AN ANALYSIS ON SOME FEATURES OF CLIMATE FRIENDLY AND CLIMATE RESILIENT CITIES

Araştırma Makalesi

Kübra YILDIRIM ÖZCAN¹ Abdullah YILDIZBAŞI²

YILDIRIM ÖZCAN, K. ve YILDIZBAŞI, A., (2020), **An Analysis on Some Features of Climate Friendly and Climate Resilient Cities**, Verimlilik Dergisi, Yıl: 2020, Sayı: 2, T. C. Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığı Yayını.

ABSTRACT

Over the years, increased human-induced activities due to alobalization caused increase in environmental problems and hence change in seasonal normals. At this point, especially recently, climate-friendly and climate resilient city concepts have started to gain importance. With this study, by making literature review about the features and conceptual contents of climate friendly and climate resilient cities, a criteria list was created and the experts' opinions regarding criteria were taken and then the prioritization was made among some of the prominent features of these cities with fuzzy AHP Method. Based on weight levels, it is found that the overall weight is on Environment and City criteria. Therefore, future regulations and implementations should focus on Environment and City criteria in order to prevent global warming and climate changes resulting from human activities. As a result, the construction of climate friendly and climate resilient cities is very important for future generations to live in a healthier and safer environment. In this regard, local climate change action plans should be made, CO₂ emission inventories should be prepared and also audits should be carried out regularly.

Keywords: Climate Friendly Cities, Climate Resilient Cities, Fuzzy AHP.

¹ Kübra YILDIRIM ÖZCAN, Asst. Prof., Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Faculty of Architecture. ORCID: 0000-0002-8602-6775

² Abdullah YILDIZBAŞI, Asst. Prof., Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Faculty of Engineering. ORCID: 0000-0001-8104-3392

^{*} Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 11.02.2020 Kabul Tarihi: 25.02.2020

İKLİM DOSTU VE İKLİME DİRENÇLİ ŞEHİRLERİN BAZI ÖZELLİKLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR ANALİZ

ÖZET

Yıllar içerisinde, küreselleşme nedeniyle artan insan kaynaklı faaliyetler, çevre sorunlarının artmasına ve dolayısıyla mevsim normallerinin değişmesine neden olmustur. Bu noktada, özellikle son zamanlarda, iklim dostu ve iklime dirençli sehir kavramları önem kazanmaya başlamıştır. Bu çalışma ile iklim dostu ve iklime direncli kentlerin özellikleri ve kavramsal icerikleri hakkında literatür taraması yapılarak bir kriter listesi olusturulmus, uzmanların olusturulan kriterleri değerlendirmesinden sonra görüsleri alınmış ve ardından bulanık AHP Yöntemi ile bu kentlerin öne çıkan birtakım özellikleri arasında önceliklendirme yapılmıştır. Ağırlık seviyelerine göre toplam ağırlığın Çevre ve Şehir kriterlerinde olduğu bulunmuştur. Bu nedenle, gelecekte yapılacak düzenlemeler ve uygulamalar için, küresel ısınmayı ve insan faaliyetlerinden kaynaklanan iklim değişikliklerini önlemek için Cevre ve Sehir kriterlerine odaklanmak yararlı olacaktır. Sonuc olarak, gelecek nesiller icin daha sağlıklı ve daha güvenli ortamlarda yaşamak icin iklim doştu ve iklime dirençli şehirlerin inşası çok önemlidir. Bu bağlamda, yerel iklim değişikliği eylem planları yapılmalı, CO, emisyon envanterleri hazırlanmalı ve düzenli olarak denetimler yapılmalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İklim Dostu Şehirler, İklime Dirençli Şehirler, Bulanık AHP.

1. INTRODUCTION

While increasing population and increasing demands of developing countries for different needs with globalization cause the increasing of prices of energy resources and other environmental problems; on the other hand they cause the decreasing of natural resources. As a result of these problems, stress on rural and urban areas increases rapidly and seasonal changes occur.

In 1950, 30 % of the population lived in urban areas; It is predicted that this ratio will be 66 % in 2050. Africa and Asia are becoming more urbanized than other regions and In 2050, the urban population is expected to be 56 % and 64 % respectively. In contrast, the global rural population is now close to 3.4 billion; It is expected to decrease to 3.2 billion by 2050. Africa and Asia are home to about 90 % of the world's rural population. The largest rural population in the world belongs to India as 857 million; followed by China with 635 million [1]. Today, there are some results arising from the activities in the urban area. Global warming, rising temperatures, drought, rising sea levels, increasing extraordinary weather events, changing seasonal norms, decreasing biodiversity, increasing health risks, increasing scarcity and migration, damage to agriculture and livestock sectors, economic losses, increasing poverty are some of these results [2,3]. In addition, more than 525.000 people lost their lives and 2.97 US \$ trillion economic losses have occured as a direct result of approximately 15,000 extraordinary weather events between 1995 and 2014. Therefore, the Paris Climate Summit has been a cornerstone in the development of a number of international policy issues related to reducing the impact of extraordinary events [4]. A resilient city, dealing with issues and events that threaten, hurt or destroy the city, through their own systems; is the city that provides its own sustainability [5]. Therefore, the concepts of Climate Friendly City and Climate Resistant City have gained importance all over the world in line with the issues of adaptation to climate change and combating climate change. Also, greenhouse gases, traffic density, intense energy use, consumption habits increase the temperature in the city and are effective in the formation of heat islands [6]. Furthermore, in the report of the Worldwatch Institute (2008) it has been reported that 262 million people were affected by climate disasters annually during the period of 2000-2004, and it is expected that 1.8 billion people will suffer from fresh water shortage by 2025, mostly in Asia and Africa and by 2080, 600 million people will be threatened by food shortage and malnutrition. Also it is stated that 180 million people currently have food shortages and 2 million early deaths occur in the world due to pollution [7].

Therefore, the loss of life and property has become important due to the seasonal anomalies caused by the usage of especially urban aress by people. In this respect, in this study, the features that are planned to be analyzed are determined by making a literature search on the concepts of Climate Friendly City and Climate Resilient City. After the aforementioned features are determined, they were weighted by Fuzzy AHP Method which is well known multi-criteria decision making method. It has various applications in many fields of science and many subjects such as evaluation of wind power plants locations [22], location selection for landfill of industrial wastes [23], prioritizing the critical success factors of organizational culture [24]. Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Methods are methods that use many gualitative and guantitative data in calculations that take into account the different performance criteria and weights of the alternatives, which enable the selection of the best choice among multiple and simultaneous alternatives. In many studies in the literature in recent years, it is seen that Fuzzy AHP is preferred due to some deficiencies of AHP. When searching for a solution with AHP, AHP ranking is guite ambiguous. Secondly, AHP results are significantly influenced by subjective decision, choice and choice of decision makers. Again, AHP creates and manages a fairly unstable judicial scale. Here, to overcome these shortcomings, an extended AHP fuzzy set can be integrated with a binary comparison called Fuzzy-AHP. The Fuzzy-AHP method allows for a more precise description of the decision making process. Fuzzy AHP approach with fuzzy logic integration, since it uses precise numbers when making binary comparisons and is inadequate in handling uncertainty and uncertainty situations. In this context, Fuzzy AHP approach is defined as a more accurate decision making process for this study. According to the defined criteria the results were evaluated and ordered by Fuzzy AHP in the next chapters.

2. DETERMINATION OF FEATURES OF CLIMATE FRIENDLY AND CLIMATE RESILIENT CITIES AND PRIORITIZATION OF THEM VIA FUZZY AHP METHOD

There are many features of climate friendly and climate resilient cities but some of them are; multi level climate partnership and multi level governance in city regions, climate planning in integrated strategies and plans, urbanrural cooperation, climate friendly spatial structure of the city through planning and zoning, climate aware architectural solutions, be sensitive to disadventaged social groups and social effects, climate awareness in the city dwellers' lifestyle, and public and sectoral stakeholders supporting the climate friendly cities [8]. While determining indicators for climate friendly and climate resilient cities, the criteria and indicators related to sources below were utilized [9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17]:

- 1. The European Foundation's Urban Sustainability Indicators
- 2. Eurostat Sustainable Development Indicators
- 3. ICLEI-URBAN LEDS Selection Criteria
- 4. C40 Selection Criteria
- 5. European Green Capital Award
- 6. European Green Leaf Award
- 7. Citta Slow Selection Criteria
- 8. European Green City Index

By examining these indicators and criteria regarding climate friendly and climate resilient cities are gathered under the main headings of Environment and City, Transportation, Construction, Energy and Ecosystem. In this direction, 24 criteria have been determined which are given in Table 1. These criteria were weighted according to experts' opinions and evaluations and then analyzed via Fuzzy AHP Method.

Environment and City	Transportation, Construction, Energy	Ecosystem	
EC 1. Having a local climate change action plan	TCE 1. Existence of projects and/or studies about gaining historical and/or cultural structures to tourism	E 1. Having biodiversity inventory and monitoring plans	
EC 2. Having budgets allocated by local government about the climate change and combating climate change issues	TCE 2. Existence of smart systems such as lighting systems that provide energy efficiency in buildings	E 2. Existence of ecological, good, sustainable and/ or organic agricultural practices	
EC 3. Existence of inventory of CO ₂ emissions and ensuring the controls for these emissions	TCE 3. The use of electrical/ hybrid buses in public transport	E 3. Using drip irrigation method in agriculture	
EC 4. Existence of natural disaster risk and action plans	TCE 4. Using renewable energy sources such as solar panels in buildings	E 4. Various measures have been taken for the usage of forest, pasture and agricultural lands	

Table 1. Criteria for Climate Friendly and Climate Resilient Cities

EC 5. Existence of monitoring, forecasting and early warning systems for natural disasters due to climate change	TCE 5. Existence of lighting tools using energy efficient and/or alternative energy sources in public lighting	E 5. Existence of water quality and hygiene monitoring systems
EC 6. Having urban security and monitoring systems	TCE 6. Existence of bicycle paths and bicycle parking points	E 6. Regarding water pollution control, being the values of various water resources within the determined value ranges according to the quality criteria specified in the law
EC 7. Participation in international platforms, networks and / or studies on climate change	TCE 7. Application of discounts in the use of transport systems for disadvantaged groups such as the elderly and needy women	E 7. Air pollution is within the parameters specified by law
EC 8. Existence of wastewater treatment and waste recovery and recycling facilities	TCE 8. Existence of rail and light rail systems	E 8. Existence of projects and/or implementations to reduce air pollution

3. BUCKLEY'S FUZZY AHP METHOD

Altough there have been several Fuzzy-AHP methods utilized in the literature, the Fuzzy-AHP that was presented by Buckley [18] utilized in this study due to easiness and computational efficiency. Buckleys' Fuzzy AHP method can be defined as follows;

Step 1: According the Buckley's Fuzzy AHP Method [18,19]; to digitize verbal values done with linguistic expressions, linguistic expressions are converted to trapezoidal fuzzy numbers. In order to determine criterion and sub-criterion weights, binary comparison matrices are created. Fuzzy set Å is created.

$$\tilde{A}^{k} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{d}_{11}^{k_{1}} & \tilde{d}_{12}^{k_{2}} & \dots & \tilde{d}_{1n}^{k} \\ \tilde{d}_{21}^{k_{1}} & \tilde{d}_{22}^{k_{2}} & \dots & \tilde{d}_{2n}^{k} \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \tilde{d}_{n1}^{k_{1}} & \tilde{d}_{n2}^{k_{2}} & \dots & \tilde{d}_{nn}^{k} \end{bmatrix}$$
(3.1)

After determination of the criteria, fuzzy AHP method and steps to be used in determination of criterion weights are explained together. The linguistic variables to be used in the pairwise comparison of the criteria are shown in Table 2.

Linguistic Variables	Value Scale	Triple Fuzzy Scale	Triple Fuzzy Reverse Scale
Equal Importance (E)	1	(1,1,1)	(1/1, 1/1, 1/1)
Low Importance (A)	3	(1,3,5)	(1/5, 1/3, 1/1)
Much Importance (C)	5	(3,5,7)	(1/7, 1/5, 1/3)
Very strong Importance (CK)	7	(5,7,9)	(1/9, 1/7, 1/5)
Extreme Importance (AS)	9	(7,9,9)	(1/9, 1/9, 1/7)
	2	(1,2,3)	(1/3, 1/2, 1)
Close Provisions Between Two	4	(3,4,5)	(1/5, 1/4, 1/3)
Values (YH)	6	(5,6,7)	(1/7, 1/6, 1/5)
	8	(7,8,9)	(1/9, 1/8, 1/7)

Table 2. Linguistic Variables to be Used in the Evaluation of Criteria [20]

Step 2: Then the fuzzy weight matrix is calculated.

$$\tilde{d}_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \tilde{d}_{ij}^k}{K}$$
(3.2)

Step 3: The binary comparison matrices are arranged according to the average values found.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{d}_{11} & \cdots & \tilde{d}_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tilde{d}_{n1} & \cdots & \tilde{d}_{nn} \end{bmatrix}$$
(3.3)

Step 4: Geometric Mean of Fuzzy Comparison Values Calculated according to Equation 4.

$$\tilde{r}_i = \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \tilde{d}_{ij}\right)^{1/n}$$
, $i = 1, 2, ..., n$ (3.4)

Step 5: Criterion weights are shown trapezoidal $\widetilde{w}_i = (lw_i, mw_i, uw_i)$

$$\widetilde{w}_i = \widetilde{r}_i \otimes (\widetilde{r}_1 \oplus \widetilde{r}_2 \oplus \widetilde{r}_3 \oplus \dots \dots \oplus \widetilde{r}_n)^{-1}$$
(3.5)

Step 6: The fuzzy number given as M = (I, w, u) is clarified as in Equation 6.

$$M_i = \frac{lw_i + mw_i + uw_i}{3} \tag{3.6}$$

Step 7: *M_i* Since the clarified values are a non-fuzzy number, the values obtained are normalized according to Equation 7.

$$N_{\rm I} = \frac{M_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i} \tag{3.7}$$

4. APPLICATION

In this study, in order to prioritize the criteria for climate-friendly cities, the algorithm of the intended approach is given in Figure 1. Accordin to this, which determined criteria are more important are pratically described below. First of all, criteria's weights should be determined. At this stage, weights were calculated by geometric mean method. In order to analyze the consistency of the binary comparison matrices created in line with the opinions received from the decision-makers, a consistency test was performed and it was determined that the consistency values for all binary comparison matrices shown in Table 2, the relative weights of the criteria were also determined. The paired comparison matrix and fuzzy equivalents of the criteria are shown in Table 2 and Table 3.

Ana Kriterler	EC	TCE	E
EC	(1,00, 1,00, 1,00)	(1,00, 3,00, 5,00)	(3,00, 5,00, 7,00)
TCE	(0,20, 0,33, 1,00)	(1,00, 1,00, 1,00)	(1,00, 3,00, 5,00)
E	(0,14, 0,20, 0,33)	(1,00, 2,00, 3,00)	(1,00, 1,00, 1,00)

 $\widetilde{r_{i}} = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{n} \widetilde{d_{ij}}\right)^{1/n} = \left[(1.00 \times 1.00 \times 3.00)^{\frac{1}{3}}; (1.00 \times 3.00 \times 5.00)^{\frac{1}{3}}; (1.00 \times 5.00 \times 7.00)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right] = [1.44; 2.47; 3.27]$ $\widetilde{r_{2}} = \left[(0.20 \times 1.00 \times 1.00)^{\frac{1}{3}}; (0.33 \times 1.00 \times 3.00)^{\frac{1}{3}}; (1.00 \times 1.00 \times 5.00)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right] = [0.41; 0.55; 1.00]$

 $\tilde{r_{3}} = \left[(0,14 \times 1,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (0,20 \times 2,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (0,33 \times 3,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[0,52; 0,74; 1,00 \right]$

Table 4. Geometric Mean of Fuzzy Comparison Values

Main Criteria		\tilde{r}_i			
EC	1,44	2,47	3,27		
TCE	0,41	0,55	1,00		
E	0,52	0,74	1,00		
Total	2,37	3,75	5,27		
Inverse Value	0,42	0,27	0,19		
Ascending Sort	0,19	0,27	0,42		

 $\widetilde{w_1} = [(1,44 \times 0,19); (2,47 \times 0,27); (3,27 \times 0,42)] = [0,274; 0,657; 1,380]$ $\widetilde{w_2} = [(0,41 \times 0,19); (0,55 \times 0,27); (1,00 \times 0,42)] = [0,077; 0,147; 0,422]$ $\widetilde{w_3} = [(0,52 \times 0,19); (0,74 \times 0,27); (1,00 \times 0,42)] = [0,099; 0,196; 0,422]$

Main Criteria	\widetilde{w}_i					
EC	0,274	0,657	1,380			
TCE	0,077	0,147	0,422			
E	0,099	0,196	0,422			

Table 5. Weights of Fuzzy Comparison Values

Table 6. Clarified and Normalized Values of Fuzzy Comparison Values

Main Criteria	M,	N ,	
EC	0,770	0,629	
TCE	0,215	0,176	
E	0,239	0,195	



Figure 1. Algorithm of the Intended Approach

Comparison Matrix for EC Sub-Criteria

Table 7. Binary Comparison Matrix for the Main Criteria of
Environment and City

Sub-Criteria	EC1	EC2	EC3	EC4	EC5	EC6	EC7	EC8
	(1,00,	(0,20,	(0,20,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(5,00,
EC1	1,00,	0,25,	0,25,	0,50,	2,00,	3,00,	4,00,	6,00,
	1,00)	0,33)	0,33)	1,00)	3,00)	5,00)	5,00)	7,00)
	(3,00,	(1,00,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(3,00,	(5,00,	(7,00,
EC2	4,00,	1,00,	0,50,	2,00,	4,00,	5,00,	6,00,	8,00,
	5,00)	1,00)	1,00)	3,00)	5,00)	7,00)	7,00)	9,00)
	(3,00,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(5,00,	(5,00,	(7,00,
EC3	4,00,	2,00,	1,00,	3,00,	5,00,	6,00,	7,00,	9,00,
	5,00)	3,00)	1,00)	5,00)	7,00)	7,00)	9,00)	9,00)

	(1,00,	(0,33,	(0,20,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(3,00,	(5,00,
EC4	2,00,	0,50,	0,33,	1,00,	2,00,	4,00,	5,00,	7,00,
	3,00)	1,00)	1,00)	1,00)	3,00)	5,00)	7,00)	9,00)
	(0,33,	(0,20,	(0,14,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(3,00,
EC5	0,50,	0,25,	0,20,	0,50,	1,00,	2,00,	3,00,	5,00,
	1,00)	0,33)	0,33)	1,00)	1,00)	3,00)	5,00)	7,00)
	(0,20,	(0,14,	(0,14,	(0,20,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(3,00,
EC6	0,33,	0,17,	0,17,	0,25,	0,50,	1,00,	2,00,	4,00,
	1,00)	0,20)	0,20)	0,33)	1,00)	1,00)	3,00)	5,00)
	(0,20,	(0,14,	(0,11,	(0,14,	(0,20,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(1,00,
EC7	0,25,	0,17,	0,14,	0,20,	0,33,	0,50,	1,00,	3,00,
	0,33)	0,20)	0,20)	0,33)	1,00)	1,00)	1,00)	5,00)
	(0,14,	(0,11,	(0,11,	(0,11,	(0,14,	(0,20,	(0,20,	(1,00,
EC8	0,17,	0,13,	0,11,	0,14,	0,20,	0,25,	0,33,	1,00,
	0,20)	0,14)	0,14)	0,20)	0,22)	0,33)	1,00)	1,00)

 $\widetilde{t}_{i}^{\prime} = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{n} \widetilde{d_{ij}}\right)^{1/n} = \left[(1.00 \times 0.20 \times 0.20 \times 0.33 \times 1.00 \times 1.00 \times 3.00 \times 5.00)^{\frac{1}{n}}; (1.00 \times 0.25 \times 0.25 \times 0.50 \times 2.00 \times 3.00 \times 4.00 \times 6.00)^{\frac{1}{n}}; (1.00 \times 0.33 \times 0.33 \times 1.00 \times 3.00 \times 5.00 \times 5.00 \times 7.00)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right] = \left[0.82; 1.21; 1.66 \right]$

 $\tilde{r}_{2}^{\circ} = \left[(3,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 7,00)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (4,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,50 \times 2,00 \times 4,00 \times 5,00 \times 6,00 \times 8,00)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (5,00 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 7,00 \times 7,00 \times 9,00)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[2,05; 2,81; 3,67 \right]$

 $\vec{r}_{5} = \left[(3,00 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 5,00 \times 7,00)^{\frac{1}{n}} ; (4,00 \times 2,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 6,00 \times 7,00 \times 9,00)^{\frac{1}{n}} ; (5,00 \times 3,00 \times 1,00 \times 5,00 \times 7,00 \times 9,00 \times 9,00)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right] = \left[2,51 ; 3,82 ; 4,83 \right]$

 $\tilde{r}_{6} = \begin{bmatrix} (0,14 \times 0,11 \times 0,11 \times 0,11 \times 0,14 \times 0,20 \times 0,20 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}} ; (0,17 \times 0,13 \times 0,11 \times 0,14 \times 0,20 \times 0,25 \times 0,33 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}} ; (0,20 \times 0,14 \times 0,14 \times 0,20 \times 0,22 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0,18 ; 0,22 ; 0,31 \end{bmatrix}$

$$\begin{split} &\widetilde{w_1} = [(0,82\times0,06); \ (0,21\times0,09); \ (1,66\times0,13)] = [0,051; 0,103; 0,209] \\ &\widetilde{w_2} = [(2,05\times0,06); \ (2,81\times0,09); \ (3,67\times0,13)] = [0,128; 0,241; 0,462] \\ &\widetilde{w_3} = [(2,51\times0,06); \ (2,82\times0,09); \ (4,83\times0,13)] = [0,157; 0,327; 0,608] \\ &\widetilde{w_4} = [(1,15\times0,06); \ (1,76\times0,09); \ (2,70\times0,13)] = [0,072; 0,151; 0,340] \\ &\widetilde{w_5} = [(0,56\times0,06); \ (0,88\times0,09); \ (1,36\times0,13)] = [0,035; 0,076; 0,171] \\ &\widetilde{w_6} = [(0,41\times0,06); \ (0,57\times0,09); \ (0,87\times0,13)] = [0,026; 0,049; 0,110] \\ &\widetilde{w_7} = [(0,27\times0,06); \ (0,40\times0,09); \ (0,62\times0,13)] = [0,017; 0,034; 0,078] \\ &\widetilde{w_8} = [(0,18\times0,06); \ (0,22\times0,09); \ (0,31\times0,13)] = [0,011; 0,019; 0,039] \end{split}$$

Sub-Criteria	\tilde{r}_i				
EC1	0,82	1,21	1,66		
EC2	2,05	2,81	3,67		
EC3	2,51	3,82	4,83		
EC4	1,15	1,76	2,70		
EC5	0,56	0,88	1,36		
EC6	0,41	0,57	0,87		
EC7	0,27	0,40	0,62		
EC8	0,18	0,22	0,31		
Total	7,95	11,67	16,03		
Inverse Value	0,13	0,09	0,06		
Increased Value	0,06	0,09	0,13		

Table 8. Geometric Mean Values of Criteria Based on the Main Criterion of Environment and City

Table 9. Criteria Weights for Sub-Criteria Based on the Main Criterion of Environment and City

Main Criteria		\widetilde{w}_i	
EC1	0,051	0,103	0,209
EC2	0,128	0,241	0,462
EC3	0,157	0,327	0,608
EC4	0,072	0,151	0,340
EC5	0,035	0,076	0,171
EC6	0,026	0,049	0,110
EC7	0,017	0,034	0,078
EC8	0,011	0,019	0,039

Table 10. Clarified and Normalized Values for Sub-Criteria Based on the Main Criterion of Environment and City

Main Criteria	M,	N,
EC1	0,121	0,104
EC2	0,277	0,236
EC3	0,364	0,311
EC4	0,187	0,160
EC5	0,094	0,080
EC6	0,061	0,052
EC7	0,043	0,037
EC8	0,023	0,020

Comparison Matrix for Sub-Criteria of TCE

Sub-Criteria	TCE1	TCE2	TCE3	TCE4	TCE5	TCE6	TCE7	TCE8
TCE1	(1,00,	(0,14,	(0,14,	(0,20,	(0,11,	(0,20,	(0,33,	(0,11,
	1,00,	0,17,	0,20,	0,33,	0,11,	0,25,	0,50,	0,14,
	1,00)	0,20)	0,33)	1,00)	0,14)	0,33)	1,00)	0,20)
TCE2	(5,00,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(0,20,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(0,33,
	6,00,	1,00,	2,00,	4,00,	0,33,	3,00,	5,00,	0,50,
	7,00)	1,00)	3,00)	5,00)	1,00)	5,00)	7,00)	1,00)
TCE3	(3,00,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(0,14,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(0,20,
	5,00,	0,50,	1,00,	3,00,	0,20,	2,00,	4,00,	0,33,
	7,00)	1,00)	1,00)	5,00)	0,33)	3,00)	5,00)	1,00)
TCE4	(1,00,	(0,20,	(0,20,	(1,00,	(0,11,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(0,14,
	3,00,	0,25,	0,33,	1,00,	0,14,	0,50,	2,00,	0,20,
	5,00)	0,33)	1,00)	1,00)	0,20)	1,00)	3,00)	0,33)
TCE5	(7,00,	(0,20,	(3,00,	(5,00,	(1,00,	(5,00,	(7,00,	(1,00,
	9,00,	0,33,	5,00,	7,00,	1,00,	6,00,	8,00,	2,00,
	9,00)	1,00)	7,00)	9,00)	1,00)	7,00)	9,00)	3,00)
TCE6	(3,00,	(0,20,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(0,14,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(0,20,
	4,00,	0,33,	0,50,	2,00,	0,17,	1,00,	3,00,	0,25,
	5,00)	1,00)	1,00)	3,00)	0,20)	1,00)	5,00)	0,33)
TCE7	(1,00,	(0,14,	(0,20,	(0,33,	(0,11,	(0,20,	(1,00,	(0,14,
	2,00,	0,20,	0,25,	0,50,	0,13,	0,33,	1,00,	0,17,
	3,00)	0,33)	0,33)	1,00)	0,14)	1,00)	1,00)	0,20)
TCE8	(5,00,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(0,33,	(3,00,	(5,00,	(1,00,
	7,00,	2,00,	3,00,	5,00,	0,50,	4,00,	6,00,	1,00,
	9,00)	3,00)	5,00)	7,00)	1,00)	5,00)	7,00)	1,00)

Table 11. Binary Comparison Matrix for the Main Criteria of Transportation,Construction, Energy

 $\widetilde{i_i} = \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \widetilde{d_{i_j}}\right)^{1/n} = \left[(1,00 \times 0,14 \times 0,14 \times 0,20 \times 0,11 \times 0,20 \times 0,33 \times 0,11)^{\frac{1}{n}}; (1,00 \times 0,17 \times 0,20 \times 0,33 \times 0,11 \times 0,25 \times 0,50 \times 0,14)^{\frac{1}{n}}; (1,00 \times 0,20 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,14 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,20)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right] = \left[0,21;0,26;0,40 \right]$

 $\tilde{r}_{2}^{\prime} = \left[(5,00 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,20 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,33)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (6,00 \times 1,00 \times 2,00 \times 4,00 \times 0,33 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 0,50)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (7,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[1,15; 1,82; 2,79 \right]$

 $\widetilde{r}_{3} = \left[(3,00 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,14 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,20)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (5,00 \times 0,50 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,20 \times 2,00 \times 4,00 \times 0,33)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (7,00 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 5,00 \times 0,33 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[0,74 ; 1,19 ; 1,91 \right]$

 $\widetilde{r_{4}} = \left[(1,00 \times 0,20 \times 0,20 \times 1,00 \times 0,11 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,14)^{\frac{1}{0}}; (3,00 \times 0,25 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,14 \times 0,50 \times 2,00 \times 0,20)^{\frac{1}{0}}; (5,00 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,20 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,33)^{\frac{1}{0}} \right] = \left[(0,35; 0,54; 0,87) \right]$

 $\tilde{r}_{5}^{c} = \left[(7,00 \times 0,20 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00 \times 5,00 \times 7,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (9,00 \times 0,33 \times 5,00 \times 7,00 \times 1,00 \times 6,00 \times 8,00 \times 2,00)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (9,00 \times 1,00 \times 7,00 \times 9,00 \times 1,00 \times 7,00 \times 9,00 \times 3,00)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[2,79; 4,17; 5,20 \right]$

 $\tilde{r_6} = \left[(3,00 \times 0,20 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,14 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,20)^{\frac{1}{9}} ; (4,00 \times 0,33 \times 0,50 \times 2,00 \times 0,17 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,25)^{\frac{1}{9}} ; (5,00 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,20 \times 1,00 \times 5,00 \times 0,33)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[0,52 ; 0,80 ; 1,22 \right]$

 $\tilde{r}_{7}^{\prime} = \left[(1,00 \times 0,14 \times 0,20 \times 0,33 \times 0,11 \times 0,20 \times 1,00 \times 0,14)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (2,00 \times 0,20 \times 0,25 \times 0,50 \times 0,13 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,17)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (3,00 \times 0,33 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,14 \times 1,00 \times 0,20)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[0,27; 0,37; 0,56 \right]$

 $\tilde{r}_{8}^{c} = \left[(5,00 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,33 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{0}}; (7,00 \times 2,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 0,50 \times 4,00 \times 6,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{0}}; (9,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 7,00 \times 1,00 \times 5,00 \times 7,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{0}} \right] = \left[1,72; 2,66; 3,67 \right]$

 $\widetilde{w_1} = [(0,21 \times 0,06); (0,26 \times 0,08); (0,40 \times 0,13)] = [0,012; 0,022; 0,051]$

$$\begin{split} & \widetilde{w_2} = [(1,15\times0,06); \ (1,82\times0,08); \ (2,79\times0,13)] = [0,069; 0,154; 0,361] \\ & \widetilde{w_3} = [(0,74\times0,06); \ (1,19\times0,08); \ (1,91\times0,13)] = [0,044; 0,101; 0,246] \\ & \widetilde{w_4} = [(0,35\times0,06); \ (0,54\times0,08); \ (0,87\times0,13)] = [0,021; 0,046; 0,113] \\ & \widetilde{w_5} = [(2,79\times0,06); \ (4,17\times0,08); \ (5,20\times0,13)] = [0,168; 0,353; 0,672] \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} &\widetilde{w_6} = [(0.52 \times 0.06); \ (0.80 \times 0.08); \ (1.22 \times 0.13)] = [0.032; 0.068; 0.158] \\ &\widetilde{w_7} = [(0.27 \times 0.06); \ (0.37 \times 0.08); \ (0.56 \times 0.13)] = [0.016; 0.031; 0.072] \\ &\widetilde{w_8} = [(1.72 \times 0.06); \ (2.66 \times 0.08); \ (3.67 \times 0.13)] = [0.103; 0.225; 0.474] \end{split}$$

	1		
Sub-Criteria		\tilde{r}_i	
TCE1	0,21	0,26	0,40
TCE2	1,15	1,82	2,79
TCE3	0,74	1,19	1,91
TCE4	0,35	0,54	0,87
TCE5	2,79	4,17	5,20
TCE6	0,52	0,80	1,22
TCE7	0,27	0,37	0,56
TCE8	1,72	2,66	3,67
Total	7,74	11,81	16,62
Inverse Value	0,13	0,08	0,06
Increased Value	0,06	0,08	0,13

Table 12. Geometric Mean Values of the Criteria Based on the Main Criteria of Transportation, Construction, Energy

Table 13. Criteria Weights for Sub-Criteria Based on Transportation, Construction, Energy Main Criterion

	\widetilde{w}_i				
TCE1	0,012	0,022	0,051		
TCE2	0,069	0,154	0,361		
TCE3	0,044	0,101	0,246		
TCE4	0,021	0,046	0,113		
TCE5	0,168	0,353	0,672		
TCE6	0,032	0,068	0,158		
TCE7	0,016	0,031	0,072		
TCE8	0,103	0,225	0,474		

Table 14. Clarified and Normalized Values for Sub-Criteria Based on the Main Criterion of Transportation, Construction, Energy

Sub-Criteria	M,	N,
TCE1	0,029	0,024
TCE2	0,195	0,162
TCE3	0,130	0,108
TCE4	0,060	0,050
TCE5	0,398	0,330
TCE6	0,086	0,071
TCE7	0,040	0,033
TCE8	0,268	0,222

Comparison Matrix for the Criteria of E

Sub-Criteria	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8
E1	(1,00,	(1,00,	(7,00,	(5,00,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(5,00,	(1,00,
	1,00,	1,00,	8,00,	6,00,	2,00,	4,00,	7,00,	3,00,
	1,00)	1,00)	9,00)	7,00)	3,00)	5,00)	9,00)	5,00)
E2	(1,00,	(1,00,	(7,00,	(5,00,	(3,00,	(5,00,	(7,00,	(3,00,
	1,00,	1,00,	9,00,	7,00,	4,00,	6,00,	8,00,	5,00,
	1,00)	1,00)	9,00)	9,00)	5,00)	7,00)	9,00)	7,00)
E3	(0,11,	(0,11,	(1,00,	(0,20,	(0,14,	(0,20,	(0,33,	(0,14,
	0,13,	0,11,	1,00,	0,33,	0,17,	0,25,	0,50,	0,20,
	0,14)	0,14)	1,00)	1,00)	0,20)	0,33)	1,00)	0,33)
E4	(0,14,	(0,11,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(0,14,	(0,25,	(3,00,	(0,20,
	0,17,	0,14,	3,00,	1,00,	0,20,	0,33,	4,00,	0,25,
	0,20)	0,20)	5,00)	1,00)	0,33)	1,00)	5,00)	0,33)
E5	(0,33,	(0,20,	(5,00,	(3,00,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(5,00,	(1,00,
	0,50,	0,25,	6,00,	5,00,	1,00,	3,00,	6,00,	2,00,
	1,00)	0,33)	7,00)	7,00)	1,00)	5,00)	7,00)	3,00)
E6	(0,20,	(0,14,	(3,00,	(1,00,	(0,20,	(1,00,	(1,00,	(0,33,
	0,25,	0,17,	4,00,	3,00,	0,33,	1,00,	3,00,	0,50,
	0,33)	0,20	5,00)	5,00)	1,00)	1,00)	5,00)	1,00)
E7	(0,11,	(0,11,	(1,00,	(0,20,	(0,14,	(0,20,	(1,00,	(0,20,
	0,14,	0,13,	2,00,	0,25,	0,17,	0,33,	1,00,	0,25,
	0,20)	0,14)	3,00)	0,33)	0,20)	1,00)	1,00)	0,33)
E8	(0,20,	(0,14,	(3,00,	(3,00,	(0,33,	(1,00,	(3,00,	(1,00,
	0,33,	0,20,	5,00,	4,00,	0,50,	2,00,	4,00,	1,00,
	1,00)	0,33)	7,00)	5,00)	1,00)	3,00)	5,00)	1,00)

Table 15. Binary Comparison Matrix for Ecosystem Main Criterion

 $\widetilde{\tau}_{1}^{c} = \left(\prod_{n=1}^{n} \widetilde{d}_{1j}\right)^{1/n} = \left[(1,00 \times 1,00 \times 7,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{2}}; (1,00 \times 1,00 \times 8,00 \times 6,00 \times 2,00 \times 4,00 \times 7,00 \times 3,00)^{\frac{1}{2}}; (1,00 \times 1,00 \times 9,00 \times 7,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 9,00 \times 5,00)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] = \left[2,19;3,08;3,79\right]$

 $\tilde{r}_{2}^{*} = \left[(1.00 \times 1.00 \times 7.00 \times 5.00 \times 3.00 \times 5.00 \times 7.00 \times 3.00)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (1.00 \times 1.00 \times 9.00 \times 7.00 \times 4.00 \times 6.00 \times 8.00 \times 5.00)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (1.00 \times 1.00 \times 9.00 \times 9.00 \times 5.00 \times 7.00 \times 9.00 \times 7.00)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[3.20 : 3.96 ; 4.53 \right]$

 $\tilde{r_{3}} = \left[(0,11 \times 0,11 \times 1,00 \times 0,20 \times 0,14 \times 0,20 \times 0,33 \times 0,14)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (0,13 \times 0,11 \times 1,00 \times 0,33 \times 0,17 \times 0,25 \times 0,50 \times 0,20)^{\frac{1}{9}}; (0,14 \times 0,14 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,20 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,33)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[0,21 ; 0,26 ; 0,38 \right]$

 $\vec{F}_4 = \begin{bmatrix} (0,14 \times 0,11 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,14 \times 0,25 \times 3,00 \times 0,20)^{\frac{1}{0}} ; (0,17 \times 0,14 \times 3,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,20 \times 0,33 \times 4,00 \times 0,25)^{\frac{1}{0}} ; (0,20 \times 0,20 \times 5,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 5,00 \times 0,33)^{\frac{1}{0}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (0,36 ; 0,51 ; 0,76] \end{bmatrix}$

 $\tilde{r}_{5}^{c} = \left[(0.33 \times 0.20 \times 5.00 \times 3.00 \times 1.00 \times 1.00 \times 5.00 \times 1.00)^{\frac{1}{9}} ; (0.50 \times 0.25 \times 6.00 \times 5.00 \times 1.00 \times 3.00 \times 6.00 \times 2.00)^{\frac{1}{9}} ; (1.00 \times 0.33 \times 7.00 \times 7.00 \times 1.00 \times 5.00 \times 7.00 \times 3.00)^{\frac{1}{9}} \right] = \left[1.22 ; 1.85 ; 2.54 \right]$

 $\widetilde{r}_{6}^{c} = \left[(0,20 \times 0,14 \times 3,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,20 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 0,33)^{\frac{1}{n}} ; (0,25 \times 0,17 \times 4,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,50)^{\frac{1}{n}} ; (0,33 \times 0,20 \times 5,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00 \times 1,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right] = \left[0,52 ; 0,84 ; 1,30 \right]$

 $\tilde{r_{7}} = \left[(0,11 \times 0,11 \times 1,00 \times 0,20 \times 0,14 \times 0,20 \times 1,00 \times 0,20)^{\frac{1}{n}}; (0,14 \times 0,13 \times 2,00 \times 0,25 \times 0,17 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 0,25)^{\frac{1}{n}}; (0,20 \times 0,14 \times 3,00 \times 0,33 \times 0,20 \times 1,00 \times 0,33)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right] = \left[1,72; 2,26; 3,67 \right]$

 $\tilde{P}_{0}^{s} = \left[(0,20 \times 0,14 \times 3,00 \times 3,00 \times 0,33 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{6}}; (0,33 \times 0,20 \times 5,00 \times 4,00 \times 0,50 \times 2,00 \times 4,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{6}}; (1,00 \times 0,33 \times 7,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00 \times 3,00 \times 5,00 \times 1,00)^{\frac{1}{6}} \right] = \left[0,84 ; 1,23 ; 1,91 \right]$

$\widetilde{w_1} = \left[(2, 19 \times 0, 06); \ (3, 08 \times 0, 08); \ (3, 79 \times 0, 11)\right] = \left[0, 147 \ ; 2, 497 \ ; 4, 491\right]$
$\widetilde{w_2} = [(3, 20 \times 0, 06); \; (3, 96 \times 0, 08); \; (4, 53 \times 0, 11)] = [1, 168; 3, 212; 5, 373]$
$\widetilde{w_3} = [(0,21\times 0,06); \ (0,26\times 0,08); \ (0,38\times 0,11)] = [0,108; 0,209; 0,453]$
$\widetilde{w_4} = [(0,36\times0,06); \; (0,51\times0,08); \; (0,76\times0,11)] = [0,188; 0,416; 0,900]$
$\widetilde{w_5} = [(1,\!22\times0,\!06);\;(1,\!85\times0,\!08);\;(2,\!54\times0,\!11)] = [0,\!641;1,\!498;3,\!006]$
$\widetilde{w_6} = [(0,52\times0,06); \ (0,84\times0,08); \ (1,30\times0,11)] = [0,275; 0,682; 1,545]$
$\widetilde{w_7} = [(0,25\times0,06); \ (0,32\times0,08); \ (0,46\times0,11)] = [0,130; 0,264; 0,542]$
$\widetilde{w_8} = [(0,84 \times 0,06); (1,23 \times 0,08); (1,91 \times 0,11)] = [0,442; 1,000; 2,260]$

Table 16. Geometric Mean Values of the Criteria Based on the Main Criterion of the Ecosystem

Sub-Criteria		\tilde{r}_i	
E1	2,19	3,08	3,79
E2	3,20	3,96	4,53
E3	0,21	0,26	0,38
E4	0,36	0,51	0,76
E5	1,22	1,85	2,54
E6	0,52	0,84	1,30
E7	0,25	0,32	0,46
E8	0,84	1,23	1,91
Total	8,79	12,05	15,67
Inverse Value	0,11	0,08	0,06
Ascending Sort	0,06	0,08	0,11

Table 17. Criteria Weights for Sub-Criteria Based on the Main Criterion of Ecosystem

Main Criteria	\widetilde{w}_i				
E1	1,147	2,497	4,491		
E2	1,168	3,212	5,373		
E3	0,108	0,209	0,453		
E4	0,188	0,416	0,900		
E5	0,641	1,498	3,006		
E6	0,275	0,682	1,545		
E7	0,130	0,264	0,542		
E8	0,442	1,000	2,260		

Main Criteria	М,	N,
E1	2,712	2,197
E2	3,421	2,772
E3	0,257	0,208
E4	0,501	0,406
E5	1,715	1,390
E6	0,834	0,676
E7	0,312	0,253
E8	1,234	1,000

Table 18. Clarified and Normalized Values for Sub-Criteria Based on the MainCriterion of the Ecosystem

Table 19. Result Weight Table for all Criteria

Main Criteria	Local Weights of Main Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Local Weights of Sub-Criteria	Global Weights of the Criteria		
		EC1	0,104	0,065		
		EC2	0,236	0,149		
		EC3	0,311	0,196		
EC	0.620	EC4	0,160	0,101		
	0,029	EC5	0,080	0,050		
		EC6	0,052	0,033		
		EC7	0,037	0,023		
		EC8	0,020	0,012		
		TCE1	0,024	0,004		
		TCE2	0,162	0,028		
		TCE3	0,108	0,019		
тсе	TCE4 0,050 TCE5 0,330 TCE6 0,071 TCE7 0,033 TCE8 0,222	0,009				
ICE		TCE5	0,330	0,058		
		TCE6	0,071	0,013		
		TCE7	0,033	0,006		
		TCE8	0,222	0,039		
		E1	0,247	0,048		
		E2	0,314	0,061		
		E3	0,023	0,005		
E	0 1 9 5	E4	0,045	0,009		
	0,195	E5	0,155	0,065 0,149 0,196 0,101 0,050 0,033 0,023 0,012 0,004 0,028 0,019 0,009 0,058 0,019 0,009 0,058 0,013 0,006 0,039 0,048 0,061 0,005 0,009 0,030 0,015 0,006 0,022		
		E6	0,075	0,015		
		E7	0,028	0,006		
		E8	0,112	0,022		



Figure 2. Evaluation of the Main Criteria by Fuzzy AHP

As a result of evaluating the main criteria with the Fuzzy AHP approach, the most important main criterion according to Figure 2 is the Environment and City criteria with 62 % ratio, followed by Ecosystem criteria with 20 % ratio and Transportation, Construction and Energy criteria with 18 % ratio.



Figure 3. Assessment of the Environment and City Main Criteria



Figure 4. Evaluation of the Main Criteria of Transportation, Construction, Energy



Figure 5. Evaluation of the Ecosystem Main Criteria

When the main criteria of Environment and City in Figure 3 are considered, "Existence of inventory of CO₂ emissions and ensuring the controls for these emissions" is determined as the most important criterion. And the second most important criterion is "Having budgets allocated by local government about the climate change and combating climate change issues". The least important criterion is determined as "Existence of wastewater treatment and waste recovery and recycling facilities". When the main criterion of Environment and City in Figure 4 is considered, "Existence of lighting tools using energy efficient and/or alternative energy sources in public lighting" is determined as the most important criterion. And the second most important criterion is determined as "Existence of smart systems such as lighting systems that provide energy efficiency in buildings." "Existence of projects and/or studies about gaining historical and/or cultural structures to tourism" is determined as the least important criterion. And finally, when the main criteria of Environment and City in Figure 5 are considered, "Existence of ecological, good, sustainable and/or organic agricultural practices" is determined as the most important criterion. And the second most important criterion is determined as "Having biodiversity inventory and monitoring plans". "Using drip irrigation method in agriculture" is determined as the least important criterion.

When the data in Figure 6 is examined, as a result of reflecting the main criteria weights to the sub-criteria and considering all of them together, it is seen that the most prominent criterion is "Existence of inventory of CO₂ emissions and ensuring the controls for these emissions". When weight levels are taken into consideration, it is seen that there are much-weighted criteria that are concentrated in sub-criteria related to Environment and City main criterion and less weighted criteria are concentrated in sub-criteria related to Transportation, Construction and Energy main criterion. The reason for this can be said that the weight levels of the main criteria have a significant effect on the result and ultimately affect the criteria ranking.

When viewed spatially; it is known that especially some types of fuels used in transportation and construction are effective in increasing greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, in order to provide energy efficiency in urban, the use of alternative energy sources and alternative modes of transportation and spatial structuring in harmony with nature are important. In this regard, countries are taking various measures and implementing various plans such as national and local climate change action plans. In this context, findings obtained from the analysis show that parallel results are formed in this direction.

Finally, the integrity and balance within the ecosystem in rural and nonurban areas are mainly impaired by human activities; hence, these criteria seem to have less importance. Because environmental problems and climate changes due to human activities and the effects of globalization are mostly caused by global warming and the activites in urban area. It is seen that the findings obtained in this analysis are in this direction also.



Figure 6. Sequencing of Weighting all Criteria with Fuzzy AHP Approach

5. CONCLUSION

In this study, primarily climate friendly and climate resilient cities have been identified and then In order to prioritize and weighting the criteria that are to be expected in these cities, in line with the opinions of experts a solution was searched with Fuzzy AHP approach which is one of the Multi-Criteria Decision Making approaches. Literature was used in the process of determining criteria and after evaluation of the created criteria list by different evaluators the final results were obtained. According to this, when all the main criteria and sub-criteria are considered, the most important criterion is determined as "Existence of inventory of CO, emissions and ensuring the controls for these emissions" and the least important criterion is determined as "Existence of projects and/or studies about gaining historical and/or cultural structures to tourism". After the ranking of the criteria obtained according to these results, it was observed that the main criteria of environment and city were more dominant than the other criteria. Based on the findings obtained in this study, by focusing on the main criteria of the environment and the city for future strategic regulations and applications, it would be beneficial to prepare the mentioned inventories both at provincial level and sectoral level. As a result, climate-friendly and climate-resilient cities and local climate change action plans, which are tried to be put forward conceptually, should be created especially for future generations, and urban transformation should be transformed into an opportunity to transform into climate-friendly and climate-resilient cities.

REFERENCES

- [1]. UNITED NATIONS, (2014), **Department of Economic and Social Affairs**, Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/352): 1.
- [2]. ERDEN ÖZSOY, C. and DİNÇ, A., (2016), Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma ve Ekolojik Ayak İzi, Finans Politik & Ekonomik Yorumlar 2016 Cilt: 53 Sayı: 619, 2016: 36-40.
- [3]. AKBULUT, E. F., (2009), İklim Değişikliğinde Alternatif Politikaların Etkinliği, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, T.C. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- [4]. KREFT, S., ECKSTEIN D., DORSCH, L. and FISCHER, L., GERMANWATCH, E.V., (2015), Briefing Paper, Global Climate Risk Index 2016, Who Suffers Most From Extreme Weather Events?-Weather-Related Loss Events in 2014 And 1995 To 2014, Bonn, November 2015: 4.
- [5]. PRASAD, N., RANGHIERI, F., SHAH, F., TROHANIS, Z., KESSLER, E. and SINHA R., (2009), The World Bank, Climate Resilient Cities, A Primer on Reducing Vulnerabilities to Disasters, Washington DC, 2009: 32.
- [6]. KUŞÇU ŞİMŞEK, Ç. and ŞENGEZER, B., (2012), The Importance of Green Spaces in Minimizing Urban Heat in the Istanbul Metropolitan Area, Megaron, 7 (2): 116-119.
- [7]. WORLDWATCH INSTITUTE, (2008), Green Jobs: Towards decent work in a sustainable, low-carbon World, Policy messages and main findings for decision makers, 2008, p.2-25.
- [8]. MINISTRY OF INTERIOR, (2011), Hungary VATI Hungarian Nonprofit Ltd. for Regional Development and Town Planning, Climate-Friendly Cities – A Handbook on the Tasks and Possibilities of European Cities in Relation to Climate Change, Ministry of Interior, Hungary –VATI, Budapest, 10-16.
- [9]. THE EUROPEAN FOUNDATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF LIVING AND WORKING CONDITIONS, (1998), Urban Sustainability Indicators, Voula Mega V. and Pedersen J., ISBN 92-828-4669-5, Ireland.
- [10]. EUROSTAT WEB SİTE, Eurostat Sustainable Development Indicators, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/sdi/indicators, 18.08.2019.
- [11]. C40 WEB SITE, **Selection Criteria**, https://www.c40.org/other/c40-cities-awards-selection-criteria, 10.08.2019.
- [12]. EUROPEAN GREEN CITY INDEX, https://apps.espon.eu/etms/rankings/2012_ European_Green_City_Index_sum_report.pdf, 08.08.2019.
- [13]. CITTASLOW WEB SİTE, Selection Criteria, http://www.cittaslow.org/content/ how-become, 07.08.2019.
- [14]. CITTASLOW TÜRKİYE İNTERNET SİTESİ, **Üyelik ve Kriterler**, https:// cittaslowturkiye.org/uyelik-sureci-ve-kriterler/, 12.08.2019.
- [15]. EU COMMISSION WEB SİTE, European Green Capital Award Evaluation Process, https://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/applyingfor-the-award/evaluation-process/, 11.08.2019.

- [16]. EU COMMISSION WEB SİTE, European Green Leaf Award Evaluation Process, https://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/europeangreenleaf/evaluation/, 11.08.2019.
- [17]. URBAN LEDS WEB SİTE, https://urban-leds.org/about-the-project/countryand-city-selection/#1559635629963-d0ff5f38-b9b8, 14.08.2019.
- [18]. BUCKLEY, J. J., FEURING, T. and HAYASHI, Y., (2001), Fuzzy Hierarchical Analysis Revisited, European Journal of Operational Research, 129: 48–64.
- [19]. BUCKLEY, J. J., (1985), Fuzzy hierarchical analysis, Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 17 (3): 233–247.
- [20]. AWASTHI, A., CHAUHAN, S. S., (2012), "A Hybrid Approach Integrating Affinity Diagram, AHP and Fuzzy TOPSIS for Sustainable City Logistics Planning", Applied Mathematical Modelling, 36 (2), 573–584.
- [21]. SAATY, R.W., (1987), "The Analytic Hierarchy process-what it is and how it is used", Mathematical Modelling, 9 (3-5), 161-176.
- [22]. ROUYENDEGH, B.D., YILDIZBASI, A., ARIKAN, U.Z.B, (2018), Using Intuitionistic Fuzzy TOPSIS in Site Selection of Wind Power Plants in Turkey, Advances in Fuzzy Systems, 1–14.
- [23]. HANINE, M., BOUTKHOUM, O., TIKNIOUINE, A. et al., (2017), An application of OLAP/GIS-Fuzzy AHP-TOPSIS methodology for decision making: Location selection for landfill of industrial wastes as a case study, KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering, 21 (6), 2074-2084. doi:10.1007/s12205-369 016-0114-4.
- [24]. CAGLAYAN, N., YILDIZBASI, A., ROUYENDEGH, B. D., (2018), Fuzzy AHP Approach to Prioritizing the Critical Success Factors of Organizational Culture, International Journal of Organizational Leadership, 7; 454-466, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3337637.