., Kapanadze, N. and Chkhikvadze, T. (2021) *Land use planning for rural development in Georgia*. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Policy Studies*, 12(3), pp. 45–62.

Lösch, A. (1954) *The Economics of Location*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

McCann, P. and Ortega-Argilés, R. (2015) 'Smart specialisation, regional growth and applications to European Union cohesion policy', *Regional Studies*, 49(8), pp. 1291–1302.

Medeiros, E. (2020) 'Territorial cohesion and European spatial planning policies: Past, present, and future', *European Planning Studies*, 28(3), pp. 443–464.

Narmania, D., Keshelashvili, G., Chokheli, E. and Kikutadze, V. (2022) 'Challenges of development of demand-oriented labor market in Georgia', *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(2), pp. 86–98. DOI: 10.52950/SS.2022.11.2.006.

Needham, B. (2016) *Dutch Land Use Planning: The Systems, Policies, and Practice of Strategic Spatial Planning*. London: Routledge.

Papava, V. (2017) *Challenges of regional policy in post-Soviet Georgia*. *Economic Profile of Georgia*, 10(2), pp. 88–102.

Papava, V. and Bedianashvili, G. (2024) 'Social and economic resilience in conditions of confrontational globalization and uncertainty'. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5003599

Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2020) 'The geography of discontent: Regional inequality and economic growth in Europe', *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society*, 13(1), pp. 1–25.

Widowati, S., Ginaya, G. and Triyuni, N.N. (2019) *Penta helix model to develop ecotourism: Empowering the community for economic and ecological sustainability*. *International Journal of Social Sciences*. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/download/91275271/293.pdf [Accessed 27 Mar. 2025].

