



FP068 in Georgia 📍

Early warnings are reaching households, but not sufficiently leading to protective actions

Under FP068, substantial progress has been made in strengthening the technical and institutional foundations of Georgia's multi-hazard early warning system. Project reporting indicates that key national and basin-level elements are now substantially in place, including an expanded hydro-meteorological monitoring network, hazard and risk mapping across all 11 river basins, forecasting platforms, and national protocols and systems for disaster-risk information. As highlighted in the IEU's recent evaluation of climate information and early warning systems (CIEWS), an important next step is the "last mile": whether strengthened systems are indeed translating into timely and effective action at the household level.

This provides an important opportunity for real-time learning. In July–August 2026, following recent climate hazard events in the project area, most commonly strong winds, hailstorms and floods, the IEU LORTA team used a rapid phone survey to examine the warning-to-action pathway: whether warnings reach households, whether they are clearly understood, and whether households know what action to take and have the practical ability to act. The findings suggest an encouraging foundation: warnings are reaching many households and are generally viewed as clear and timely. At the same time, they point to an important implementation challenge: closing the gap between receiving a warning and taking protective action.

💡 About this evidence

The phone survey is part of The IEU's **Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment (LORTA) programme's** ongoing impact assessment of the community-based interventions under **FP068**. The findings presented here are descriptive rather than causal: at the time of the phone survey, the community-level interventions were still being rolled out, and no clear differences were observed between the treatment and comparison communities. The results therefore provide a real-time implementation snapshot, not an estimate of project impact. The planned endline impact evaluation will assess impacts once project implementation has progressed further.

What are the households telling us? 🏠

01

Warnings are reaching households, but protective action remains limited. Among 400 households that had experienced a hazard in the previous three months, 65% received a warning before the event. Among those warned, 97% said the message was clear and 89% considered the available lead time sufficient; more than 80% reported receiving the warning at least one day before the event. Yet only 24% of households that received a warning also reported taking protective action, equivalent to 16% of all hazard-affected households. This points to an important gap between warning receipt and household action.

⚠️ The Warning-to-Action Pathway

Affected by a hazard in the past three months

100%
n = 400

Received a warning before the hazard

65%
n = 261

Received a warning and took protective action

16%
n = 64
24% of those warned

Note: Figure is based on 400 households in the FP068 impact assessment sample who reported experiencing at least one natural hazard in the previous three months. The sample was drawn from communities in Western Georgia identified as high-risk through the project's hazard-mapping exercise. Source: IEU analysis of Wave 2 phone survey, July–August 2026. The rapid phone survey data collection was supported by generous funding from KDI School of Public Policy and Management and Monash University.



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Independent
Evaluation
Unit



TRUSTED EVIDENCE.
INFORMED POLICIES.
HIGH IMPACT.

Knowledge and practical constraints may be important barriers to acting on warnings.

02

When households were asked how they would respond to a hypothetical disaster warning, 41% said they were unlikely, or neither likely nor unlikely, to take protective action. Among this group, not knowing what action to take (37%) was the most common reason. Practical constraints accounted for a further 29%, driven mainly by having nowhere safe to go or no transport (15%) and mobility, disability or caring responsibilities (13%). Trust appears to be an important foundation rather than the main bottleneck: among respondents likely to act, 65% cited trust in the warning system as their main reason, while distrust and concerns about false alarms accounted for only 9% of reasons among those unlikely or uncertain to act.

03

Practical preparedness and community-level support remained limited at the time of the survey: among households with prior hazard experience, only 6% had an agreed place to evacuate to, 7% had a plan for how to leave the community, and 7% had ever participated in a disaster training or drill. Yet among hazard-affected households, protective action was more common among those who had participated in a disaster training or drill (69% versus 22%) and among those reporting at least one local preparedness arrangement, such as a designated municipal contact or a community preparedness meeting (40% versus 19%). These patterns suggest that opportunities to learn and practise what to do, together with local support, may help households translate warnings into action.

Main reasons for being unlikely to take protective action if warned



Note: Sample includes 274 households who said they would be unlikely to take protective action if warned of a disaster in the next 24 hours (41% of 725 respondents). Source: IEU analysis of Wave 2 LORTA phone survey. July-August 2026.

Considerations for FP068 going forward



Drawing on the survey findings, these are considerations for strengthening the warning-to-action pathway during the project's remaining implementation period.



Make warnings actionable

Pair hazard information with clear, location- and hazard-specific guidance on what households should do.



Pair warning dissemination with practical preparedness

Use training and drills to help households practice appropriate actions and understand local response arrangements.



Address practical barriers to action

Consider access to safe places, transport, and support for households facing mobility, disability or caring constraints.



Test the warning-to-action pathway

As warning systems are strengthened, assess whether households receive alerts, know what to do and are able to act, and use the findings to refine implementation.

LOOKING AHEAD

These findings are particularly relevant as the project considers changes to its approach to last-mile warning communication. Should the project's approach evolve during the remaining implementation period, the findings can help inform how warning messages, public awareness and local preparedness are designed to support action at household level. The planned endline impact evaluation by the IEU LORTA team will further examine changes in household preparedness and resilience, including whether improvements in the early warning system translate into more effective warning receipt and action at the "last mile".



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Independent
Evaluation
Unit



Project: FP068 Scaling-up Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and the Use of Climate Information in Georgia
Content ownership: IEU LORTA team
Lead author: Michell Dong, IEU Impact Evaluation Specialist (mdong@gcfund.org)