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This Handbook seeks to explain the contents of a long and complex treaty, the Association Agreement, including the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA), between Georgia on the one hand, and the European Union (EU) and its 28 member states, on the other. Like most complex legal texts, it cannot be read like a book. The purpose here is therefore to make it possible for anyone to understand what each chapter of the Agreement means, in terms of both the nature of the commitments that the parties have assumed, and the prospects for their implementation.

This second edition of the Handbook reflects the two years that have elapsed since the first edition was published in 2016. This has allowed for a comprehensive update, with an early indication of how the implementation of the Agreements is progressing.

In writing the Handbook, the authors had a broad range of readers in mind, including officials, parliamentarians, business leaders, lawyers and business consultants, think tanks, civil society organisations, university teachers, trainers, students and journalists.

The structure of this Handbook essentially mirrors that of the Agreement, but the chapters are not identical to it. Some chapters in the Agreement of lesser interest are not covered, and there is some rearrangement of various chapter headings.

The present volume is one of a trilogy of Handbooks that cover very similar but not identical agreements between the EU and its member states, and Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. All three books are available electronically for free downloading in English and the respective languages of the three countries, at www.3dcftas.eu.

There are some references in the Handbook to an Association Agenda, which is a document drawn up jointly by Georgia and the EU to review progress in the implementation of the Association Agreement, and which usefully provides updating and some greater detail on various topics. The Agreement and Agenda are thus not to be confused. The official texts of both documents are also available in English and in Georgian, at www.3dcftas.eu.
A much shorter, popular version of this book has been prepared with the aim of reaching a wider readership, including students. This version is also available in print and online for free downloading in English and Georgian, at www.3dctae.eu.

The Handbook has been prepared by two teams of researchers and experts, from CEPS in Brussels and Reformatics in Tbilisi. Established in 1983, CEPS is a leading think tank on European affairs, with a strong in-house research capacity and an extensive network of partner institutes throughout the world. Its mission is to produce sound policy research leading to constructive solutions to the challenges facing Europe.

Reformatics is an independent international consulting firm in Tbilisi founded by former high-level officials in Georgia who were instrumental in their country’s impressive achievements in economic reforms over the last decade. The firm currently undertakes advisory projects in Central and Eastern Europe, Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia. Its contributors express their thanks to Nika Gilauri for helpful comments on several chapters.

While much of the content of the Handbook is undoubtedly rather dry, we hope that the reader will appreciate the lighter touch in the artwork of Constantin Sunnerberg, which graces the book’s cover and the introductory page of each chapter.

Thanks are due to the CEPS editorial team, Anne Harrington, Margarita Minkova and Jackie West, for their painstaking work.

Finally, the authors are most grateful to the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) for their support and funding for the project, and in particular to Mirja Peterson, Maria Liungman and Sanna Leino for their encouragement and support.

The views expressed in this book are entirely those of the authors and should not be attributed to CEPS, Reformatics, Sida or the European Union.
**SUMMARY**

**What?**

The Association Agreement between the European Union (EU) and Georgia is a comprehensive treaty covering Georgia’s relationship with the EU. The trade-related content is covered in the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA), which is one important part of the overall Agreement. For the EU it is a ‘mixed’ agreement, i.e. engaging both the EU and its member states. It is a voluminous text with many annexes.

The Agreement was signed on 27 June 2014, and has subsequently been ratified by Georgia, the European Parliament and all 28 EU member states. While most of the economic content of the Agreement has been provisionally in force since 1 September 2014, its definitive and complete entry into force took place on 1 July 2016.

While the Agreement is intensely technical, in essence it is an act of geopolitical significance for Georgia, affirming its European identity and its strategic foreign policy priority of developing closer ties with the EU.

**Why?**

The political and economic objectives of the Agreement are fundamental for the future of Georgia as an independent and secure European state, and can be simply defined.

The political purpose is to deepen the realisation of Georgia’s ‘European choice’ and its relations with the EU. This means making a reality of fundamental European values, namely democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights, and the norms of the European security order. Membership of the EU is not pre-figured in the Agreement, but neither is it excluded in the longer run.
The economic purpose is to help modernise Georgia’s economy, by boosting trade with the EU and other major trading partners worldwide, and by reforming economic regulations in line with European best practice. These steps should lead ultimately to the highest level of economic integration between Georgia and the EU.

How?

Of all the countries of Eastern Europe, Georgia has distinguished itself by pushing ahead unilaterally over the years since the Rose Revolution of 2003 with a radical economic liberalisation and reform agenda. It has succeeded in reducing corruption and establishing a highly favourable business climate. The Association Agreement and DCFTA thus build on a most promising base.

The Agreement amounts to a charter for Georgia’s modernisation and Europeanisation through alignment with European norms, which generally correspond to best international practice. Georgia does not have to ‘re-invent the wheel’ in many technically complex areas. The country takes a careful approach to alignment with European legislation, however, avoiding excessive or premature obligations. There are also considerable flexibilities over the implementation of commitments, with procedures for extending timeframes or updating the legislative references if both parties agree. There is much ‘learning by doing’ for both Georgia and the EU, and the need to adjust the detail of legislative requirements where necessary. For the EU, the DCFTA with Georgia, as well as those with Moldova and Ukraine, represent especially deep examples of the new model of comprehensive agreements being made with countries in the wider Europe and other continents (Korea, Canada).

Since 1 September 2014, the EU has opened its market for tariff-free imports from Georgia almost completely. Yet since 2006, Georgia has been engaged in a radical unilateral opening of its market towards the whole world. This means that the opening of the EU market offers only new opportunities and no risks for Georgia, since its economy has already adjusted to the discipline of international competitiveness.

Financial support is available to help with technical assistance and investment where there are heavy adjustment costs, with grants from the EU, and loans or investment from the European financial institutions.¹

¹ Notably, these are the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD).
The Agreement is no magic wand to cure Georgia’s outstanding political and economic challenges. But its provisions do engage with a substantial part of Georgia’s political and economic reform agenda. Ultimately, it is a roadmap for Georgia to join the many small but very open European economies that do or can achieve very high standards of economic and social development.

Part I. Political Principles, the Rule of Law and Foreign Policy

These chapters deal with the non-economic content of the Agreement, and the commitments made are, while of fundamental importance, mostly qualitative in nature.

Democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law are deemed ‘essential elements’ of the Association Agreement, such that in the event of their grave violation the Agreement may be suspended. As a young democracy, Georgia has progressed in establishing democratic institutions. The constitution has been revised several times, most recently in 2017-18. There have been tensions in the relations between the president and the ruling majority, which were evident in the process leading up to constitutional amendments, for example. Georgia’s political landscape has been characterised by informal governance of the oligarch Bidzina Ivanishvili, who stepped down as prime minister in 2013 but maintained the role of key decision-maker behind the scenes. In May 2018 he returned to a more formal position as chairperson of the Georgian Dream party.

The country continues its wide-ranging reforms in the justice field, although concerns remain with respect to selective justice, freedom of the media and the independence of courts. Georgia’s human rights record has improved since the Rose Revolution. Substantial improvement is seen at the legislative level, with practical implementation to be further improved.

Table S 1. Overview of political principles, rule of law and foreign policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Assessment/results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Political institutions.</td>
<td>Democratic development in progress; concerns over role of unofficial leadership Sound legislation; implementation lagging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Human rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Judiciary</td>
<td>Concerns over selective justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Anti-corruption</td>
<td>Impresssive de-corruption achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Visa regime</td>
<td>Big achievements largely sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visa-free travel a major advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foreign/security</td>
<td>Close cooperation with EU, participation in EU military missions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The table contains an overview of the political principles, rule of law, and foreign policy agreements, detailing progress and concerns in various areas such as political institutions, human rights, judiciary, anti-corruption, and visa regime.
Georgia has made major progress in combating corruption and has become an international leader in this respect. It remains committed to continuing reforms in this direction, which is crucial for the overall success of the Association Agreement and Georgia’s economic future.

These reforms link to the conditions that the EU set for extending visa-free access for Georgian citizens to travel to the EU. According to the European Commission, the conditions were duly met, enabling the Council of the European Union to agree on the scrapping of visas for short-term visits as of March 2017.

Foreign and security policy is a crucial component of EU-Georgian cooperation, given both Georgia’s strategic objective of integration with the EU and the need to counter security threats posed by Russia. Georgia aligns itself on many EU positions adopted in international diplomacy and is one of the most active non-member state partners of the EU in several military missions. The most significant security action by the EU in Georgia so far is its Monitoring Mission (EUMM) along the occupation lines of the separatist regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. This action began in October 2008 after the war with Russia and continues in 2016. In April 2018, Georgia announced a ‘peace initiative’ aimed to facilitate the movement of trade and people across the administrative borders with the separatist territories of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. While this has not met with a positive reaction from the leadership of these two territories, it represented a significant policy change and opening on the part of Tbilisi.

Part II. Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area

These chapters are the hard core of the economic content of the Agreement, covering both tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade, with many legally binding obligations undertaken by both parties.

The elimination of tariffs forms the classic basis of a free trade area. Georgia is an exceptional case in that it unilaterally and radically liberalised its external trade policies as early as 2006. With the DCFTA, the EU caught up with Georgia in liberalising its imports and, since 1 September 2014, the two parties enjoy virtually completely tariff-free trade for exports and imports, making the pact unique compared with the other two DCFTAs.
Since the entry into force of the DCFTA there has been only a modest growth of exports to the EU. But combined with decline in Georgia’s trade with the CIS due to the unfavourable economic situation of CIS trade partners, 2013-17 saw a change of trade structure towards the EU. The positive effects of the DCFTA are likely to build up strongly over the medium to long term, since the Georgian economy has already absorbed the adjustment to competitive, open market conditions. Development of export-oriented industries will be facilitated by progressive approximation to the EU’s technical standards for industrial and agricultural goods.

Also important for the future development of Georgia’s trade structures is its accession to the Pan-Euro-Mediterranean convention for preferential rules of origin. When this comes fully into force, and notably for Georgia’s bilateral trade relations with Turkey in making possible ‘diagonal cumulation’, there will be enhanced opportunities for the development of new export-oriented industries. A wider trade-liberalising impact of the DCFTA is most notable in Georgia’s new free trade agreement with China, which entered into force in 2018, and could see Georgia become a location for Chinese direct investment aimed at exporting to the EU market.
The DCFTA includes key measures to ensure fast, efficient and transparent customs services, and Georgia is advancing well with its legislative and institutional commitments. Georgia implemented significant reforms in customs policy for trade facilitation well before the signature of the Agreement and DCFTA.

Adoption of European technical regulations and standards for industrial and agri-food products is vital for the modernisation and competitiveness of Georgian products. The government has adopted comprehensive strategies and an ambitious programme for industrial standards, thus to eliminate technical barriers to trade (TBTs), as well as food safety with sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) regulations. These involve ambitious long-term objectives, and Georgia adopts a gradual and progressive approach so as not to incur undue costs in the short run.

For the service sectors, Georgia’s schedule of specific commitments in the WTO is very liberal and leaves little room for further liberalisation. As a result, there is an asymmetry with more liberalisation and fewer reservations on the Georgian than the EU side.

Georgia’s public procurement system has undergone significant changes for approximation to EU requirements and international best practice, with some limited gaps in legislative approximation remaining to be addressed. Georgia has had a fully electronic system of procurement in place since 2010, ensuring greater transparency and simplicity, and significantly decreasing administrative costs and corruption.

Georgia’s intellectual property rights (IPR) system is mainly in compliance with international best practices, agreements and EU legislation. As one of its priorities in IPR, Georgia has been registering geographical indications and appellations of origin, for example for wines, and has been protecting them internationally.

Georgia recently aligned its competition legislation largely with the key principles of EU competition law. Its Competition Agency is independent and has investigative and decision-making powers.

**Part III. Economic Cooperation**
The chapters under this heading are numerous, but they range greatly in terms of the extent of legal obligations and their economic importance.

As regards the overall macroeconomic policy, radical reforms starting in 2004 enabled Georgia to achieve impressive results with fast growth and great improvements in its international rankings related to
the ease of doing business and perceptions of corruption. But then the economy suffered several adverse economic shocks, first with the 2008 war with Russia, followed by the global financial crisis. Yet the economy has proved quite resilient. A liberal regulatory system and a diversified economic structure enabled Georgia to recover relatively quickly from the crisis, and reached an average annual growth rate of 6.6% in 2010-12. Growth became sluggish from 2013, but in 2017 it accelerated compared to recent years reaching 5.0%. The EU is supplying significant financial assistance to the country, including macroeconomic loans alongside the IMF, budget grants and major investment from the EIB and EBRD.

Table S 3. Overview of EU-Georgian economic cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Macroeconomics</th>
<th>Acceleration of macroeconomic growth since 2017 underway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Financial services</td>
<td>Banking system sound; approximation to be done gradually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Transport</td>
<td>Ambitions as regional transport and logistics hub of Caucasus and connecting regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Energy</td>
<td>Substantial positive transformation before DCFTA; acceded to Energy Community in 2017, with derogations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Environment</td>
<td>Comprehensive reforms underway, some ahead of schedule, some very costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Digital</td>
<td>ICT sector rapidly developing, gradual alignment on EU law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Consumer protect</td>
<td>Installation of a modern system within five years of entry into force of DCFTA means a substantial change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Company law</td>
<td>Legal approximation on track, including recent amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Agriculture</td>
<td>Socially sensitive sector, limited commitments, controversial land legislation recently adopted restricting land ownership for foreigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Employment/social</td>
<td>Largely compliant with EU &amp; ILO rules; introduction of labour inspectorate controversial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Education, culture</td>
<td>Ongoing reforms improve competition and quality in education system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Science, technology</td>
<td>Participates in Horizon 2020; some quality niches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. Agencies and programmes | Taking up considerable number of possibilities
---|---
27. Cross-border cooperation | Useful projects across Armenian and Azerbaijan borders
28. Civil society | Main NGOs support democratic practice; emergence of pro-Russian NGOs a concern

Georgia’s financial market is mostly represented by a comparatively well-developed banking sector, while other parts of the financial system are less developed. Most EU legislation is very complex for Georgia to implement. Approximation to EU legislation, if done properly and taking into account local market developments, is an opportunity for Georgia to ensure a sound and prudent financial system.

Georgia has the ambition to become a transport and logistics hub in the Black Sea–Caucasus–Caspian Sea region, and to fully integrate its infrastructure into the international and regional transport systems. The DCFTA sets out the EU’s detailed regulatory regime for transport by sea, road, rail and inland waterways. For air transport the EU and Georgia concluded a Common Aviation Agreement in 2010. There are now more low-cost airlines connecting Georgia with Europe, boosted by the new opening for visa-free travel. Georgia is well positioned to benefit from the joining up of China’s new Silk Road initiative with the transport networks of the EU.

Georgia’s energy sector has undergone a radical transformation, establishing a competitive regulatory and tariff system to attract substantial investment and diversify energy supplies for ensuring energy security. Georgia acceded to the Energy Community Treaty in 2017, which entails alignment with EU energy policies with derogations taking into account local realities. This step will link to a highly ambitious programme of environmental and climate change actions provided under the Agreement, for energy efficiency, air and water quality, and management of waste and dangerous chemicals. These actions will entail significant costs for many businesses, but with predictable long-term health and economic benefits.

The broad sector of ICT, embracing the entire body of information and communications technology, is a vital strategic part of the economic reform and modernisation process in Georgia. The ICT sector has been developing rapidly, notably through exemplary government e-services. The Agreement provides for gradual alignment
with basic EU regulatory practices, and the programming for approximation is mostly within three to five years.

Agriculture is a socially important sector for Georgia’s economy, but one that suffered disastrous losses of output and capacity in the first two decades of the post-Soviet period. The current 2015-20 strategy seeks to position the sector on a reform and recovery path. The EU and EIB are funding considerable technical assistance and investment projects. However, there is controversial new legislation forbidding the foreign purchase of agricultural land.

The fundamental reform of Georgia’s Labour Code began in 2006, which led to the modernisation of labour regulations and the adoption of the major ILO conventions, and more recent reforms in 2013 already implementing the EU’s requirements on key issues of labour law and anti-discrimination. Other domains for legislative approximation under the Agreement include company law, corporate governance and consumer protection.

Since 2004, Georgia has been implementing a set of reforms in the education sector to increase competition and quality in public and private education. These reforms are supported in the Agreement, notably for higher education through the Bologna process, and with the Erasmus+ providing large numbers of Georgian students with exchanges in EU universities.

There are extensive possibilities for Georgian participation in the activities of the many EU agencies and programmes, with the potential to develop institutional capabilities and advance policy reforms. For example, in 2016 Georgia became an associate and full participant in the EU’s main research funding instrument, Horizon 2020. The EU supports Georgian civil society organisations, considering them both a driver for democratic change and a watchdog of government activity.

**Part IV. Legal and Institutional Provisions**

A comprehensive, joint institutional framework will monitor the implementation of the Agreement and provide a platform for political dialogue. The Association Council has a broad competence to amend the annexes of the Agreement, but not the main body of the Agreement. Implementation of the Agreement is supported by well-defined mechanisms for dispute settlement. The meetings of the Association Council and its committees are held regularly, and the system is functioning correctly.
Table S 4. Overview of legal and institutional provisions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Dispute settlement</td>
<td>No legal disputes so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Institutional</td>
<td>Association Council and committees have worked as planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall assessment**

These first years of implementation of the Association Agreement and DCFTA allow some preliminary assessments to be made. The overall record is most positive, with the implementation timetables of the Agreement largely respected, and even in some cases executed ahead of schedule. New developments include accession in 2017 to the Energy Community Treaty.

Georgia’s young democracy is a dynamic process and overall the country has made substantial progress since the Rose Revolution of a decade ago. However, there are still issues to be sorted out in the functioning of its political institutions, including the top-level informal political leadership and aspects of the judiciary.

Macroeconomic performance is overall sound with no major instabilities. The DCFTA has not yet triggered significant growth in exports to the EU, but this is a long-term process and the new opportunities are clearly and securely established, among others through new post-DCFTA free trade agreements signed by Georgia, as well as the possibilities of ‘diagonal cumulation’ of origin, as described above.

Compared to other states of Eastern and South Eastern (Balkans) Europe, Georgia has established a relatively high and leading position on several important accounts. Foremost among these are its sustained success in de-corruption, liberalisation of goods and services markets, economic and business climate reforms, as reflected in various international rankings. These form an excellent basis for ongoing and future development.

Georgia aspires to full membership of the EU at some point in the future. It is notable that its overall ranking on a combination of political and economic indicators is even ahead of the front-running Balkan states that are currently negotiating membership.²
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Part I.
Political Principles, the Rule of Law and Foreign Policy
1. **Political Principles**

**Provisions of the Agreement**

The entire Association Agreement is premised on a common commitment to the modern, democratic political values of the EU, recognising in the preamble that “the common values on which the European Union is built – namely democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law – lie also at the heart of political association and economic integration as envisaged in this Agreement”.

These principles are repeated in Art. 2 and declared “essential elements” of the Agreement. This description links up to Art. 419, which provides that in the event of violation of these principles the Agreement may be suspended. Political dialogue and cooperation on “domestic reform” should be conducted with respect for these same principles (Art. 6). This political dialogue is conducted through regular meetings at different ministerial and senior official levels.

On the substantive implementation of the basic principles, the jointly agreed Association Agenda (hereafter the ‘Agenda’) text of 17 November 2014 is more explicit. Priority matters for action include institutional questions on guaranteeing democracy, respect for the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. These challenges are addressed in considerable detail in the Agenda.

*Institutions guaranteeing democracy.* Strengthening the institutions is seen as a central element in ensuring the democratic conduct of elections, addressing any shortcomings in the legislative framework and election administration identified by OSCE and
ODIHR. In the EU-Georgia Human Rights Dialogue of mid-June 2015, the EU “called on Georgia to address the recommendations of the OSCE/ODIHR recommendations in good time before elections [in] 2016”.

In the same vein, constitutional amendments should be subject to comprehensive consultation domestically, while at the same time respecting the roles of the prime minister and the president. There should be adequate checks and balances as the political system undergoes transition from a semi-presidential to a parliamentary system and the decentralisation strategy should be in line with the European Charter of Local Government of the Council of Europe.

**Human rights and fundamental freedoms.** The expectations about Georgia’s respect for human rights are laid down in the “Georgia in Transition” report prepared in 2013 by the former Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights Thomas Hammarberg, who advised the government. This includes ensuring respect for the rights of the most vulnerable groups and national minorities, in conformity with the Framework Convention of the Council of Europe for the protection of national minorities, the ratification and transposition of the UN Convention on Statelessness and the Council of Europe recommendations on the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. The Agenda also calls for guaranteeing the effective implementation of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, promoting awareness of anti-discrimination in the judiciary, administration and law enforcement bodies, and including civil society as watchdogs in the process. The Agenda pays specific attention to combating the ill treatment and torture of human beings through updating and implementing the National Strategy and Action Plan, as well as strengthening the monitoring of the penitentiary system, police and military by both internal and external bodies.

**Developments in Georgia**

**Constitutional.** The constitution of Georgia is that of a young democracy, with only two decades of experience since the 1995 constitution established the foundations of a modern democratic system. Against the background of post-Soviet turbulence, a civil war, ethno-political tensions and the transformation from a totalitarian to a
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democratic system of governance, the process could hardly be a smooth one, and the constitution has been amended numerous times.

The 1995 constitution established three branches of government: legislative, executive and judiciary. The first major change was introduced in 2004, as a result of which the power of the president increased, and the political and legislative authority of the parliament decreased considerably. At the same time, the amendments of 2004 separated the judiciary from the function of the prosecutor.

Six years later, in 2010 another wave of constitutional amendments took place, with a change from a presidential to a semi-parliamentary system, which came into force after the 2013 presidential elections.

One of the remaining challenges lies in the overlapping powers and inter-institutional tensions between the president and prime minister, which was more related to the governing style of the current government than the constitutional set-up. This was further aggravated by the overt influence of former Prime Minister Bidzina Ivanishvili over the political processes in the country, which has been widely criticised as being informal governance.

There has been debate about the case for further amendments to strengthen constitutional stability, to increase the independence of constitutional institutions (among them the judiciary) and to ensure stronger guarantees of human rights protection, including the rights of minorities. As a result, a State Constitutional Commission was established in 2016 to draft amendments to the constitution.

The major and long-awaited objective, among others, was to abolish single-mandate constituencies and establish a fully proportional election system that would reduce the risk of single party rule.

The composition of the Commission corresponded to the initial ambition of securing a wider engagement. Still, the work of the State Commission and the motivation of the ruling party were questioned on a number of grounds. The president boycotted the Commission and the main opposition parties protested the final session and final vote on draft amendments. Amendments were adopted regardless of the lack of agreement. The text of draft amendments differed from those
submitted to the Venice Commission. The work of the Commission and the motives of the ruling party were hence questioned and lambasted both internally and externally.

The amendments of the constitution were adopted in September 2017 and will be enacted following the 2018 presidential elections. Georgia will switch to a fully proportional election system in 2024.

On the positive side, amendments included some important provisions such as the commitment to Georgia’s full membership of the EU and NATO; measures to ensure equality for men and women and the right to access the internet.

However, a number of key amendments lacked the support of the opposition and the civil society:

- **Electoral system** - a fully proportional system will not be introduced for the 2020 parliamentary elections, but only enter into force for the 2024 elections.
- **Presidential election** – the 2018 election will be the last held by popular vote. Subsequently an electoral college will elect the president.
- **Definition of marriage** – this is stipulated as being between “a man and a woman”. No-one except the ruling party and affiliated actors supported this definition, which is criticised for being discriminatory and in line with Russian propaganda.
- **Purchase of land** – another amendment that was approved regardless of broad disagreement is the banning of foreigners from purchasing land in Georgia – contrary to the previous liberal regulation in this regard. Both opposition and civil society argued against the amendment. Again, the influence of Russian propaganda was evident.

**Human rights.** As a member of the Council of Europe alongside all EU member states, Georgia adheres to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and is bound by the
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rulings of the Strasbourg Court. Respect for these norms are “essential elements” of the Association Agreement, the violation of which could (as noted above) lead to the suspension of the Agreement.

Whereas Georgia’s human rights record is generally respectable, concerns do remain. They are set out in detail in the Association Agenda. Implementation of judgments rendered by the European Court of Human Rights is one of them. Georgia also needs to fight against discrimination and torture, protect the rights of minorities and ensure freedom of religion.

Adoption of the National Human Rights Strategy 2014-20, and the consequent Action Plan, have generally been welcomed as positive steps, especially because they were drawn up in an inclusive manner. The documents incorporate recommendations from the Ombudsman’s Office, the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, national and international human rights NGOs, and the country report by Thomas Hammarberg, then in his capacity as EU special adviser on legal reform and human rights in Georgia. Concerns remain that most of the progress has been made at the legislative level, however, while implementation lags behind.

Organisations like Human Rights Watch, Freedom House and local advocacy groups7 criticise the government for its lack of accountability for abuses by law enforcement officials, and the absence of an independent and effective mechanism for investigating crimes committed by such officials.8 Investigations into past abuses remain problematic.

In May 2015, the Inter-Agency Coordination Council approved the 2015-16 Action Plan on the fight against torture, inhuman, cruel and humiliating treatment or punishment, which was drafted on the basis of the National Human Rights Strategy (2014-20). In 2015, the government began implementation of the Istanbul Protocol, which provides comprehensive and practical guidelines for the investigation and documentation of torture. Nonetheless, fact-based allegations against the police for cases of human torture persist and are not duly investigated.

To this end, in 2016 and 2017, NGOs and the Public Defender’s Office raised concerns about reports of mistreatment by police officials. The impartiality and effectiveness of the investigation was further questioned and establishment of investigative mechanisms was
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7 Among these groups are the Human Rights Centre and Global Young Leaders Academy.
requested. The annual report of the Public Defender flagged several cases of the ill-treatment of inmates, despite the adoption of a new Law on Penitentiary Service and amendments to several legislative acts, including the Detention Code in 2015.⁹

In June 2017, a legislative initiative was launched by the government on establishing a special department within the Office of the Chief Prosecutor to examine allegations of torture and ill treatment. Follow-up legislation is planned for provision of free legal advice to subjects of ill-treatment and torture.

The EU has spoken out on more than one occasion against the practices of selective justice and the political nature of prosecutions, for instance against former President Mikheil Saakashvili, who was charged in absentia with a pre-trial detention. The case of former Prime Minister Vano Merabishvili is considered to be one of the most controversial cases, as the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) ruled that Georgia violated his rights, and the former prime minister remains in prison. The former mayor of Tbilisi, Gigi Ugulava, was held in pre-trial detention for more than nine months, in clear breach of the Constitution, released by the Constitutional Court but re-arrested 23 hours later. The Court of Appeal further re-qualified the charges against Mr. Ugulava and shortened his sentence, finally releasing him.

There has been no progress in ending politically motivated prosecutions. The lawyer of the former Defence Minister of Georgia, Bacho Akhalaia, was detained, and another political opponent Paata Burchuladze was summoned to the Prosecutor’s Office. However, the government permitted international and domestic organisations to visit political prisoners.

Blackmailing with personal data has remained a challenge. Numerous unauthorised videos compromising and blackmailing politicians were released on the internet. Other public figures reported being blackmailed with recordings of their private lives. Law enforcement agencies failed to identify sources and take appropriate measures. In response, the office for Personal Data Protection was granted an authorisation of investigation under the monitoring of the Chief Prosecutor. However, the security services are still able to access telecommunication networks.

Local and international human rights defenders raised concerns in May 2016 over the case of an Azeri activist and journalist, Afghan Mukhtarli, living in self-imposed exile in Tbilisi, who was kidnapped in Georgia and rendered to Azerbaijan, where he faced charges. An investigation is in process, since Mr. Mukhtarli raised allegations against the Georgian high officials (see also chapter 2).

The Georgian parliament adopted an anti-discrimination bill, as part of the EU-Georgia Visa Liberalisation Action Plan, with an overwhelming majority in 2013. The draft bill would have introduced the independent institution of an inspector for equality protection, which was considered by the OSCE/ODIHR to be a real attempt to address all forms of discrimination. Yet, as a result of a harsh debate and the radical stance of the Orthodox Church, the law in its current form does not envisage any effective, legally binding mechanism to monitor the elimination of discrimination. Instead, the Public Defender’s office is in charge of taking anti-discrimination measures. According to reports, there are still grave human rights violations of religious minorities and the LGBT community. The Human Rights Centre has criticised the government for its inadequate response to acts of violence against minorities.\(^\text{10}\) Offences on the grounds of gender identity remain mostly unpunished.\(^\text{11}\)

On the other hand, there has been significant progress in addressing the issues of ethnic minorities over the last decade. A set of legislative measures, targeted policies and financial investment has improved the conditions for the integration of ethnic minorities in public and political life. Despite years of long programmes aimed at improving the use of the state language by ethnic minorities, this remains a challenge and requires further efforts. Georgia is participating in the UN process for a ‘Universal Periodic Review’ of human rights, and has implemented most of the recommendations addressed to it as a result. Georgia has still not managed to find consensus on ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, which is an outstanding obligation towards the Council of Europe undertaken in 1999.

The government has consistently issued statements about the grave human rights situation in the occupied regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali (South Ossetia), and has persistently requested the access of
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the OSCE/ODIHR and international human rights organisations to the occupied territories, so far without results.

**Gender equality.** Women’s rights and gender equality have been placed high on the government’s agenda, especially after a spate of murders in 2014 in which at least 23 women died in domestic violence cases. The president of Georgia declared 2015 the year of women. The constitution already upholds the principle of equal rights for men and women, and in 2010 a Gender Equality Law was enacted. In 2014, Georgia harmonised its domestic legislation with the Istanbul Convention. A first legislative package – which introduces, among others, ‘forced marriage’ as a criminal offence – has been finalised. In May 2017, Georgia ratified the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. The Convention entered into force in September 2017.

Domestic violence remains a major concern in the country. The government has pursued an active awareness-raising campaign that has substantially altered public perceptions of domestic violence. In January 2018, a Human Rights Department was established in the Ministry of Interior. The department is tasked with ensuring a timely response to domestic crimes, violence against women, discrimination, trafficking, crimes by/against minors, as well as the efficiency of respective case investigations.

In June 2017, the Parliament considered the call for female quota provisions in parliament, but this was voted down in March 2018. The parliament does provide a financial incentive scheme for parties that promote women as candidates in elections, however.

Although the government established an Inter-Ministerial Commission on Gender Equality and Empowerment to encourage women’s empowerment, the economic empowerment of women has hardly developed, especially in rural areas, among internally displaced women and women affected by conflict.

The practice of early marriage continues to be an issue in certain regions of Georgia.

**Local governance.** A new Local Self-Government Code has been one of the significant actions of the government for strengthening local government as part of a decentralisation process, and for increasing the participation of local communities in local policymaking. Among other initiatives, the Code has increased the number of cities (by seven) that have the status of local government. The government also placed particular emphasis on ensuring multi-party representation with the
introduction of a minimum threshold of 4% for proportional, party-list elections.

In 2017, under amendments to the legislation on self-government seven cities – Telavi, Mtskheta, Gori, Akhaltsikhe, Ambrolauri, Ozurgeti and Zugdidi – lost the status of independent self-governing units and were merged with larger self-governing communities. The process lacked public debate, a fact harshly criticised by the opposition and civil society.\textsuperscript{12} Progress in the field of local governance has thus somewhat reversed in comparison to 2014 in the Freedom House Report.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Political principles at a glance}
\end{center}

\begin{quote}
Democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law are deemed “essential elements” of the Association Agreement, but are not detailed in the text. The Association Agenda text, however, is more substantial on these matters.

As a young democracy and regardless of the progress achieved, Georgia still struggles to strengthen democratic institutions. The process whereby the government pushed through changes to the constitution in 2017 was much criticised.

Georgia’s human rights record has improved since the Rose Revolution. A greater degree of improvement is seen at the legislative level, with practical implementation to be further improved.

Adoption of an Anti-Discrimination Law marks significant progress in the protection of minority rights, while improvements on the ground are yet to materialise.
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesub {12} See article Parliament Reduces Number of Self-Governing Cities on Civil.ge (http://civil.ge/eng/article.php?id=30234).

\end{footnotesize}
2. **RULE OF LAW AND MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE**

This chapter deals with several related issues, notably the role of the judiciary in the rule of law, the fight against organised crime, corruption and terrorism, and policies for border management and the movement of persons, including the crucial issue of visa-free travel between Georgia and the EU.

**Judiciary and the rule of law**

The Association Agenda foresees reform of Georgia’s Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure Code (e.g. the right to a fair trial, independent investigation, and reforms to juvenile justice and plea-bargaining). Furthermore, it calls for the implementation of the 2013 reform of the Prosecutor’s Office, transparency in criminal proceedings and strengthened oversight of law enforcement, revising the rules of administrative detention and conducting capacity-building activities among the judiciary and law enforcement professionals. To those ends, Georgia has committed itself to developing a Judicial Strategy and Action Plan with clear benchmarks.\(^{14}\)

The constitution establishes a legal basis for an independent judiciary that is free from political influence. Nevertheless, the judiciary

has been the object of criticism for years. While the previous government succeeded in substantially reducing corruption, and in establishing institutional effectiveness, the lack of political independence of the judicial system, including the Prosecutor’s Office, remained unaddressed. The government, both the previous and the incumbent one, has been carrying out intensive reforms in this direction, yet the judicial system is still not fully up to international standards and best practices. The continuation of reforms is required.

In 2012 the newly elected government announced judicial reforms as its major priority and opted for making the judicial system considerably more transparent and independent than it had been in preceding years. Consequently, in the period of 2012-17 the government launched three waves of judicial reform:

The first wave involved changes in the composition of the High Council of Justice (HCoJ), replacing members of parliament with representatives of civil society and academia, and sharing the authority to elect/appoint new members of the HCoJ between the judicial, legislative and executive branches of government.

The second wave established life tenure for judges on the High Council, conditioned by a successful probation period of three years and developing objective criteria for their appraisal.

The third wave aimed at increasing independence of judges and strengthening the concept of impartiality; among other legislative changes, an automated case distribution system was introduced to avoid politicised case handling and decisions.

These reforms were largely welcomed and considered positive by stakeholders. However, once put in practice, they have not succeeded in making the judiciary independent and free of political influence. The Young Lawyers Association has been one of the loudest critics of the reforms: legislative changes were incomplete, belated, and often adapted to the interests of an influential group of judges.

The practice of selecting Members of the High Council of Justice demonstrated certain key shortfalls, which are mainly related to lack of transparency. At the same time, what was considered as a step forward
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in 2015 - wider engagement of stakeholders in the HCoJ - deteriorated in 2016 in parallel with increasing criticism from civil society.

The legislative initiative on increasing independence of judges and strengthening the concept of impartiality was delayed until 2017. During this time the process of appointments was mostly concluded by informal agreements, while members of the HCoJ failed to provide justifications for voting in favour of elected judges. The reforms were further declared ineffective as civil society detected a clan within the justice system that held leverage over the decisions of the HCoJ.

The initiative of electronic distribution of cases has likewise failed to deliver the objective. Politically sensitive cases continued to be assigned to judges who fell victim to political blackmail. Such was the case over the Rustavi 2 television channel, one of the strongest and most critical broadcasters; and also with respect to the trial against five former defence ministry and general staff officials in the so-called ‘cable case’, who were released in January 2017 after being pardoned by the President Giorgi Margvelashvili. Notably, according to the report of the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, courts were more likely to approve detention or give custodial sentences to members of the United National Movement (UNM), compared with bail and fines issued to pro-government activists in comparable cases.

Since the Georgian Dream came to power, more than 30 members of the previous government have been charged with criminal offences, and 14 have been arrested or put into pre-trial detention. Yet no criminal charges have been brought against any UNM party members who have switched parties since 2012. In some cases, investigations stopped altogether after the individuals changed their party allegiance and left the UNM. Political statements by government officials disregarded the presumption of innocence in labelling the UNM members as criminals.

Reflecting these setbacks, the Freedom House report on Nations in Transit 2018 rated Georgia 5.00 (7.00 being the worst possible score), a fall compared to 2016 (4.75).

The success of judicial reform also has to rest heavily on reforming the Prosecutor’s Office, which has been persistently criticised for being politically biased. In 2015, in line with the requirements of the Association Agreement, the government approved a package of legislative amendments to the Law on the Prosecutor’s
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Office. The law aimed at establishing a depoliticised and independent Prosecutor’s Office, and thus implied a new rule for the selection/appointment and dismissal of the prosecutor general. Although the prime minister no longer appoints the prosecutor general, the ruling parliamentary majority retains the power to select the desirable candidate. A key concern is the role of the minister of justice in the selection process and the lack of merit-based professional criteria. The Venice Commission advised on avoiding appointment of a candidate that is supported by the ruling party only.

The fight against crime, corruption and terrorism

Even if only a handful of provisions in the Association Agreement mention combating corruption expressis verbis (e.g. Arts 4, 17, and Title VII on anti-fraud), the principal idea is mainstreamed across the whole text in many specific provisions; for instance over public procurement rules, competition policies and state aids, and intellectual property rights, among others.

Here Georgia’s fight against corruption has improved dramatically since the Rose Revolution of 2003. The government has strengthened the anti-corruption institutional framework, created an online state procurement system and an online financial declarations system for public officials (based on the principle of ‘everybody sees and knows everything’), and developed e-treasury and e-budget programmes. Most government services are delivered electronically, based on a principle of ‘silence is consent’, which minimises risks of corruption and leaves little room for corrupt practices by service-issuing entities. In general, the government has carried out significant legislative reforms, thereby establishing a solid ground for the prosecution of corruption-related crimes. Georgia has demonstrated steady progress in its fight against corruption for over a decade now, and the government is intensifying efforts in this field. Its development of innovative solutions for public procurement and public service delivery won Georgia accolades and UN awards in 2012.

With the Association Agreement, Georgia committed itself to carrying on with its public administration reform and building an accountable, transparent and professional civil service. This reform drive is also pushed by civil society organisations. In 2011, Transparency International Georgia (TIG) stressed the lack of a verification system for asset declarations as a major gap in its earlier National Integrity System assessment. In 2014, the Georgian government began working on the introduction of such a system. At
the same time, the Georgian parliament also adopted TIG’s recommendation regarding local government, and expanded the list of local government officials who are required to file asset declarations.\textsuperscript{18} In 2015, amendments to the law on the “Conflict of Interests and Corruption in Public Service” were approved by parliament. In addition, a draft Code of Ethics was drawn up and an Automated Human Resources Management System was implemented in 18 ministries.\textsuperscript{19}

In April 2015, the government approved and updated an Anti-Corruption Strategy and the new Anti-Corruption Action Plan for 2015-16, along with a monitoring methodology for their implementation. According to evaluations by the Council of Europe and OECD, Georgia has implemented all but one of the 15 recommendations issued to it by these organisations.\textsuperscript{20} In 2017 a verification system for asset declarations of public officials was put in place. Meanwhile, TIG has outlined an array of important issues yet to be addressed, regarding informal influence over public institutions, the establishment of an independent anti-corruption body to prevent high-level corruption, depoliticising the civil service, and a transparent recruitment and dismissal process in the civil service to exclude politically motivated decisions and nepotism.\textsuperscript{21}

The most important conclusion is that the big achievements in de-corrupting Georgia made during the Saakashvili administration a decade ago have been sustained, notwithstanding a change of government. While the successor government has been in general highly critical of its predecessor, it has not undone the achievements of anti-corruption policy. Thus the Transparency International Index ranked Georgia 46\textsuperscript{th} out of a total of 180 countries, higher than several EU member states.\textsuperscript{22} The 2017 Business Bribery Risk index by Trace International ranks Georgia 23\textsuperscript{rd} out of 200 countries ahead of the EU average,\textsuperscript{23} and improvement on the 2016 ranking (28\textsuperscript{th}). A slight deterioration was recorded in the 2017 Global Corruption Barometer

\textsuperscript{19} See www.eu-nato.gov.ge/sites/default/files/AA%20NAP%202015%20.
\textsuperscript{21} See www.transparency.ge/en/node/5749.
\textsuperscript{22} See https://www.transparency.org/country/GEO#chapterInfo.
\textsuperscript{23} See https://www.traceinternational.org/trace-matrix?#25.
Survey, with reports by respondents on paying a bribe increasing to 7% from 4% in 2013.\textsuperscript{24} In the 2017 the World Justice Project Rule of Law Index Georgia maintains the 1st place in the ‘absence of corruption dimension’ in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.\textsuperscript{25}

**Movement of persons and border management**

The Association Agreement sets the stage for a comprehensive dialogue and cooperation on legal migration, the trafficking and smuggling of people, border management, asylum and return policies, and the mobility of persons, including visa-free travel with the EU.

To this end, the EU-Georgia Visa Liberalisation Dialogue was launched on 4 June 2012 and the Visa Liberalisation Action Plan (VLAP) was initiated in February 2013.\textsuperscript{26} In March 2017, after successful implementation of the VLAP, visa requirements for Georgian citizens willing to travel to the Schengen zone for a short-stay was abolished.

After the first ten months of visa-free movement the EU published its first assessment, which clarified that despite some breach of the regulations, the overall situation was not alarming. Nevertheless, the Commission outlined two major problems: 1) an increase of Georgian nationals seeking asylum in EU countries and 2) an increase of criminal cases with involvement of Georgian citizens.

The Ministry of Interior strengthened its cooperation with the EU member states to address the cases of violations and avoid further complications. Locally, the government of Georgia continues regular informative campaigns to reduce the abovementioned cases of violation.

More broadly, a number of significant changes have been introduced to the migration-related legislation since the Rose Revolution, when the country launched an open door policy to ensure liberal access. Georgia’s migration policy has seen substantial

\textsuperscript{24}See https://www.transparency.org/news/feature/governments_are_doing_a_poor_job_at_fighting_corruption_across_europe www.transparency.org/gcb2013/country/?country=georgia.

\textsuperscript{25} See https://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/documents/WJP_ROLI_2017-18_Online-Edition_0.pdf

\textsuperscript{26} See corresponding documents and reports at the web page of State Commission on Migration Issues (http://migration.commission.ge/index.php?article_id=17&clang=1).
progress. Apart from advances under the VLAP, migration management structures and a coordinating agency were established, and migration-related policies streamlined.

In December 2015, the government approved the 2016-20 Migration Strategy and its Action Plan for the period 2016-17, which succeeded the 2013-15 Strategy. A Unified Migration Analytical System was introduced, which collects data from various government agencies on migration, emigration and internal migration. Such a unified database helps it identify and forecast risks, as well as apply suitable measures in line with the EU standards.

The government also introduced an electronic database of asylum seekers, refugees and persons with humanitarian status. Indicators have been elaborated to monitor decision-making on asylum applications, facilitating the decision-making process to grant or deny asylum. Asylum conditions, decision processing and flow for immigrants have largely been improved.

Georgia continues its fight against trafficking in human beings. Apart from preventive and investigative measures, improved shelters are being established for victims of violence, including children. Another major step has been the establishment of a Labour Conditions Inspection Department, which has been functional since 2015 and Human Rights Department functional at the Ministry of Interior since 2018.

Questions mounted about the border monitoring of Georgia after the Azerbaijani activist and journalist Afgan Mukhtarli, living in self-imposed exile in Tbilisi, was kidnapped in Georgia and rendered to Azerbaijan, where he faced charges. An investigation is in process,
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27 The State of Migration in Georgia, Report developed in the framework of the EU-funded Enhancing Georgia’s Migration Management project (http://migration.commission.ge/files/enigma-state-of-migration_e_version.pdf).
28 Ibid.
29 To be tested by mid-2016.
32 State Commission on Migration operates a web-page that offers comprehensive information at http://migration.commission.ge/
33 Ibid.
since Mr Mukhtarli raised allegations against the Georgian high officials. In addition to Human Rights concerns, answers are missing to the question of how a person re-emerged in a foreign country without a passport and without being registered at the border.

Later in November 2017, a 24-hour special operation was carried out in Tbilisi as a result of which an armed group of people suspected of planning a terrorist attack was liquidated. Among them the most wanted terrorist, who held a high rank in ISIS and had participated in a number of terrorist attacks, including at the Istanbul Ataturk airport, was killed. How Ahmed Chatayev, one of the most wanted terrorists in the world, managed to get back into Georgia is still unknown.

**Rule of law and movement of people at a glance**

*Georgia continues to be a leading country in the fight against corruption and remains committed to reforms in this direction, which is crucial for the overall success of the Association Agreement and for Georgia’s economic future.*

*Concerns over selective justice and rule of law remain. Progress still has to be seen in ensuring the independence of the judiciary and increasing trust towards courts.*

*The entry into force of visa-free travel to the EU has been a highly welcome development.*
3. FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY

The Association Agreement seeks to facilitate the gradual convergence of Georgia’s foreign, security and defence policies with those of the EU at bilateral, regional and multilateral levels. These include areas covered by the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).

The CFSP encompasses issues related to the strategic interests and external objectives of the EU, the joint actions and common positions adopted by the Union and the procedures for taking these actions and positions.

The CSDP covers a wide range of activities, including humanitarian, conflict prevention and peacekeeping tasks, intervention by combat forces in crisis management and post-conflict stabilisation.

In general terms, the Agreement reaffirms the parties’ commitment to the international canons of sovereignty, territorial integrity and the inviolability of borders in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.

Georgia has been aligning its positions with many CFSP declarations since 2011 on a voluntary basis, having joined 47% of the CFSP declarations in 2014. In 2015, Georgia joined 221 statements released by the EU in conjunction with different international organisations.

Georgia’s priorities. In view of the grave security challenges posed by Russia in the post-Soviet space, and particularly the EU Association Agreements signed by Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine,
Georgia stresses the need for a more robust, strategic EU engagement in its neighbourhood.

Georgia regards Russia’s aggression in Ukraine as part of a strategy that draws parallels with the Russian–Georgian War of 2008. Georgia is highly interested in Ukraine’s integration into Western institutions. At the same time, the strategy of the Georgian Dream government is to normalise relations with Russia. To this end, the government has tried to keep a low profile on sensitive issues with Russia, including the international sanctions. Although Georgia joined the EU’s policy of non-recognition of Russia’s annexation of Crimea, the government has refrained from participating in the sanctions imposed by the EU and the US against Russia over its destabilisation in Donbas – a position that is controversial among Georgian public opinion.

Georgia continues to participate actively in Western security missions. Thanks to their high degree of interoperability, the Georgian armed forces have been providing significant contributions to both NATO\(^\text{34}\) and EU-led peace support operations.

Participation in CSDP missions and the development of related national capabilities have been among the priorities of the government. Since signing and ratifying the Framework Participation Agreement with the EU in November 2013, Georgia has adopted the necessary by-laws to allow for its personnel to participate in CSDP missions. The legislation is currently being revised for further improvement.

Adjustments to the planning process for participation in military CSDP operations are currently being considered to ensure swifter crisis-response capabilities. Georgia is also working to strengthen its civilian contribution to CSDP missions. Taking into consideration the diversity of the CSDP tasks and accumulated experience,\(^\text{35}\) the government aims at establishing a pool of trained civilian candidates ready to be deployed whenever required.

\(^{34}\) Georgia has become the fourth non-member state to be a member of the NATO Response Force. Georgia was one of the largest non-NATO troop contributors to the International Security Assistance Force, which completed its mission in Afghanistan in December 2014. It is currently one of the top overall contributors to the follow-on NATO-led mission (Resolute Support) to train, advise and assist the Afghan forces. Georgia continues to provide transit for supplies destined for forces deployed in Afghanistan. The Georgian government has also pledged financial support for the further development of the Afghan National Security Forces (www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_38988.htm?selectedLocale=en).

Conflict diplomacy. Georgia and the EU are committed to working together for the peaceful resolution of regional conflicts. The Agreement restates the need for a peaceful and sustainable resolution of conflicts with respect for Georgia’s territorial integrity and sovereignty, as well as for post-conflict reconciliation and rehabilitation (e.g. the return of displaced persons). The Agreement also recognises the need to fulfil the obligations of the Six-Point Agreement of 12 August 2008 brokered by then French President Nicolas Sarkozy in stopping the war with Russia and the decisions adopted in the framework of the Geneva International Discussions (co-chaired by the OSCE, the EU and the UN). The Association Agenda foresees regular EU-Georgia bilateral consultations on the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and encourages trade, travel and investment across the administrative lines.

In April 2018, the Georgian government introduced a peace initiative: "A Step to a Better Future", proposing cooperation measures in the fields of education and trade to Abkhazia and the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia, which was widely welcomed, including by the EU. The peace initiative focuses on enhancing educational opportunities for the residents of these occupied regions, and, most importantly, supports economic and trade activities across the dividing lines.

Educational institutions in these regions are not covered by Georgian legislation, and thus have not been part of the Bologna process. Graduates of these educational institutions thus had very limited opportunities to study abroad as they did not hold recognised education certificates. To facilitate educational opportunities for residents of the secessionist regions, Georgian citizenship will no longer be required. An “individual number” will be introduced with no indication of citizenship or any other status.

Facilitation of trade across dividing lines will now be possible: residents of Abkhazia and the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia will be able to access Georgian and foreign markets. The initiative offers a simplified identification mechanism to individuals willing to engage in trade activities across the dividing lines, without this implying citizenship. A ‘Uniform Service Centre’ is proposed, to operate on the

36 See http://smr.gov.ge/Uploads/Education__9dd0e9dc.pdf
37 See more on Enhancing Educational Opportunities for the residents of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali Region/South Ossetia http://smr.gov.ge/Uploads/Education__9dd0e9dc.pdf
‘one window’ principle and provide services for registration, certification, phytosanitary, labelling and other requirements on both sides of the dividing lines. Individuals engaging in economic and trade activities will be assigned a special taxpayer status. The government also plans to establish a fund to sponsor business start-ups and entrepreneurial projects that will further develop trade across the dividing lines.\(^{38}\) Implementing this initiative will require additional legislative amendments, whose practical progress is yet to be seen.

It has to be said that Tbilisi’s initiative has so far only received politically negative responses from Sukhumi or Tskhinvali. Nevertheless, this is a major opening on the part of Tbilisi; it is to be hoped that more constructive attitudes will prevail in due course.

**CSDP mission in Georgia.** Immediately following the Six-Point Agreement, on 1 October 2008 the EU launched the EU Monitoring Mission in Georgia (EUMM), which has been successively extended so far until the end of 2016. The goal of the EUMM is to observe compliance by Russia and Georgia of the Six-Point Agreement, and crucially to prevent a renewal of hostilities. It further seeks to improve the security environment through its presence as a stabilising force and to create conditions for civilians to cross the occupation lines. EUMM consists of around 200 unarmed monitors from the EU member states. The mission patrols areas adjacent to the South Ossetian and Abkhazian occupation lines.

Although the EUMM is mandated to be present in the whole territory of Georgia, the de facto authorities of Abkhazia and South Ossetia have thus far denied the monitors access to the territories under their control. Worse, after Russia recognised the independence of South Ossetia following the 2008 war, the Russian-backed security forces of South Ossetia have been pushing the occupation line deeper into Georgian-controlled territory, which the EUMM could not prevent. In July 2015, the occupation line was moved to within 500 metres of Georgia’s E60 motorway, which is the main road linking Tbilisi to the Black Sea coast. Creeping occupation continued throughout 2016. As of May 2017, there were 52 kilometers of barbed wire fences along the Administrative Boundary Line across the occupied South Ossetia and 48 kilometers along the Administrative Boundary Line across the Occupied Abkhazia. Distance between the boundary line for South Ossetia and the major Georgian East-West highway is 400 meters. The

\(^{38}\) See more on Facilitation of Trade Across the Dividing Lines [http://smr.gov.ge/Uploads/Concept_EN_0eaaaac2e.pdf](http://smr.gov.ge/Uploads/Concept_EN_0eaaaac2e.pdf)
new fence also places a 1.6 kilometre segment of the BP-operated Baku–Supsa pipeline inside the occupied territory.

In March 2017, two crossing points on the Administrative Boundary Line of Abkhazia were closed, which jeopardised confidence-building measures. People across the boundary line are denied access to basic services.

Between 2008 and 2016, around 2,000 people were detained by Russian occupation forces for alleged illegal border crossings of the Administrative Boundary Line of occupied South Ossetia. Some 14,000 cases of detention have been registered across the Administrative Boundary Line of occupied Abkhazia. There have been cases of Georgian citizens being killed (Giga Otkhozoria in May 2016, Archil Tatunashvili in February 2018).

In March 2018, the Parliament of Georgia adopted a bi-partisan resolution condemning Russia’s occupation of Georgian territory. It denounced Russia-supported illegal elections, gross violations of human rights in the occupied regions of Georgia, kidnappings and the continuing hardship of Georgian citizens.

Although the EUMM is still denied access to the occupied regions despite Georgia’s insistence, it remains the only international monitoring and reporting mechanism on the ground.

**Georgia in EU CSDP operations.** Under the Agreement, Georgia and the EU have committed themselves to enhancing their cooperation in crisis management, and in particular Georgia’s participation in EU-led crisis management or training missions conducted under the CSDP. It contributes to the Immediate Reaction Team of the EU’s Military Advisory Mission in the Central African Republic (EUTM RCA). Georgia continues its engagement in the EUTM RCA until September 2018 and is represented by 35 personnel. In 2015, Georgia deployed a representative to the EU Advisory Mission in Ukraine. Georgia continues to be involved in the CSDP Mission in the Republic of Mali. The EU acknowledges Georgia as one of the most active non-member state partners in the CSDP.

**International Criminal Court.** The Association Agreement reaffirms that the prosecution of acts of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity should take place at both the national and international levels. To this end, the Agreement promotes the implementation of the 1998 Rome Statute on the International Criminal Court. The EU-Georgian Association Agenda stipulates cooperation with the Court for investigations into the 2008 war.
Weapons of mass destruction and disarmament. Georgia and the EU have agreed to advance the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction through the ratification and implementation of the relevant international instruments. Their cooperation efforts aim at effectively controlling and combating the illegal arms trade (in line with the Council of the European Union’s Common Position 2008/944/CFSP) and international terrorism (in line with, inter alia, the framework of UN Security Resolution 1373 of 2001).

Foreign and security policy at a glance

Foreign and security policy is a crucial component of EU-Georgia cooperation, given both Georgia’s strategic objective of EU integration and the need to counter security threats posed by Russia.

Since 2011, Georgia has aligned itself with many EU positions adopted in international diplomacy.

The most significant security action by the EU in Georgia so far is its Monitoring Mission (the EUMM) along the occupation lines of the separatist South Ossetian and Abkhazian regions, which began in October 2008 after the war with Russia and has continued since then.

“A Step to a Better Future” is an important recent peace initiative by the Georgian government, aiming at the progressive renewal of interpersonal and commercial relations with the populations of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, in particular in the areas of education and trade. Whether Abkhazia and South Ossetia will respond constructively remains to be seen.

Georgia participates in several CSDP military missions, notably in the Central African Republic and Mali, and in a civilian mission in Ukraine. In this regard, it is one of the most active non-member state partners of the EU.
PART II.
DEEP AND COMPREHENSIVE
FREE TRADE AREA
4. **Market access for goods**

Tariff liberalisation is the basic starting point for creating a free trade area. Georgia is an exceptional case in that it unilaterally and radically liberalised its external trade policies back in 2006. Since the start of the provisional application of the DCFTA on 1 September 2014, the EU has caught up and completed the free trade area with its own tariff liberalisation for imports from Georgia.

**Provisions of the Agreement**

The DCFTA has established a free trade area for trade in goods as part of the EU–Georgia Association Agreement, with provisional application since 1 September 2014.

Both parties have thus abolished import duties for almost all products. Unlike the DCFTAs with Moldova and Ukraine, the Agreement with Georgia does not include transitional periods for the elimination of import duties. That is because of the liberal reforms undertaken earlier by Mikheil Saakashvili’s administration, which in 2006 eliminated import tariffs for most products, making Georgia’s applied most favoured nation (MFN) WTO tariff rate – at 1.5% – one of the lowest worldwide. Quantitative restrictions on imports and exports are also prohibited by the DCFTA, except if allowed by the relevant WTO rules (i.e. Art. XI GATT).

The DCFTA only sees three limited exceptions to the full liberalisation of trade in goods, all in the area of agricultural products. First, the EU will still apply an annual tariff rate quota on just one agricultural product (which is not a major one), namely garlic. Georgia
may export annually 220 tonnes of garlic to the EU tariff-free. The EU’s MFN customs duty rate shall apply to imports exceeding the limit of the tariff rate quota.

Second, certain types of fruits and vegetables are subject to an ‘entry price’ system for imports into the EU (e.g. tomatoes, courgettes and peaches). Under the entry price system, customs duty is composed of two parts: ad valorem duty and specific duty. Through the DCFTA, the ad valorem duty, expressed as a percentage of customs value, is abolished. The specific duty, expressed in €/100 kg, depends on the extent, if any, to which the customs value (invoice price) of the product imported into the EU is below a certain entry price defined by the EU. The level of the specific duty is zero when the customs value of the product is equal to or higher than the entry price. In practice, it seems that in most cases products imported from Georgia will not be subject to the specific duty, as their customs value will be higher than the entry price.

Third, for trade in most (processed) agricultural products, listed in Annex II-C, an “anti-circumvention mechanism” is foreseen. This Annex defines for each category of these products an average annual volume of imports (i.e. a ‘trigger level’). If imports from Georgia into the EU reach 70% of this trigger level in a given year, the EU must notify Georgia about the volume of imports of the products concerned. When 80% of the trigger volume is reached, Georgia can provide the EU with a sound justification that it has the capacity to produce the products or exports to the EU in excess of the volumes set out. In that case Georgia can export to the EU products in excess of the trigger levels free of customs duty. This provision thus does not restrict Georgian exports, but is a safeguard against supplies from third countries passing fraudulently as Georgian products.

The DCFTA also prohibits export duties and includes a standstill clause stating that neither party may increase any existing customs duty or adopt any new customs duty on goods originating in the territory of the other party.

Rules of origin. These are laid down in Protocol I of the Association Agreement. Rules of origin determine when products have been wholly produced in the territory of one of the parties, or when they have been “sufficiently worked or processed” in order to obtain a “certificate [of origin] EUR.1”. An annex to the protocol defines four criteria for ‘sufficient processing’ for each product: i) a change of tariff heading (e.g. a screw will be deemed as originating in Georgia if it is made from imported steel, which is a different tariff heading); ii) a
minimum value added (e.g. for passenger cars, the value of all the non-originating materials used to manufacture the car may not exceed 40% of the total value of the product); iii) specific processing or working requirements determined product by product; or iv) a combination of the first three requirements.

It is important to note that Art. 3 of this protocol envisages ‘diagonal cumulation’ among countries which have free trade agreements with each other and are at the same time members of the Regional Convention on Pan-Euro-Mediterranean (PEM) preferential rules of origin. This means that, for example, a producer in Georgia may manufacture a product from materials imported from Turkey and export this product to the EU as a ‘Georgian product’, provided that more than the minimal processing requirements took place in Georgia and Turkey taken together. However, for this diagonal cumulation to be applicable, Georgia and its respective FTA partners first have to amend their bilateral free trade agreements (FTA) to align them with the EU’s system of rules of origin. Georgia already joined the Regional Convention on Pan-Euro-Mediterranean (PEM) preferential rules of origin. The PEM Convention allows a much wider scope for diagonal cumulation between the EU, Turkey and the countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), the Mediterranean European Neighbourhood Policy and Western Balkans, providing that FTAs are in place, including protocols on rules of origin consisting of identical rules (i.e. as in the PEM protocol on rules of origin).

Implications for Georgia

As already noted, before concluding the EU–Georgia DCFTA, Georgia had and continues to have one of the most liberal foreign trade policies in the world, with zero or low import tariffs, minimal non-tariff regulations and customs procedures facilitating trade. Since 2006, Georgia has undertaken a number of reform initiatives seeking to further streamline, liberalise and simplify trade regulations and their implementation. As a result, today 80% of goods are free from customs duties. Following this unilateral liberalisation of tariffs, imports into Georgia have increased substantially, alongside increased inflows of foreign direct investment, accounting for a large portion of the imports.

Today Georgia enjoys free trade with markets extending across a population of over 2.3 billion, including the EU, EFTA, the CIS, Turkey and China. Negotiations on a free trade agreement with Hong-Kong have been concluded and the agreement was signed in June 2018.
In addition, Georgia is working with India to finalise a joint FTA feasibility study, and considering an FTA with Israel.

As regards the likely impact of the DCFTA, there have been several model-based studies. The latest one, conducted by the European think tanks Ecorys and Case (2012), concluded that in the short term the DCFTA would increase Georgia’s exports to the EU by 9%. Yet after the first year of its provisional application, the situation was somewhat different. Georgia’s exports to the EU in 2015 did increase, but only by 4% (see Table 4.1). Still, this figure is rather favourable compared to the 23% decline in total Georgian exports worldwide. One of the reasons for such a sharp drop was the economic crisis in the CIS region, especially Ukraine and Russia. The significant devaluation of the Georgian Lari, coinciding with the provisional application of the DCFTA, also made it difficult to analyse the real impact of the DCFTA’s application on Georgia’s trade. Georgia’s exports have recovered since September 2016, including exports to the EU, which increased by 13% in 2017 compared to 2016. This was despite the fact that the export of nuts (one of the main export products to the EU) fell by more than 60% due to a bad harvest in 2017. The number of companies exporting to the EU in 2017 increased by 32% compared to 2013, reaching more than 700.

The increase in Georgia’s exports to the EU consisted mainly of industrial products such as copper ores, concentrates and fertilisers. Thus, while exports of agricultural products decreased by 37%, exports of industrial products increased by 44%.

The table below provides statistical data on trade between Georgia and the EU countries in the past ten years, between 2008 and 2017. As the table shows, trade between the EU and Georgia increased more rapidly in the four years before the DCFTA than in the four years after its application. The pace of export and import growth decreased, mainly due to the slowdown in growth, with imports also curbed as a result of the devaluation of the Georgian lari.

---

Table 4.1 Trade turnover between Georgia & EU countries ($ mn), 2008–17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total turnover</td>
<td>7,797</td>
<td>5,609</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>9,259</td>
<td>10,433</td>
<td>10,933</td>
<td>11,463</td>
<td>9,505</td>
<td>9,408</td>
<td>10,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>2,787</td>
<td>2,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth (%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share (%)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total exports</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports to EU</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth (%)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share (%)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total imports</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td>4,476</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>7,072</td>
<td>8,056</td>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>8,602</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>7,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports from EU</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>2,266</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth (%)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share (%)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>-1421</td>
<td>-1093</td>
<td>-1157</td>
<td>-1626</td>
<td>-2076</td>
<td>-1659</td>
<td>-1748</td>
<td>-1436</td>
<td>-1643</td>
<td>-1551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Geostat.
The following two tables provide data on the top-ten export and import products as of 2017.

**Table 4.2 EU–Georgia trade structure by commodity (top 10 products by volume), exports to the EU, 2017 ($ millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Share of total export %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2603</td>
<td>Copper ores and concentrates</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3102</td>
<td>Nuts</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3109</td>
<td>Mineral or chemical fertilisers, nitrogenous</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2709</td>
<td>Crude petroleum oils</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2710</td>
<td>Petroleum oils and oils obtained</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208</td>
<td>Alcoholic beverages</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4011</td>
<td>New pneumatic tyres, of rubber</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7202</td>
<td>Ferro-alloys</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201</td>
<td>Mineral water</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Geostat.

**Table 4.3 EU–Georgia trade structure by commodity (top-ten products by volume), imports, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Share of total imports (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2710</td>
<td>Petroleum oils and oils obtained</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3004</td>
<td>Medicines</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8703</td>
<td>Motor cars</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8704</td>
<td>Motor vehicles for the transport of goods</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8517</td>
<td>Telephone sets</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8471</td>
<td>Automatic data processing machines and units thereof</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8702</td>
<td>Motor vehicles for the transport of ten or more persons</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9018</td>
<td>Medical, surgical instruments and appliances</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208</td>
<td>Alcoholic beverages</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0207</td>
<td>Poultry meat and edible offal</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Geostat.
There have been no noteworthy changes in the export structure by commodity since the entry into force of the DCFTA. No entry price system or anti-circumvention mechanism has yet been applied. Since the application of the DCFTA in 2014, several new products (kiwi, dried lemon, persimmon, blueberry, quince, fruit jams, pet furniture, glass bottles) have been exported to the EU market, but in limited quantities. At this stage many Georgian food products cannot satisfy EU food safety requirements. Georgia needs to approximate EU legislation on sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures in order to receive the necessary recognition of its products by EU authorities. Georgia has already prepared and agreed a legislative approximation list in the SPS field with the European Commission, which envisaged gradual approximation over the period until 2027 (see chapter 8).

At the same time, the overall structure of foreign market shares of Georgian exports has changed substantially since the provisional application of the DCFTA (see Table 4.4). The share of exports to the EU among Georgia’s total exports rose from 20.9% in 2013 to 24% in 2017 (the years before and with the DCFTA respectively), while the CIS share fell over the same period from 55.5% to 43%, due to the very unfavourable economic situation in Ukraine and Russia.

The table below compares Georgia’s trade structure by country and region in 2013 (before the DCFTA) and four years after the entry into force of the DCFTA, in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country or Region</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CIS</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of world</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td>2,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>2,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CIS</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of world</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,011</td>
<td>7,981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Geostat.

As for the import structure, the EU’s share of Georgia’s total imports decreased slightly: 28.3% in 2013 and 28% in 2017 (Table 4.4).
economy’s limited raw-material resources. Activation of diagonal cumulation with Turkey will thus substantially increase the benefits of the DCFTA with regard to export and investment promotion. There is already Turkish investment in the textile industry that is primarily oriented towards exports. It is expected that after enactment of diagonal cumulation, these businesses will further expand and new investment will be attracted.

In order to activate diagonal cumulation, Georgia has acceded to the PEM Convention and signed the relevant amendment to the bilateral free trade agreement with Turkey, which has been already ratified by Georgia. In March 2018 the relevant amendment was made to the DCFTA. Georgia also started consultations on this matter with Ukraine and Moldova as both of them are members of the PEM Convention.

Georgia aspires to export goods that have not yet entered the EU market. It has already begun to work towards EU recognition of priority export goods, such as Georgian honey and fish. But there should be prospects for a far more radical expansion and diversification of Georgian exports to the EU. In this context, the free trade agreement between Georgia and China could be of great importance, when combined with China’s ambitions to develop its transport corridors through to the EU market. China’s so-called ‘One Belt One Road’ programme includes a corridor across Kazakhstan and the Caspian Sea and on to Europe through the South Caucasus and Turkey. Georgia is well placed to profit from these developments, with the possibility that export-oriented Chinese investment could be attracted by the combination of the DCFTA and diagonal cumulation with Turkey.

In this latter respect, Georgia’s situation with the DCFTA may be compared favourably with Armenia’s choice to join the Eurasian Customs Union. This Customs Union prevents Armenia from making a free trade agreement bilaterally with China or any other country, whereas Georgia is free to do so under the DCFTA.
Market access for goods at a glance

With the DCFTA, Georgia and the EU now enjoy almost completely tariff-free trade for exports and imports.

The first year of the DCFTA saw only a modest growth of exports to the EU. But this compares favourably with massive declines in Georgia’s trade with Russia and Ukraine, resulting in a major shift in trade structure in the direction of the EU. Exports to the EU increased in 2017, mainly due to the increased export of industrial products.

The positive effects of the DCFTA are likely to grow significantly over the medium and long term, with ‘diagonal cumulation’ of rules of origin with Turkey and progressive approximation of EU legislation on SPS measures and technical barriers to trade.

Georgia’s free trade agreement with China has entered into force, and could become a location of choice for Chinese direct investment aimed at exports to the EU market. In addition, an FTA was signed with Hong Kong in June 2018. A feasibility study on a prospective Georgia-India FTA is underway and the possibility of an FTA with Israel is being explored. These new developments are a by-product of the EU-Georgia DCFTA, which increases Georgia’s attractiveness as a trade and investment hub connected to the European market.
5. TRADE REMEDIES

This DCFTA chapter includes rules on ‘trade defence’ measures that the EU and Georgia can take against imports from the other party that cause or threaten to cause injury to domestic industry, notably anti-dumping, anti-subsidy and safeguard measures. These DCFTA provisions essentially incorporate the relevant WTO rules.

Anti-dumping and countervailing measures. The DCFTA provisions on anti-dumping and countervailing measures rely on Art. VI of GATT (1994), the WTO Anti-Dumping Agreement, and the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures. If a company exports a product at a price lower than the price it normally charges on its own home market it is considered to be ‘dumping’ the product. The WTO agreement allows governments to act against dumping where there is a ‘material’ injury to the competing domestic industry. But the government must be able to show that dumping is taking place, calculate the extent of dumping (how much lower the export price is compared with the exporter’s home market price), and show that the dumping is causing injury or threatening to do so. The importing country may then impose a countervailing (provisional) duty to correct any damage to its industry.

The DCFTA adds specific features of the EU’s trade defence practices that go beyond the WTO agreements, such as the ‘public interest’ and the ‘lesser duty’ rules. The former implies that a party may decide not to impose anti-dumping or countervailing measures when it is not in the public interest to do so, for example when the interests of consumers or the employment situation would be negatively affected. The lesser duty rule implies that the amount of (provisional) anti-dumping duty cannot be higher than necessary to avoid damage
to the domestic industry. This rule stresses the remedial rather than punitive character of the EU’s approach to trade defence.

Trade defence measures have almost never been adopted in EU–Georgia trade relations, but in December 2015 the European Commission initiated an anti-dumping investigation against certain manganese oxides from Georgia.

**Safeguard measures.** The DCFTA provisions on safeguard measures rely on Art. XIX of GATT (1994) and the WTO Agreement on Safeguards. These rules regulate when and how WTO members may take a safeguard action (e.g. quantitative restrictions or duty increases higher than bound tariffs) to protect a specific domestic industry from an increase in imports of any product that is causing, or threatening to cause, serious injury to the industry. The key difference here, compared with the anti-dumping provisions, is that it does not require finding an ‘unfair’ practice by particular supplying enterprises or countries. Correspondingly, the safeguard action has to be applied to all WTO member states, and the country imposing these measures may have to pay compensation to other members whose trade is affected. This largely explains why anti-dumping measures are used much more than safeguard measures.

Georgia does not have domestic legislation on anti-dumping, countervailing or safeguard measures, as its liberal trade and economic policy has considered lower prices to be beneficial for consumers and has not sought to ‘punish’ trade partners for cheaper imports. Therefore, Georgia has never applied such measures against any of its trade partners, although at the multilateral level it is part of the relevant WTO agreements. The current government has prepared draft legislation on anti-dumping and safeguard measures, but the adoption has been postponed with an unclear timeline.

---

40 It was only in the early 1990s that the EU imposed an anti-dumping duty on ferro-silico-manganese originating in Georgia (Commission Decision 95/418/EC of 26 July 1995 accepting undertakings offered in connection with the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of ferro-silico-manganese originating in Russia, Georgia, Ukraine, Brazil and South Africa and terminating the proceeding against Georgia).

Trade remedies at a glance

There are provisions for anti-dumping, anti-subsidy and safeguard measures to protect the importing economy from serious damage, or threats thereof, based on the relevant WTO rules.

These trade remedies have not been used so far in EU-Georgia trade relations.

Georgia does not have domestic legislation on anti-dumping, countervailing or safeguard measures, in line with its liberal trade and economic policy.
6. CUSTOMS AND TRADE FACILITATION

For the DCFTA to work well there have to be high-quality customs services at the frontiers with efficient and speedy facilitation of traffic, avoiding delays and corruption. This chapter of the DCFTA seeks to fix key principles for customs legislation and procedures, and facilitate operational cooperation between the customs services of the EU and Georgia.

Provisions of the Agreement

The customs chapter is substantive and detailed in terms of key principles, legislative commitments and numerous operational provisions.

Key principles for customs legislation and procedures. At a general level, the EU and Georgia commit to ensure that their customs legislation and procedures shall be stable, transparent and non-discriminatory and shall prevent fraud. They also aim at reducing and simplifying the data and documentation required by customs agencies.

At the legal or operational level, the parties undertake the following commitments:

• Approximate Georgian legislation with the EU’s customs code, establish modern transit conditions and cooperation between customs services (see details below).
• Apply relevant international instruments, including those developed by the World Customs Organization and the revised
Kyoto Convention on the Simplification and Harmonization of Customs Procedures.

- Apply a single administrative document for customs declarations.
- Provide for binding rulings on tariff classification and rules of origin.
- Adopt rules that ensure that any penalties imposed for the breach of customs regulation or procedural requirements are proportionate and non-discriminatory.
- Provide effective and transparent procedures guaranteeing the right of appeal against the administrative rulings and decisions of customs and other agencies.
- Prohibit administrative fees having the equivalent effect of import or export duties.

**Customs code.** Annex XIII states that Georgia has to approximate most provisions of the Community Customs Code (CCC), laid down in Regulation (EEC) 2913/92, within four years after the entry into force of the Agreement. Important provisions of the CCC relate to the status of an authorised economic operator (AEO), origin of goods, transparency rules, customs controls and procedures, methods of customs valuation, customs declaration, the release of goods, storage of goods, free zones and temporary admission of goods. Georgia does not have to implement specific CCC provisions that are only relevant for EU member states (e.g. relating to the EU’s common agricultural policy).

Yet because the CCC was considered outdated, as it still relies heavily on paper-based processes, it was replaced in October 2013 by the Union Customs Code (in Regulation (EU) 952/2013). The new UCC will complete the progression to a paperless and electronic customs environment, and introduce several new procedures. The substantive provisions of the UCC entered into force on 1 May 2016, but there is a transition period until 31 December 2020 to develop new IT systems or to upgrade existing ones. The new procedures will need to be transposed in the DCFTA by the Customs Sub-Committee. Within four years Georgia also has to implement the EU rules on the relief of customs duties, enshrined in Regulation (EC) 1186/2009, and on

---

42 The Regulation entered into force on 30 November 2013 and repealed Regulation (EC) 450/2008. In 2015, the European Commission adopted the Delegated Act and Implementing Act allowing the Union Customs Code to enter into force on 1 May 2016.
actions against goods suspected of, or actually infringing, certain intellectual property rights in Regulation (EU) 608/2013.

_Transit traffic_. The EU and Georgia must ensure the progressive interconnectivity of their respective customs transit systems, with a view to Georgia acceding to the Convention of 20 May 1987 on a common transit procedure (hereinafter referred to as the Common Transit Convention (CTC)), which was amended in 2017 in order to be aligned with the new UCC. This procedure is used for the movement of goods between the 28 EU member states, EFTA countries, Turkey, Serbia and Macedonia. Georgia already has observer status in relation to the CTC and has to approximate legislation to the provisions of the Convention within four years following the entry into force of the Agreement. A crucial step in this regard will be Georgia’s adoption of the CTC’s new computerised transit system (NCTS), which enables an economic operator to submit common transit declarations electronically.43

_Customs cooperation_. The EU and Georgia shall also strengthen their customs cooperation. They have to exchange information concerning customs legislation and procedures, cooperate on the automation of customs procedures, exchange relevant information, best practices and data, cooperate in the planning and delivery of technical assistance, etc. The DCFTA outlines procedures for “Mutual Administrative Assistance in Customs Matters”, annexed in Protocol II of the Association Agreement. It sets out detailed steps for information exchange in cases of suspected or actual fraud in relation to customs legislation. Customs authorities may also provide “spontaneous assistance”.

The DCFTA establishes a Customs Sub-Committee to monitor the implementation and administration of the customs and trade facilitation chapter. This Customs Sub-Committee meets regularly and discusses issues such as legislative and policy developments; the strategic framework for EU-Georgia Customs Cooperation; risk management and the fight against fraud; rules of origin and customs enforcement of intellectual property rights.

Georgia will also have to strengthen its relations with the business community by consulting regularly with trade representatives

---

43 Regarding the accession of EU neighbouring countries to the CTC, see European Commission, Communication, Communication, Strategy to prepare certain neighbouring countries for accession to the 1987 EC-EFTA Conventions on a common transit procedure and the simplification of formalities in trade in goods, COM(2010) 0668 final, Brussels, 18 November 2010.
on legislative proposals and procedures related to customs and trade issues. All customs-related legislation has to be transparent and made publically available, as far as possible through electronic means, and a consultation mechanism should be in place to debate proposals for new or amended customs legislation.

On 4 January 2016, Georgia ratified the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement which has been in force since February 2017. This agreement contains provisions for expediting the movement, release and clearance of goods, including goods in transit. It also sets out measures for effective cooperation between customs and other relevant authorities on trade facilitation and customs compliance issues.

In addition to the DCFTA, the EU and Georgia have developed other instruments for customs cooperation, notably in the context of the Eastern Partnership. For example, in March 2015 the EU and Georgia adopted a strategic framework for customs cooperation. This initiative seeks to step up customs cooperation and to facilitate the implementation of the DCFTA customs rules. The focus of this strategic framework will be on risk management and the fight against fraud, the creation of safe and fluid trade lanes, investment in customs modernisation and improvement of transit. One particular point of interest relates to safe and fluid trade lanes, to achieve maximum trade facilitation and enable reliable business, with customs acting as a link in the supply chain. For example, the EU and Georgia intend to create fast lanes to move pre-approved eligible goods across the border quickly. Recognition of AEOs could be part of this process. In the EU, economic operators can apply for AEO status to benefit from reduced controls and simplified customs procedures. The AEO status is granted to reliable operators that comply with security and safety standards.

**Implementation perspectives**

*Customs services.* Georgia implemented impressive reforms of its customs services starting from 2004, turning one of the most corrupt and complicated customs regimes into a competitive customs system, whereby traders are treated like clients by customs officials. Georgia’s customs policy is in line with the country’s objective to become a regional hub for trade, transit and transport, given its geographical location. The policy included these specific reforms:

44 See “Customs cooperation with Georgia, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine” (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/policy_issues/international_customs_agreements/geomoldukr/index_en.htm).
dramatic reduction of customs duties, whereby 84% of goods are imported customs duty-free, and a cutback of 16 different customs duties to only 3 by 2007, which are set at 0%, 5% and 12% (see chapter 4);

- drastic reduction in the number of documents required for export and import from 54 to only 2;
- increased transparency and the set-up of e-services with full automatisation of all customs operations;
- successful introduction of the customs one-stop shops, where customs procedures are fast and efficient;
- establishment of modern customs-clearance zones, which significantly simplify clearance of goods at the border and cover the whole chain of customs clearance. Customs clearance takes on average 15 minutes where standard procedures apply;
- launch of a risk management system at customs based on risk profiles, random selection and selectivity criteria, which also simplify clearance procedures. Based on the risk level, e-declarations are channelled to different risk corridors;
- introduction of different risk corridors for customs procedures, streamlining the clearance of goods, more specifically,
  - a green corridor, where goods are released immediately and are not subject to any checks, either documentary or physical. Approximately 82% of import declarations and 91% of export declarations are channelled through the green corridor;
  - a blue corridor, where goods are examined after being released (post-clearance control). Approximately 2% of declarations are channelled through the blue corridor for both imports and exports;
  - a yellow corridor, where goods are subject to full documentary checks but no physical examination. Approximately 9% of declarations for imports and 5% for exports are channelled through the yellow corridor; and
  - a red corridor, where goods are subject to both documentary checks and physical examinations. Approximately 7% of declarations for imports and 2% for exports are subject to procedures through the red corridor;
- establishment of a so-called ‘golden list’ of traders, which go through the green corridor;
- physical upgrade and construction of modern customs facilities, and introduction of jointly operated customs checkpoints with neighbouring countries, such as Turkey; and
• institutional unification of the tax and customs authorities into a single entity – the Revenue Service.

Most of the abovementioned reforms were implemented before the provisional entry into force of the DCFTA. Georgia therefore already complies with the key principles for customs legislation and procedures defined in the DCFTA. The reforms in the customs area, notably increasing transparency, reducing customs duties, simplifying clearance and introducing e-procedures, have led to the elimination of corruption at customs.

According to the World Bank’s latest Enterprise Survey (2013), Georgia achieves the best score in almost all areas covered by the indicator on preventing corruption.\(^\text{45}\) The percentage of firms expecting to give gifts to obtain an import licence is 0, compared with 14.6% in Eastern Europe and Central Asia; the average of all 135 countries covered by the survey is 14.7%.

According to the OECD’s Trade Facilitation Indicators (2017), Georgia performs better with respect to simplifying documents, harmonising procedures, automation, governance and impartiality and trade community involvement than (non-OECD) Europe on average, as well as Central Asia and lower-middle-income countries.\(^\text{46}\)

**Approximation process under the DCFTA.** Reforms implemented before the entry into force of the DCFTA have created a solid basis for the effective fulfilment of obligations undertaken through the DCFTA and for a smooth transition to EU customs norms.

Approximation of Georgian customs legislation, procedures and systems has started and is in progress. New customs legislation in accordance with Community Customs Code (CCC) has been drawn up and discussed among governmental bodies, with the private sector and all interested parties. Draft customs legislation has also been shared with the EU. But as noted above, the CCC was replaced with the Union Customs Code (UCC) and in light of this new development Georgia is now in the process of revising draft customs legislation in order to bring it in compliance with the UCC, which will have to be agreed with the EU.


Georgia is working on acceding to the CTC (see above) and to the Convention on simplification of formalities in trade in goods. A relevant action plan has been elaborated and Georgia is moving forward with its implementation. Efforts are underway to identify the legislative changes needed to simplify transit procedures with countries that are parties to the CTC, and to introduce the NCTS.

The Revenue Service is working on introducing a mechanism in Georgia for Authorised Economic Operators (AEO), which makes simplified customs procedures possible for certified enterprises, especially those engaged in regular cross-border supply chain operations. The relevant legislative changes have already been adopted and the work is underway on secondary implementing legislation.

To further streamline the risk-based customs control system, work is in progress on the Advance Passenger Information/Passenger Name Records. The relevant legislative amendments have been introduced to the Tax Code of Georgia. Work is underway to draft and adopt the secondary implementing legislation.

In the process of implementing the DCFTA, Georgia is benefiting from various EU assistance projects, such as TAIEX and Twinning, dedicated to capacity building of the customs authority, sharing experience and best practices of EU member states, as well as approximating legislation and improving infrastructure. Georgia actively participates in Integrated Border Management, a flagship initiative of the Eastern Partnership, and its pilot projects, the Customs 2020 Programme and the training, capacity-building efforts and seminars provided by the World Customs Organization.

**Diagonal Cumulation.** DCFTA envisages the possibility of diagonal cumulation with the members of the Convention on Pan-Euro-Mediterranean (PEM) Rules of Origin. Diagonal cumulation allows countries that have a free trade agreement to cumulate origin of goods among each other. Georgia acceded to the PEM convention on 1 July 2017. In line with the PEM convention, activation of diagonal cumulation requires that the PEM rules of origin be included in bilateral FTAs. Georgia has already started this process with Turkey and the EU. The relevant decision amending the Georgia-Turkey FTA was signed on 27 October 2016. Georgia has already ratified the amendment and Turkey is in the process of ratification. Diagonal cumulation will not apply in this case to agricultural products because the EU-Turkey Customs Union does not cover such products, only industrial goods. The EU-Georgia Customs Subcommittee has made a decision on revising Protocol I to the Association Agreement and in
March 2018 the relevant amendment was made to the DCFTA. As for Georgia’s other FTA partners, which are also PEM Convention members, consultations have started with Ukraine and Moldova. Georgia’s FTA with European Free Trade Association (EFTA) already includes a reference to the PEM rules of origin.

Activation of diagonal cumulation between Georgia, the EU and Turkey is important for developing local industries in Georgia as a small country with limited raw-material resources.

**Customs services at a glance**

Georgia implemented significant reforms in customs policy for trade facilitation well before the signature of the Association Agreement and DCFTA.

*The DCFTA includes key measures to ensure fast, efficient and transparent customs services. Georgia is advancing well towards fulfilling its legislative and institutional commitments, among others approximating its legislation to the Union Customs Code recently adopted by the EU.*

*A high level of transparency and well-developed e-services have made Georgian customs corruption-free and one of the most efficient institutions in the country.*

*A well-developed and fully modernised infrastructure for customs clearance has made customs procedures easier, faster and cheaper.*

*Georgia acceded to the PEM Convention in July 2017, thus opening new opportunities for diagonal cumulation of origin between Georgia and its trade partners who are also members of the PEM and have FTAs with each other.*
7. TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR INDUSTRIAL GOODS

As the customs tariffs will almost fully disappear between the EU and Georgia, non-tariff technical barriers to trade (TBT), such as technical standards and safety requirements, will become the main obstacle to trade. To tackle these technical barriers, Georgia will approximate its legislation to the relevant EU legislation, standards and procedures. This will be a long and complex operation, but one that will increase the potential for Georgian industrial production to become more modernised and internationally competitive.

Provisions of the Agreement

Basic features of the EU system. While the system is highly complex and has been changing over time, its basic features can be simply described. There is a two-tier system:

- First, there is a limited amount of EU harmonised legislation, of which a few ‘horizontal’ regulations or directives cover the general methodology and institutional framework, and around 30 harmonised directives (under the EU’s ‘New Approach’ and ‘Global Approach’) that cover broad, ‘sectoral’ product groups, such as machinery, lifts, medical devices and low pressure vessels. For these product groups, the directives outline just the ‘essential requirements’ related to health and safety that products have to meet before they can be placed on the EU market. The precise means for meeting these requirements are dealt with by relevant standards.
Second, there is a very large number of around 5,000[^47] product-specific ‘harmonised standards’, providing the technical means to comply with the essential health and safety requirements defined in the sectoral product directives. These standards are produced at the request of the European Commission by one of the three technical organisations (CENELEC for electrical products, ETSI for telecommunications equipment and CEN for the largest number of other products).[^48] When the Commission is satisfied with the proposed standards, it publishes them in the *Official Journal of the European Union*, so they then have official status as ‘harmonised’, which are presumed to meet the essential requirements of the applicable directive. The three technical organisations have produced as many as 25,000 standards in all, including the 5,000 harmonised standards.

An overview of the harmonised standards, grouped by the sectoral product directives, can be found on the website of the European Commission.[^49] For example, for the important category of ‘machinery’, the relevant directive that defines the health and safety requirements is listed, followed by several hundred harmonised standards for specific products or components.

The qualitative difference between the directives and standards is that while the directives are binding laws that set the safety and health requirements, the relevant standards outline the ways and means of achieving those requirements. The harmonised standards, while having official recognition, are voluntary for manufacturers, which may choose either to apply them or to use their own specifications. In the latter case, however, the burden of proof shifts to the manufacturer to prove the ‘conformity’ of the approach it chooses to meet the requirements of the directive. It is usually a more costly procedure than applying the harmonised EU standards, which give the presumption of automatic conformity with the relevant directive.

[^47]: Author’s calculation on the basis of the data included in the 2014 annual report of the three European standardisation organisations; see also CENELEC (www.cencenelec.eu/Pages/default.aspx) and ETSI (http://www.etsi.org/).

[^48]: CENELEC refers to the European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardisation, ETSI stands for the European Telecommunications Standards Institute and CEN refers to the European Committee for Standardisation.

When placing a product on the EU market covered by the EU’s harmonised legislation, the manufacturer has to draw up and sign an EU Declaration of Conformity. In this declaration, the manufacturer ensures and declares (or in some specific cases a third party assesses) that the products concerned satisfy the essential requirements of the relevant product directives and that the applicable procedures for conformity assessment have been followed. By drawing up the EU Declaration of Conformity, the manufacturers assume responsibility for the compliance of the product. A conformity assessment body, accredited or recognised in the EU, must verify the compliance of the product with the relevant directive requirements and issue a certificate of conformity. Only then can the manufacturer affix the Conformité Européenne (CE) marking to the product. Products bearing the CE marking are presumed to be in compliance with the applicable EU legislation and benefit from free circulation in the EU market.

**Horizontal directives.** Georgia has committed itself to approximating the principles and practices of the relevant, horizontal EU legislation. Annex III-B to the DCFTA includes a list of horizontal EU laws that give non-exhaustive guidance for Georgia’s approximation with EU legislation. This Annex leaves some flexibility for Georgia, as no strict implementation deadlines are included. Important horizontal EU laws that are included in this list are two legal acts of 2008 known as the ‘New Legislative Framework’, namely Decision 768/2008/EC on a common framework for the marketing of products, and Regulation (EC) 765/2008 on the requirements for accreditation and market surveillance. The decision sets out a common framework of general principles and reference provisions for the marketing of products. It establishes criteria for EU sectoral legislation by providing the definitions of fundamental concepts (e.g. what is “placing on the market” and what are “harmonised standards”). It also defines the obligations for manufacturers, importers and distributors, and defines several “modules” of conformity assessment procedures, which are explained further below together with the accreditation requirements.

In addition, Georgia is required to approximate Directive 2001/95/EEC on general product safety and Directive 85/374/EEC on liability for defective products. The directive on general product safety imposes general safety requirements on any product placed on the market and outlines the criteria for considering a product to be safe. Georgia has to ensure that producers comply with these rules and monitor product compliance with the applicable EU requirements. It will have to identify products that pose a serious risk to health and
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safety, and prohibit such products from being marketed. The directive on liability for defective products establishes the principle of objective liability, or liability without fault, of the producer in cases of damage caused by a defective product. The directive also specifies the exemptions of producers from liability in several circumstances.

**Sectoral directives.** Georgia will approximate the sectoral EU directives listed in Annex III-A of the DCFTA, which reflect Georgia’s priorities as defined in the government’s strategy document of March 2010. This Annex includes 21 sectoral directives (harmonised, under the New and Global Approaches) covering a wide range of products, such as machinery, lifts, the safety of toys, medical devices and simple pressure vessels. These sectoral directives have to be approximated within four, five or eight years after the entry into force of the Agreement. The sectoral directives define for each product group the ‘essential’ health and safety requirements and the specific conformity assessment procedures to be followed (explained further below). This approximation task is complicated by the fact that several EU acts listed in Annex III-A have been recast or repealed by new acts since the Agreement was negotiated. A draft decision of the EU-Georgia Association Committee in Trade Configuration on updating Annex III-A is already prepared and is under discussion between the parties.


51 The EU adopted and notified to Georgia the following acts:

- Recreational Craft and Personal Watercraft Directive 2013/53/EU,
- Low Voltage Directive 2014/35/EU,
- Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive 2014/30/EU,
- Directive 2014/34/EU, on equipment and protective systems intended for use in potentially explosive atmospheres,
- Lifts Directive 2014/33/EU,
- Simple Pressure Vessels Directive 2014/29/EU,
- Measuring Instruments Directive 2014/32/EU,
- Non-Automatic Weighing Instruments Directive 2014/31/EU
- Radio Equipment Directive 2014/53/EU,
- Pressure Equipment Directive 2014/68/EU,
- Cableway Installations Regulation (EU) 2016/424,
- Personal Protective Equipment Regulation (EU) 2016/425,
- Appliances burning gaseous fuels Regulation(EU) 2016/426,
- Medical Devices Regulation (EU) 2017/745,
- In Vitro Diagnostic Medical Devices Regulation (EU) 2017/746.
European standards. The Agreement requires Georgia to adopt the corpus of European standards, which consists of 25,000 European standards (i.e. all the standards developed by CEN, CENELEC and ETSI, including the 5,000 harmonised standards). Clearly, this is a huge task, but because the Agreement does not provide a timeframe for transposing the standards, Georgia will be able to prioritise its transposition efforts. Georgia is also required to repeal any conflicting national standards, including conflicting GOST standards (Gosstandart, i.e. standards whose origins were from the Soviet Union).

Georgia has to ensure that its relevant national bodies participate fully in the European and international organisations for standardisation and conformity assessment, including accreditation. In particular, Georgia is obliged to progressively fulfil the membership conditions for the European standardisation organisations CEN, CENELEC and ETSI.

Conformity and surveillance procedures. The Agreement envisages wide-ranging cooperation between the two parties in the fields of market surveillance and conformity assessment procedures. Moreover, the parties have to promote cooperation between their respective organisations, public or private, responsible for these matters.

As noted above, Georgia will approximate the principles laid down in Decision 768/2008/EC on a common framework for the marketing of products. This decision establishes a highly complex set of differentiated models (the “modules” referred to in the text) for conformity assessment procedures. The sectoral directives covering different product groups identify which module of conformity assessment is required. For certain groups of products that present a high risk to the public interest (e.g. pressure vessels, lifts and certain machine tools), a conformity assessment by a third party is required before placing the product on the market. These third parties are laboratories, inspection and certification bodies that are known generally as conformity assessment bodies or more formally as ‘notified bodies’. Georgia will have to ensure that its notified bodies offer all guarantees of independence, objectivity, confidentiality and professional integrity. For various low-risk products, the manufacturer can make its own ‘declaration of conformity’.

Georgia will also approximate Regulation (EC) 765/2008 mentioned above, which lays down rules on the requirements for accreditation of conformity assessment bodies and for market surveillance of products to ensure that products placed on the EU
market fulfil the specific health and safety requirements defined in the sectoral EU legislation. This regulation includes detailed rules on how a national accreditation body (i.e. the body that evaluates whether a conformity assessment body meets the specific requirements) should be organised. There has to be a single national accreditation body, operating with impartiality and objectivity, and on a non-profit basis.

In addition, Georgia will have to develop and maintain surveillance authorities that monitor and verify whether products placed on its market meet the EU’s health and safety requirements. These market authorities must test the characteristics of products through documentary, physical and laboratory checks. The surveillance authorities must have the competence to withdraw products from the market that present a serious risk. However, a decision to withdraw products from the market has to be proportionate to the risk related to health and safety, communicated to the relevant economic operators and state the exact grounds on which it is based. Moreover, in such a case, Georgia will have to notify the European Commission of the decision and notify it to the Rapid Alert System for dangerous non-food products (RAPEX).

The DCFTAs signed with Moldova and Ukraine envisage the conclusion of Agreements on Conformity Assessment and Acceptance of Industrial Products (ACAAs), but this is absent from the Georgian DCFTA. ACAAs are specific types of mutual recognition agreements envisaged by the EU for the eastern or southern parts of the European Neighbourhood Policy and the Western Balkan countries. By concluding an ACAA, the parties agree that the industrial products to be listed in the annexes of an ACAA, fulfilling the requirements for being lawfully placed on the market of one party, may be placed on the market of the other party without additional testing and conformity assessment procedures. Before concluding an ACAA, the partner states would first have to fully implement their obligations related to the EU’s directives, including the harmonised standards, and accreditation and conformity assessment institutions, as described above. The key point about the ACAA is that while it has the advantage of assuring access to the EU market without requiring conformity assessment beyond what is performed in the exporting country for its home market, it has the disadvantage that the partner state has to require EU standards for its imports from third countries. In Georgia’s case, this requirement will be a constraining factor for cheaper imports of industrial goods from certain markets such as China or the CIS. The latter consideration is why Georgia opted not to include a commitment on including ACAAs in its Agreement.
Implementation perspectives

**Legislative approximation.** In line with its TBT Strategy and Programme (Decree No. 965, 16.7.2010) in 2011 Georgia started to implement the sectoral legislation of the 21 New Approach directives, followed by the relevant harmonised standards.

So far, and in accordance with the schedule of the TBT Programme, Georgia has adopted national regulations based on six sectoral, New Approach directives that cover the following products:

- cableway installations designed to carry persons (Decree No. 320, 15.8.2011);
- lifts (Decree No. 289, 20.7.2011);
- pressure equipment (Decree No. 51, 19.6.2013);
- efficiency requirements for new hot-water boilers fired with liquid or gaseous fuels (Decree No. 49, 17.6.2013);
- simple pressure vessels (Decree No. 50, 19.6.2013); and
- recreational craft (Decree No. 52, 31.12.2013).

The two horizontal EU directives, on general product safety and on liability for defective products, have also been approximated in Georgian legislation, namely in the Code on Product Safety and Free Movement of Goods. Market surveillance of products placed on the market is based on relevant legislation and technical regulations for the specific product groups (i.e. regulated areas). In line with Regulation (EC) 765/2008, the draft amendments to the Product Safety and Free Movement Code has been prepared and submitted to the Parliament of Georgia in 2018. Amendments introduce market surveillance procedures and relevant sanctions in order to upgrade market surveillance system in line with best EU practice.

According to the draft decision of the EU-Georgia Association Committee in Trade Configuration on updating Annex III-A most legislative approximation obligations taken by Georgia apply starting from 2019. Therefore, approximation work has not been very intensive so far. In 2019 Georgia’s legislation will be approximated to:

- Directive 2009/48/EC on the safety of toys,
- Directive 98/37/EC relating to machinery,
- Regulation (EU) 2016/425 on personal protective equipment,
- Regulation (EU) 2016/426 on appliances burning gaseous fuels, Directive 2014/53/EU on radio equipment,
- Directive 2014/34/EU on equipment and protective systems intended for use in potentially explosive atmospheres, and

**Standards.** In the period from 2009 (when the preparation process for the DCFTA negotiations began) to the end of 2017, the total number of international and European standards adopted by Georgia reached 11,700.

From 2012, the annual Standards Programme of the Georgian National Agency for Standards and Metrology was implemented and renewed according to the Code of Good Practice of the TBT agreement. The adoption of international and European standards as Georgian ones has taken place according to best practices in this field, which means their adoption either by the ‘cover sheet’ method (i.e. without translation of the body text into Georgian) or by full translation.

Out of the total number of registered Georgian standards, around 98% are international and European standards and only about 2% are original Georgian standards, which were developed for specific Georgian products.

According to the Code on Product Safety and Free Movement of Goods, all standards are voluntary. The following types of standards can be used in Georgia:

- international and regional (CIS) standards;
- the standards of any EU or OECD member state;
- Georgian standards, in areas not covered by the above; and
- Georgian company standards.

Georgian producers are entirely free to manufacture products for export to third country markets according to those countries’ own technical standards. On the import side, for almost a decade Georgia has unilaterally accepted products of a group of countries if conformity assessment documents are issued in accordance with a due legal procedure. These countries are listed in a Georgian government decree and include countries with ‘developed quality infrastructures’, and notably as indicated above, OECD and EU member states.

GOST standards are still used in Georgia on a voluntary basis, according to the 1998 Agreement signed by CIS countries on the Implementation of Agreed Policies in the Fields of Standardization, Certification and Metrology of CIS countries. Georgian companies interested in exporting goods to CIS countries can use the GOST standards.

**Conformity assessment.** According to the government’s policy, conformity assessment of a product is recognised if relevant documents
are issued in accordance with a due legal procedure of a country with a ‘developed quality infrastructure’ without any additional procedures’, meaning in practice OECD countries. Assessment can be conducted by the conformity assessment body accredited in Georgia, or accredited in countries that are signatory parties to the Mutual Recognition Arrangement/Multilateral Recognition Arrangement.

The Georgian side is working on the sectoral approximation of legislation, and after that, if needed, specific sectors for which ACAAs might be concluded will be identified.

**Accreditation.** Reforms in the Georgian accreditation system started in 2005, when, in line with international best practice, the accreditation process was institutionally separated from standardisation. Accreditation is given by the national accreditation body – the Georgian Accreditation Centre (GAC).

The GAC undertakes accreditation in accordance with international standards in both regulated areas (where accreditation is mandatory) and non-regulated ones (where accreditation is not mandatory), i.e. voluntary areas. It operates in accordance with the international standard ISO 17011, and its goal is to carry out the accreditation process based on best practice and the guideline documents of the relevant, specialised international organisations.\(^{52}\) Moreover, GAC operations almost fully comply with Regulation (EC) 765/2008 (explained above).

In May 2017 the GAC signed a Bilateral Recognition Agreement with the European Cooperation for Accreditation (EA). The agreement recognises the Georgian Accreditation Center (GAC) in the following areas:

- Testing and calibration (ISO/IEC 17025)
- Product Certification (ISO/IEC 17065)
- Certification of personnel (ISO/IEC 17024)
- Inspection (ISO/IEC 17020)

In line with the above Agreement, conformity assessment documents (certificates and laboratory test protocols) issued by organisations accredited by GAC are recognised in the EU, which reduces the cost of certification of local production and contributes to the increase of competitiveness of products from Georgia. Thanks to this Agreement it

\(^{52}\) Notably, these are the European Cooperation for Accreditation (EA), International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation and International Accreditation Forum.
is now possible to obtain internationally recognised conformity assessment certificates in Georgia for such products as mineral water, non-alcoholic beverages, canned fruit and vegetables and furniture, among others.

**Market surveillance.** The Technical and Construction Inspection Agency (TCIA) is the main market surveillance authority and has the power to take all appropriate measures if products pose a serious risk, such as withdrawing them from the market.

The TCIA conducts supervision of technically hazardous products, such as cranes, pressure vessels, cableway installations, lifts, main oil and gas pipelines and mine extracting sites (pits and quarries).

**Conclusion.** Georgia has been careful to address technical regulations and standards for industrial products in a manner that does not prejudice its liberal trade policy, or impose excessively burdensome timetables for approximation to EU regulations and standards. In particular, Georgia has legislated to accept products certified to be in conformity with the technical regulations of any OECD country. Furthermore, it has not committed to make ACAAs with the EU that would impose conditions on Georgia’s imports from third countries. The language of its commitments to adopt European standards speak of “best endeavours” to “gradually achieve approximation” (in Article 47), with periods for the implementation of many EU laws of five to eight years after the entry into force of the Agreement.
Technical standards for industrial goods at a glance

Adoption of EU technical regulations and standards for industrial products is vital for the modernisation and competitiveness of Georgian products. Georgia’s roadmap for this domain is defined in a comprehensive strategy and programme for legislative action adopted by the government. Georgia has been careful not to enter into commitments such as for ACAAs that might prejudice its liberal trade policy or impose excessively burdensome timetables for adoption European standards.

Georgia is making advances towards approximating the EU’s ‘New Approach’ directives according to the agreed timeline, which in many cases can extend from five to eight years after entry into force of the Agreement.

The authorities responsible for standards, metrology and accreditation have made good progress in modernising their infrastructure, internal legislation and procedures for similarity with the EU.
8. FOOD SAFETY REGULATIONS

This chapter of the Agreement has the objective of facilitating trade in agricultural and food commodities and plants covered by sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) regulations, while safeguarding human, animal and plant life or health (Art. 181). The key mechanism for doing so is for Georgia to gradually approximate its SPS legislation with that of the EU, with procedures to establish effective equivalence. The Agreement also aims at reaching a “common understanding” on animal welfare standards.

Provisions of the Agreement

Approximation. The Agreement does not itself define the list of laws to be approximated, and instead requires Georgia to submit within six months of its entry into force “a comprehensive strategy” for their gradual implementation (and thus to complete Annex XI-B). The products to be covered are listed (in Annex IV-A), including live animals and animal products.

Underlining perhaps a further degree of flexibility in the Agreement, beyond the gradual approximation, is this legally somewhat ambiguous statement: “This approximation list shall serve as a reference document for the implementation of this chapter” (Art. 55.4).

Equivalence. Rules are established for recognising the equivalence of measures taken by Georgia with those of the EU, or for groups of measures, for sectors or subsectors, and commodities or groups of commodities. The process shall be launched by the exporting
party based on the “objective demonstration of equivalence” and the “objective assessment of this demonstration” by the importing party. This process should be interactive. It is then for the importing party to determine equivalence, or not, or to withdraw or suspend equivalence, based on internationally recognised standards or proper scientific evidence. Verifications may be made by the importing party, for which there are detailed rules. Where equivalence is recognised there will be a reduction of physical checks at frontiers and simplified procedures.

**Trade conditions.** When the approximation has been fully undertaken the import conditions for the products or sectors in question shall apply to the whole territory of Georgia as an exporting country (Art. 60). Yet this still requires that enterprises wishing to export to the EU obtain certification from the “competent authority” of Georgia, which has to guarantee that the establishment meets relevant health requirements of the EU, and has the power to suspend the establishment’s listing in the case of non-compliance.

**Pests and animal diseases.** There are detailed provisions for handling problems of animal or plant diseases and pests. The diseases and pests in question are listed. Procedures are established to recognise the pest-free status of given regions for the purpose of trade. In addition, there are procedures for notifying risks to public, animal or plant health owing to diseases.

**Safeguard measures.** Where the importing country needs to take measures to control a serious health hazard or risk, it may take provisional restrictive measures affecting imports, but these have to be suitable or proportional to the risks in order to minimise the disruption of trade.

**SPS Subcommittee of the Association Council.** This subcommittee has the task of reviewing the implementation of the SPS chapter, and may inter alia decide upon modifications to the annexes. Decisions shall be taken on the basis of consensus of the parties.

**Pre-existing import arrangements.** The EU maintains a comprehensive system for the regulation of imports of agri-food products from third countries to assure their compliance with its SPS requirements, notably under Regulation (EC) 854/2004 on rules for the organisation of controls of products of animal origin. In particular, this regulation allows for individual exporting enterprises to be recognised as being in conformity with EU regulations even though this may not be the case for the whole sector and not, for example, for enterprises that do not export.
These enterprise-specific arrangements are currently used by many countries, including Ukraine and Moldova, which have numerous approved enterprises. Recently, a few Georgian companies (i.e. fishery products and animal skin processing) were also approved by the EU. This is because since 2009, as part of the DCFTA preparation process, Georgia has been setting up relevant EU-style institutions in the SPS field and approximating its food safety legislation to that of the EU, but this is a lengthy and complex process. Between 2006 and 2009, in the context of economic deregulation reforms and the fight against corruption, the old Soviet-style institutions and SPS procedures were abolished or suspended to reduce a regulatory burden on enterprises.

The EU provides substantial technical assistance and capacity building in the SPS field through various initiatives. For example, a Comprehensive Institutional Building Programme (with EU funding of €2.7 million) will support the National Food Agency (NFA) of Georgia, a twinning project supports the Revenue Service of Georgia (€1 million) to improve the food safety border controls and a project with the UN’s Food and Agriculture Organization assists Georgia in controlling the foot and mouth animal disease.

**Implementation perspectives**

Georgia’s agricultural sector employs around 50% of the total workforce, including a large share of the socially vulnerable population. The agricultural sector is also characterised by a large number of small subsistence farms: 95% of farmers are small, i.e. own about a hectare of land and approximately two to three cows per family on average, with low levels of efficiency and limited income (see also chapter 22). Taking these basic facts into account, the introduction of EU food safety standards needs to be done carefully and gradually (on which see further below).

**Preparing for the DCFTA.** Prior to starting the DCFTA negotiations, Georgia’s legislative framework and implementation practices were quite different from the relevant EU legislation or international best practice. Therefore, in 2009 the EU requested that Georgia fulfil a number of preconditions before the start of negotiations on the DCFTA, which were launched at the end of 2011.

As a result, the government adopted a Comprehensive SPS Strategy and Legislative Approximation Programme in December 2010, substantially streamlined its SPS, veterinary and plant protection legislation, and approximated it with the EU’s major horizontal legislation. The registration of food business operators, both legal
persons and individual entrepreneurs, had already begun in February 2010.

In July 2010, implementation began of suspended provisions of the law on inspections of food business operators and traceability control. At first, only food business operators exporting to the EU were subject to SPS inspections. In a second stage, since January 2011, inspections and traceability controls have been extended to cover all food business operators, which are legal persons. Currently, the NFA undertakes onsite inspections for all kinds of food/feed business operators. Onsite inspections are done without prior notification to business operators, but planned on the basis of risk assessment. According to the latest data, in 2014 the NFA undertook 5,184 onsite inspections.

Georgia adopted the Code on Food/Feed Safety, Veterinary and Plant Protection and legal acts on the following main issues:

1. general hygiene rules for food/feed-producing enterprises or distributors;
2. specific hygiene rules for animal-origin food;
3. monitoring and state control for food safety, veterinary and plant protection areas;
4. rules on the destruction of food/feed; and
5. a general plan for crisis management in the field of the food/feed safety.

**DCFTA implementation.** Georgia is continuing to implement reforms to SPS standards, with an ongoing approximation process that includes the following matters:

1. approval of food business operators;
2. food labelling for the information of consumers;
3. a rule for controlling the levels of pests and agrochemicals in food/feed;
4. registration and identification of animals;
5. official control of animal-origin products;
6. preventive and quarantine measures for contagious animal diseases;
7. veterinary inspection of animals designated for slaughtering;
8. registration and state control of veterinary medicines;
9. requirements on traceability in food safety, veterinary and plant protection; and
10. technical regulations for milk, dairy products and honey.
Thus, the main horizontal (core) EU regulations are already approximated, but substantial legislative work needs to be done to approximate vertical (i.e. product-by-product) regulations.

To aid completion of the whole process of aligning SPS legislation, the Agreement requires (in Art. 55) that no later than six months after its entry into force, Georgia should submit a list (as defined in Annex IV) of EU SPS, animal welfare and other legislative measures that it will approximate. The list should be divided into priority areas and identify products where trade should be facilitated. The government authorities accordingly revised the 2010 SPS Legislative Approximation Programme and in cooperation with EU experts prepared the SPS approximation list that became part of the Agreement in March 2017 following a decision of the EU-Georgia SPS subcommittee, thus amending Annex XI-B of the AA. The approximation list has three parts:

- food safety – 101 EU regulations;
- veterinary – 84 EU regulations; and
- plant protection – 87 EU regulations.

The regulations should be gradually approximated and almost all of them within a decade. The SPS approximation list is divided into priority areas, as reflected in the approximation timetable. High priority regulations will be approximated in the first years of approximation.

In line with above-mentioned list, Georgia’s SPS legislation has already been approximated to 72 EU legal acts in food safety, veterinary and plant protection fields. Due to these approximation efforts the situation has started to improve in several respects, especially the traceability of animal origin products. In 2015 animal identification and registration started, with over one million animals having been registered. In addition, the requirement for HACCP (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points) has been introduced for slaughterhouses and milk-processing firms. The approval of animal origin food processing business operators started from 1 January 2016. So far, 211 business operators have been approved and 396 operators provisionally approved. In parallel, technical regulations on milk, dairy produce, honey and labelling of bovine animal products have been introduced.

The government is working to obtain approval of animal origin products for export to EU member states. For the export of animal-origin products there are requirements to obtain “recognition of equivalence”. According to Art. 57 of the Agreement, equivalence may
be recognised in relation to an individual SPS measure, for a group of SPS measures or a system applicable to a sector, subsector, commodities or a group of commodities. Georgia must notify the EU as soon as approximation is achieved in relation to a measure, a group of measures or a system. This must be the basis for Georgia to initiate requests for recognition of equivalence of the measures concerned. The consultation process in response to a request should begin within three months. The EU must finalise the process within 360 days.

The Agreement envisages the possibility of provisional approval of establishments.\(^{53}\) This gives the possibility to establishments already in compliance with EC regulations to export their products to EU member states.

Notably, Georgia has some first success stories with regard to EU recognition of animal origin products. In 2017 the EU added Georgia to the list of third countries that are allowed to export honey, Black Sea fish and fish products to the EU. In these cases, sector-wide recognition by the EU has taken place. In addition, wool and animal skin can be exported to the EU where recognition has taken place at the enterprise, but not at the sector level. The actual benefits of this recognition can be evaluated once the trade data in the post-recognition period becomes available.

**Institutional infrastructure of “competent authorities”**. The institutional framework of the food safety system in Georgia consists of a number of institutions, whose efficient coordination is essential.

The Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for policymaking in the field of food safety, whereas the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Protection is responsible for participating in efforts to set food safety parameters and norms, and contributing to crisis management.

The NFA under the Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for food safety supervision, monitoring and control, including onsite planned and ad hoc inspection, documentary checks, sampling for testing, monitoring and surveillance. The NFA is also responsible for exercising state control over the compliance of food/feed at all stages of production, processing and distribution with the requirements determined by Georgia’s legislation.

---

\(^{53}\) See the Association Agreement, Annex VII, “Provisional Approval of Establishments”.

The Revenue Service under the Ministry of Finance is responsible for compliance with SPS regulations at the external borders of Georgia.

A crucial component of the SPS institutional system is a set of public and private laboratories for testing and verification. The majority of public laboratories are responsible for veterinary and disease control. As for the private laboratories, they provide testing for food, alcohol and non-alcoholic drinks. Laboratories are accredited by the Georgian Accreditation Centre, which operates in accordance with recognised international standards. The laboratory of the Ministry of Agriculture was accredited in March 2014 by the American National Accreditation Board. This means that the results of testing are recognised internationally.

**Main challenges of the legislative approximation process.** The SPS chapter of the DCFTA amounts to an ambitious, extensive and costly process of legislative approximation. These high compliance costs are a particular concern for small businesses and farmers, whose production capacities are limited and which do not have any real prospect of exporting to the EU in the near future. For example, the introduction of general hygiene rules for food business operators imposes requirements regarding the design, structure and operational processes of farms and enterprises. As mentioned above, 95% of Georgian farms are very small, and there is a risk that they may not comply with EU requirements.

---

54 The Accreditation Centre offers accreditation of conformity assessment bodies in different fields according to the following standards:

- ISO/IEC 17025:2006 General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories;
- EN 45011 or ISO/IEC Guide 65 General requirements for bodies operating product certification systems;
- ISO/IEC 17021 Conformity assessment – Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems; and
- ISO/IEC 17024 Conformity assessment – General requirements for bodies operating certification of persons.

55 The American National Accreditation Board provides accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025 testing, calibration and forensics laboratories; ISO/IEC 17020 inspection bodies and forensic inspection agencies; ISO/IEC 17043 proficiency testing providers; ISO Guide 34 reference material producers; and industry-specific programmes. The Board also accredits ISO/IEC 17021 certification bodies.
Notably, EU legislation provides for exemptions if a) goods are sold on the local market, b) traditional methods are used and c) food is produced in geographically constrained areas, as could be the case for high mountain areas in Georgia.

Yet at the same time, in practice some EU regulations are being transposed in Georgia in the local legislation without taking local sensitivities into account. For example, the Georgian parliament has amended the Code on Food/Feed Safety, Veterinary and Plant Protection, according to which official control of natural persons active in agriculture through subsistence farming should start in January 2020. This amended legislation is silent on the issues of special measures for the cases mentioned above. That means that the NFA may from 2020 undertake onsite inspections of persons who have, for instance, two hens and two cows, and these persons will be responsible for setting up modern food safety systems in their households. The NFA actually would need to inspect the houses of these families, as most of them do not have farm buildings and facilities. The 2020 timeframe, however, is sufficiently far off for this issue to be further considered, and for a suitable regime of exemptions to be defined for the special categories in question.

As regards the timelines for approximation, certain relatively complex regulations are being approximated ahead of schedule, for example the law on the labelling of GMO-designated food/feed and GMO-origin products. A prudent approach is advisable, especially in areas involving significant compliance costs for the private sector and food business operators, and especially where Georgia has no obligation of approximation at a fixed point in time.

The public authorities responsible for food safety in Georgia have substantial powers for conducting official checks, and with the legislative approximation process these powers have been further increased, with corresponding risks of corruption. Preventive measures are called for. For example, for avoiding corruption risks, in 2010 the government elaborated checklists, whereby inspectors are obliged to conduct inspections based on the predetermined questionnaires, and any irregularities have to be agreed and co-signed by the business operator and the inspector representing the NFA.

Thus, overall, a considerable effort is needed to ensure the smooth introduction of a modern food safety system in Georgia. For the increase of exports and the competitiveness of its agricultural products, Georgia needs to gradually introduce and approximate an effective food safety system. This reform effort should be undertaken in a
manner that is sensitive to realities on the ground and the social aspects of the farm sector. Relevant European and international standards allow for such an approach through gradual approximation of the regulatory framework and the introduction of exemptions for certain categories of very small farms.

**Food safety (SPS) at a glance**

In the period before the DCFTA, Georgia’s regulatory and institutional framework on SPS measures was characterised by limited regulation and an absence of most forms of state SPS control. Such an approach was adopted in the context of economic liberalisation and the fight against corruption.

Georgia started to introduce an EU-style institutional and legal framework for SPS measures during the preparation process for the DCFTA negotiations. Since signing the DCFTA, Georgia has outlined a strategy for completing approximation of virtually all EU SPS legislation.

The EU recognition of animal origin products is an early sign of success. In 2017 the EU added Georgia to the list of third countries allowed to export honey and some fish products to the EU. In these cases a sector-wide recognition by the EU has taken place. In addition, wool and animal skin can be exported to the EU where the recognition has taken place on an enterprise basis, rather than the whole sector.

Still, a careful approach is recommended when implementing EU legislation, given that the agricultural sector employs almost half of the labour force, many of whom are subsistence farmers. Provisions in EU law for exemptions for certain categories of very small farmers should be applied.
9. Services

The development of a dynamic and competitive service sector is of huge importance for the modernisation of the Georgian economy. In this regard the DCFTA provides for a comprehensive liberalisation of establishment and trade in services, yet subject to extensive reservations – more by the EU than by Georgia.

Provisions of the Agreement

The provisions of the agreement are organised under three headings: i) establishment, ii) cross-border supply of services and iii) temporary presence of natural persons for business purposes.

Establishment. This means that either enterprises (‘legal persons’) or individuals (‘natural persons’) have the right to pursue business in the country of the other party. Enterprises may create or acquire branches or representative offices. Individuals may pursue their business as self-employed persons or set up undertakings that they control.

The Agreement provides for national treatment and MFN treatment for establishment. This means that the EU and Georgia must grant as regards the ‘established’ enterprises treatment no less favourable than that accorded to its own enterprises, or those of any third country, whichever is better.

However, for several service sectors both the EU and Georgia have reservations that restrict national treatment or MFN treatment. These reservations are laid down in the annexes to the Agreement (Annex XIV-A and E). Georgia has fewer reservations than the EU and
its member states (see Table 9.1). Georgia’s liberal approach is mainly due to the fact that the country has only a few reservations at the level of the WTO (i.e. in its Schedule of Specific Commitments on Trade in Services).\textsuperscript{56} As the services sector represents an important part of the Georgian economy, the country opted for a liberalised market in order to allow foreign companies and investors to enter the Georgian market, establish companies in the country and create competition in certain sectors – all of which ultimately leads to the development of the sectors in question. It is important to note that these reservations in the DCFTA are placed on a \textit{negative list}. This means that the EU and Georgia will open up all services sectors, except for those sectors listed where reservations apply (as detailed in the annexes). This approach guarantees automatic coverage for new services not listed as exceptions.

Georgia has for example some important reservations derogating from national treatment and MFN obligations with regard to communication services, notably with respect to postal services, programme transmission services or broadcasting services, construction and related engineering services (for which not less than 50\% of the staff must be Georgian citizens), or educational, financial and transport services.

The list of EU reservations is complicated because it includes both EU-wide and member state-specific reservations. With regard to horizontal reservations (i.e. reservations applying to all sectors or subsectors) significant EU-wide reservations concern for example that economic activities regarded as public utilities may be subject to public monopolies. Several member state-specific reservations also exist for real estate purchases. Numerous EU-wide or member state-specific reservations remain in the areas of agriculture and hunting, fishing, energy mining, professional services, financial services, transport services, etc.

The Agreement also includes a standstill clause that forbids, subject to the reservations in the annex, the EU and Georgia from adopting new discriminatory regulations as regards the establishment of enterprises of the other party by comparison with their own enterprises. A soft commitment is included to further negotiate investment protection provisions and an investor–state dispute settlement mechanism.

\textsuperscript{56} For an overview of Georgia’s reservations under the GATS, see http://i-tip.wto.org/services/SearchResultGats.aspx.
Table 9.1 Reservations with regard to national treatment or MFN for establishment in service sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EU party reservations</th>
<th>Georgia reservations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU-wide reservations</td>
<td>Member state-specific reservations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal reservations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral reservations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of member state-specific reservations stands for the number of reservations that are being applied by different EU member states.

**Cross-border supply of services.** The DCFTA section on cross-border supply of services covers the supply of a service from the territory of one party into the territory of the other party without the supplier’s presence in the importing country (GATS Mode 1), and the consumption of that service abroad where a service consumer (e.g., a tourist or patient) moves to another country’s territory to obtain a service (GATS Mode 2).

The EU and Georgia have to accord services and service suppliers of the other party market access and national treatment. But this does not apply to audiovisual services, national maritime cabotage, or domestic or international air transport services.\(^{57}\) Contrary to the section on establishment in the Association Agreement, the section on cross-border supply of services works with a positive list. This means that the EU and Georgia only make market access and national treatment commitments in those service sectors listed in the Annex.

In the sectors where market access commitments are undertaken, the EU and Georgia may not apply the following restrictions:

(i) a limit on the number of service suppliers (e.g., by quotas, monopolies, exclusive service suppliers or the requirements of an economic needs test);

(ii) a limit on the total value of service transactions or assets in the form of quotas or the requirement of an economic needs test; or

---

\(^{57}\) The conditions of mutual market access in air transport are covered by the bilateral Common Aviation Area Agreement (explained in Art. 125 of the Association Agreement).
DEEPENING EU-GEORGIAN RELATIONS: WHAT, WHY AND HOW? | 79

(iii) a limit on the total number of service operations or the total quantity of service output by quotas or the requirement of an economic needs test.

As the table below shows, there is an asymmetry in the number of reservations in the DCFTA between the EU and Georgia, with Georgia being by far more liberal.

Table 9.2 Reservations with regard to market access and national treatment for cross-border supply of services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Sector</th>
<th>EU*</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode 1</td>
<td>Mode 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and related services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational, cultural, sports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport services</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These are EU-wide reservations or member state-specific reservations.

Note: EU-wide and member state-specific reservations are grouped together. The number of member state-specific reservations stands for the number of reservations that are being applied by different EU member states.

The sectors or subsectors liberalised, including the reservation over market access and national treatment, are listed in detail in Annex XIV-B (EU and its member states) and XIV-F (Georgia). Still, liberalisation is, similar to establishment, rather asymmetrical: whereas Georgia only has a limited number of reservations or unbound service
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sectors in its list, the EU has numerous reservations (Table 9.2). Again, this is mainly due to Georgia’s liberal approach in the WTO GATS.

_Temporary presence of natural persons for business purposes._
This section covers measures of the parties concerning the entry into and temporary stay in their territory of categories of natural persons for business purposes (GATS mode 4), such as key personnel (i.e. senior personnel responsible for the setting-up or operation of an establishment), graduate trainees, business sellers or independent professionals.

Both the EU and Georgia have to allow entrepreneurs of the other party to employ natural persons of the other party in their establishment, provided that they are key personnel or graduate trainees. The temporary stay of key personnel and graduate trainees must be for a period of no longer than three years for intra-corporate transferees, 90 days in any 12-month period for business visitors for establishment purposes, and one year for graduate trainees. Each party must also allow the entry and temporary stay of business visitors of the other party for a period of no longer than 90 days in any 12-month period. However, for these three categories (i.e. key personnel, graduate trainees and business visitors), the EU and its member states will apply many reservations (172 in total), such as the requirement of an economic needs test, residency requirements and nationality conditions. Again, Georgia has a much more liberal approach and only excludes 31 subsectors from liberalisation (i.e. ‘unbound’). 58

The DCFTA also liberalises services provided by contractual service suppliers in specific sectors. Each party has to allow the supply of services into their territory by contractual services suppliers of the other party. Nevertheless, this liberalisation is subject to several conditions and reservations. Important conditions are, for example, that the natural persons must be engaged in the supply of a service on a temporary basis as employees of a juridical person, which has obtained a service contract not exceeding 12 months. Moreover, they must possess at least three years’ professional experience in the relevant sector and must have a university degree or a qualification demonstrating knowledge of an equivalent level and relevant professional qualifications. The reservations (mostly residency

---

58 For the lists of reservations on key personnel, graduate trainees and business sellers, see Annex XIV-G (Georgia) and Annex XIV-C (EU and EU member states).
requirements or economic needs tests) are listed in the annexes. The EU party has more reservations than Georgia. Whereas the EU has 73 reservations in 18 sectors, Georgia only imposes a limited number of reservations (i.e. 14 reservations, mainly in the area of computer services). Similar or identical conditions and reservations also apply to the sectors for which the parties liberalise the supply of services by independent professionals.

**Regulatory framework and internal market treatment.** The DCFTA requires that licensing and licensing procedures proceed in a clear, transparent and pre-established manner and that it is proportionate to a legitimate public policy objective. Furthermore, judicial, arbitral or administrative tribunals or procedures have to be established to review licensing decisions. These rules also apply to qualification requirements for individuals to supply a specific service. The Agreement envisages the mutual recognition of necessary qualifications and/or professional experience that natural persons must possess to provide a specific service. The EU and Georgia shall encourage their relevant professional bodies to provide the Trade Committee recommendations on mutual recognition of requirements, qualifications, licences and other regulations.

In four services sectors, i.e. i) postal and courier services, ii) electronic communications, iii) financial services and iv) international maritime transport, the DCFTA includes specific rules and procedures on regulatory cooperation. Georgia has committed itself to approximate to the EU’s key legislation in these four sectors (included in Annex XV). Although the Agreement does not strictly oblige Georgia to approximate the EU legislation, it states that “with a view to considering further liberalisation of trade in services, the parties

---

59 See the EU’s reservations in Annex XIV-D and Georgia’s reservation in Annex XIV-H.

60 Derived from the authors’ own calculations. The EU-wide and member state-specific reservations are grouped together. The number of member state-specific reservations stands for the number of reservations that are being applied by different member states.

61 These sectors are for the EU: i) legal services, ii) architectural services, iii) engineering services, iv) computer services v) management consulting services and vi) translation services. For Georgia they are the following sectors: i) (integrated) engineering services, ii) urban planning and landscape services, iii) computer and related services, iv) management consulting services and related services and v) other business services.
recognise the importance of the gradual approximation of the existing and future legislation of Georgia to the list of the Union *acquis* included in Annex XV”.

It links progress of the implementation of these approximation commitments with further liberalisation. The Trade Committee can review and modify the annexes with reservations in these four sectors if Georgia implements the relevant EU legislation. The potential scope of further liberalisation is not specified in the Agreement.

*Box 9.1 Summary of commitments and reservations of the EU and Georgia for service sectors*

**EU**

- Reservations on establishment: *substantial horizontal and sectoral reservations*
- Commitments on liberalisation of cross-border supply of services: *large liberalisation, but with extensive reservations*
- Reservations on key personnel, graduate trainees and business sellers: *extensive reservations*
- Commitments on contractual services suppliers and independent professionals: *extensive reservations*

**Georgia**

- Reservations on establishment: *large liberalisation with few reservations*
- Commitments on liberalisation of cross-border supply of services: *almost full liberalisation*
- Reservations on key personnel, graduate trainees and business sellers: *extensive liberalisation*
- Commitments on contractual services suppliers and independent professionals: *large liberalisation with few reservations*

**Implementation perspectives**

The services sector is an important part of the Georgian economy and during recent years it developed much faster than other sectors of the economy. This is particularly true with regards to sectors such as financial services, transport, communications and construction.

---

62 See Arts 103, 113, 122 and 126.
Moreover, the services sector represents a solid part of Georgia’s external balance of payments. It makes for a positive part of the current account, and offsets the negative balance coming from trade in goods. Still, this positive effect mainly comes from the tourism sector, while the export of other services is rather limited.

From the beginning, when joining the WTO, Georgia chose a liberal approach towards trade in services. This can be well observed in Georgia’s GATS schedule, which includes only a very limited number of horizontal and sector-specific reservations. Therefore, Georgia does not have much room for further liberalisation when negotiating free trade agreements. In addition, Georgia does not apply any limitation or discrimination towards foreign services suppliers.

Table 9.3 EU trade in services with Georgia, 2013-2015 (billion €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU trade in services with Georgia</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>% change 2014/2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% change 2015/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU exports</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU imports</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total trade</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade balance</td>
<td>+2.</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Trade in services between the EU and Georgia has more than doubled between 2006 and 2014, both in terms of imports and exports. In 2014 and 2015 the total trade in services between both partners amounted to €0.9 billion and basically stayed at the same levels.

Because the DCFTA envisages special provisions in four sectors (postal and courier services, electronic communications, financial services and international maritime transport), it is useful to look at Georgia’s prospects for trade in those services.

As far as postal and courier services are concerned, currently there is no specific legislation regulating this sector. The market is liberalised and open for foreign companies. Legislation, which is under preparation by the Georgian government in this area, is being elaborated in line with EU directives. Yet, as Georgia’s postal market itself is mainly represented by foreign companies, there is little chance that Georgian postal companies will be able to operate in the EU market.
With regards to communication services, the situation is much more advanced, as Georgia’s legislation was initially (even before signing the DCFTA) broadly in line with EU legislation, and further approximation is underway. However, also in this sector, the Georgian market is represented by mostly foreign-owned companies, including some European ones. Therefore, in the short run, it is very unlikely that these companies will export services to the European market. Georgia, together with the other EaP countries, is exploring closer cooperation with the EU Digital Single Market. In 2015 the European Commission adopted the Digital Single Market strategy, which aims to ensure access to online activities for individuals and businesses under conditions of fair competition, consumer and data protection, removing geo-blocking and copyright issues, among other goals. Two years after the strategy was initiated, the Commission had made 35 legislative proposals, covering e-commerce, copyrights, cybersecurity, the European data economy, e-privacy, etc.\textsuperscript{63} Whereas some of these proposals brought concrete results (e.g. the end of roaming charges for all travellers in the EU, new rules on data protection and privacy in electronic communications, and on cross-border portability of online content services), the remaining proposals still need to be approved.

Specific cooperation over the Digital Single Market already took place in the context of the Eastern Partnership. For example, the second EaP ministerial meeting on Digital Economy, held in Tallinn on 5 October 2017, discussed cooperation in this area and during the latest EaP Summit in November 2017 participants agreed to cooperate on the Harmonisation of Digital Markets, in order to extend the benefits of the Digital Single Market to partner countries. This will be fostered in the framework of the EU4Digital initiative, which aims to deliver the benefits of the Digital Single Market to the EaP countries.\textsuperscript{64} In this context, cooperation will focus on supporting the partner countries in numerous respects: strengthening the independence of national telecom regulators, harmonising spectrum allocation and roaming pricing, implementing national strategies for broadband development, cybersecurity, digital innovation, interoperable eHealth services and digital skills and piloting cross-border e-Signatures, electronic trade and Digital Transport Corridors. At this point the EU and Georgia are


not considering an update to the DCFTA (services) annexes to incorporate specific elements of the new Digital Single Market legislation, but this may be pursued in the future in sectors such as E-commerce.

In the financial services sector, although the DCFTA includes a comprehensive list of EU legislation to which Georgia’s respective legislation should be approximated, there is no clear roadmap for when the EU might open its financial market to Georgia. Therefore, prospects in this area are also very limited.

As regards maritime transport services, the approximation commitments will mainly advance and modernise the standards for maritime transport in Georgia, and this should lead to increased exports of these services across the Black Sea to Romania and Bulgaria in the EU and also to Ukraine.

Thus, while these four sectors have only limited possibilities for exporting to the EU, the provisions of the Agreement for the regulation of service sectors make Georgia an increasingly interesting site for foreign investment in these areas. Such investors may increase Georgia’s competitiveness in the sectors concerned, whose products enter the value added chain more generally, and therefore should boost Georgian exports to the European market.

At a first stage it is more likely that Georgia will benefit from trade liberalisation in sectors such as professional services, where EU requirements are more open for Georgian services suppliers. The most important part of services liberalisation for Georgia concerns the temporary presence of natural persons for business purposes (GATS Mode 4). While Georgian companies might not benefit from trade liberalisation straight away, certain individual services suppliers and in particular independent professionals might do so. At the same time, various reservations in the EU, such as nationality requirements and economic needs tests, effectively limit the possibilities for Georgian services suppliers. This is particularly true for contractual services suppliers and independent professionals.
Services sector at a glance

Trade in services is important for the economic development and competitiveness of the entire economy, including service-related sectors.

Georgia’s schedule of specific commitments in the WTO is very liberal, leaving little room for further liberalisation. Given that the EU keeps a considerable number of reservations in trade in services, there is an asymmetry with more liberalisation and fewer reservations on the Georgian side.

In the short term, the prospects for Georgia to increase exports of services to the EU is limited by legislative approximation clauses. However, a substantial increase of inbound tourism to Georgia is contributing to increased services exports in this area.

The liberalisation of the temporary presence of natural persons for business purposes is potentially important for Georgia, but market opening by the EU is limited by numerous reservations.
10. PUBLIC PROCUREMENT

Public procurement in the EU and Georgia is of great economic importance. It accounts for around 18% of GDP in the EU and offers an enormous potential market for Georgian companies. The DCFTA provides for the gradual and reciprocal liberalisation of the parties’ public procurement markets under the strict condition that Georgia implements the EU’s key public procurement rules. Georgia has to ensure that public purchases of goods, works and services are transparent and fair, guarantee sound competition, tackle corruption and ensure that public authorities get the best value for their taxpayers’ money.

Provisions of the Agreement

In the DCFTA chapter on public procurement, the EU and Georgia envisage mutual access to their respective public procurement markets on the basis of the principle of national treatment at the national, regional and local levels for public contracts and concessions in the traditional sectors as well as in the utilities sector.

The DCFTA procurement rules only apply to contracts above certain value thresholds listed in Annex XVI-A (Table 10.1). However, the agreement states that these thresholds should be adapted at the moment of entry into force of this agreement to reflect the thresholds in place under the EU directives. As further explained below, in 2014 the EU adopted a new legislative package on public procurement. In light of this new EU legislation, both the EU and Georgia will need to update these thresholds.65

65 Such a decision has already been adopted in EU-Moldova DCFTA (Decision 2-16 of the EU-Moldova Trade Committee) and prepared in the EU-Ukraine DCFTA.
Table 10.1 Thresholds for the application of public procurement rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts</th>
<th>Threshold (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Public supply and service contracts awarded by central government authorities</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Public supply and public service contracts not covered by point (a)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Public works contracts and concessions</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Works contracts in the utilities sector</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Supply and service contracts in the utilities sector</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annex XVI-A of the DCFTA.

The DCFTA includes provisions relating to i) institutional reforms and the award of procurement contracts, ii) Georgia’s approximation with the EU’s public procurement acquis and iii) market access.

**Institutional reforms.** Georgia has to establish and maintain an appropriate institutional framework necessary for the proper functioning of its public procurement system. In particular, Georgia has to designate a central executive body responsible for economic policy tasked with guaranteeing a coherent policy in all areas related to public procurement, including implementation of this chapter. In addition, Georgia has to establish an impartial and independent body that will review decisions taken by contracting authorities or entities during the award of contracts. Proper judicial protection for persons having an interest in obtaining a particular contract and who are being harmed by an alleged infringement will have to be ensured.

**Award of contracts.** The DCFTA also defines “basic standards regulating the award of contracts”, which are derived directly from the EU’s public procurement legislation, and include the principles of non-discrimination, equal treatment, transparency and proportionality. Georgia has to comply with these basic standards no later than three years from the entry into force of the Agreement. This set of rules lays down key publication requirements. Georgia has to ensure that all its intended procurements are properly published and made public in order to enable the market to be opened up to competition and to allow any interested economic operator to have access to information regarding the intended procurement prior to the award of the contract. Concerning the award of contracts, these basic standards state that all contracts have to be awarded through transparent and impartial award procedures that prevent corruptive practices. This impartiality has to
be ensured, especially through the non-discriminatory description of the subject matter of the contract, equal access for all economic operators, appropriate time limits and a transparent and objective approach. Contracting entities may not impose conditions that directly or indirectly discriminate against the economic operators of the other party, such as the requirement that economic operators interested in the contract must be established in the same country, region or territory as the contracting entity. Georgia has to ensure that contracts are awarded in a transparent manner to the applicant who has submitted the economically most advantageous offer or the offer with the lowest price, based on the tender criteria. The final decisions are to be communicated to all applicants and upon request of an unsuccessful applicant, reasons must be provided in sufficient detail to allow a review of the decision.

**Legislative approximation.** According to the provisions of the Agreement (Annex XVI), Georgia needs to approximate to Directive 2004/18 on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts and Directive 2004/17 on coordinating the procurement procedures of entities operating in the water, energy, transport and postal services sectors (i.e. utilities). However, in 2014 the EU adopted a new legislative package on public procurement that replaced Directives 2004/17 and 2004/18. These new public procurement directives aim to simplify the EU procurement regime, introduce more flexibility, establish better access to EU procurement markets for SMEs and ensure that greater consideration is given to social and environmental criteria. Moreover, a specific directive is adopted on the award of concession contracts. This legislative package was adopted in February 2014 and member states had time until April 2016 to transpose the new rules into their national law. In order to keep up with these new EU public procurement rules, the EU-Georgia Trade Committee will need to update Annex XVI.66 The new acts for the approximation are Directive 2014/23 on the award of concession contracts, Directive 2014/24 on public procurement, and Directive 2014/25 on procurement by entities operating in the water, energy, transport and postal services sectors. These directives do not have to be implemented in their entirety or at

---

66 The EU-Moldova Trade Committee has already adopted the corresponding procurement annex in Decision 2/2016. The envisaged update for the Georgia procurement chapter will be very similar and is a useful point of reference (for comments on the update of the Moldova procurement chapter (annex), see the chapters on procurement in the Moldova ‘Handbook’).
once, however. Annexes from XXI-B to XXI-N divide these directives into “basic”, “mandatory” and “non-mandatory” elements (i.e. provisions that are not mandatory but recommended for approximation) and elements “that fall outside the scope of legislative approximation”.

**Market access.** This DCFTA chapter clearly links market access to Georgia’s progress in approximating the annexed EU public procurement rules and institutional reforms. Annex XVI includes an “indicative time schedule” for institutional reform, legislative approximation and market access. This time schedule foresees five phases for Georgia to implement the provisions of the EU’s public procurement directives, and the specific market access that Georgia and the EU will grant to each other (Table 10.2). The market access provided in each phase will imply that the EU shall grant access to contract award procedures to Georgian companies – whether or not established in the EU – pursuant to EU public procurement rules under treatment no less favourable than that accorded to EU companies, and vice versa. Although this schedule envisages a simultaneous market opening, it has to be noted that Georgia’s public procurement market was already open for EU companies before the DCFTA entered into force, and that EU companies can therefore already participate in Georgia’s procurement market. There is no requirement for registration of those companies in Georgia. On the EU’s side, the indicative time schedule foresees that each phase shall be evaluated by the Trade Committee and the EU’s market access will only take place after a positive assessment by this Committee, which will take into account the quality of Georgia’s legislation as well as its practical implementation. The Trade Committee shall only proceed to the evaluation of a next phase once the measures to be implemented in the previous phase have been carried out and approved. This indicative time schedule also needs to be updated, together with the annexed EU legislation, in order to approximate to the new EU procurement package.

Prior to the beginning of legislative approximation, Georgia has to submit to the Trade Committee a comprehensive roadmap for the implementation of requirements of the procurement chapter (hereafter referred to as the ‘public procurement roadmap’), covering all reforms in terms of legislative approximation and institutional capacity building. This roadmap has to comply with the five phases of the indicative schedule of Annex XVI (Table 10.2). Following a favourable opinion by the Trade Committee, this roadmap will be considered the reference document for the implementation of this chapter.
Table 10.2 Indicative time schedule for approximation of public procurement rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Indicative time schedule (after the entry into force of the DCFTA)</th>
<th>Market access granted to the EU by Georgia</th>
<th>Market access granted to Georgia by the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Implementation of the “basic standards”, the institutional reforms and the public procurement roadmap</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Supplies for central government authorities</td>
<td>Supplies for central government authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Implementation of the basic elements of Directive 2004/18 (replaced by the new, 2014 legislative package (see above)) EC and of Directive 89/665/EEC</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Supplies for state, regional and local authorities and bodies governed by public law</td>
<td>Supplies for state, regional and local authorities and bodies governed by public law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Implementation of the basic elements of Directive 2004/17 (replaced by the new, 2014 legislative package (see above)) EC and of Directive 92/13/EEC</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Supplies for all contracting entities in the utilities sector</td>
<td>Supplies for all contracting entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Implementation of “other elements” of Directive 2004/18 (replaced by the new, 2014 legislative package (see above)) EC</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Service and works contracts and concessions for all contracting authorities</td>
<td>Service and works contracts and concessions for all contracting authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Implementation of other elements of Directive 2004/17/EC</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Service and works contracts for all contracting entities in the utilities sector</td>
<td>Service and works contracts for all contracting entities in the utilities sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annex XVI of the DCFTA.
Implementation perspectives

Development of Georgia’s public procurement system. Since the first Law on Public Procurement was adopted in December 1998 (N1721), Georgia’s public procurement system and legislation has been continuously developing. The current public procurement framework – the Law on State Procurement (LSP) – was adopted in 2005 and came into force on 1 January 2006. Since its enactment, the LSP has been streamlined and has undergone a series of amendments. The main aims of the LSP are to ensure the rational use of financial resources; develop healthy competition in the production of goods, supply of services and construction works necessary for the state’s needs; ensure a fair and non-discriminatory approach towards participants in the procurement process; assure the publicity of the process; create a unified electronic system of public procurement and build public confidence in it. The scope of the LSP covers purchases of goods and the supply of services and construction works by contracting authorities, using funds from the state, autonomous republics or local budgets, funds of public bodies and grants or loans guaranteed by the state.

The main responsible agency is the State Procurement Agency (SPA), an independent legal entity under public law. Between 2012 and 2014, the SPA was merged with the Free Trade and Competition Agency, based on the Swedish model and with the assistance of Swedish experts, and was renamed the Competition and State Procurement Agency. Yet later (in 2014), this agency was split again into the Competition Agency and the SPA.

According to the current Law (taking into account the amendments made in 2017) on State Procurement, there are eight methods for awarding contracts:

1) **electronic tender**, used for purchases of homogeneous objects with a value equal to or above €75,182;\(^{67}\)

2) **simplified electronic tender**, used for purchases of homogeneous objects with a value up to €75,182;

3) **simplified procurement**, used for purchases of a value below €1,880;

4) **design contests**, used for procurement of design-related projects and services

\(^{67}\) GEL exchange rate to euros of 2.66.
5) **consolidated tender**, a unified, centralised state procurement procedure conducted by the SPA, for the purchase of homogeneous procured objects for different procuring entities.

6) **two-stage tender**, procurement of goods, services and construction works on the basis of price and other quantitative criteria;

7) **e-tender without auction**, which operates like the so-called "sealed bid auction" (the proposal is submitted only once);

8) **different acquisition procedure for construction works**, conducted according to the so-called prequalification procedure.

The share of contracts awarded by type of procurement during 2012-17 as a share of the total value of contracts awarded was as follows: electronic tenders – 65.3%; simplified procurement (direct contract) – 34.7%. The award criterion used in electronic tenders and simplified procurement is that of the lowest price. From 2016 SPA introduced an additional tender procedure, called a ‘two-stage tender’, where a procuring entity may award a bidder according to price and other quantitative criteria. In such a two-stage tender, relative weighting attached to price can be set between 30-70%, correspondingly other quantitative criteria may also vary between 30-70%.

Electronic and simplified electronic tenders are published on the Unified Electronic System in the Georgian language. In the case of supply of goods or services contracts of more than 2 million GEL (€670,893) and works contracts of more than 4 million GEL (€1,341,786) in value, notice should be published also in English. Below these values, the notice, apart from Georgian, may be published in English. An electronic tender is conducted by a tender committee set up by the

Under the LSP, a ‘White and Black List Registry’ is compiled of participants in public procurement, which is maintained on the SPA’s website. Blacklisted are those persons/bidders/suppliers who do not submit a guarantee for implementing the contract, or refuse to sign the contract with the procuring entity, and/or fail to perform or improperly perform their obligations under the contract. Blacklisted participants may not participate in public procurement or be awarded a public procurement contract within one year after they are placed on the Black List. White-listed are those suppliers complying with the qualification criteria, and who inter alia have not been registered in the Black Lists for public procurement or by the Revenue Service during the past year, are not undergoing insolvency proceedings, do not have any debt towards the state budget, and during last three years have had
no less than 1 million GEL (€335,446) of turnover. When participating in public procurement, qualified suppliers registered in the White List shall enjoy simplified procedures.

Streamlining of legislation. The legislation on public procurement that existed before 2017 needed further improvements in order to bring it fully into compliance with EU principles, including but not limited to the areas outlined below. Some of these requirements were reflected in the Georgian legislation as a result of recent amendments in 2017. Others still need to be approximated according to the implementation timeline as envisaged by the DCFTA.

- **Compliance with the DCFTA basic standards.** Georgian legislation had to be streamlined further to better reflect the principles of equal treatment and proportionality.
- **Scope and coverage of public procurement.** The definition of contracting authorities should still be streamlined according to the EU definition.
- **Procurement procedures.** The different types of EU contract procedures, explained above (i.e. open, restricted, negotiated and competitive), had to be introduced in the current LSP. The 2017 legislative amendments corrected these differences in legislation.
- **Time limits and notices.** The minimum time limits provided by the LSP for submitting tenders were shorter than those envisaged by the EU directives. The 2017 legislative amendments corrected these differences in legislation.
- **Tender documents.** Georgian legislation related to tender documentation needs rules for the mandatory and optional exclusion of economic operators in line with EU directives. The system of the Black List should be revised.
- **Concessions.** The law does not constitute a sufficiently solid legal basis for the development of concessions. The approximation of Georgian legislation with that of the EU is envisaged in phase 4 of the indicative time schedule (see Table 10.2).

See below for a more detailed account of steps being taken.

Institutional framework and review system. Georgia already complies almost fully with the DCFTA’s institutional requirements, explained above. Georgia has a well-established central institutional framework for coordinating, implementing and monitoring public procurement, with the leading role taken by the independent SPA.
A Dispute Resolution Board (DRB) was established at the SPA, consisting of six members – three appointed by the SPA and three elected by civil society organisations. The involvement of NGOs ensures transparency of the process and independence of the DRB. Complaints about the procurement system can be addressed to the DRB, apart from the contracting authority or a court. Submission and hearing of a complaint are not subject to a fee. Complaints are submitted electronically by filling out a form on the tender page.

From its establishment in December 2010 until December 2017, 5,232 complaints were submitted to the DRB, of which 1,051 were fully granted, 1,789 not granted, 1,063 partially granted, 127 withdrawn, 1,201 deemed inadmissible and one is still under consideration. During the same period, 105 DRB decisions were appealed to the court, but none successfully, except three decisions, which were re-appealed by the SPA.

**E-procurement.** A significant change to the public procurement system was the introduction of the e-procurement system in 2010, with the establishment of the Unified Electronic System of State Procurement. The traditional paper-based tendering system was entirely replaced with a new electronic system, which has ensured greater transparency and simplicity of the procurement process, significantly reduced administrative costs and increased accessibility. Registration is mandatory only for attaining the status of contracting authority and supplier. Registration is simple and easy and it does not require an electronic signature certificate. So far, 4,455 contracting authorities and 36,060 suppliers have registered. Contracting authorities are obliged to publish their annual procurement plans in the system through the so-called ‘e-plan module’. Bidding is made by e-auction. Many international organisations have given a high appraisal of Georgia’s e-procurement system. For example, the UN awarded the Georgian e-procurement system 2nd place among 471 candidates from 71 countries in the UN Public Service Award in 2012. The EBRD ranked Georgia at the top of its 26 countries in the region with regard to the implementation of e-procurement.\(^\text{68}\)

Taking into consideration that the basic e-procurement requirements of the EU directives have already been met, Georgia will be able to accommodate new legal developments in accordance with the approximation schedule.

\(^{68}\) See the State Procurement Agency’s platform at https://tenders.procurement.gov.ge/.
**Capacity building on public procurement.** The SPA is conducting training for contracting authorities through its Training Centre, which was established in 2014. Still, the current capacity of the Training Centre is not sufficient and needs to be expanded. The development of guidelines, instructions and manuals is envisaged to better address the specific training needs of stakeholders. In 2014-2016 1,530 persons were trained by the training centre.

**Implementation of the DCFTA obligations**

In line with the DCFTA obligations under Article 145 the State Procurement Agency (SPA), with UNDP and SIGMA support, prepared a comprehensive ‘‘Roadmap and Action Plan for the Implementation of the Public Procurement Chapter of the EU-Georgia Association Agreement’’, which prior to the adoption was discussed with the representatives of civil society, business sector and other stakeholders. The government adopted the Roadmap on 31 March, 2016. According to the Roadmap, the process of gradual approximation is anticipated over a seven-year period from 2016 to 2022 and is divided into five phases, with specific legislative and institutional changes to be made.

In order to meet the basic standards of Article 144, the Parliament adopted amendments to the Law on Public Procurement on 6 April 2017. The amended law fully introduced the principles of equal treatment and proportionality. It also introduced reasonable timeframes for the call for tender and for familiarisation with the terms of the tender. New amendments have also increased time limits for the submission of tenders. In addition, three new procurement procedures were introduced, including the so-called two-stage tender and a restricted procedure with pre-qualification.

In order to meet DCFTA obligations under Article 143(2) to designate an impartial and independent public body, which will be tasked with the review of decisions taken by the contracting authorities, the SPA prepared draft amendments to the Law on Public Procurement. According to the amendments the current composition of the Dispute Resolution Board (DRB) will be enlarged by the representatives of the Georgian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Competition Agency and Business Ombudsman of Georgia. The draft amendments were adopted by Parliament in 2017 and the composition of the DRB was enlarged accordingly.
Public procurement at a glance

Georgia’s public procurement system has undergone significant changes to align with EU requirements and international best practices. Remaining gaps are being addressed through, among others, the process of DCFTA legislative approximation.

There is a well-established, central institutional framework for public procurement, with the leading role taken by an independent body – the State Procurement Agency.

Based on the principle of ‘dynamic approximation’ Georgia has to approximate its legislation to the most recent EU legislative package adopted in 2014, i.e. after the completion of EU-Georgia negotiations on the DCFTA.

Georgia’s procurement system has been fully electronic since 2010, ensuring greater transparency and simplicity, significantly reducing administrative costs and increasing accessibility.

The UN awarded Georgia’s e-procurement system 2nd place among 471 candidates from 71 countries in the UN Public Service Awards in 2012 and the EBRD ranked Georgia at the top of its 26 countries in the region with regard to the implementation of e-procurement.
11. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

In our knowledge-based economies, the protection of intellectual property is important not only for promoting innovation and creativity, but also for increasing employment and improving competitiveness. The DCFTA requires Georgia to modernise its system on intellectual property rights (IPRs). These reforms will contribute to a stable legal environment in Georgia for the protection of IPRs, which is crucial for attracting foreign investment.

Provisions of the Agreement

The DCFTA chapter on IPRs seeks to facilitate the production and commercialisation of innovative products while guaranteeing an adequate level of protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights. It complements Georgia’s obligations under the WTO’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). This WTO agreement establishes minimum levels of protection that each government has to give to the intellectual property of fellow WTO members. The DCFTA confirms these WTO rules and even goes beyond them in several areas. This has important implications for Georgia, as in principle it has to extend these ‘TRIPS-plus provisions’ to all WTO members pursuant to the TRIPS’ most favoured nation clause (Art. 4 TRIPS).

Contrary to other DCFTA chapters, the IPR section does not oblige Georgia to approximate a selection of the EU’s IPR legislation annexed to the Agreement. The main text of the DCFTA is very
detailed, however, and its provisions reflect – or sometimes even copy – several principles and procedures of the EU’s IPR legislation. The DCFTA lays down rules on copyrights, trademarks, geographical indications (GIs) and designs, including detailed enforcement provisions.

**Copyrights.** The parties must comply with several international conventions and agreements (e.g. the Rome Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations, the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, and the World Intellectual Property Organisation Copyright Treaty). With regard to the duration of authors’ rights, the DCFTA states that the rights of an author of a literary or artistic work have to be protected for 70 years after his/her death. The Agreement also covers broadcasting and communication to the public, protection of technological measures and rights of management information and resale rights. A provision on cooperation on collective management of rights goes beyond the TRIPs agreement, but only envisages (i.e. a soft commitment) that the parties’ ‘collecting societies’69 conclude agreements with each other in order to promote the availability of works, as well as ensure the mutual transfer of royalties for the use of such works.

**Trademarks.** The DCFTA mainly requires the implementation of international agreements, such as the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks and the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purpose of the Registration of Marks. Moreover, Georgia must establish a fair and transparent system for the registration of trademarks, in which any refusal by the relevant trademark administration is communicated to the applicant in writing and duly reasoned. Georgia also has to provide a publicly available electronic database of trademark applications and registrations.

**Geographical indications.** The text of the Agreement recognises that Georgia’s IPR legislation (i.e. the Law on Appellations of Origin and Geographical Indications of Goods) already meets the required conditions with regard to registration and control of geographical indications (GIs) (Annex XVII-A), and therefore does not require further approximation to EU law. This is because Georgia concluded an

---

69 More specifically, these are authorities established under national IPR law that represent the holders of a certain IPR and that are responsible for administering the IPRs of its members, such as societies responsible for collecting copyright royalties for musicians.
agreement on GIs with the EU prior to the DCFTA, which was later simply integrated into the DCFTA. The annexes contain an elaborate list of geographical indications for the agricultural products, foodstuffs and types of wines and spirit drinks of both parties (e.g. for the EU, these include prosciutto di Parma, champagne and feta cheese). Those listed are to be protected against any direct or indirect commercial use or misuse of a protected name for comparable products, going beyond the TRIPS’ requirements. A specific subcommittee on GIs shall monitor the implementation of these provisions and report to the Trade Committee. As foreseen in the Agreement, the EU and Georgia added new GIs to the agreement. In November 2016 and in March 2018 the GIs Committee adopted decisions amending Annex XVII-C of the DCFTA (lists of agricultural products and foodstuffs other than wine and spirits to be protected) and Annex XVII-D (list of spirit drinks to be protected) to add new GIs.\textsuperscript{70}

\textit{Designs and patents.} Georgia also has to provide for the protection of independently created designs that are new and have an individual character. The protection shall be provided by registration and shall confer upon the holder the exclusive right to use the design and to prevent third parties not having his/her consent from using it, in particular to make, offer, put on the market, import or export it. The duration of protection available shall amount to 25 years from the date of filing of the application for registration. Specific rules are provided for patents for medicinal and plant protection products. For example, the provisions on pharmaceutical data protection, which go beyond the TRIPS agreement, require that Georgia shall implement a comprehensive system to guarantee the confidentiality, non-disclosure and non-reliance on data submitted for the purpose of obtaining an authorisation to put a medicinal product on the market.

\textit{Enforcement of IPRs.} The agreement provides a strong section on the enforcement of IPRs. These commitments go beyond the TRIPS agreement. The complementary measures and remedies in the DCFTA have to be fair and equitable and may not result in additional barriers to trade. The section on civil measures and procedures, which is largely based on the EU’s IPR Enforcement Directive,\textsuperscript{71} includes detailed

\textsuperscript{70} Decision No 1/2016 of the Geographical Indications Sub-Committee of 10 November 2016 amending Annex XVII-C and Part B of Annex XVII-D to the Association Agreement

Decision No 1/2018 of the Geographical Indications Sub-Committee of 14 March 2018 modifying Annexes XVII-C and XVII-D to the Association Agreement.

\textsuperscript{71} See Directive 2004/48 EC on the enforcement of intellectual property rights.
procedural provisions on judicial enforcement of IPRs (e.g. on transparency, procedural fairness, right to information, measures for preserving evidence and publication of judicial decisions). Judicial authorities must have the power to recall products from the market that are found to be infringing an intellectual property right or to order the destruction of those goods. Furthermore, judicial authorities must be able to issue an injunction and penalty payments or pecuniary compensation payments against the infringer with the aim of prohibiting the continuation of the infringement. Also, provisions on the liability of intermediary service providers (e.g. online service providers) are foreseen. These are copied from the EU’s E-Commerce Directive and provide for a ‘safe haven’ regime, under which certain types of intermediary service providers are exempted from liability for IPR infringements, under certain conditions.

In its Single Market and Digital Single Market Strategy of November 2017 the Commission adopted a comprehensive package of measures to further improve the application and enforcement of IPR, and to step up the fight against counterfeiting and piracy. Many of these new IPR rules will be relevant to Georgia. For example, in November 2017 the Commission adopted a Guidance Communication clarifying the provisions of the IPR Enforcement Directive.

Implementation perspectives

*Georgia’s IPR system.* The intellectual property system in Georgia has been evolving gradually. In 1992, Georgia created its national patent service, which since has evolved into a National Intellectual Property Centre (Sakpatenti). Georgia was the first of the former Soviet Republics to establish such an institution. Sakpatenti is an independent legal entity of public law responsible for protecting intellectual property in the country, as well as defining IPR policy. Sakpatenti reports to the prime minister. Sakpatenti’s mandate consolidates all the branches covering intellectual property. The first laws in this sphere

---

72 These provisions are included in the DCFTA chapter on “Establishment, trade in services and electronic commerce” (Arts 129–133).
73 See the Electronic Commerce Directive 2000/31/EC on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the internal market.
were adopted and enacted in 1999. These regulated patents, copyrights, trademarks, geographical indications, etc. Since then, this legislation has undergone a series of amendments, which have been in compliance with EU standards and offer an increasingly high level of protection for the right holders.

The intellectual property system is evolving gradually. Sakpatenti has introduced a new e-filing system and database, which has made the process of filing applications easier. Sakpatenti, in collaboration with the World Intellectual Property Organization, created an intellectual property education centre, which implements a range of educational initiatives and is involved in a number of capacity-building activities in the field. Signing the Association Agreement/DCFTA has contributed to elevating Georgia from the Caucasus, Central Asia and Eastern European Regional Group to a Central European and Baltic Country Regional Group at the World Intellectual Property Organization. This platform enables Georgia to exchange experience on IPRs with EU countries, which by itself will facilitate an active dialogue on issues of EU integration.

Because the protection of GIs is a priority for the country, there has been a rapidly growing number of registered GIs and appellations of origin. At the time of writing, 18 Georgian wines with an appellation of origin, 8 mineral waters and 20 geographical indications (13 cheese, 6 other agricultural products and 1 spirit drink) have been registered. A non-profit (non-commercial) legal entity, ‘Origin Georgia’, was jointly established by Sakpatenti and the National Wine Agency, and will contribute to developing the GI system in the country.

**Fulfilment of the DCFTA requirements.** Although Georgian legislation on IPRs was broadly in line with EU standards prior to signing the Agreement, Georgia still needed to reform its system to fully comply with the DCFTA requirements explained above.

In December 2017, a package of legislative amendments drafted by Sakpatenti was adopted ensuring compliance of national IPR legislation with DCFTA requirements. These amendments aimed to strengthen intellectual property protection measures and introduced effective mechanisms for their enforcement. Namely, amendments were made to the following legislative acts: Patent Law of Georgia; Trademark Law of Georgia; Law of Georgia on Copyright and Related Rights; Law of Georgia on Design; Law of Georgia on Drugs and Pharmaceutical Activity; Law of Georgia on Pesticides and Agrochemicals; The Civil Procedure Code of Georgia. Legislative
amendments to these laws include, but are not limited to, the topics discussed below.

**Copyrights and related rights.** The Georgian copyright system was mainly in compliance with DCFTA requirements. However, a few amendments were introduced, which in some circumstances set different timeframes for protection. For example, with regard to phonograms (i.e. audio recordings), the rights of a performer will expire after 70 years from the date of the first publication or the first communication to the public of the performance (instead of 50 years). The same 70-year timeframe was applied to producers of phonograms, provided that the phonogram was lawfully published within 50 years.

**Trademarks.** To comply with the DCFTA transparency conditions for trademarks, an amendment requires that a refusal to register a trademark is duly reasoned. With that amendment Georgia’s legislation and practice with regard of trademarks are in full compliance with the provisions of DCFTA.

**Patents.** In line with the DCFTA chapter on IPRs, Georgia adopted a regulation regarding a supplementary protection certificate, which extends patent protection for the time necessary for administrative procedures before placing the product on the market. Even though this possibility had previously existed in Georgian patent law, the new regulation closely complies with EU legislation. The same rule was made applicable to plant protection products.

The parties are obliged to recognise the importance of the Declaration of the Ministerial Conference of the WTO on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, and to contribute to the implementation of its paragraph 6, which addresses compulsory licensing. Accordingly, Georgia adopted the regulation on compulsory licencing, under which, in some cases and under certain conditions, special permission may be issued to use without the owner’s consent inventions protected as a patent or utility model. Amendments to the Law on Medicines and Pharmaceutical activities guarantee confidentiality, non-disclosure and non-reliance on data submitted for the purpose of obtaining an authorisation to put a medicinal product on the market, as required by the DCFTA. Moreover, clinical test data will remain confidential for six years after placing a product on the market within the territory of one of the member states. In certain cases, this timeframe can be extended to seven years.

**Enforcement.** After adoption of the new amendments, Georgia put in place comprehensive rules regarding civil enforcement of intellectual property rights. These amendments fully reflect the
enforcement provisions of the DCFTA chapter on IPR and ensure proper functioning of the system and effective implementation of sanctions.

**Opportunities and challenges.** For Georgia, as a producer of agricultural products for export, protection of its geographical indications and appellations of origin on the EU territory is of utmost importance. In that respect, having the possibility of exporting and placing on the EU market Georgian GIs and appellations of origin will bestow substantial benefits to Georgian farmers and companies. Yet along with providing opportunities, the implementation process may pose some challenges for the country. One of the most significant of these is the readiness of Georgian SMEs to adapt to a more knowledge-based economic system.

Further, the legislative changes could be challenging for some specific segments of the Georgian economy, for example for the pharmaceutical sector where Georgia depends on imported rather than locally manufactured generic medicines.

**Intellection property rights at a glance**

*Georgia’s system for protecting intellectual property rights is mainly in compliance with international best practices, agreements (e.g. TRIPS) and EU legislation.*

*IPR legislation was recently amended in 2017 to further comply with the DCFTA’s IPR requirements. For this purpose, a comprehensive legislative package was adopted.*

*In line with its IPR priorities, Georgia has been registering geographical indications and appellations of origin and has been protecting them internationally. In 2016 and 2018 the GIs committee of the Agreement amended and extended the list of protected GIs.*

*Special amendments were enacted in Georgian legislation to promote innovative activities.*
12. COMPETITION POLICY

An effective competition policy, controlling abuse of a dominant position by companies and trade-distorting subsidies by the government, is essential for the sound functioning of a modern economy. It leads to a level playing field for economic operators and the benefits of lower prices, better quality and wider choice for consumers, while reducing the scope for corruption.

Provisions of the Agreement

The DCFTA chapter on competition is very limited, especially compared with the corresponding chapter in the Ukraine and Moldova DCFTAs. It only includes a few broad provisions that do not require Georgia to approximate the EU’s competition rules and system.

**Antitrust and mergers.** Georgia is obliged to maintain comprehensive competition laws that affectively address anti-competitive cartels, mergers and the abuse of a dominant position by enterprises. These competition laws should be enforced by an appropriately equipped authority in a transparent and non-discriminatory manner, respecting the principles of procedural fairness and rights of defence. Moreover, they should also apply to state monopolies, state enterprises and enterprises entrusted with exclusive rights in so far as the application of these competition rules does not obstruct the particular tasks of public interest assigned to these enterprises.

**State aids.** The DCFTA does not create new obligations that go beyond Georgia’s obligations under the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures. There is only a requirement that both the
EU and Georgia must report regularly to each other on their subsidy activities.

**Institutional aspects.** The Agreement is largely silent on how Georgia’s competition policy should be administered. The EU’s own experience in this regard entails some strong messages. In many member states, the government or parliament (or both) makes the top-level appointments of heads of competition institutions for fixed terms for medium-term periods (five or six years), but the appointees cannot be dismissed at the discretion of the government or parliament. Most importantly, the individual case decisions of these bodies are sovereign, and not subject to approval by the government.

**Georgian competition policy**

*Early developments of competition policy.* The Georgian parliament adopted the first competition framework law (Law on Monopolistic Activity and Competition) in 1996. The law was not in compliance with international standards, as it prohibited monopoly (instead of prohibiting abuse of dominant positions) and was oriented towards price control. This first law was thus more an anti-monopoly regulation than a competition law. The responsible authority was the Anti-monopoly Agency, which was empowered to carry out only documentary investigations. The Agency did not have the power to conduct onsite investigations or dawn raids.

In 2005, a new Law on Free Trade and Competition was adopted, replacing the previous one. It formed part of wider reform efforts notably seeking to reduce corruption, and in this case the reportedly widespread corruption in the enforcement of the 1996 law. Its scope was mainly focused on state aids, and therefore was not a framework law for competition policy overall. It lacked key definitions of the abuse of dominant position, concentrations, cartels, etc. While the 2005 law had created the Competition and Free Trade Agency, it lacked independence and investigative powers, and had no powers in the area of anti-trust.

*Recent developments and EU practice.* As already mentioned, the competition policy chapter of the Association Agreement includes no specific references to EU laws for approximation by Georgia. This means that the relevant Georgian authorities have a considerable degree of discretion on how to define and operate competition policy. The evolution of Georgian competition policy, however, is heavily influenced by EU law and practice. In particular, the new 2012 Law on Free Trade and Competition was elaborated in close cooperation with
experts from the Swedish Competition Authority, and drafted in line with EU practice.

In the new 2012 law, the following topics were added: provisions on state aids, abuse of dominant position, *ex post* regulation of concentrations (prior notification was not required), cartels, relevant market, fines and sanctions. Yet some sectors remained under special competition regulations: energy, communications and financial services. In common international practice, these sectors are referred to as ‘non-liberalised sectors’ because the risk of concentration and abuse of dominant position are rather high, and thus they are regulated by special laws and sector regulators.

The Competition and State Procurement Agency was created as an independent body accountable to the government. The Agency was given investigative powers.

Further amendments to the law were made in 2014, covering the following areas:

- *antitrust provisions*, which address abuse of dominant position, *ex ante* regulation of mergers and acquisitions, restrictive agreements, concerted practices, decisions by undertakings, terms of relevant market, principles of block exemptions, leniency programmes, fines and sanctions. The law is in line with the Arts 101 and 102 of the EU Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union;

- *state aid provisions*, covering general rules on procedures for granting state aid, *de minimis* state aid; and

- *institutional provisions* on further institutional independence, investigative powers and decision-making powers.

The Competition and State Procurement Agency was divided into two independent state authorities: the Competition Agency and the State Procurement Agency. Accordingly, the Competition Agency is now responsible only for competition policy issues, and no longer for state procurement. The Competition Agency is an independent regulatory body, subordinated to the prime minister and responsible for the implementation of competition legislation. It has a wide range of powers: to investigate the abuse of dominant positions, cartels and any infringement of competition legislation (including *ex officio* investigations and onsite inspections); to impose sanctions or fines for

---

76 The legislation that governs competition policy consists of the competition law and secondary legislation (six regulations on competition and one regulation on state aid).
competition legislation infringements; to spin off companies; and to prohibit or control mergers and acquisitions.

The Competition Agency has already undertaken a number of activities involving its consent or investigation of mergers and acquisitions, abuse of a dominant position, restrictive agreements and concerted practices and infringement of state aid provisions.

The Competition Agency of Georgia undertook the following activities in 2014-17:

- eight merger notifications received and all of them were approved;
- six investigations were conducted on Competition Restrictive Agreements, and a violation was established in 1 case;
- six investigations were conducted on Abuse of Dominant Position and violations were not established;
- two applications on State Aid were submitted and both were approved;
- eight investigations were conducted on Inadmissibility of Distortion of Competition by State Authorities and violations were established in all of them;
- two investigations were conducted on Prohibition of Unfair Competition and violations were established in both cases.

Despite legislative changes in 2014, the Competition Law still has some important shortcomings. A dominant position is negatively (nominally) defined, which provides that a dominant position per se restricts competition. According to best practices, a dominant position by itself is not something negative by definition and is not prohibited. Only abuse of a dominant position is prohibited by EU and international regulations. Subsequent to recent changes, the current law provides a legal basis for price regulation, and as a result the Competition Agency can act as a price inspectorate, which restricts market competition.

Strict ex ante regulation of mergers and acquisitions is envisaged by the new legislation. It defines strict procedures for notification of mergers and acquisitions (for example, economic agents who want to undertake a merger should provide a relevant market analysis themselves). Georgia has a small economy, in which nearly 98% of enterprises are either small or medium-sized. To increase export potential, it is vital for many companies to merge or acquire shares in other companies. For instance, Luxembourg only regulates mergers and concentrations ex post, which is in line with EU regulations.
Implementing the new competition legislation will involve overcoming the following main challenges:

- lack of knowledge of competition legislation and experience in dealing with competition cases on the part of the responsible judges (at the Tbilisi City Court and Tbilisi Appeal Court);
- insufficient capacity building for the development of the Competition Agency;
- lack of awareness of competition law by the private and public sectors and by civil society; and
- lack of efficient coordination among the key regulatory agencies, which diminishes the capacity of the Competition Agency to implement the antitrust policy in an effective manner.

In order to contribute to overcoming the above challenges a two-year EU-funded twinning project: ‘Support to the Georgian Competition Agency’ started in 2017. The main objectives of the project are: to increase the legal, economic and technical capacities of the competition agency; to improve cooperation between agency and sector regulators, and to promote a culture of competition within Georgian society.

Overall, Georgian legislation is now largely compliant with the key principles of the EU competition acquis. There remains the issue of the extent to which competition legislation designed for the large EU internal market is suitable for Georgia, a country whose market size is around 100 times smaller and is still in transition. This issue can only be assessed properly after the Competition Agency has acquired more experience of competition enforcement.

**Competition policy at a glance**

*The provisions in the DCFTA for competition policy are very limited and do not require approximation with EU competition rules and policies.*

*Nevertheless, Georgia recently aligned its competition legislation largely with the key principles of EU competition law.*

*The Competition Agency is independent and has investigative and decision-making powers, which it has applied in practice.*
13. STATISTICS

A modern and internationally comparable statistical system is indispensable for informed policy-making and for the work of the business sector and civil society. All the post-Soviet states have had to face the same challenges of radical reform to their statistical systems, notably the move from systems that essentially served the needs of the state to systems that serve the private sector and society as a whole and, more technically, to a greater use of sampling methods rather than exhaustive data collection.

Provisions of the Agreement

The EU has engaged all six Eastern Partnership (EaP) states and the Central Asian states in extensive cooperation programmes to assist this long and complex process. Many of the projects listed below are ‘group activities’ for the whole EaP and, in some cases, also with the Central Asian states.

For Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia this is enhanced by collaboration and by the explicit commitments made in the Association Agreements to align their statistical systems to that of the EU: Eurostat, which sets out a huge number of legal regulations in the Statistical Requirements Compendium. This is a highly ambitious programme. The time horizon for compliance with EU regulations is not specified, however, but experience from the accession of the new member states of the EU would indicate that this is a long-term process. For a realistic perspective, it took around 15 years for other new EU members to
complete the transition, with much more support from the EU than Ukraine, Moldova or Georgia will be receiving.

Cooperation between Eurostat and partner states is structured as follows:

- three-day seminars on statistical strategies, once a year;
- training courses on current issues and recent developments in statistical systems, about five to six times over a two-year cycle;
- collection of selected data series, about 300 in number (i.e. a selection of key series, though fewer than what the EU member states comply with), in which the partner states submit data in accordance with Eurostat questionnaires, allowing Eurostat to publish comparable data series;
- in-depth assessment of the statistical systems of Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia (called Global Assessments), see below; and
- activities of the EaP multilateral platform and panel on statistical systems. This consists of conferences held in EaP capitals at a rate of about two per year, each taking up a particular theme in depth (such as the labour market and migration).

Developments in Georgian statistics

The legal basis for statistical activities in Georgia is stipulated under the Law on Official Statistics, which came into force in 2010. The aim of the law is to ensure production of independent, objective and reliable statistics in accordance with the fundamental principles of the United Nations and European Statistics Code of Practice. The law defines Geostat as the executive agency for all statistical activities, as an independent legal entity of public law, managed by a board. The Geostat Board consists of seven members and a chair, of which five members are non-public servants.

Eurostat completed a Global Assessment of the Georgian Statistical System in 2013, evaluating its level of conformity with UN and European codes of practice, as specified in the Eurostat Statistical Requirements Compendium. The main recommendations of the report referred to the institutional framework, and notably the independence of the National Statistics Office of Georgia (Geostat).

---

Action upon these recommendations is seen in the changes to the law in 2015, which reformed the appointment procedures of non-public members of the Geostat Board, to be based on open competition. In addition, Geostat will form an Advisory Board. The law now also makes it mandatory for business respondents to comply with Geostat questionnaires.

The General Population and Housing Census was conducted in 2014, collecting demographic, educational, labour force, migration, housing agricultural and other data. This was the first census in the region conducted with the help of digital (geographical information system) maps. The final results of the census were published in 2016 and are available on the internet (www.census.ge).

In 2014, the Quality and Methodology Sub-Division was created at Geostat and the interagency working group was set up to improve the coordination of national statistics. Geostat presented the European Code of Practice to this working group.

Annual national action plans are agreed between the EU and Georgia for the implementation of the requirements of the Agreement. Geostat’s 2017 and 2018 action plans focus on national accounts, quality issues, foreign trade and business statistics.

In 2016 a new methodology for defining the size of enterprises was drawn up, which is close to the methodology of EUROSTAT. Since the first quarter of 2017, Geostat has disseminated data on business statistics according to the new methodology. New software is now applied to process data on foreign trade statistics. From January 2016, foreign trade statistics, alongside the standard format, have been disseminated according to the Broad Economic Categories (BEC) and Standard International Trade Classification (SITC). Since February 2017 statistical data on Georgia’s external merchandise have been processed and disseminated according to mode of transport. Respective data for 2016 were fully updated.

As Geostat currently does not provide sufficient statistical data on trade in services, improvement in this area has become one of the priorities of a twinning project that is being prepared by Geostat. Geostat needs more resources to strengthen its professional staff and to improve the quality and coverage of official statistics.
Georgian statistics at a glance

Georgian legislation provides a strong basis for producing independent, objective and reliable statistics in line with the fundamental principles of United Nations and the European Statistics Code of Practice.

The national statistics agency, Geostat, was established as an independent institution in 2010; its work had been based on the experience of advanced statistical systems and conducted with the support of international organisations.

Substantial progress has been made to improve the capacity and performance of the national statistical system over the last decade, but it is still a long way from meeting the Statistical Requirements Compendium of Eurostat.
PART III.
ECONOMIC COOPERATION
14. MACROECONOMIC CONTEXT AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The macroeconomic context

Following the breakup of the Soviet Union, Georgia experienced a period of dramatic social, economic and political change, with bigger losses in output in the first years of independence than any other CIS state (-29% in 1993 alone). Tax revenues dropped catastrophically and the budget deficit reached 26% of GDP in 1993.

The economy began to recover in 1995, and in the period 1995-99 it achieved an average growth rate of 7%, later reaching a double-digit rate in 2003 mainly with a contribution from the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline construction.

Despite some progress in privatisation and other structural reforms, at the beginning of the 2000s Georgia was still facing serious economic and financial challenges. The government was not able to consolidate its finances, largely because of problems with governance and corruption. Tax collection, as a share of GDP, was among the lowest in the CIS. The country was facing severe difficulties in meeting its external financial obligations and had to engage in a round of debt restructuring at the Paris Club. The shortfall in public funds had especially impacted the country’s vulnerable population.

After the Rose Revolution in 2003, however, the new government implemented comprehensive reforms aimed at liberalising the economy and at sustainable economic growth, based on private sector development. The establishment of an attractive business environment alongside macroeconomic stability led to significant inflows of foreign
direct investment, which reached a peak in 2007 of $2 billion (almost 20% of GDP). As a result, economic growth surged ahead to impressive double-digit rates, averaging 10.5% in 2005–07 (Table 14.1). The liberalisation reforms and economic performance led to spectacular improvements in Georgia’s position in international rankings and surveys of the ease of doing business along with perceptions of corruption, such as the Doing Business report by the World Bank Group and the Corruption Perception Index by Transparency International. Notably, Georgia entered the top ten category worldwide (8th place) in terms of the ease of doing business according to the Doing Business report of 2014, up from 100th place in the Doing Business report of 2006 and holds 9th place in the Doing Business report 2018.78

Table 14.1 Georgia’s main economic indicators, 2005-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth (%y/y)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (%y/y period average)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget deficit (% GDP)</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross external debt (% GDP)</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>110.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign direct investment ($ mn)</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current account balance (% of GDP)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Preliminary data.

Sources: Ministry of Finance of Georgia, National Bank of Georgia, National Statistics Office of Georgia, IMF.

One of the strengths of Georgia’s economy during these developments was its diversified structure, with no dependence on a single sector or external market. The policy of diversified growth

helped Georgia to cope comparatively well with the Russian trade embargo, unilaterally introduced by Russia in 2006 on all Georgian agricultural products.

Despite the war with Russia in 2008, coupled with the global financial and economic crisis, the economy has proved to be relatively resilient to these huge political and economic shocks. During 2008 and 2009, the Georgian economy did not go into significant recession, although there was a major increase in the budget deficit. The economy soon recovered, with GDP growth averaging 6.6% over 2010–12 (Table 14.1). Foreign investment shrank initially with the global financial crises and the Russian–Georgian military conflict, but in recent years it has returned to high levels, with $1.8 billion (10.6% of GDP) recorded in 2014, followed by a slight fall in 2015-2017 and reaching again over $1.8 billion in 2017.

As from 2013, Georgia’s economic performance was less impressive, partly owing to the difficult external economic environment, but also to the lack of a clear pro-business economic policy vision and a slowdown of liberal reforms since 2013. The slower pace of the implementation of infrastructural projects during 2013-16 also had a negative impact on economic growth. This slowdown and the exchange rate depreciation of trading partners, especially Russia, lowered Georgia’s exports and migrant worker remittances. The shortfall in foreign earnings and a worldwide strengthening of the US dollar caused the lari to depreciate by more than 20% against the dollar in 2015. The depreciation process further continued in the second half of 2016 reaching 30% over a two-year period. This depreciation increased the public debt as well as the debt burden on borrowers with dollar-denominated loans.

Real GDP growth was only 2.9% in 2015 and 2.8% in 2016, but in 2017 economic growth accelerated to reach 5.0% (Table 14.1) driven by consumption and external demand. From the supply side trade, construction and transport made the largest contribution to growth, while agriculture and household activities contributed negatively to growth. In 2017, the highest real growth, 11.2%, was identified in construction and hotels and restaurants sectors.

The current account deficit, which remained in the two-digit area during previous years, dropped from 13.2% to GDP to 8.9% in 2017. The fiscal deficit in 2017 was 3.9% of GDP, a slight reduction from 4.1% of GDP in 2016.
Provisions of the Agreement and EU financial assistance

The text of the Association Agreement on macroeconomic cooperation is short and simple. It foresees regular dialogue on macroeconomic policy. Georgia shall seek to “gradually approximate its economic and financial regulations to those of the EU, while ensuring sound macroeconomic policies” (Art. 277), but there are no timetables or precise references to EU legislation.

There is a further chapter on the management of public finances (Art. 279), which is entirely about Georgia’s system of internal control of public finances and the functioning of the State Audit Office as an independent institution. 2017 marked ten years of EU support to public finance reforms in Georgia. Cooperation has led to a more transparent, understandable and internationally recognised government budget system in Georgia. The Open Budget Survey 2017 ranks Georgia among the top five out of the 102 countries surveyed globally, together with New Zealand, South Africa, Sweden and Norway.

While the provisions of the Agreement in the macroeconomic field are thin, in practice the EU is supplying significant macro-financial assistance (MFA) to Georgia following on from and complementing an IMF approved Extended Arrangement Under the Extended Fund Facility (EFF) in April 2017. Negotiations on €45 million MFA (out of which €10 million is a grant) are ongoing. Under the previous Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Georgia and the EU in December 2014 the EU provided Georgia with a €46 million MFA, equally divided between grants and loans.79

Further grants from the EU budget are programmed for the period 2017-20, for an amount that may range between €371 and $453 million, to support Georgia’s reform agenda through financial and technical cooperation. More than 100 projects are currently being carried out in Georgia. The EU provides over €100 million in assistance to Georgia annually. Funding comes mostly from the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI), which supports Georgia in achieving the goals set out in the AA. The cooperation is focused on reforming the public administration and justice sectors, as well as on agriculture and rural development, with complementary support being

79 See the “Memorandum of Understanding between the European Union as donor [and] Georgia as beneficiary and the National Bank of Georgia as Beneficiary’s Financial Agent”, signed in December 2014.
planned for capacity development in support of the Association Agreement and DCFTA.

Projects under the Neighbourhood Investment Facility (NIF) usually co-fund investments by the European Investment Bank (EIB), Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and selected financial institutions of EU member states. The NIF’s grant funding eases the financial conditions for the investors. Georgia has received €86.5 million grants through the NIF between 2008-16. Currently five infrastructure projects financed by KFW, EBRD, and EIB are complemented by a €46.5 million grant from the NIF.

The EIB and EBRD are making major contributions to financing investment in the Georgian economy. From a strictly legal standpoint, these financial activities do not derive their basis from the Agreement, but they are important in complementing and helping to fund its implementation.

The European Investment Bank is a major investor in Georgia, and has extended a total of €1.3 billion of loans and investment so far. A third of all ongoing donor financial projects receive financial contributions from the EIB. The EBRD has made financial contributions amounting to €2.9 billion in 212 projects. Some 81% of these investments are directed towards the private sector. The EBRD’s leading contributions have been in the fields of energy and financial institutions followed by industry, commerce and agribusiness. The EBRD's investments and activities in Georgia are, per capita, among the largest of all the countries in which the EBRD operates. Notably, the EBRD organised its 24th annual meeting in Tbilisi in 2015.

The CEB provides €14 million sovereign loans to Georgia to finance a comprehensive rehabilitation of schools in Tbilisi. This project is co-financed by €6 million provided by the Eastern Europe Energy Efficiency and Environment Partnership (E5P). The Council of Europe Development Bank has financed projects in private sector amounting to approximately €45 million.
Macroeconomics and funding from the EU at a glance

In the years between independence and the 2003 Rose Revolution, Georgia made only slow progress in economic policy reforms. The subsequent change of government led to liberal regulatory reforms, and gave rise to a period of rapid economic growth.

The reforms enabled Georgia to achieve impressive improvements in its international rankings related to the ease of doing business and perception of corruption, where Georgia emerged among the best performers worldwide.

The economy has suffered several adverse economic shocks in recent years, first the 2008 war with Russia and then the global financial crisis, but it has proved quite resilient and recovered rapidly.

From 2013 on there was sluggish growth, partly due to a shift in fiscal priorities from capital to social expenditure, lack of pro-business reforms and economic challenges in Georgia’s external partners. However, in 2017 growth accelerated and capital spending gains momentum.

The EU is supplying significant financial assistance to Georgia, including macroeconomic grants alongside the IMF, budget grants and major investment from the European Investment Bank and EBRD. The latter institutions support the energy and financial sector, in particular.
15. Financial Services

The Agreement envisages a comprehensive alignment by Georgia with the EU system for regulating banks, insurance and securities markets with adoption, at least in the long run, of the entire EU legislative body of laws. The objectives are for the financial markets to be safe and efficient for consumers, to be systemically sound for the economy, for the industry to have open access to EU markets and to secure its competitiveness and modernisation.

Provisions of the Agreement

General provisions. The Agreement commits Georgia to ensuring its financial market regulations are ‘gradually made compatible’ with those of the EU on banking, insurance, securities and asset management. A large number of EU laws, 51 in total (listed in Annex XV-A), are to be approximated with implementation timetables of mostly five to seven years. There is a much more limited number of core regulations of systemic importance, however, and many of the others are technical implementing provisions for the core regulations.

National treatment. In general, the Agreement provides for ‘national treatment’ for the establishment and the cross-border supply of services, meaning that each party shall grant to the other party’s operators treatment no less favourable than for its own. This is in line with standard WTO/GATS principles, where national treatment nonetheless only applies once a service provider has legally entered the market (i.e. this ‘national treatment’ does not in itself grant market access, which is a separate matter – see further below). In addition,
there are detailed provisions facilitating the “temporary presence” of key personnel and suppliers of services.

**Further market access.** There are numerous specific reservations by individual EU member states (listed in Annex XIV), many of which may be of small significance, but still complicate and limit the openness of the market. The Agreement is cautious about further market opening measures by the EU, as stipulated in Art. 122: “With a view to considering further liberalisation...the parties recognise the importance of the gradual approximation of the existing and future legislation of Georgia” to the international best standards as well as EU laws.

**International standards.** The Agreement calls in Art. 116 for Georgia to “make its best endeavours” to apply internationally agreed standards, inter alia:

- Basel ‘Core Principles for Banking Supervision’,
- International Association of Insurance Supervisors ‘Insurance Core Principles’,
- International Organisation of Securities Commissions’ ‘Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation’,
- OECD’s Agreement on exchange of information on tax matters,
- the G20 ‘Statement on transparency and exchange of information for tax purposes’, and

**Banks – Capital requirements.** The global financial crisis in 2008–09, with the collapse or near-collapse of major banks of systemic importance, has led to a radical strengthening of the capital reserve requirements of banking systems. The Agreement cites several key laws (subsequently revised):

- Directive 2006/49/EC on the capital adequacy of investment firms and credit institutions, later replaced by the 2013 Regulation (EU) 575/2013 on prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms; and
- the related Directive 2006/48/EC on the business of credit institutions, replaced in 2013 by Directive 2013/36/EU on access to the activity of credit institutions and the prudential supervision of credit institutions and investment firms.
These texts transpose into EU law the latest global standards on bank capital adequacy, commonly known as the ‘Basel’ regulatory norms. The new texts are a combination of directives, which give some leeway to member states on how to implement the provisions, and regulations, which in EU law are directly applicable and specify the harmonisation requirements. While the basic minimum capital requirement of 8% of equity capital is unchanged (as in Basel I and the 2006 directives), the definition of capital has been tightened and further categories of reserve requirements have been introduced, leading essentially to the following regime (under Basel III and the new 2013 laws):

- a minimum capital reserve requirement of 8%,
- a capital conservation buffer of 2.5%,
- a countercyclical capital buffer of 0 to 2.5%,
- a capital buffer for systemically important institutions of 0 to 3.5%, and
- a systemic risk buffer of 0 to 3 to 5%.

As a result, depending on the specific features of individual banks, the requirements could effectively be doubled, although small to medium-sized banks can be largely exempt from the additional requirements. These capital reserve requirements are subject to extremely complex methodologies for definition and calculation, which take up the bulk of the texts in question. There are also new requirements with respect to liquidity to cover stress conditions.

**Insurance.** The crucial law for regulating the insurance industry is Directive 2009/138/EC on the taking-up and pursuit of the business of insurance and reinsurance, also known as ‘Solvency II’, which is a fundamental text detailing rules for the conduct of the industry, its supervision and solvency. Georgia has six years to implement these reforms.

**Securities (MiFID).** The EU has established a comprehensive regulatory regime for investor transactions by stock markets, other
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80 ‘Basel I’ was the first internationally agreed set of banking regulations negotiated and produced by the Bank for International Settlements (located in Basel), while ‘Basel III’ is the most recent version that takes into account the need for changes in the light of the 2009 financial crisis. While these norms are international, the EU legislates to make them strictly operational and binding.

trading systems and investment firms, with a single authorisation for investment firms to do business anywhere in the EU. The key law is Directive 2004/39/EC on markets in financial instruments (MiFID I), supplemented by an implementing Directive (2006/73/EC). In 2014 the EU adopted new MiFID Directive 2014/65/EU (MiFID II), which is more complex and sets new requirements for investor protection, transparency, market structure etc. EU member countries should apply measures gradually by September 2018. Two other important directives concern rules for the prospectus for issuance of securities (2003/71/EC), and for controlling insider dealing (2003/6/EC). The further large number of directives in this section mostly involves amendments or implementing details of the three main directives cited here.

**Investment funds (UCITS).** The basic law of the EU for investment funds was revised in 2009 in the wake of the Madoff scandal of 2008, with Directive 2009/65/EC on collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS). The market in question has grown to a substantial size in the EU. Hence, this text underwent a further important revision in 2014 (Directive 2014/91/EU).

**Financial derivatives.** The EU introduced complex rules to regulate financial derivatives in Regulation (EU) 648/2012 on over-the-counter derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (also called ‘EMIR’). This was a major development, enabling the EU to deliver the G20 commitments on over-the-counter derivatives agreed at the Pittsburgh summit in September 2009. The regulation ensures that information on all European derivative transactions will be reported to trade repositories and be accessible to supervisory authorities.

**Implementation perspectives**

**Current state of the financial markets in Georgia.** Financial markets in Georgia are mainly represented by the banking sector, while other areas, such as insurance, the stock exchange, investment and pension funds, are less developed, of which the insurance sector is the most advanced.

The main institution governing the financial sector is the National Bank of Georgia (NBG), which was established in 1991 when Georgia gained independence from the Soviet Union. The NBG is the single regulator for the financial sector with just some exceptions. In 2008-09, a Financial Supervision Agency (FSA) was established as a regulator for the financial system, separating this function from the
broader, monetary policy functions of the National Bank. A similar reform was undertaken in 2015, when a new independent FSA was created, and the supervisory function was kept separate from the NBG. This reform, however, was appealed in the Constitutional Court of Georgia as being against the constitution, namely Art. 95(1). The case is still pending in the Constitutional Court and the decision has not been taken yet, but the government already returned the supervisory functions to the NBG.

The main regulations concerning the financial system are based on several pieces of legislation, namely the Law on Commercial Banks, Law on Insurance, Law on Securities Market, Law on Investment Funds and Law on Microfinance Organisations. This legislation has been developed in recent years taking into account international standards of prudential supervision and regulation of the financial market.

There are 16 commercial banks in Georgia, of which three banks are so-called ‘systemically important’ banks, and constitute more than half of the entire banking sector. The two largest commercial banks are listed on the London Stock Exchange. The banking sector is well developed in Georgia, showing high growth rates and resilience over the past decade. By the end of 2017 the total assets of commercial banks had increased by 206% since 2010, while total loans had increased by 236%. At the same time, the share of non-performing loans in total volume of loans remains comparatively low – by the end of 2017, this indicator decreased from 3.4% in 2016 to 2.8% (using IMF methodology).

The development of the insurance market is underway. There are 17 insurance companies in the country, of which three are rather large. In 2017, net profit of insurance companies increased by 12% annually and reached GEL 20.34 mln. During the same period, equity capital increased by 13% and reached GEL 154.25 mln. There are no mandatory categories of insurance in the country except insurance of bank deposits and insurance against civil liability for foreign vehicles. Market capitalisation is still very low. In 2016, due to changes in the Georgian Law on Insurance, EU Solvency I requirements for solvency margins, reporting standards and the minimum capital of insurance undertakings were introduced.

According to the Agreement, Georgia has the obligation to approximate Directive 94/19/EC on Deposit Guarantee Schemes within six years after entry into force of the Agreement and apply different thresholds for insurance, taking into consideration local market developments. Nevertheless, Georgia started implementation
of deposit insurance system in 2017 according to the new Directive 2014/49/EU, except some provisions. In May 2017, the Law on Deposit Insurance System was adopted and Deposit Insurance Agency was established.

Other parts of the financial market are very small, with minor roles. There are two stock exchanges, one licensed central depository, seven brokerage companies and four independent registrars of securities in Georgia. Capitalisation of the stock exchange is negligible, while over-the-counter trade is rather well developed. Owing to the reforms undertaken in recent years, the stock exchange and central depository institutions act on the basis of self-regulatory principles.

Currently, four companies maintain private pension schemes, (but three are operational) with the total funds attracted by them in 2015-17 amounting to only € 8.7 million. Currently, Georgia has a pay-as-you-go system for retirement compensation.

In 2017, Georgia elaborated legislation for pension reform, which provides for the establishment of a compulsory, contributory pension system (pillar II). This is an important development, but not one that features in the Association Agreement.

Requirements of the Association Agreement. Although the Agreement itself aims at liberalising trade in goods as well as services, it should be underlined that the EU is not offering Georgia comprehensive market opening in financial services immediately or unconditionally. Therefore, the process of legislative approximation is the precondition for market opening.

In addition to the Annex on legislation approximation, the main body of the text of the Association Agreement on financial services envisages that the parties will make their “best endeavours” to apply international standards in their financial systems, which is a rather loose commitment (paragraph 3 of Art. 116). That is mainly because these international standards apply to the entire financial market. Yet, as mentioned above only the banking sector in Georgia’s financial market is rather developed. Adopting international standards in areas with limited or almost no development would be very difficult and burdensome for the sector.

For this reason, Georgia has chosen variable time periods for approximation of its financial legislation to that of the EU – from two to eight years. The short period mainly applies to anti-money laundering provisions, where Georgia’s position is already fairly compatible with international standards, and the longest period will be taken for the insurance sector, where market development is limited.
Banking. Georgia gradually introduces Basel III principles in the banking system, taking into consideration developments in the country’s banking sector. Thus, as the core EU directives on banking incorporate Basel requirements, Georgia has chosen to proceed over significant transition periods. Moreover, there is also a clause included in the Annex allowing the country to postpone the implementation of more advanced approaches defined by the EU directives.

In June, 2017, Georgia introduced a regulation on disclosure of information for commercial banks within Pillar 3 according to which banks are obliged to disclose qualitative and quantitative information on regulatory capital elements, risk-weighted assets, remuneration of senior management within the frameworks of Basel III, also corporate governance and risk management related issues according to EU transparency principles.  

For the development of risk-based supervisory framework and encouragement of sustainable credit standards, in August 2017, capital adequacy requirements of Basel III for interrelated borrowers in retail banking increased from GEL 350 000 up to GEL 2 mln. This will enable banks to include micro, small and medium sized businesses (MSEs) in the retail class. Consequently, the supervisory burden on such credits will be softened and access to credits for SMEs will be increased. Minimum capital requirements for loans of physical persons increased from GEL 250 000 to GEL 1 mln.

Another important change in the banking sector was the introduction of deposit insurance. In May, 2017 a Law on deposit Insurance System was adopted according to which, all bank deposits of physical persons up to GEL 5 000 (except for bank management and shareholders holding 5% and more share of capital) should be insured. Banks are obliged to pay initial contributions in the amount of GEL 100,000 and monthly regular contributions of 0.067% of covered deposits in the national currency and 1% of covered deposits in foreign currency.

According to the Agreement, Georgia had the obligation to implement Directive 94/19/EC on deposit insurance within five years of the entry into force of the Agreement. Nevertheless, Georgian legislation was approximated to the new Directive 2014/49/EU ahead of time, apart from some requirements. Notably, Georgia does not
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82 NBG’s Governor Decree, June 22, 2017.
83 From EUR 80 208 to EUR 320 832 (ExRate-1 EUR: 3.1169 GEL).
84 UR 1,604 (ExRate-1 EUR: 3.1169 GEL).
apply deposit insurance to other financial institutions or to the deposits of companies. Georgia also applies different thresholds for obligatory insurance. Introduction of the deposit insurance system significantly increases costs for banks, which is expected to become an additional burden for customers. Trust in the banking system in Georgia is quite high, even without the deposit guarantee scheme; during the last seven years the total volume of deposits has almost tripled.

In order to approximate to Directive 2002/87/EC on the supplementary supervision of credit institutions, insurance undertakings and investment firms in a financial conglomerate, a draft law is being elaborated. In addition, work is ongoing to identify priority requirements of EU directives on capital adequacy of investment firms and credit institutions.

**Insurance.** Although legal approximation with EU legislation in this area envisages approximation to the EU Solvency II directive, due to the limited development and market capitalisation of the sector, Georgia started to introduce Solvency I requirements for insurance companies. In 2016, changes were implemented to the law on Insurance, introducing minimum and supervised capital requirements, insolvency standards and other requirements, which are burdensome for Georgian insurance companies, given their comparatively low level of development. Insurance companies are obliged to keep minimum capital in cash on bank accounts, which will create significant pressure, especially for small insurance companies. In December 2017, the rule for calculation of minimum capital requirements was adopted and thresholds on insurance and reinsurance increased. According to this rule, a gradual increase of thresholds for minimum capital requirements is envisaged until December 2020.

As for Solvency II, which envisages a risk-based approach for calculating solvency capital requirements for insurance undertakings, alignment with this regulation will be extremely difficult for the country’s insurance market without prior, enhanced market capitalisation.

Another important aspect of legislative approximation is to introduce insurance against civil liability in respect of the use of motor vehicles. This system currently does not exist in Georgia and there are several reasons for that. Among them is that the limited development of the insurance market makes it difficult to administer such a system in an efficient way. Another issue is rather social, with a reluctance of the population to accept mandatory insurance. To take some steps in this direction, a phased introduction of the system is ongoing. First, it will apply only to foreign vehicles, and then gradually to domestic
commercial and finally to all domestic vehicles. The law on MTPL (Motor Third Party Liability Insurance) for foreign vehicles was drawn up and submitted to the Parliament for adoption. The law sets mandatory requirements for insurance against civil liability for foreign vehicles entering Georgian territory. Premiums are defined according to types of vehicles and periods of stay in Georgia. A special agency, the Mandatory Insurance Centre, will be created to implement a new scheme. It is understood that this mandatory type of insurance will enhance the capitalisation of the insurance market and create a basis for introducing stricter EU solvency requirements.

*Capital markets.* As outlined above, the development of Georgia’s capital market is very limited. As a result of the reforms undertaken, the operation of this market is based on self-regulatory principles. Georgia intends to further develop its capital market. In this process, it is understood that aligning with EU requirements in this area will be extremely difficult as these requirements have been set for well-developed EU capital markets. Therefore, this process of approximation requires careful analysis and consideration in relation to the development of the local market.

The same point applies in particular to the requirements for drawing up a prospectus. EU legislation in this area stipulates that there should be no offering of securities to the public without a prospectus. Even the resale of securities might be regarded as a situation where the drawing up of a prospectus is required. In Georgia’s case, the legislation defines that if the issuer’s securities are traded on the recognised stock exchange of a foreign country, the issuer is free to issue securities without any additional regulation. Furthermore, if the entity has provided regular reports to the NBG during the last two years, there are softened requirements for the prospectus. Approximation to these aspects of EU legislation will involve introducing stricter requirements in the corresponding Georgian legislation. A roadmap for approximation to the EU capital market directives is being drawn up. In addition, a working process on the elaboration of legislation on investment funds according to the UCITS directive has been started.

According to the AA, Georgia has the obligation to implement Directive 2004/39/EC on markets in financial instruments (MiFID I) within five years after the entry into force of the Agreement, but as mentioned above, MiFID II Directive - 2014/65/EU was adopted in 2014, repealing Directive 2004/39/EC. MiFID II is highly complex and provides more comprehensive regulations for markets and financial instruments than MiFID I. The Georgian government is in
communication with the European Commission to discuss what should be Georgia’s obligations in relation to implementation of MiFID II Directive, and over what time horizon.

**Anti-money laundering.** Georgia is rather well positioned in this area. As one can easily observe, in this part of the Annex, Georgia made a commitment to gradually approximate to EU law in the shortest periods (two to three years) compared with other parts of the Annex. This is because Georgia’s legislation is basically in line with the international standards in this respect. For implementation of Directive 2005/60/EC on anti-money laundering, changes to the law on the organisation of gambling business were drafted and have been submitted to parliament for approval.
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**Financial markets at a glance**

*Georgia’s financial market is mainly represented by a comparatively well-developed banking sector, while other parts of the financial system are less developed.*

*Most EU legislation is very complex and for this reason Georgia is taking long transition periods for the approximation of EU laws. This is especially true of some new EU legislation for capital markets (e.g. MIFID II). However, Georgia has accelerated some measures, including a deposit insurance scheme.*

*However, the process of approximation, if done properly and taking into account local market developments, is an opportunity for Georgia to ensure a sound and prudent financial system.*

*There is also an issue of market openness. The EU market will only be fully open to Georgia when the approximation process is completed.*
16. Transport

Transport has been a key sector for the internal market since the early days of the European integration process. As a result, the EU has a well-established body of law and policies in this field. The DCFTA seeks to expand and strengthen Georgia’s transport cooperation with the EU and to promote efficient, safe and secure transport operations, as well as greater interoperability of transport systems. This will be crucial in helping Georgia’s industries integrate into EU supply chains and to boost contact between people, especially since the EU granted visa-free travel to Georgia to the Schengen area starting from March 2017.

Provisions of the Agreement

Overall, the DCFTA provides for a progressive liberalisation of transport in road, rail, inland waterways, sea and air, with approximation to many EU rules and standards. In some instances, there are further special agreements, such as the 2010 EU-Georgia Common Aviation Area Agreement (CAA).

Of the transport modes, air and maritime (including intermodal) are of special importance for links with the EU. The main text of the DCFTA spells out the regime for shipping in considerable detail, whereas it simply refers to the CAA and deals with the other modes of transport in the annexes.

Air transport. The DCFTA refers to the 2010 EU-Georgia CAA, which aims at progressively liberalising air transport between the EU and Georgia, “adapted to their reciprocal commercial needs and the conditions of mutual market access” to routes and capacity. The
removal of market access restrictions between the EU and Georgia should attract new entrants to the market and create opportunities to expand the operations of Georgian airports. So far, all but four EU member states have ratified the CAA.

The CAA promotes regulatory cooperation and the harmonisation of regulations and approaches based on EU legislation in aviation safety, aviation security, air traffic management, computer reservation systems (CRS) and the environment (measures listed in Annex III), as well as non-discrimination and the creation of a “level playing field for economic operators”. The CAA foresees the gradual transition of Georgia to the application of the EU’s air transport acquis (Annex II). The transitional arrangements provide that the implementation and application by Georgia of the EU legal acts indicated in Annex III is subject to an evaluation by the European Commission and validation by a separate decision of the EU–Georgia Joint Committee.85

Yet, the CAA does not confer complete internal market access to Georgian carriers: they only obtain the right to fly between Georgia and an EU destination, either directly or via an intermediate point in the neighbourhood, in the European Common Aviation Area or in Iceland, Liechtenstein or Switzerland (Annex II). That excludes Georgian carriers from operating flights within EU member states (cabotage) and flights between two EU member states unconnected to a flight to or from Georgia.

The legal regime applicable to air transport services is convoluted. In general terms, the DCFTA will defer to the CAA as and when this enters into force. In the meantime, the DCFTA excludes national and most favoured nation (MFN) treatment for domestic and international air transport services, whether scheduled or non-scheduled. There are, however, exceptions to this rule, notably for i) aircraft repair and maintenance services, during which an aircraft is withdrawn from service; ii) the selling and marketing of air transport services; iii) CRS services; iv) ground-handling services; and v) airport operation services (Arts 78-79 of the DCFTA). Still, the reservations

85 Until a positive evaluation, the right for the air carriers of both parties to exercise “5th freedom rights” other than those already granted by bilateral agreements between Georgia and EU member states, is excluded. The fifth freedom allows an airline to carry passengers from one’s own country to a second country, and from that country to a third country (and so on). Fifth-freedom traffic rights are intended to enhance the economic viability of an airline’s long-haul routes.
mentioned in the DCFTA have to be regularly reviewed by the Association Council’s subcommittee dealing with transport, in order to progressively liberalise the establishment conditions and resolve the legal inconsistencies between the CAA and the DCFTA.\textsuperscript{86}

\textit{International maritime transport.} The DCFTA prescribes a regime of “unrestricted access to cargoes on a commercial basis, freedom to provide international maritime services, as well as national treatment in the framework of the provision of such services” and contains a number of standstill clauses to prevent the parties to the Agreement from introducing measures constituting (disguised) restrictions or having discriminatory effects. The right of establishment for service suppliers is excluded for national maritime cabotage.\textsuperscript{87} Annex XIV-A to the Agreement imposes no national or MFN treatment obligations on the Union for the establishment of a registered company for the purpose of operating a fleet under the national flag of Georgia. Conversely, Georgia has no national or MFN treatment obligations with respect to passenger transportation by maritime transport and supporting services for maritime transport from entrepreneurs from the Union (Annex XIV-D).

Through the DCFTA, Georgia has committed itself to adopt and implement rules for, inter alia, the qualification of seafarers, safety standards for passenger and cargo ships, and legal acts on the liability

\textsuperscript{86}This should prevent any problems associated with the hierarchy of legal regimes when the CAA enters into force. In the same vein, Arts 78-79 relate to the freedom of establishment and not to the cross-border provision of services. As these services are typically provided through establishment, one could argue that the DCFTA regime will prevail in practice. In some cases, however, services are provided without establishment (e.g. self-handling), which will mean that the applicable rules will have to be derived from the CAA. Similarly, the DCFTA lists two EU-wide reservations on establishment in the area of air transport services, one relating to the rental of aircraft with crew, the other with respect to CRS (Annex XVI-A). The relevant provision on CRS in the CAA (Art. 13) refers to access to the market, without detailing whether this is through or without establishment; this may indeed create a conflict, in which case one could either argue that the specialised (i.e. CAA) or the later agreement (i.e. the DCFTA) takes precedence.

\textsuperscript{87}Art. 78 states that “[w]ithout prejudice to the scope of activities which may be considered as cabotage under the relevant domestic legislation, national maritime cabotage under this Chapter covers transportation of passengers or goods between a port or point located in Georgia or a Member State of the EU and another port or point located in Georgia or Member State of the EU, including on its continental shelf, as provided in the UNCLOS and traffic originating and terminating in the same port or point located in Georgia or a Member State of the EU.”
of carriers of passengers by sea in the event of accidents. Georgia is also required to harmonise its legislation on, inter alia, ship inspection, port state control and flag state obligations. The timetables in Annex XV-D prescribe such harmonisation within four to five years of entry into force of the Agreement, except for the implementation of the International Safety Management Code and the minimum level of training of seafarers, which are required within a period of three years.

Road transport. Companies, operators and drivers from Georgia are expected to comply in full with the EU’s laws. At the same time, eight member states have issued reservations concerning the full liberalisation of the road transport sector with Georgia. These reservations should be regularly reviewed by the Association Council’s subcommittee dealing with transport in order to progressively liberalise the market.

This situation puts the onus on the Georgian legislature to approximate domestic rules and standards to those of the EU, and introduce the necessary monitoring, inspection and enforcement mechanisms to assure proper implementation of the EU directives and regulations. Short timetables apply to international transport, whereas vehicles and operators engaged only in national transport usually benefit from double the time to comply with the approximated legislation. For instance, immediate priority should be given to implementing market admission rules and creating a single, electronic state register for international road carriers (within one year; four years for national transport operators), as well as ensuring working time controls in road transport activities (as of the entry into force of the Agreement for international transport; within five years for national transport). The implementation of legislation pertaining to technical conditions (e.g. dimensions and weights, speed limitation devices, and roadworthiness tests) is two years, with some exceptions.

---

89 See Directive 2008/106/EC.
90 See Regulation (EC) 1071/2009 concerning the conditions to pursue the occupation of road transport operator. Annex XIV-A: Residency is required for the transport manager.
91 See Directive 2006/22/EC.
92 See Directive 96/53/EC.
93 See Directive 92/6/EEC.
94 See Directive 2009/40/EC.
Annex XIV-D to the DCFTA does not impose national or MFN treatment obligations on Georgia with respect to road transport services, including passenger transportation, the rental of commercial vehicles with operator and supporting services for road transport to entrepreneurs of the EU. Here too, bilateral road transport agreements prevail on the basis of reciprocity, which allow the respective countries to carry out international transportation of passengers and cargo.

**Railway transport.** Georgia’s 1500-km rail network is entirely broad gauge and is not directly connected to the EU. The DCFTA aims at reforming the rail transport sector and gradually liberalising the freight and passenger rail market. As with other modes of transport, this requires improving technical and technological quality standards. The timetables for approximation are quite long (five to eight years). Annex XIV-D to the DCFTA nonetheless points out that Georgia does not extend national or MFN treatment to supporting services for rail transport services, and that the railroad infrastructure is Georgia’s state property and its exploitation a monopoly (Annex XIV-D).

**Inland waterway transport.** Georgia’s internal navigable waterway system is negligible and mainly used for recreational purposes. While the DCFTA lists the conditions for progressive approximation to EU standards, i.e. qualifications for operators, a central register and safety standards for vessels, harmonisation of this body of the EU’s law is of marginal practical importance.

**Implementation perspectives**

Transport became one of the fastest growing sectors of Georgia’s economy, averaging about 5% real annual growth between 2003 and 2017, thus recording growth by 98% in total. In 2017 the share of transport in Georgia’s GDP amounted to 7.8%. In 2016, for the first time since 2008, the transport sector experienced a decline in real terms by 0.3%. One of the main reasons for this negative growth was a decline in railway transportation – the volume of cargo shipment fell by more than 10% compared to 2015. In 2017 the transport sector recovered and increased by 7.2% in real terms. During the past decade (2006-16) €2,222 million was invested in fixed assets. By the end of 2017, the number of those employed in the transport sector was by 29% higher than a decade ago. In recent years, the transport sector has attracted a considerable amount of investment, including state funds and investment by the WB, EIB, EBRD, ADB and other international financial institutions.
**Air transport.** This transport mode is the economically most vibrant in EU–Georgia relations. The sector has grown exponentially in recent years, thanks to Georgia’s radical liberalisation, internationalisation and modernisation reforms. In line with the 2005 Presidential Resolution on Measures for the Liberalisation of Air Traffic, amendments to existing international (bilateral) agreements were negotiated and new agreements were signed, all aiming at the removal of restrictions on flight frequencies, capacities, tariffs, destination points and the number of designated airlines. Georgia adopted the policy of open skies and has liberalised its air transport market with 24 states, including Switzerland, Turkey and the US.

The market for air travel between the EU and Georgia received a further boost from the granting of visa-free travel for EU citizens by Georgia in 2006. In March 2017, the EU introduced the visa-free regime for Georgian citizens. This gave additional stimulus to travel between the EU member states and Georgia.

On 11 July 2014, the Georgian government established an Interagency Council for the elaboration of a CAA Implementation Action Plan. By the end of 2017, Georgia had already approximated and fully implemented 9 of the 69 EU aviation directives and regulations and 18 regulations are partially implemented. This also led to amendments to the Georgian Air Code. The gradual transition of Georgia to the full application of the legislation referred to in Part C of Annex III (aviation safety) is subject to assessments carried out by the European Commission in cooperation with the competent authorities of Georgia. When Georgia has fully implemented this legislation, the Joint Committee determines the precise status and conditions for Georgia’s participation in the European Aviation Safety Agency beyond its current observer status, which is already assisting the country to prepare for the full implementation of the EU’s air safety law.95

95 Georgian aircraft that did not have a type of certificate issued in accordance with the relevant EU legislation could be managed under the responsibility of the competent Georgian authorities, in line with the applicable national safety requirements. Those aeroplanes, which were engaged in cargo-only operations that did not meet EU safety requirements by 1 January 2015 (deadline) were removed from the national registry (are not operational). Certain helicopters, engaged in operations such as search and rescue, aerial work, training, emergency, agricultural and humanitarian flights can be managed by competent Georgian authorities, in line with the applicable national safety requirements no later than 31 December 2019, provided that the aircraft comply with international aviation safety standards.
As a result of these and other reforms, Georgian airports have experienced robust growth since 2005. During the period 2010-17, the number of passengers carried by Georgian airports increased 4.4 times. In 2017, more than 1.2 million passengers were transported through Georgian international airports. One of the reasons for the increase is the visa-free travel from Georgia to the EU. The three international airports (in the eastern, central and western parts of the country) are serving more than 50 destinations worldwide. By the end of 2017, about 35 companies were operating in Georgia, including low-cost carriers, some of which (e.g. Wizz Air, Pegasus Airlines and Atlasjet Airlines) have been operating for a number of years. During 2016-17, 13 new low-cost airlines entered into Georgian market. In 2016, Kutaisi International Airport became a base for Wizz Air, which has direct flights to the EU.

In July 2017, the expansion of Tbilisi International Airport was finalised. A new arrival terminal was constructed by TAV Georgia, which operates Tbilisi and Batumi International Airports. The capacity of Tbilisi International Airport increased from 2.8 million passengers to up to 3.5 million annually. The expansion of Kutaisi international airport has also started and is expected to end in 2018.

**International maritime transport.** Georgia’s main seaports are Batumi and Poti. They are important points of the Trans-Caucasian Corridor (TRACECA), connecting the Romanian port of Constanța and the Bulgarian port of Varna with the landlocked countries of the Caspian region and Central Asia. The Baku–Batumi railway and pipelines make the Batumi seaport an important transit point for Caspian oil. After a decline from 2014, in 2017 the number of containers passing through Georgian ports increased by 20% compared to 2016, and amounted to 395 thousand TEU (Twenty-Foot Equivalent Unit). For further development and utilisation of Georgia’s transit potential, in 2015, the government expressed interest in the construction of a deep sea port in Anaklia. In 2016 the winner was announced. Preparation activities for the construction of the Anaklia Deep Sea Port started at the end of 2017. The port should gradually reach the capacity of handling 100 million tonnes of cargo annually. The government will provide railway and road infrastructure to the port.

Georgia gradually approximates its legislation to the maritime transport directives and regulations listed in the AA. By the end of 2017, Georgia had fully implemented eight and partially one of the 23 maritime directives and regulations.
**Road transport.** The road network in Georgia consists of 1,600 km of main or international highways that are considered to be in a good condition, primarily as a result of sizeable investment in infrastructure by state and European and international financial institutions. There are some 20,000 km of secondary and local roads that require further upgrade. During 2017-20 the government plans to build and repair 1,000 km of roads, of which 350 km is highway. The government also plans to build the Rikoti pass, improving connections between the east and west of Georgia by the end of 2020, the total cost of which is estimated to be about €660 million.\(^6\) Passenger road transport destined for the EU is marginal. The majority of overland road haulage passes through Turkey.

By the end of 2017, Georgia partially implemented 9 out of 11 directives and regulations on road transport. Georgia already adopted legislation which makes roadworthiness tests obligatory according to the Directive 2009/40/EC. According to changes in the relevant government decree, new and upgraded requirements were set to roadworthiness test centres. Roadworthiness tests became obligatory for all types of vehicles, including taxis, which will gradually apply from 2018. To meet the new requirements, test centres require substantial investment in both infrastructure and human resources. The requirements of roadworthiness will be especially challenging for taxi services and vehicles owned by poorer families, in particular in the countryside.

As for Motor Third Party Liability Insurance (MTPLI), a law conforming to Directive 2009/103/EC was adopted in December 2017, but at this stage is applicable only to foreign vehicles. By 1 January 2019, the legislation will require obligatory insurance against civil liability, also for vehicles registered in Georgia, causing additional compliance costs for car owners.

**Silk Road.** Due to its favourable geographical location, Georgia is the shortest link for the transportation of goods between Europe and Asia. In particular, the following transport projects have an important function in this context:

- Construction and development of the Anaklia New Deep Water Black Sea Port will have the competitive advantages of strategic location, capacity to receive Panamax-type vessels, one-stop shop solutions, simple and fast procedures and year-round safe navigation. The Anaklia Port will give new impetus to increasing

---

\(^6\) GEL 2 billion. ExRate 3.0435 (22.02.2018).
the competitiveness of the TRACECA corridor and attract additional cargo flows from Europe to Asia and vice versa through the territory of Georgia.

- The Baku–Tbilisi–Kars New Railway Connection Project, whose construction started in 2008, will connect Azerbaijan, Georgian and Turkish railways, and importantly will connect Georgia to Europe via rail. The main construction works on Georgian territory are completed and the railway will be fully operational by the end of 2018. The cargo and passenger handling capacity of the railway is expected to be 1 million passengers and 5 million tons of freight per year, with the perspective for increases up to 15 million tons in the future. The new rail track in Azerbaijan and Georgia retains the former Soviet rail gauge, and conversion to the European gauge rail used in Turkey is done at Akhalkalaki, close to Georgia’s border with Turkey.

- The modernisation of the Georgian railways started in 2011, with the aim to optimise freight and passenger traffic, improve operational safety and maximise freight throughput capacity. About 80% of construction works are completed; finalisation is expected by the end of 2019.\(^7\)

- Construction and rehabilitation of the East–West Highway, which started in 2006, has great importance for Georgia and its neighbouring countries as well as for the EU as a strategic transit route between Europe and Central Asia. At this stage, 170 km of highway has been completed and construction of an additional 100 km highway is ongoing. Construction and rehabilitation of the East–West Highway is co-financed by the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency and the European Investment Bank.

- Railway freight transportation from China to Europe created an opportunity for the freight to move from China to the Black Sea ports of Georgia with transit time reduced from 40-45 to 9-14 days. The first freight shipment took place in 2015, and since then a total of 16 shipments have been carried out.

- The creation of logistics centres in Georgia is envisaged as part of the East–West Highway Corridor Improvement Project financed by the World Bank. A feasibility study was completed

\(^7\) By the end of 2017, Georgia partially implemented Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations as defined by the AA.
and two best locations are identified in the eastern and western parts of Georgia. In 2017 the government announced an expression of interest to select an investor and evaluation of investment proposals and the selection process is ongoing.

In March 2015, the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia and the Ministry of Commerce of the People’s Republic of China signed a Memorandum on the Silk Road Economic Belt Development Cooperation. As detailed in chapter 4, Georgia has concluded a free trade agreement with China, which will make for synergies with the transport projects.

**Transport at a glance**

Georgia aims to become a transport and logistics hub in the Black Sea–Caucasus–Caspian Sea region, and fully integrate its infrastructure into international and regional transport systems. Substantial liberalisation of transport policies as well as sizeable investment in infrastructure projects has contributed to this goal.

In 2017 the European Union granted Georgian citizens visa-free travel to Schengen states, which will further boost mobility between EU member states and Georgia and enhance transport linkages.

The DCFTA sets out the EU’s detailed regulatory regime for transport by sea, road, rail and inland waterways, notably on the qualifications of transport operators, the technical safety of vehicles and vessels, and the activities of inspection bodies.

For air transport, the DCFTA refers to the EU–Georgia Common Aviation Agreement of 2010, which will eventually further open up and integrate Georgia’s air transport market with that of the EU.

Georgia started a gradual approximation of its transport legislation to the EU directives and regulations.

Georgia is well positioned to benefit from joining China’s new Silk Road initiative with the transport networks of the EU.
17. ENERGY

The energy sector in Georgia is of high economic and strategic importance as the country’s energy security and independence is influenced by the region’s geopolitical considerations. Adding to its major hydroelectric capacity, in recent decades there have been decisive investments in oil and gas pipeline connections with Azerbaijan, transiting on to Turkey and across the Black Sea. These have also assured Georgia a high degree of energy independence from Russia.

Provisions of the Agreement

The Agreement contains two separate chapters on energy – one under the DCFTA heading on trade-related issues and another on broader cooperation on energy policy. Both chapters include references to the Energy Community Treaty, signed by the EU and several Balkan states in 2005, with Moldova becoming a full party to it in 2010, followed by Ukraine later in 2011.

In October 2016 Georgia signed the ‘Protocol Concerning Accession of Georgia to the Treaty Establishing the Energy Community’ (Protocol on Accession) and in July 2017 it officially became a full member of the Energy Community.

Trade-related requirements of the DCFTA. The DCFTA chapter on ‘trade-related’ energy applies basic, free trade provisions in the electricity, crude oil and natural gas sectors. Customs duties and quantitative restrictions on the import and export of energy goods are generally prohibited. Energy prices for the supply of gas and electricity to industrial consumers shall be determined solely by market prices.
Regarding the transit of energy goods, the DCFTA incorporates elements of Art. V GATT 1994 and of Art. 7 of the 1994 Energy Charter Treaty,98 both of which assure the freedom of transit.

**Broader provisions on energy cooperation.** This chapter envisages cooperation in general terms over virtually the whole landscape of energy policy issues, including energy policy strategies, energy crisis mechanisms, the modernisation of energy infrastructures, enhancement of energy security, energy efficiency and savings, and support for renewable energies. The most precise indications of how this may be done is contained in Annex XXV of the Agreement, which lists numerous EU laws and the timetables for Georgia’s ‘gradual approximation’, mostly within three to five years, unless the terms of accession to the Energy Community Treaty provide otherwise.

Of strategic importance for the EU’s long-term energy saving and climate policy goals are directives for energy efficiency, notably on the energy performance of buildings,99 and on energy end-use efficiency.100 The implementation periods in the EU itself are quite long, extending in some cases to 2020. Both directives have proved difficult to implement in many EU member states, and have recently been replaced by updated directives.101 This is one of many instances where the provisions of the Agreement already need to be updated with regard to revisions of EU laws. The new directives introduce the concept of ‘nearly zero-energy buildings’, to become mandatory for new buildings or major renovations by 2020, albeit with a number of provisions allowing for flexibility.

---

98 The Energy Charter Treaty of 1994 is not to be confused with the Energy Community Treaty of 2005. The Energy Charter was an early attempt to establish a wider, international, energy legal order for the post-Soviet era, including the EU, Russia and all other former Soviet Union states, and a number of non-European states. However, Russia never ratified this Treaty, and the enterprise has had only a limited effect, although its transit provisions are legally and operationally significant.


100 See the Directive on energy end-use efficiency (2006/32/EC), subsequently replaced by Directive 2012/27/EU.

**Energy-using products.** The Agreement sets out in Annex XXV two framework directives, accompanied by detailed implementing directives or regulations on energy-using products. The first defines the eco-design requirements of energy-using products, such as household electrical appliances, to be implemented within three years after the entry into force of the Agreement. The second concerns the labelling of household appliances regarding their energy consumption, to be implemented in two years. These directives and regulations specify the technical conditions under which the products may bear the CE conformity mark, and are therefore allowed to be placed on the EU market.

**Energy Community Treaty.** The Association Agreement refers to Georgia’s application to accede to the Energy Community. As mentioned above, in July 2017, Georgia became a Contracting Party to the Energy Community. The blocks of EU law that feature in the Energy Community Treaty cover the following aspects:

- electricity and gas, with rules for internal markets, access to networks, cross-border exchanges and security measures;
- renewable energy promotion;
- energy efficiency measures;
- oil, with a provision for maintaining minimum stocks; and
- the environment (see further in chapter 18).

The content here is basically already covered in the list of EU laws in Annex XXV to the Association Agreement. Implementation periods of three years are stipulated, but with the provision that this will only apply if accession to the Energy Community provisions is not effective within two years of the coming into force of the Agreement – which is now not the case given the timing of Georgia’s accession to the Energy Community.

Among these provisions, of particular importance are the rules for electricity and gas networks in the so-called ‘unbundling’ directives of the EU’s Third Energy Package. These require that transmission operators, such as electricity transmission lines and gas pipelines, are

---

separated from producers or suppliers of energy, and assure freedom of access to the relevant transmission infrastructure for all suppliers or producers of energy.

Within the EU itself, there are derogations from the Third Energy Directive under the “isolated market” clause (Art. 49 of the Directive 2009/73/EC, Third Energy Package), as follows:

Member States not directly connected to the interconnected system of any other Member State and having only one main external supplier may derogate from Articles 4 (Authorization), 9 (Unbundling), 37 (Market Opening) and/or 38 (Direct Lines). A supply undertaking having a market share of more than 75 % shall be considered to be a main supplier. Any such derogation shall automatically expire where at least one of the conditions referred to in this subparagraph no longer applies. Any such derogation shall be notified to the Commission.

In practice, this derogation applies to Cyprus, Latvia, Estonia and Finland.

This derogation does not feature in the Energy Community Treaty, since it was assumed to be for direct neighbours with land frontiers with the EU. Georgia has reportedly requested access to this provision during the negotiations, and notably with reference to Regulation (EC) 715/2009 concerning the cross-border natural gas trade. This request was granted as a result of negotiations.

The Protocol on Accession provides a timeframe for the implementation of key reforms in the energy sector agreed in the framework of Association Agreement, including in the areas of electricity and gas markets, energy efficiency, renewable energy and energy-related environment.

The South Caucasus Pipeline and the North-South Gas Pipeline are exempted from the implementation of Directive 2009/73/EC and Regulation (EC) No 715/2009 until 31 August 2026, the date of expiration of the Energy Community Treaty. This directive and regulation set requirements related to the effective unbundling of energy production and supply interests of the network.

The Protocol will not affect the Intergovernmental Agreement between Georgia and Azerbaijan related to transit, transportation and sale of natural gas in and beyond the territories of Georgia and the Azerbaijan through the South Caucasus Pipeline.

The fact that Georgia is an isolated market without direct interconnections with energy networks of any member of the energy
community was taken into account and provisions of the Energy Community Treaty related to competition do not apply to Georgia insofar as trade between the contracting parties of the community may be affected.\textsuperscript{105}

In addition, with regard to Directives 2001/80/EC, 2012/27/EU, 2009/28/EC, 2010/30/EU, and 2010/31/EU related to energy efficiency, renewable energy and air quality, Georgia will be granted 12 months longer for implementation than the other Contracting Parties.\textsuperscript{106} The longest period for implementation by the end of 2029 is given for directives related to the energy efficiency of buildings (2010/31/EU) and on emissions from large combustion plants (2001/80/EC).

**Implementation perspectives**

*Georgia’s energy sector.* During the last decade, Georgia’s energy sector has seen a major transformation. An inefficient and corrupt energy system was substantially reformed and restructured starting from 2004 and the country moved from a state of frequent blackouts to a condition where it attracts sizeable foreign direct investment (FDI) and exports electricity to all its neighbours. For Georgia, which aspires to and in reality is emerging as a regional transit hub, ensuring stable and diversified energy transit has a vital importance. Furthermore, as reduction of energy dependence on Russia has been Georgia’s key strategic objective since 2004, it has achieved a much higher level of energy security through assuring alternative, diversified sources of energy supply, mainly from Azerbaijan.

In addition, Georgia’s energy sector reforms have resulted in a competitive tariff system, capable of attracting FDI to the sector, and privatisation of state-owned energy generation and distribution networks, mainly to foreign companies. There has been an increase of Georgia’s transit potential and electricity export capabilities, with greater utilisation of the country’s vast renewable energy resources, namely hydropower generation.

Georgia is enhancing its integration into European energy-related institutions. In 2009, Georgia joined the Energy Security multilateral platform of the Eastern Partnership. Since 2010, Georgia has been a member of the International Renewable Energy Agency.

\textsuperscript{105} Chapter IV of Title II.

\textsuperscript{106} Source: Protocol on Accession.

In 2017, the Ministry of Energy was merged with the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia (MoESD) and all responsibilities related to energy policy and implementation of the Association Agreement will now lie with the MoESD.

Georgia’s electricity sector is growing fast and seeks to satisfy a rising demand for electricity in both the country and the region. Almost 100% of the population has access to electricity.

The collection rate of billings to clients increased from a disastrous 50% in 2003 to 100% by 2008. With solid investment in the hydropower sector, Georgia’s electricity export capacity is robust. Turkey is one of the key destinations for electricity exports, given the tariff structure and seasonal electricity consumption patterns in Georgia and Turkey: Georgia consumes the bulk of electricity in winter, whereas Turkey’s peak demand is in summer.

Georgia currently exploits only around 20% of its potential hydropower capacity. The policy directed at developing domestic sources of renewable energy and a suitable legal environment has resulted in high interest among foreign investors and a growing share of the energy sector in the country’s FDI. Over the period of 2007–17, the share of energy-related FDI in total FDI was on average 13%. The peak in energy-related FDI was reached in 2011–13 (on average 21% share in total FDI), when several hydropower projects began. This followed Georgia’s announcement of the construction of a high-voltage transmission line with Turkey and coincided with the start of the promotion of renewable energy projects with prospects of exporting to Turkey.

Since 2007, electricity generation has increased by 38%, reaching 11,531 million KWh in 2017. The growth was driven by rehabilitated power plants, improved efficiency and increased total generation capacity. Local electricity consumption reached 11,027 million KWh in 2016. During the last decade (2007-17) electricity generation has on average increased by 4% per annum. At the beginning of 2017, 77 electricity producers were operating in Georgia, with the total generation capacity of 3.869 MW.

Along with rehabilitation of the existing transmission infrastructure, the construction of new facilities was initiated. The most important project of the last few years has been the Black Sea Transmission Line, connecting Georgian and Turkish electrical systems with an HVDC convertor station and a 500/400 kV transmission line.
Construction started in 2011 and the line was put into operation in 2014, giving an additional 700 MW capacity of trans-border exchange.

In addition, in relation to the construction of a new 500 kV transmission line connecting Georgia and Azerbaijan, an important part of the construction/rehabilitation work has been completed. The construction of a new 220/110kV substation at Khorga and rehabilitation of several substations were finalised. Box 17.1 shows the substantial European participation in the funding of these investments.

Box 17.1 European-funded investment in the Georgian energy sector

*European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.* Transmission network projects total €285 million; in addition are hydropower plant projects ($97 million and €20 million), and distribution network projects ($25 million). These funds have been allocated mainly for the period 2010–16, except for the Enguri HPP project, which started in 1998.

*Kreditanstalt fuer Wideraufbau (KfW).* Transmission network projects total €238 million and power plant projects €5 million. Funds were allocated mainly for the period until 2016. A further €125 million was allocated in April 2017 as an extension of this programme.

*European Investment Bank.* Transmission network projects total €80 million and power plant projects €20 million. Funds have been allocated for the period 2010–16.

*European Commission, Neighbourhood Investment Facility.* Transmission network projects total €18 million, for the period 2014-16.

*European Union.* A transmission network project totalled €80 million, with funds allocated for 2010-13.

For further development of the electricity system, Georgia’s Ten-Year Network Development Plan for 2017-27 was drawn up and approved in 2016. The goal of the plan is to ensure further security, power quality and sufficient transfer capacity for domestic consumers as well as for power exchange with neighbouring countries.

For effective implementation of the Energy Community Treaty, the power and competencies of Georgian National Energy and Water Supply Commission (GNERC), which is the sole, country-wide regulatory authority will be strengthened and competencies expanded. EU Directives on electricity (2009/72/EC) and gas (2009/73/EC)
require a considerably enhanced role of the national regulator, notably in terms of ensuring competition on the internal market and consumer protection.

**Natural gas.** Over the period 2001-15, natural gas consumption increased by almost 100%. In this respect, the country is import-dependent and steps towards the diversification of suppliers were taken to ensure security and reliability. In 2016, demand slightly decreased (by 6.4%) due to the reduced consumption of natural gas by thermal power plants.

Georgia has continued to support the initiatives related to the transportation of hydrocarbon resources in the framework of the Southern Gas Corridor. The second stage of the Shah–Deniz project started in 2014, in which Georgia plays an important role as a transit country. For further development of its transit capacity, Georgia is participating in the Azerbaijan–Georgia–Romania Interconnector Project (AGRI) for the transportation of liquefied natural gas via the Black Sea to Europe. It is planned to promote the AGRI project in conjunction with the European Commission in order to include it in the definitive list of projects to be financed by the European Fund for Strategic Investments.

A main issue for Georgia was the regional context of the energy community directives and regulations, notably with regard to cross-border trade in natural gas and use of transport infrastructure for natural gas. Unlike Ukraine and Moldova, Georgia does not have common borders with any of the energy community members. This will impede implementation of certain provisions of the Energy Community Treaty, as none of Georgia’s neighbours (Turkey, Russia, Armenia and Azerbaijan) seem likely to become a member of the energy community in the foreseeable future, and transit pipelines traversing Georgian territory are not designed to handle reverse flows.

Consequently, both the South Caucasus Pipeline and North–South Gas Pipeline are exempted from, or allow delayed implementation of provisions of the Energy Community Treaty. Some other provisions of the Energy Community Treaty, such as Art. 6 (on regional solidarity), Art. 7 (on promotion of regional cooperation) and Art. 42 (on the regulatory regime for cross-border issues) of Directive 2009/73/EC do not apply to Georgia.

The Georgian gas market could be qualified not only as an isolated, but also as an emerging market. Although Georgian legislation enables all consumers to freely choose their suppliers and all suppliers to freely deliver natural gas to their customers, the limited
sources of gas supply prevent the formation of a really developed and fully competitive gas market. In particular, Russia cannot be considered a reliable gas supply source in the medium and long term.

Russia was the dominant supplier of gas, covering almost 100% of Georgian gas demand until 2007. Russia's policies towards Georgia, however, have pushed Georgia to diversify its supply portfolio. As a result, Azerbaijan has become the main source of gas supply. The total volume of gas delivered from different suppliers in Azerbaijan, with the State Oil Company of Azerbaijan Republic (SOCAR) as a major supplier, currently accounts for 90% of total gas consumption in Georgia. In 2016, Georgia conducted complex negotiations with economic and geopolitical dimensions with both SOCAR and GazProm, allowing for an additional 500 million cm of gas at favourable prices. In 2017, Georgia concluded a new agreement with GazProm, which provides for a gradual monetisation of the remuneration system for transit of gas from Russia to Armenia. This is less beneficial than the former system of compensation in natural gas. According to the new arrangement, Georgia will be able to buy additional supplies of natural gas from Russia during the winter period, for the reduced price ($185 per 1,000 cm).

Georgia has to carry out comprehensive legislative changes to implement the EU’s Gas Directive (2009/73/EC). Georgia must ensure that all customers (household and non-household) become eligible customers, which means that they should be free to purchase gas from the supplier of their choice and to switch to a new supplier; these new provisions will be introduced in 2018 and 2019.

Electricity. Membership of the energy community creates future potential opportunities for Georgia, which possesses huge potential to develop hydro-electricity trade with European countries through Turkey, and to increase the security of supply. More specifically, the Black Sea Transmission Line connecting Georgia to Turkey could integrate its market with that of the Energy Community. Georgia may potentially receive support from the Community in the event of emergency situations as well. Yet, similar to the gas sector, Georgia cannot benefit from certain provisions of the Energy Community Treaty related to cross-border exchanges unless it is directly interconnected with Energy Community members, which is not the case. Still, Turkey is now joining the European Network Transmission System Operators for Electricity (ENTSOE), which may open up the possibility for Georgia to receive certain benefits in the long term. A harmonised approach at the regional level related to the establishment of transparent rules for cross-border trade with Turkey would facilitate
the transmission of electricity generated in Georgia to the territory of Turkey and encourage Georgia’s potential for export not only to Turkey, but also to the EU market through Turkey.

As for the current electricity market in Georgia, the system entails bilateral contracts with multiple buyers and sellers at the wholesale level, combined with an independent regulator, which establishes tariffs for end-users.

One of the challenges for Georgia in the electricity sector may be the organisation of the internal electricity market in line with the Energy Community Treaty (Directive 2009/72/EC), and especially the possible implications of requirements related to the privatisation of generators and distributors. According to the Accession Protocol, Georgia has to implement Directive 2009/72/EC concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity (repealing Directive 2003/54/EC), and Regulation (EC) 714/2009 on conditions for access to the network for cross-border exchanges in electricity (repealing Regulation (EC) 1228/2003) by 31 December 2018. Accordingly, Georgia is obliged to make significant changes for the legal unbundling of transmission and distribution activities, including the unbundling of distribution from supply activities (vertical integration). This could affect at least one significant distribution company, which holds distribution assets together with generation units and several hydropower plants, and is building a high-voltage transmission line connecting Georgia and Turkey.

Georgia has to implement Directive 2005/89/EC concerning measures to safeguard security of electricity supply and infrastructure investment by 31 December 2019. At the same time, it was agreed with the energy community that an additional period of one year will be necessary for Georgia to test and adjust provisions and market instruments for the implementation of Directives 2009/72/EC and 2005/89/EC.

A challenge for Georgia is the existing system of long-term guaranteed power purchase agreements (PPA) between new power producers and the market operator. This limits price deregulation according to the Treaty. On the one hand, the PPA facilitates the development of new power plants, which is important for the country’s energy security, but on the other hand, the obligation of parties of a PPA to sell and purchase electricity at an agreed price for a long period undermines competition on the energy market. After liberalisation of the electricity market, the government will be obliged to buy electricity from the cheapest available supplier.
**Renewable energy.** The development of renewable energy is central to the overall energy policy of the energy community, as it reduces dependence on fossil fuels and improves security of supply. The implementation of the Renewables Directive requires first, the elaboration of a national renewable energy action plan; and second, determination of the national targets that have to be achieved by 2020.

Currently, the share of renewable energy generation in total electricity generation is around 80%, and the share of renewable energy in final energy consumption is 27%. Due to abundant hydro resources, hydropower is the main source of electricity generation in Georgia. In 2016 electricity generation by hydro-electric power plants (HPPs) increased by 10%. Currently more than 60 HPPs operate in Georgia with 2,792 MW total installed capacity. A number of HPPs are under construction.

The first wind power plant (WPP) in Georgia was constructed with EBRD financial support in the Shida Kartli region (Gori) in 2016. This WPP consists of six wind turbines (each with 3.45 MW installed capacity). Wind resource potential in Georgia is estimated to be 1,500 MW in total, with leading to an average estimated annual generation of around 4 TWh.

The Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources, which Georgia committed to implement according to the Accession Protocol by 31 December 2018 (but additional time can be considered),\(^{107}\) requires setting minimum requirements for the use of energy from renewable sources in new and renovated buildings and the introduction of measures creating an effective legislative and regulatory framework to attract investment in renewable energy.

At the time of writing, a National Renewable Energy Action Plan is being drafted.

**Energy efficiency.** As in the case of the Renewables Directive, the main challenge regarding the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directives is that currently there is no legislative basis and no particular policy related to energy efficiency. The majority of buildings were built during Soviet times, and heating and insulation systems are largely obsolete. Also, new buildings may not satisfy EU energy efficiency standards. Therefore, a careful and gradual approach is recommended here to reduce compliance costs at least to a reasonable level. A draft
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\(^{107}\) *Source: Protocol on Accession.*
National Energy Efficiency Action Plan (NEEAP) has been elaborated and discussion with line ministries is ongoing.

**Energy policy at a glance**

The Georgian energy sector has undergone substantial positive transformation, as a result of which Georgia has diversified its energy supply to ensure energy security and established a competitive regulatory and tariff system to attract significant investment in the sector.

Cooperation with international partners in the energy sector, notably the EU, is important for Georgia given its aspirations to serve as an energy transit corridor, to function as an alternative to Russia.

In 2017, Georgia became a Contracting Party of the Energy Community. However, as an isolated market without direct interconnection to the energy markets of member countries, Georgia is exempted from the application of Third Energy Package requirements for cross-border trade. In addition, membership of the energy community will not affect intergovernmental agreements already concluded by Georgia or subsequent agreements.

The obligations of membership of the energy community have considerable implications for the domestic regulatory regimes for gas, electricity and renewables, however, which should be beneficial in the medium to long run. It should also facilitate international investment in energy projects, by assuring a stable regulatory environment aligned with European standards.
18. Environment

The environment and climate change chapters of the Agreement are very ambitious and commit Georgia to cooperation across the entire landscape of environmental policy issues. Implementation will be a long and difficult process, with high costs, given Georgia’s starting point, but should ultimately result in a material improvement in environmental quality and modernisation of the economy.

Provisions of the Agreement

Georgia agrees to undertake a gradual approximation of its legislation to that of the EU in environmental policy and climate change (two separate chapters). This will involve approximation to certain provisions of 23 directives and 4 regulations of the EU within time periods of two to five years in the majority of cases. This list represents virtually the whole corpus of EU environmental law and policy, from general environmental governance methods to specific matters of air and water quality, and others.

Environmental governance. Several directives concern the principles and practices of environmental governance. The central provisions imply significant changes for Georgia. Directives 2001/42/EC and 2001/92/EU require environmental impact assessments (EIAs) for certain plans and programmes affecting the environment. Directive 2004/35/EC establishes rules of financial liability for the environment based on the polluter-pays principle.
These regulations mean certain costs that businesses will have to bear, in order to prevent arguably even bigger costs for the environment itself and the public interest.

**Air quality.** There are five EU directives included in the air quality section, including Directives 2008/50/EC and 2004/107/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air. Other rules require controlling the emissions of volatile organic compounds resulting from the storage of petrol and its distribution (Regulation (EC) 1882/2003 and Directive 2004/42/EC), and a reduction of the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels (Directive 1999/32/EC).

Where, in a given zone or agglomeration, ambient air exceeds a certain limit value or target value, the authorities shall ensure that air quality plans are established for those zones to achieve the related limit value. The transport sector and associated activities will be among those that will have to pay a higher price for the benefit of cleaner air.

**Water quality and resource management, including the marine environment.** There are six directives in this section. The centrepiece is a directive on establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, for the protection of inland surface waters, groundwater and coastal waters. Its objective for the EU itself has been to achieve a good status for all waters by 2015. The approach is based heavily on the river basins principle, for which countries must prepare management plans and detailed management programmes. The parties should ensure that the pricing of water encourages consumers to use resources efficiently.

There are further key directives on wastewater treatment, the quality of drinking water, and marine environmental policy to be implemented within three to eight years. These concern the identification of sensitive areas and agglomerations; preparation of investment programmes for urban wastewater collection and treatment; standards for drinking water; and development of a marine environmental strategy.

**Waste management.** Three EU directives cover the full cycle of managing different types of waste. According to the hierarchy of waste management techniques, landfilling is the least preferable option and
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108 See Directive 2000/60/EC as amended by Decision 2455/2001/EC.
111 See Directive 2008/56/EC.
should be limited to the necessary minimum, in accordance with the Landfill Directive (1999/31/EC). This defines different categories of waste and sets up a system of operating permits for landfill sites. Existing landfill sites may not continue to operate unless they are brought into compliance with the provisions of the directive. Georgia has a six-year time lag for implementation. A directive on the management of waste from extractive industries requires procedures for the management and monitoring of excavation voids, a permit system, financial guarantees, an inspection system, etc.112

Introducing the polluter-pays principle and other regulations listed above imply adding significant responsibilities to the industries that will need to factor the waste management cost into the prices of their products.

**Natural habitats.** The protection of nature is subject to two directives for natural habitats and sanctuaries for wild birds (92/43/EC and 2009/147/EC). These directives establish principles and procedures for the designation of special protection zones, and would be helpful references for various Georgian stakeholders, including NGOs, in their work in this domain.

**Industrial pollution and industrial hazards.** There are two directives in the section. The Industrial Emissions Directive (2010/75/EU) covers all industries liable to produce harmful emissions: energy, metals, minerals, chemicals, pulp and paper, large-scale pig and poultry production, waste-management industries, etc. It sets out the main principles for the permitting and control of such installations, specifying limit values for noxious substances. It requires the application of the best available techniques, for which the criteria are specified, such as the use of low-waste technologies, low hazard materials and provisions for recycling.

The ‘Seveso’ Directive (96/82/EC) concerns controls over dangerous substances that risk major accident hazards. In regulated industries, both current and future enterprises may be significantly impacted financially.

**Chemical management.** Two EU regulations will apply. The first one regulates the export and import of dangerous chemicals ((EC) 689/2008), which requires having an export notification, handling and other relevant procedures in place. The second one, Regulation (EC) 1272/2008, deals with the classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures.
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Climate change. On climate change the central elements of EU policy identified in the Agreement with Georgia concern ozone layer-depleting substances and certain fluorinated greenhouse gases. Regulations (EC) 842/2006 and (EC) 1005/2009 require the designation of a national authority and a reporting system for acquiring emissions. The government will need to establish bans on the production of controlled substances, except for specific uses, licensing systems for the import and export of controlled substances for exempted uses, and obligations to recover, recycle, reclaim and destruct used controlled substances. Procedures for monitoring and inspecting leakages of controlled substances will need to be in place as well.

Implementation perspectives

The environmental status quo in Georgia. Since 2004, Georgia’s overarching national priority has been to liberalise the economy and to stimulate economic growth. As satisfying international environmental requirements are often a costly matter, Georgia has consciously delayed implementation of certain environmental requirements. Yet the Agreement now offers an opportunity, although often complex and costly, to bring Georgia’s environmental governance, legislation and implementation practice closer to international best practice.

In terms of policy and the institutional framework, recent developments signal progress in relation to existing practices. Environmental planning is now practised and a National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP 3) for the period of 2017–21 has been elaborated and submitted to the government of Georgia for approval.

The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection (MENRP) has notably succeeded in improving environmental and hydro meteorological monitoring networks, especially in relation to surface water monitoring. Real time data received from the stations are gathered daily in the central office and published on the official website of the National Environmental Agency.

At the end of 2017, due to the structural changes within the government, the MENRP was merged with the Ministry of Agriculture, excluding the competences related to licensing the use of natural resources, which moved to the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development. All responsibilities related to environmental policy and implementation of the Association Agreement will now lie with the new Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia (MEPA).
As a result of the EU technical assistance project implemented in 2016-17 to approximate environmental standards to EU environmental norms, the streamlining of Georgia’s environmental legislation as well as implementation has improved, and progress has been achieved. Further improvement is required both in terms of legislative approximation and implementation, however. For example, requirements for air quality, industrial and other emissions will be implemented gradually.

Improvement of the quality of EIA reports still needs additional efforts. Flaws concern the scope, organisation, transparency and enforceability of impact assessment conditions.

The new Code on Environmental Assessment, adopted in 2017, among others, imposes obligations related to strategic environmental assessment across a broad number of economic sectors, which itself requires additional financial and human resources to be borne not only by the business sector, but by the government as well.

The Law on Public Procurement does not consider environmental criteria in public sector procurement of goods and services. Both the polluter-pays and user-pays principles still need to be respected in the water sector. Water charges are not creating incentives for the rational use of water resources; there are no fees for drawing on surface waters.

Air quality has been one of the major environmental threats and a pressing issue in the past several years in Georgian cities. Since 2008, the general trend of emissions of air pollution substances has been negative, with almost all emissions on the rise. National air quality standards are still based on maximum allowable concentrations, and cannot be directly compared with the standards used by the World Health Organization or the EU.

Georgia introduced stricter regulations related to ozone-depleting substances than is required by the respective EU regulation, aiming to protect ambient air. The scope of the adopted regulation is thus broader than the EU regulation, creating additional burdens for those to whom it applies. Moreover, these regulations have been introduced much earlier than had been indicated in the Agreement.

While Georgia is rich in water resources, access to safe drinking water is still a challenge in almost all regions. The water supply
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113 Exceptions here are for trisodium phosphate and sulphur oxides.

infrastructure in Georgia needs a further upgrade. Between 55 and 75% of the water consumed by the population has a groundwater origin. Municipal wastewater remains a major polluter of surface waters. Currently, sewage collection systems exist in 41 towns, and most of the wastewater treatment plants are inoperable.

A new legal act on waste management, the Waste Management Code, entered into force in January 2015, as a result of which regular reporting on industrial waste is required. Targets and measures for waste management and for management of radioactive waste are defined in NEAP 3. Special landfills for hazardous waste disposal will need to be provided by the state, as otherwise legal disposal of such waste remains problematic. Most of the 63 official municipal landfills operational today are inadequate and have negative impacts on the environment. Waste collection in rural settlements also needs improvement. Collection of municipal waste is provided only in urban areas. It is estimated that about 70% of the municipal waste generated is collected by regular services.

Some provisions of the Waste Management Code, among others related to waste management activities, require environmental assessment decisions as defined in the Environmental Assessment Code. This requires significant compliance costs from the business sector as well as management costs from the government side.

The rich nature of Georgian flora is evident from its high level of endemism, with around 21% of Georgian flora (up to 900 species) being endemic. In recent years, more new protected areas have been established. As a result, the area of protected territories has risen from 7.09% of Georgia’s territory to 8.8%.

**Environmental governance.** In order to comply with the requirements of the directives on Environmental Impact Assessment (2011/92/EC) and strategic environmental assessments (2001/42/EC), an Environmental Impact Assessment Code was drawn up and adopted in 2017. The new Code ensures that all plans, programmes and projects likely to have a significant impact on the environment are subject to EIAs, prior to their approval or authorisation, and is in compliance with ESPOO Convention (named after the city in Finland where it was adopted). The Code also considers core principles of the Aarhus Convention. According to the Code increased minimal thresholds for EIA as well as the requirement for strategic environmental assessment (SEA) were introduced, to be implemented in 2018.
To comply with the Environmental Liability Directive, a working group was established by the MENRP Minister’s order (in February, 2017), which is drafting relevant legislation. Also ongoing is work on secondary legislation on Methodology of Environmental Damage Calculation integrating measures for remediation and appropriate calculation of the compensation required in case of environmental damage.

Legislation on managing and publishing environmental information in accordance with Directive 2003/4/EC, has been developed and approved (March, 2017). A system now operates in testing mode.

For effective implementation of Industrial Emissions Directive, strengthening of administrative capacities is ongoing in the framework of an EU twinning project.

**Air quality protection.** To comply with the requirements of the EU Air Quality Directive, changes were implemented in the Georgian law on the Protection of Ambient Air related to pollution of air with harmful substances and fuel quality. A by-law on air quality standards has been drafted and work on final revision is ongoing. In addition, the air quality monitoring network has been expanded. At present 6 automatic stations are operational in four cities. Air quality passive samplings have been carried out in 16 cities of Georgia.

The Association Agenda requires ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol by Georgia. To meet these requirements a by-law on petrol quality standards has been amended to reach the required standard in 2017. Another by-law on quality standards of heavy fuel oil and gas oil has been drafted in line with Directive 1999/32/EC on emissions from maritime transport.

The Low Emission Development Strategy (LEDS) for 2017-30 has been drawn up to provide a package of measures for each sector of the economy that should support the rational use of energy resources and strengthen environmental protection.
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115 See Directive 2004/35/EC.
116 See Directive 2010/75/EU.
117 See Directive 2008/50/EC (CAFE) and daughter Directive 2004/107/EC (Arts 3(1) and (3)).
118 The Protocol aims, in the long run, to achieve the protection of health and ecosystems by bringing deposition and concentrations of pollutants below critical loads and levels.
To comply with the requirements of (EU) 2016/802 Directive, a technical regulation on the reduction of sulphur content of certain liquid fuels was adopted (May, 2017).

**Water quality and water resources management.** A law on water resources management in accordance with Directive 2000/60/EC was drafted, a regulatory impact assessment (RIA) implemented, and currently analysis of the law regarding compliance with existing legislation is ongoing. Related by-laws concerning the ecological standards of water quality have also been drafted, which will be approved after the adoption of the law on water resources management. A River Basin Management Plan for the Chorokhi-Ajaristskali River has also been introduced as a pilot case. Plans for a bilateral agreement with Azerbaijan for cooperation on the Kura River are still being elaborated.

A by-law on wastewater discharges has been drafted in response to the directive on wastewater treatment.119

To satisfy the requirements of the Directive (2007/50/EC) on assessment and management of flood risks, work on a forecasting model/early warning system is underway to protect vulnerable communities of the Rioni River Basin.

**Waste management.** A number of legislative works have been carried out to meet the requirements of the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC). The Waste Management Code entered into force in December 2015. A by-law on the classification of waste according to its types and properties and on the required records and reports has already entered into force. An electronic register and database was established and is being tested to allow waste-generating companies to provide records and report electronically.

The Waste Management Code sets additional requirements for the business sector, among others, related to the establishment of the position of an environmental manager, the elaboration of waste management plans, which should include information on types of waste, its volume, measures for the prevention of waste generation and separation, information methods of waste recycling etc. Waste management plans should be submitted to the MEPA for revision. All these incur compliance costs for businesses.

The National Waste Management Strategy for 2016-30, a National Waste Management Action Plan for 2016-20, as well as by-

laws on municipal and hazardous waste collection and treatment, were adopted by the government in early 2016.

In 2015-16, amendments to the Law of Georgia on Radioactive Waste and the Law on Nuclear and Radiation Safety were adopted.

In 2017, the technical regulation on Medical Waste Management was adopted, which, among others, considers creating the position of an environmental manager in companies generating medical waste, elaborating waste management plans and defining rules for collection and temporary storage of medical waste. In addition, a by-law on Animal Waste Management was elaborated, which will be further streamlined in the framework of an EU assistance project on improvement of waste management systems.

To comply with the requirements of Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions, a by-law was drawn up to be submitted to the government of Georgia for approval.

**Protection of nature.** On the conservation of wild birds, the draft of a new Law on Biodiversity was elaborated, in line with Directives 92/43/EC and 2009/147/EC. The law covers regulations on habitat and species protection, along with the conservation of natural habitats, including those of wild fauna, flora and wild birds.

Georgia has engaged in a project under the Council of Europe to establish an Emerald Network in Eastern Partnership countries. One of the important tasks here is identification of the Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas, as well as their management priorities.

In order to meet the requirements of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC), amendments to the Law on Marine Space were elaborated and submitted to the parliament for approval.

**Industrial pollution and hazards.** In this area, Georgia is receiving support from the Czech Development Agency for the prevention and management of major industrial accidents, including the strengthening of legislative and technical capacities. As a result, for the fulfilment of requirements of the Directive 2012/18/EU (SEVESO), the draft law of Georgia on Major Accidents Prevention Caused by Hazardous Chemicals and Chemical Mixtures has been drawn up. A draft by-law on the Rule of Import and Export of Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides and Implementation of Prior Informed Consent Procedure has also been drawn up, as required by the respective EU regulation.

**Climate action.** In line with Regulation (EC) 842/2006 on certain fluorinated greenhouse gases, the stakeholders related to the data
collection on fluorinated gases (hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride) have been identified and the problems pertaining to the current system for data management have been analysed.

On 22 April 2016 Georgia signed the Paris Agreement, which was approved by the government in February 2017 and entered into force on 7 June 2017. Georgia submitted its first Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Georgia plans to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 15% unconditionally compared with the business-as-usual scenario by 2030. The 15% reduction target will be increased up to 25% conditionally, subject to a global agreement on access to low-cost financial resources and technology transfer.

In 2017, the roadmap for the National Plan for Climate Change Adaptation was developed.

A number of amendments to the Law on Protection of Ambient Air were implemented during 2016 for approximation with Regulation (EC) 1005/2009 related to ozone layer depleting substances. The deadline for implementation of provisions regulating ozone layer depleting substances for undertakings is 7 years after the entry into force of the Paris Agreement, so the approximation of this rather complex Regulation was undertaken far ahead of time by Georgia.

**Forestry.** The MENRP developed a new forest code. Harmonisation of the respective laws and legal acts is in progress within the framework of the FLEG II programme of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument. The mapping of Georgia’s forests has been done and a forest-zoning map is available. Regulations on non-timber forest products and secondary wood products are also being prepared.
Environment at a glance

Until recently, Georgia has been deliberately delaying environmental objectives in order to prioritise economic growth.

Under the Agreement however, Georgia has committed itself to a highly ambitious programme of environmental and climate change actions. These will come at a significant cost for many businesses, but with predictable long-term health and economic benefits.

Measures are now being taken across a wider range of environmental policies. The Environmental Impact Assessments Code was adopted, and progress has been made in air and water quality management and the management of waste and dangerous chemicals.

Overall Georgia is achieving notable progress in implementation of environmental standards, but this sometimes takes place ahead of legal approximation schedule, or more extensively than required under the Agreement, causing unjustified costs at an early stage.
19. DIGITAL SECTOR

This chapter on the digital economy and society deals with a family of provisions in the Agreement on related topics, more precisely on electronic communications and postal services, information society and audiovisual policy. It inescapably concerns a strategic dimension to the challenge of creating a modernised and internationally competitive economy.

Provisions of the Agreement

Electronic communications. For electronic communications, there are complex provisions in Arts 104 to 113 of the Agreement setting out the ground rules for a competitive and well-governed telecommunications sector. These pertain to the regulatory authority, principles for the authorisation of licences to service providers, the rights of access to interconnections with other service providers and principles for governing the allocation of scarce resources, such as radio frequencies. Existing EU legislation to which Georgia should approximate gradually within three to five years is specified in Annex XV-B, which includes a set of key directives adopted in 2002 and amended in 2009:

- Framework Directive 2002/21/EC (as amended by Directive 2009/140/EC) on electronic communications networks, which defines the products covered and the need for independent administrative capacity of the national regulator;
- Directive 2002/20/EC (also as amended by Directive 2009/140/EC) on the authorisation of licences for operators in the sector;
• Directive 2002/19/EC (also as amended by Directive 2009/140/EC) setting out the requirements that operators with significant market power must assure open access to network facilities and non-discriminating interconnection charges; and

• Universal Service Directive 2002/22/EC (as amended by Directive 2009/136/EC), which requires respect for the interests and rights of users, such as ‘number portability’ between operators.

Postal and courier services. The regulatory rules aim at preventing anti-competitive practices in this sector, regulating licensing provisions for universal service providers and ensuring the independence of the regulatory body. Several directives are specified in Annexes XV-C, for which there should be approximation within five years. Courier services in the EU are increasingly subject to criticism for their high costs, and action in this regard is planned.

Information society. The objective here is to ensure the widespread availability of information and communication technologies (ICT), with quality services and affordable prices. The accent in the text is on “exchange of information on best practices”.

Audio-visual services. Ground rules for the regulation of television broadcasting are laid down in the Audio-visual Media Services Directives (2007/65/EC and 2010/13/EU). Georgia will implement these provisions within three years.

Digital single market. This broad digital domain, including all of the above, is witnessing one the fastest rates of technological change and development. That means that the stock of EU laws and regulations in this field is also subject to comparatively fast change and development. The European Commission has set out the directions for further developments comprehensively in its 2015 policy paper on a “Digital Single Market for Europe”.120 It outlines the agenda for action under three broad headings: i) better online access for consumers and businesses, ii) creating the right regulatory conditions for advanced digital networks, and iii) building the digital economy through investment, interoperability and standardisation. Sixteen specific action points are highlighted, several of which will see amendment to the laws cited in the Agreement for approximation, including reform of the directives on electronic communications, copyright regimes,
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consumer protection, courier services, audio-visual services, and a Priority ICT Standards Plan.

**Implementation perspectives**

*Overview of the ICT sector in Georgia.* The ICT sector has seen substantial diversification and growth over the last decade. Transformation of the ICT sector has especially advanced since 2004, when the newly elected government after the Rose Revolution declared ICT as its priority, confirming its critical importance for economic development.

In 2017, the ICT sector represented a 2.3% share of GDP. This share increased steadily from 2004, although the annual growth rate dropped from an average of 10% (2010–12) to 3.0% (2013–17).

Since 2004, the government has invested heavily in ICT infrastructure for its own administration, as well as in the provision of electronic services to the public. Some of the governmental institutions, such as the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Healthcare, have achieved significant results in this regard, providing a wide range of e-services to the public and legal entities. These results are partly owing to the liberalisation of laws regulating the ICT market and innovative solutions for the delivery of government services.

As a consequence of reform efforts in the sector, Georgia has improved its ICT position in international rankings over recent years. With the growth of GDP and the spread of social and economic improvements, the demand for ICT products and services has also grown. For example, the number of internet users has been increasing rapidly, from 8% in 2010–11 to around 50% in 2015–16. The number of fixed broadband subscriptions rose from 1 to 12% of the population over the same period.

According to the World Economic Forum’s “Global Competitiveness Report”, however, there are many areas where Georgia’s ICT competitiveness could be further improved, such as the commercialisation of science, the efficiency of the goods market and the labour market, financial market development, technological readiness and absorption, and business sophistication and innovation.
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The extent of innovation in the country is still unsatisfactory and spending by both the government and the private sector on research and development remains comparatively low, which is reflected in various international evaluations and ratings.

In 2015, the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development launched an overall ‘Internetisation’ project. The goal of this $150 million project is to provide fibre optic connections to each village and town in Georgia. Currently, it is estimated that about 79% of the population has access to the internet, of which 21% has access to a fixed broadband connection. After successful implementation of the project, broadband services should become available to 91% of the population in over 2,000 villages and settlements. This initiative will further improve the ICT indicators and hence the country’s position in international ICT rankings.

**Electronic communications.** In 2005, the Law on Electronic Communications was approved by the parliament and since then numerous amendments and reforms have been introduced. The law defines the legal and economic basis for operation in the electronic communications sector, principles for developing a competitive environment and regulation, the functions of the Georgian National Communications Commission (GNCC) as a regulatory institution and other relevant aspects.

In response to increased concerns about cyber security issues worldwide, the Georgian Cyber Security Strategy was elaborated, with a principal document outlining state policy, strategic goals and guiding principles, and laying down action plans and tasks.

The National Action Plan for the Implementation of the Association Agreement and the Association Agenda between Georgia and the EU was approved by the government. In the Plan, the GNCC, along with the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, are responsible for bringing Georgian legislation into compliance with EU directives. Regular progress reports are issued on a quarterly basis.122

Along with signing the Agreement, Georgia has developed the main features of state policy in ICT and taken responsibility for gradually bringing existing laws and regulations on electronic communications and broadcasting into compliance with the EU acquis, which includes the EU legislation and related obligations set out below:

122 See the Association Agreement Action Plan Reports (https://aa-monitoring.ge/site/#!/en/reports).

The current legislation does not cover the universal service obligations defined in Directive 2002/22/EC on universal service and users’ rights relating to electronic communication networks and services. The article on universal service was removed from the Law on Electronic Communications. The GNCC was obliged to draft a regulatory act on universal service within a year from the signature date of the law in 2005, but since then no action has been taken.\(^{123}\)

Number portability is covered by a corresponding GNCC decree, and from February 2011 portability service has been available for customers of Georgian operators.\(^ {124}\)

To approximate the provisions of Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector, the amendments to legislation on personal data protection entered into force in 2014. The amendments, among others, introduced the institution of the Personal Data Protection Inspector, and expanded the mandate of the Inspector towards data processing for police purposes.

To reflect the relevant provisions of Decision 676/2002/EC on a regulatory framework for radio spectrum policy, the GNCC has the obligation to draft the regulatory act on a national plan for radio frequency spectrum distribution.\(^ {125}\)


The provisions of the Audio-visual Media Services Directive 2010/13/EU on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in member states concerning the provision of audio-visual media services are to be implemented within three years of the entry into force of the Agreement.

Although most of the provisions are already covered by existing laws and regulations, there is still some room for further legislative approximation. With that purpose the GNCC together with EBRD experts prepared the draft amendments to the Law on Electronic Communication (ECA) aiming to approximate the ECA to the EU legislation indicated in Annex XV-B to the Association Agreement, namely to: Directive 2002/19/EC (Access Directive); Directive 2002/20/EC (Authorisation Directive); Directive 2002/21/EC (Framework Directive) and Directive 2002/58/EC (ePrivacy Directive). The proposed amendments include changes, proposals and modifications, mostly concerning the following areas:

- The right to use radio frequencies and authorisation mechanisms – introduction of a general permission as an alternative to licences awarded via auctions or so-called beauty contests;
- Specification of conditions for the use of radio frequencies;
- Market definition, market analysis and imposition of remedies on operators with significant market power;
- Merger control regulation in the field of electronic communications carried out by the GNCC;
- Introduction of a public consultation process that must be carried out in connection with important decisions and resolutions of the GNCC;
- Introduction of interim measures to be imposed by GNCC in cases of immediate and serious threats;
- Specification of rules for imposing a fine or other obligations on operators in breach of the legislation;
- Introduction of data protection rules in electronic communications regulation based on the ePrivacy Directive.

**Audio-visual services.** With the signing of the 2006 agreement of the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) on switching terrestrial TV from analogue to digital, the government has defined its strategy for developing digital terrestrial television. The ITU agreement
establishes the terms for switching to digital broadcasting, as well as the regulations on usage and coordination of radio frequency-related issues.

The 2004 law on broadcasting is not in full compliance with the existing EU Audio-Visual Media Services Directive. The provisions of this directive should be implemented within three years of the entry into force of the Agreement except for Article 23 of this directive, which must be implemented within five years. The relevant amendments to the law have been already prepared by the GNCC and discussed with stakeholders.

There were some complaints from stakeholders regarding the most recent amendments to the law on broadcasting, according to which the procedures for electing GNCC members have been changed. This amendment specifies that GNCC members will be elected by a majority of votes in parliament, thus not giving the opposition or non-parliamentary political entities any influence over the composition of the commission.

Postal and courier services. According to the Agreement, the law on postal services should be based on directives concerning rules for developing the internal market of postal services, improving the quality of service and further opening postal services to competition (Directives 97/67/EC and 2002/39/EC amending 97/67/EC).

The Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development (MOESD) prepared a draft law in 2014 with the purpose of introducing a new regulatory framework in the postal sector. The draft law identified the GNCC as the regulatory authority for the postal sector, which has to authorise operators to engage in postal service activities.

Yet the draft law envisaged that only one company (Georgian Post) will be assigned the status of national postal service operator, which means that the company will have significant market power and all other companies will have to provide their services through it. Private companies and NGOs have objected that this contradicts the relevant EU Directive (2002/39/EC) and will worsen the competitive environment in Georgia. The Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development halted the approval procedures of the law and initiated discussions with the private sector and NGOs. In line with these discussions and with the help of EBRD experts, by the end of 2017 the MOESD prepared a new draft law which was also agreed with the EU side. Concerns of the private sector and NGOs were well accommodated in the new draft, namely removing the “postal
monopoly” in the sector from the original draft legislation, which was a main concern of businesses.

A major new development in EU policy in this field is the General Digital Protection Regulation (GDPR – EU/2016/679), which entered into force in the EU in May 2018. This is a highly complex and fundamental law, addressing the newly emerging challenges to assure adequate privacy and control over personal information that may enter the major social networks. Given the scale of this legal innovation it would be prudent for Georgia to observe the experience within the EU itself before considering approximation.

The digital sector at a glance

This broad sector, embracing electronic communications and the entire ICT economy, is a vital strategic part of the economic reform and modernisation process in Georgia.

The ICT sector has been developing rapidly, notably through the e-services provided by the government.

The Agreement provides for gradual alignment with basic EU regulatory practices, and the programming for approximation mostly within three to five years. Georgian legislation is partly compliant with EU directives and work is underway to implement a National Action Plan for approximation of the remainder.
20. CONSUMER PROTECTION

EU legislation is intended to ensure a consistent and high level of protection for the health and safety of consumers by means of strict common safety rules and standards for products and services circulating within the internal market. Specific legislation on consumer protection, as discussed in this chapter, concerns broad principles and horizontal measures for enforcement. The bulk of the substantive conditions for the safety of individual foods, industrial products and services, however, are defined in sectoral legislation of the EU’s internal market, and are therefore discussed in other chapters.

Provisions of the Agreement

The Agreement’s provisions on consumer protection include a number of general commitments. The most fundamental of these is that the Parties to the Agreement “shall cooperate in order to ensure a high level of consumer protection and to achieve compatibility between their systems of consumer protection” (Art. 345). This requires, inter alia, the exchange of information on consumer protection systems, consumer education, empowerment and redress, as well as fostering the activities of independent consumer associations (Art. 346).

It further requires Georgia to gradually approximate its legislation to 19 EU legal acts, as set out in Annex XXIX to the Agreement, within timeframes that are generally more relaxed than those applied to, for example, Ukraine (generally five instead of three years).

Product safety is a key objective of consumer policy. Under the Agreement, Georgia is expected to implement the provisions of the General Product Safety Directive (GPSD). The main principles of the
GPSD were in fact already laid down in Georgia’s legislation in 2012 through the Code on Safety and Free Movement of Products. Notably, new measures have been adopted in the EU to reinforce the safety of the food chain and of cosmetic products under the European Commission’s 2013 Product Safety and Market Surveillance Package.

In order to curb unfair commercial practices, misleading advertising and unfair contract terms, Georgia should approximate its legislation to a series of EU directives, all within a period of five years. The same applies to the rules geared towards tightening the regimes for doorstep selling, package holidays, consumer credit and financial services.

For enforcement of consumer rules, the EU adopted in 2013 new legislation on alternative dispute resolution and online dispute resolution, providing fast, low-cost and out-of-court procedures for consumers to seek redress, and these will soon become applicable throughout the EU.\(^\text{126}\)

**Implementation perspectives**

As a post-Soviet country, Georgia has had limited experience in the field of consumer protection. Currently, there is no national consumer protection authority, although several regulatory bodies and government agencies do have consumer protection units. The Georgian National Energy and Water Supply Regulatory Commission and the Georgian National Communication Commission, for example, have consumer ombudsmen offices. In both Commissions, the consumer protection units are integral parts of the institution and have the responsibility to protect consumer rights in the setting of tariffs and in assuring access to services. The National Food Agency, responsible for market surveillance of the food and feed markets, and the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs also have their own consumer protection units, albeit with rather limited powers. Further entities, such as internal audit or quality assurance divisions, also offer consumer protection.

A new draft Law on Consumer Rights Protection provides a much wider variety of consumer rights than the 2012 Code of Safety and Free Movement of Products. It takes account of the EU’s GPSD and covers requirements for, among others, distance and outdoor contracting, misleading advertisement and the role of NGOs in the protection of consumer rights. The new law was due to be adopted by parliament in 2016 and discussions over its provisions have started. However, the private sector has raised concerns related to the responsibilities of a new consumer ombudsman. Also, the draft law does not incorporate the provisions of a number of directives that Georgia has to approximate, for example, on package travel, package holidays and package tours. It is advisable to review the draft again in the light of the exact obligations assumed by Georgia on the one hand and its impact on and cost for the government and business sectors on the other, in particular as approximation obligations under the consumer protection chapter have to be fulfilled within five years after the entry into force of the Agreement.

The creation of a modern consumer protection system in Georgia, based on European best practices, still requires an investment of effort and resources by the country. Georgia’s commitments in the consumer policy area can be divided into two categories. The first part includes requirements for the creation of a system of consumer rights protection and is related to administrative costs, as relevant government institutions in charge of consumer protection will need to be created. The second part is related to costs for the business sector, as such obligations require change in existing practices between businesses and consumers.

To cite some examples, Georgia has an obligation to adjust its existing rules and practices in areas such as banking, tourism and leather products. In the banking sector, certain adjustments will be needed due to the higher protection of clients required. For example, a client will have the possibility to withdraw from a credit agreement in a 14-calendar-day period following its start date without giving any reason. In the tourism sector, tour operators will become liable to the consumer for the proper performance of the obligations arising from the contract, irrespective of whether such obligations are to be performed by that operator and/or retailer or by other suppliers. Such regulations can potentially increase the price of products like package holidays. As far as leather products are concerned, those containing biocide dimethylfumarate should not be placed or made available on the market.
The regulatory cost involved in the implementation of such requirements varies for businesses and the government, depending on whether the measures are product-specific or are more of a general or administrative nature. For example, one directive prohibits placing ‘novelty lighters’ on the market that are not child-resistant, but here ensuring compliance is not costly because the lighters are mainly imported from EU countries that are already compliant. Implementation of EU acts belonging to the first category mentioned above requires substantial administrative resources in order to create or adapt the required institutions, functions and procedures.

In line with the Agreement, in 2016 Georgia has approximated its legislation to two EU legislative acts: the Directive 87/357/EEC on products which are dangerous imitations of foodstuffs, and Commission Decision 2006/502/EC on lighters which are child-resistant. The latter entered into force on 1 January 2018, after a delay requested by business interests. In addition, Georgia’s legislation will be approximated to the Commission Decision 2009/251/EC on products containing the biocide dimethylfumarate in 2022.

There is a small number of NGOs active in the area of consumer protection, such as the Federation of Georgian Consumers, the Center for Strategy and Development of Georgia, and the European Foundation. The Center for Strategy and Development of Georgia has created a special web-portal (www.momkhmarebeli.ge), which provides information to consumers and answers their questions.

**Consumer protection at a glance**

*As a post-Soviet state Georgia has limited experience in consumer protection. The creation of a modern consumer protection system based on European best practices is therefore quite a radical step, requiring an investment of effort and resources.*

*The Agreement requires approximation to EU legislation in the consumer protection area mainly within five years after the entry into force of the Agreement.*

*A new law takes into account a key EU directive for general product safety to a substantial degree.*
To further support Georgia’s transition into a fully-functioning market economy and to create a stable environment for investment and trade, the Association Agreement includes a brief chapter on i) company law, ii) corporate governance and iii) accounting and auditing. It only includes a short and soft provision stating that Georgia aims to cooperate with the EU in these areas. In view of this aim, the EU and Georgia will set up a regular dialogue in order to share information and expertise on both existing systems and new developments in these three areas. Georgia undertakes to approximate a selection of EU law and international standards (Annex XXVIII).

In 2016-2017, changes were implemented in Georgian legislation to approximate standards and norms regulating different aspects of company operations: accounting, financial audit and financial markets. Georgia undertook extensive reform in the field of accounting and auditing through the adoption of a new law on Accounting, Reporting and Auditing taking into account Directives 2013/34/ EU (concerning annual financial statements, consolidated financial statements and related reports) and 2006/43/EC (concerning statutory audits of annual accounts and consolidated accounts). Relevant changes were introduced in the Law on Securities Market. Company legislation was also further streamlined to increase shareholder rights, transparency and corporate governance (see below for greater detail).

---

Company law. Here the objective is to improve the protection of shareholders, creditors and other stakeholders by undertaking to approximate a list of EU company law directives.

An important Directive (2009/101/EC), to be implemented within five years, requires public limited liability companies (PLLCs) to disclose basic information on their constitution and statutes, balance sheets and the profit and loss accounts for each financial year, and on the appointment of the persons authorised to represent the company in dealings with third parties, winding-up or liquidation of the company, etc. With regard to financial accounting documents, prepared in accordance with relevant EU directives, here the Association Agreement provides for a certain waiver, indicating that the exclusion of certain types of companies from this requirement shall be communicated to the Association Council and decided by Georgia within one year from entry into force of the Agreement.

This information has to be recorded in a file opened in a central register, commercial register or a company’s register. The file must be published in the national gazette or by other means, and be made available in electronic format. This directive also includes rules on the nullity of companies, requiring a court judgment. An exhaustive list of circumstances in which nullity may be ordered is provided (e.g. no instrument of constitution was executed or the objects of the company are of an unlawful nature).

In Georgia, PLLCs (so-called accountable entities) were subject even before the signing of the Association Agreement to rather high regulatory standards, and so the requirements of the directive cited above will not create a significant additional burden.

A second important Directive (77/91/EEC, updated by 2012/30/EU and replaced by (EU) 2017/1132), to be implemented within three years, concerns the maintenance and alteration of the capital of PLLCs, and seeks to protect shareholders and creditors. It requires that the statutes include such information as the objectives of the company, the amount of capital and rules governing the appointment of members responsible for managing the company. Moreover, the value, number and form of the subscribed (company-issued) shares and capital have to be published. The directive sets the

---

128 More specifically, it covers safeguards for the protection of the interests of members and third parties.

129 These pertain to safeguards in respect of the formation of public limited liability companies and the maintenance and alteration of their capital.
minimum capital requirement for EU PLLCs at €25,000, but Annex XXVIII stipulates that the minimum capital requirements for Georgia shall be clarified by a decision of the Association Council. This directive also regulates the distribution of dividends, the issuance and acquiring of shares and any increasing or reduction in a company’s capital. It limits the possibility for a PLLC to acquire its own shares. This latter provision will most likely not create any significant problems for implementation, but the minimum capital requirements may prove problematic. Currently, minimum capital requirements are applied only to financial institutions that are licensed either by the National Bank of Georgia or the Insurance State Supervision Service of Georgia. This requirement serves prudential regulation purposes. It may be difficult for other companies (non-financial entities) to meet the minimum capital requirement.

Georgia already introduced provisions concerning the pre-emptive rights of shareholders according to Directive 2012/30/EU (replaced by the Directive (EU) 2017/1132), related to i) offering of shares to shareholders on a pre-emptive basis in cases of increase of capital by issuing new shares, and ii) the pre-emptive rights of shareholders in acquiring subscribed shares from other shareholders in case of redemption – in both cases in proportion to the capital represented by their shares. Time limits for distribution of dividends were also introduced.

In addition, as outlined in Table 21.1, Annex XXVIII includes several other directives in the area of company law, which Georgia has to approximate within three to six years after the entry into force of the Agreement.

Table 21.1 EU company law directives applicable to Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU directive</th>
<th>Substance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive 78/855/EEC concerning mergers of public limited liability companies (replaced by Directive 2011/35/EU)</td>
<td>Deals with mergers between public limited liability companies in a single EU country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 82/891/EEC concerning the division of public limited liability companies, as amended by Directive 2007/63/EC and 2009/109/EC</td>
<td>Deals with the division of public limited liability companies in a single EU country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It has to be noted that in 2017, a new Directive (EU) 2017/1132 on codification of certain aspects of company law concerning limited liability companies was adopted. The new directive codifies and replaces several EU directives, bringing the rules established by the

---

130 Directive (EU) 2017/1132 codifies or replaces Directive 82/891/EEC concerning the division of public limited liability companies; Directive 89/666/EEC concerning disclosure requirements for branches opened in an EU country by certain types of company governed by the law of another country; Directive 2005/56/EC on cross-border mergers of limited liability companies; Directive 2009/101/EC on coordination of safeguards which are required by EU countries of companies within the meaning of the second paragraph of Article 48 TFEU; Directive 2011/35/EU concerning mergers of public limited liability companies and Directive 2012/30/EU on coordination of safeguards.
repealed directives together without changing their content or adding new rules. Such a directive was required in the area of company law as the relevant legislation was spread across many different legal acts — the first directives dated from the 1960s and 1970s and had been amended numerous times. Out of eight company-related directives applicable to Georgia, the Directive (EU) 2017/1132 replaces five, excluding the three following directives: 2009/102/EC on setting up a single-member company (in which all shares are held by a single shareholder), 2004/25/EC on takeover bids and 2007/36/EC on the exercise of certain rights of shareholders in listed companies (amended by Directives 2014/59 EU and 2017/828, which facilitate the interaction between companies and their shareholders and add transparency for institutional investors).

During 2016-2017, changes in Georgian Company Law were adopted for the establishment of more transparent conditions for accountability reflecting the provisions of a new Law on Accounting, Financial Reporting and Auditing (see below). Aiming at achieving greater effectiveness in internal control, the establishment of internal audit committees with at least one independent member became obligatory for publicly listed companies. Relevant changes were implemented in Georgian Company Law and the Law on Securities Market. Georgia introduced provisions related to single-member private limited liability companies according to Directive 2009/102/EC. Restrictions are imposed on the acquisition of shares of a parent company by a daughter company if 50% or more of its shares are held by the parent company.

**Accounting and auditing.** In this area, Georgia has undertaken to approximate to Directive 78/660/EEC on the annual accounts of certain types of companies and to Directive 83/349/EEC on consolidated accounts. These two directives meanwhile have been replaced by Directive 2013/34/EU, which significantly simplifies and reduces the administrative burdens for enterprises, with the aim of achieving greater cross-border comparability of accounts. The new directive also introduces mandatory requirements for disclosure of payments by enterprises to governments in the extraction and logging of primary forest industries. Approximation to Regulation (EC) 1606/2002 on the application of international accounting standards is also under consideration. This rule requires EU companies to prepare their accounts in accordance with international accounting standards (IAS)/international financial reporting standards (IFRS), both of which are issued by an international private organisation, the International Accounting Standards Board. Georgia also must implement Directive
2006/43/EC, which lays down the conditions for the approval and registration of persons who carry out statutory audits, the rules on independence, objectivity and professional ethics applying to those persons and the framework for their public oversight. This directive was amended in April 2014 by Directive 2014/56/EU, which further improves the quality of statutory audits through, inter alia, strengthening the independence of statutory auditors and audit supervision, and making the audit reports more informative.

Before 2016, mandatory audits and application of IFRS were applicable to accountable entities whose shares were traded on the stock exchange, entities subject to licensing by the National Bank of Georgia, and enterprises where the number of partners exceeds 100. In 2016, a new law on Accounting, Financial Reporting and Auditing was adopted, which replaced the existing law adopted in 2012. Georgian legislation was approximated with Directives 2013/34/EU and 2006/43/EC and IFRS, and mandatory audits became obligatory for other types of companies as well. Under the new law, the majority of companies, except for small companies, became obliged to carry out accounting and financial reporting according to IFRS. A supervisory Body for Accounting, Financial Reporting and Auditing (Service) was established under the Ministry of Finance. Companies, except for public interest entities (PIE), listed companies and financial institutions, are divided into 4 categories (according to annual income, volume of assets and number of employees). Large companies (1st category) should comply with IFRS requirements, while companies of the 2nd and 3rd category should apply the IFRS for SMEs. Small companies (4th category) and non-commercial entities are obliged to carry out accounting according to standards established by the supervisory body. Compulsory audits and corporate reporting requirements, which should include comprehensive information, apply to PIEs and 1st and 2nd categories. For transparency, financial accounts, corporate and audit reports are published by the supervisory body. These obligations create additional burdens for the business sector in terms of financial and human resources. Audits are conducted according to ISA standards in line with Regulation (EC) 1606/2002. According to the law, an audit company has the right to start operation upon registration in the special registry and insurance of professional responsibility the amount of which is high (at least €33,700\(^{131}\)). At the same time, contrary to the requirements of Directive 2006/43/EC, which sets exemptions for examination and certification of accountants

\(^{131}\) At least GEL 100 000 ExRate: 2.9649; 02.04.2018.
(working in audit companies), who have university diplomas in relevant fields and practical training, Georgian legislation requires obligatory certification. Upon certification, accountants must register in the Audit Registry, otherwise they do not have the right to perform audit activities.

**Corporate governance.** The EU and Georgia agreed to cooperate over corporate governance policy in line with international standards (i.e. the OECD Principles on Corporate Governance), with gradual approximation to the EU legislation listed in Annex XXVIII. This Annex includes Commission Recommendation 2004/913/EC fostering an appropriate regime for remuneration of directors of listed companies, and Recommendation 2005/162/EC on the role of non-executive or supervisory directors of listed companies and on the committees of the supervisory board, completed after the 2008 financial crisis as per Recommendation 2009/385/EC. These recommendations provide guidelines on best practices for remuneration policy. With regard to directors’ remuneration, these recommendations require a balance between fixed and variable remuneration, and make the variable component conditional upon measurable performance criteria. Termination payments (‘golden parachutes’) should also be subject to certain limitations and should not be paid in the event of inadequate performance. Each listed company should also publish a statement on its remuneration policy, including performance criteria and the variable components of remuneration. These principles of corporate governance are a recommendation for Georgia, as there are no strict deadlines for their implementation (contrary to those in the area of company law, and accounting and auditing). Therefore, their implementation may be timed to avoid undue costs for the Georgian private sector. Nevertheless, Georgia already introduced provisions related to the disclosure of financial documentation of accountable entities, which should include information from the company about the remuneration of directors, as well as on other incomes. In order to increase transparency, relevant changes were introduced in the Law on Securities Market, and shareholders owning at least 5% or more shares of an accountable entity can request information about the remuneration of directors and members of its supervisory board, while in the case of a listed company, any shareholder can request such information.

---

132 Directive 2006/43/EC, Article 9.
**Company law at a glance**

The Association Agreement entails obligations for Georgia in the areas of company law, accounting and auditing, and corporate governance.

For PLLCs, the implementation of relevant EU directives will not create significant problems. For other types of companies, however, especially SMEs, some requirements may be problematic, for example those related to minimum capital.

Georgia already introduced mandatory application of accounting, financial reporting and auditing standards for a broader scope of companies, through the adoption of a new law in accordance with the respective EU regulations. Softer requirements apply to SMEs. Considering the development level of many companies, implementation of the new legal requirements may create an additional burden for a large number of companies, as it requires additional resources.

Georgia made improvements in company legislation related to the increase of shareholders rights, transparency and improvement of corporate governance.

Overall, implementation of these company law standards will improve Georgia’s business climate, as it will create a transparent and clear environment for enterprises, including an appropriate level of protection for company shareholders and creditors.
Agriculture is an important sector of the Georgian economy, as well as for society. It is still characterised by a large number of small family farms, with an average plot size of about 0.2 hectare, which consequently lack modern technology and skills. Only a few sectors, such as wine, beverages and hazelnuts, are internationally competitive, making up 14.6% of total exports in 2017, and 74.3% of agricultural exports.

For this reason, Georgia has abstained from taking on premature commitments to replicate EU farm policies. However, the policy agenda for agricultural and rural development is very substantial and here the EU can contribute valuable assistance.

**Provisions of the Agreement**

The Agreement states that “the parties shall cooperate to promote agricultural and rural policies, in particular through progressive convergence of policies and legislation”. It goes on to list general objectives, such as improving competitiveness, exchanging best practices, and promoting modern and sustainable agricultural production (Arts 332-334). The Agreement further states that there shall be a regular dialogue on relevant issues.

This text is significant for what it omits. Unlike the Ukrainian and Moldovan agreements, Georgia makes no commitment to approximating any EU legislation in this field. Given the number of small and poorly developed farms in Georgia, this is understandable, because many EU regulations would be unsuited to Georgian realities.

In support of the Agreement, the EU is active in many technical and financial assistance projects. For example, it funded a comprehensive survey conducted by the FAO on the state of Georgia’s
agriculture sector. This identified a broad agenda for action, namely to overcome shortcomings in the agri-food supply chain and policy inefficiencies. Major current EU projects are under the European Neighbourhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development (ENPARD), covering the period of 2013-22, with a total budget of €179.5 million. ENPARD is implemented in three phases: phase I – for 2014-17 with a budget of €52 million; phase II – for 2016-19 with a budget of €50 million and phase III – for 2018-22 with a budget of €77.5 million. The programme aims to improve living conditions and promote sustainable economic development and inclusive growth in rural areas via different measures and interventions. Out of the total ENPARD budget, about 60% is dedicated to budget support for the government’s agriculture and rural development activities, and the remaining amount for various projects, including grants for small farmers’ cooperation.

Complementing the Agreement, in May 2015 the European Investment Bank (EIB) signed a Declaration of Intent to set up a financing facility for Georgian small and medium-sized enterprises active in the wine industry and horticulture, which was the EIB’s first loan to Georgia’s agri-food sector to finance agri-food production, processing and sales chain. A loan agreement with a total amount of €100 million with 12 years maturity was signed in December 2016. Under the facility, the EIB considered financing up to 50% of eligible projects. The initiative was also supported by the European Commission through grants from its Neighbourhood Investment Facility.

To modernise the agricultural sector and improve market access for small farmers, the UN International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) launched the AMMAR (Agricultural Modernisation, Market Access and Resilience) project in 2014. IFAD provided a $13.3 million loan and a $500,000 complementarity grant. The project is also co-financed by the Global Environmental Facility grant of $5.3 million. The government is also contributing $1.8 million to the AMMAR project.

---

Georgia’s agricultural sector

Georgia has the potential to further diversify agricultural production and exports. Both agricultural output and incomes suffered significant declines after the end of the Soviet period, when Georgia’s agricultural production suffered the severest collapse in the region, and from 1991 to 2001 it dropped to around 32% of its Soviet level.

The main agricultural products in Georgia are maize, potato, wheat, barley, vegetables and fruits (grapes, citruses, apples and hazelnuts) and livestock (cattle, sheep and goats, pigs and poultry).

Table 22.1 Agriculture as a share of GDP, sown area and livestock numbers, 1990–2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sown area (thousands, hectares)</th>
<th>Cattle (thousands, head)</th>
<th>Agriculture* share of GDP (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agriculture includes hunting, forestry and fishing.

*Source: Geostat.*
As shown in Figure 22.1, the decline in the agricultural sector has levelled out in recent years and output has shown some growth. The real growth rate of the agricultural sector, including forestry and fishing, was 11.3% in 2013, 1.6% in 2014, 1.5% in 2015, only 0.3% in 2016 and in 2017 it fell by 2.7%.

Agriculture provides a safety net for a very large number of jobless people who might otherwise be starving, and thus serves a very important social function. However, many of those employed in agriculture are individual subsistence farmers, lacking skills and resources to move to the next level in terms of productivity. There are about 642,200 agricultural holdings in Georgia, of which 639,963 belong to households and only 2,246 to legal entities. Small, fragmented family farms dominate. The high level of fragmentation of agricultural land holdings, mostly in private hands, makes substantial private investment challenging, as investors have to buy land from single holders. At the same time, a significant part of agricultural land is not yet registered by the owners, which is an obstacle for their use for economic activities (e.g. for access to finance).

Due to changes in the Georgia’s constitution in 2017, the right of agricultural land ownership was withdrawn for foreign investors (foreign citizens and companies) and legal entities. It can be owned

---

134 See the 2014 Census of Agriculture of Georgia.
only by the state, municipality, citizens or unions of citizens of Georgia. Exceptional cases of agricultural land ownership may be determined by the organic law only, which is not yet adopted. These drastic changes will probably have a negative effect on Georgia’s agricultural sector, which lacks the know-how that could have come with foreign investment.

Georgian agriculture lacks qualified human resources, capital, access to veterinary and plant protection services, storage facilities and a developed land market. Georgia has low agricultural productivity (more than three times lower than in developed EU countries). There is further potential for growth and diversification in agricultural production. In the past 17 years (and before) Georgia has been importing a significant proportion of its food, although the share of food imports against total imports has been declining.

Table 22.2 Food imports to Georgia, 2000-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total imports</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>8,602</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>7,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($ mn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food imports</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($ mn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share in total</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imports (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Geostat.

Diversification of the existing markets and the opening of new markets has been among the top priorities of Georgia’s economic reforms.

Table 22.3 Food exports from Georgia, 2000–17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total exports</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($ mn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food exports</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($ mn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share in total</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exports (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Geostat.
The government places great emphasis on the need for investment in increasing output and productivity in agriculture, and in 2015 launched its strategy for Agricultural Development of Georgia 2015–20. The strategy aims to create an environment that will increase competitiveness in the agri-food sector, promote stable growth in high-quality agricultural production, ensure food safety and security, and eliminate rural poverty through sustainable development of agriculture and rural areas.

The state provides budgetary support for the development of agriculture, primary production as well as processing, through various agricultural production support programmes. To encourage agricultural activities the government provides financial support for the insurance of risks against natural disasters and supports the establishment, development and technical assistance of agricultural cooperatives. Despite this state support, the growth rate of agricultural sector is still low and requires a comprehensive approach to modernise and enhance its competitiveness.

Rural development

For the further development of rural areas and approximation to EU rural policy, Georgia has undertaken its first steps. An Inter-Agency Coordination Council has been set up to coordinate rural policy. The Rural Development Strategy of Georgia for 2017-20 was drawn up and adopted in December 2016. The strategy aims at the diversification of the rural economy, improvement of social conditions and living standards in rural areas and the sustainable use of natural resources through various policy measures. These measures are indicated in rural development action plans (RDAP) for 2017 and for 2018-20. In 2018-20 the RDAP will see 69 policy measures with an overall budget of €552,000. In order to support the engagement of the local population in the elaboration and implementation of rural policy, eight Local Action Groups (LAGs) were established in eight pilot municipalities of Georgia under the EU’s ENPARD programme.

---
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Georgian agriculture at a glance

Agriculture is a socially important sector of the Georgian economy, accounting for 8.1% of its GDP.

However, Georgian agriculture suffered disastrous losses of output and capacity in the first two decades of the post-Soviet period, which meant that it was inappropriate to embark on any premature programme of approximation to the EU regulatory model.

Georgia has introduced a rural development policy and started its implementation with the current 2017–20 strategy, but further effort is needed for approximation to EU rural policy and best practices.

In 2017, the right of agricultural land ownership was withdrawn from foreign investors (foreign citizens and companies) and legal entities. Agricultural land can only be owned by the state, municipalities, citizens or unions of citizens of Georgia. This measure risks limiting agricultural development.

The EU is funding considerable technical assistance and investment projects.
23. EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

This chapter seeks to promote cooperation over a large part of EU labour law and related conditions of work. Since 2006, Georgia’s Labour Code has been substantially reformed with large reliance on ILO conventions upon which the Association Agreement further builds.

Provisions of the Agreement

The Agreement sets out (in Annex XXX) a comprehensive agenda for Georgia to “approximate gradually” to the employment and social policy laws of the EU under three basic headings: labour law, anti-discrimination and gender equality, and health and safety at work. The first two headings cover basic principles of the Labour Code.

Labour law. There are eight directives requiring approximation within four to six years.

The Individual Employment Conditions Directive (91/533/EEC) establishes the employer’s obligation to inform employees of the conditions applicable to the contract or employment relationship. The aim of the directive is to provide employees with improved protection, to avoid uncertainty and insecurity about the terms of the employment relationship and to create greater transparency in the labour market.

The Directive (1999/70/EC) fixed-term contracts aims to improve the quality of fixed-term work by ensuring the application of the principle of non-discrimination and to prevent abuses arising from the use of successive fixed-term employment contracts. A basic principle is that open-ended contracts are and remain the general form
of employment relationships and fixed-term contracts should be the exception. The Part-time Work Directive (97/81/EC) sets out to eliminate unjustified discrimination against part-time workers and to improve the quality of part-time work.

The Collective Redundancies Directive (98/59/EC) sets out requirements for the information to be given to workers on the reasons, the numbers and categories of workers concerned, and of redundancy compensation payments.


The Gender Directive on equal treatment prohibits any less-favourable treatment of men or women on grounds of gender, or of women due to pregnancy or maternity. It also prohibits sexual harassment. The directive establishes only minimal requirements, allowing EU countries to be able to maintain higher or more extensive levels of protection. The Parental Leave Directive (96/34/EC) provides for three months of leave; the Pregnant Workers Directive (92/85/EEC) prohibits work that risks endangering health and safety and also for leave before and/or after confinement of 14 weeks.

The Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) implements the principle of equal treatment between people irrespective of racial or ethnic origin. It gives protection against discrimination in employment and training, education and social protection. It gives victims of discrimination a right to make a complaint through a judicial or administrative procedure.

Health and safety at work. This section includes references to 26 EU laws, which is explained by the need to specify separately the safety requirements for particularly dangerous products, such as carcinogens or explosives, and the working environment in specific industries, such as construction sites or underground mineral extraction. Most of these
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technically specific directives have long implementation delays of seven or ten years.

However, the centrepiece is the Framework Directive on health and safety at work (89/391/EEC). The scope of the Directive is expansive, applying to all sectors, including industry, agriculture, commerce and services. The directive describes employer obligations, which include providing workers with information and safety training, taking necessary measures for first aid and fire-fighting and consulting with workers and their representatives regarding matters of health and safety. Workers are required to correctly use machinery and personal protective equipment, and to inform their employers if a situation poses a danger. This directive is limited to setting out general principles. It is to be approximated by Georgia in a relatively short period of three years, and Georgia already started this process (on which see further below).

Implementation perspectives

Until 2006, labour relations in Georgia were regulated by the labour code, which was adopted in the Soviet period in 1973. In practice Georgia inherited from its Soviet past a system of highly defunct and corrupt labour relations, with a ‘silent’ consensus between the executive government and the sole/monopolistic trade union, the legal heir of the Soviet trade union. There was no right to strike, it was very difficult to fire an employee even during the liquidation process of a company, employment contracts were generally for an indefinite term, and fixed-term contracts were authorised only in exceptional cases (e.g. seasonal work).

In 2006, Georgia adopted a new labour code, bringing the legislative framework more in line with international standards. It aimed at a basic legalisation of labour relations and a reduction in informal employment in the sizeable informal sector of the economy.

*ILO conventions*. In reforming the Labour Code, Georgia took major recourse to ILO conventions, of which 16 have been ratified, including all the eight fundamental conventions. This ensures, inter alia, the freedom of association and recognition of the right to collective

\[137\] Below is the list of ratified ILO conventions.

Fundamental conventions: C029 - Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29); C087 - Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948
bargaining, the elimination of all forms of forced labour and child labour, and of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

In 2006, Georgia also ratified the relevant articles of the Social Charter of the Council of Europe, which notably concerns essentially workers’ rights. As explained in Box 23.1, there is a close relationship between many of the ILO conventions and EU directives, and adoption of the conventions provides assurance that there is large degree of compliance with the EU directives.

**Box 23.1 Relationship between EU employment and social directives and ILO conventions**

“There is an interplay between EU labour law, the European Social Charter and ILO Conventions: EU law, in particular the Charter of Fundamental Rights, takes into account the European Social Charter and ILO Conventions and in turn influences the evolving content and monitoring of the latter instruments.

All EU Member States are also members of the ILO. The EU is committed to promoting the ILO’s ‘Decent Work’ agenda to promote rights at work, encourage decent employment opportunities, enhance social protection and strengthen social dialogue on work-related issues.

All EU countries have ratified the core labour standards – that is, the fundamental ILO conventions on freedom of association, collective bargaining, forced and child labour, equal remuneration and the elimination of discrimination. EU countries have also ratified the ILO ‘Governance Conventions’ on labour inspection, employment policy and tripartite consultations, as well as a considerable number of other ILO conventions.

(No. 87); C098 - Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98); C100 – Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100); C105 – Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105); C111 – Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111); C138 – Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138); C182 – Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182).

**Priority convention:** C122 – Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122).

**Technical (other) conventions:** C052 – Holidays with Pay Convention, 1936 (No. 52); C142 – Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142); C181 – Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181); C185 – Seafarers’ Identity Documents Convention (Revised), 2003 (No. 185); C151 – Labour Relations (Public Service) Convention, 1978 (No. 151); C117 – Social Policy (Basic Aims and Standards) Convention, 1962 (No. 117).
While ILO standards cover a wider range of areas than those in which the EU is competent to legislate, and EU law often goes beyond the minimum provisions of ILO conventions, the principles that underlie the action of both organisations are similar. There is much common ground in the content of EU Directives and ILO conventions, with EU law reinforcing ILO standards. Directives on issues such as working time and young workers explicitly seek to take into account relevant ILO standards.

The protection, realization and enforcement of core labour standards as well as the promotion of the ratification and effective application of other up-to-date ILO conventions underpinning the Decent Work Agenda are part of a growing number of bilateral agreements between EU and third countries, such as the new generation of EU free trade agreements. The follow-up mechanisms of these agreements include monitoring mechanisms involving social partners.”


References in the Association Agreement to the above ILO conventions are contained in the chapter on trade and sustainable development, where Georgia is already in compliance given its ratification of the main ILO conventions.

In 2009, also in cooperation with the ILO, Georgia set up the Tripartite Commission as a dialogue forum to address labour issues with the Georgian Trade Unions Confederation and Georgian Employers’ Association.

The main remaining challenge in relation to ILO conventions concerns labour inspectorates, notably the Labour Inspection Convention (CO81) and the one for Agriculture (C129). This is a sensitive matter for Georgia, which abolished the labour inspectorate under the new labour code in 2006, as it was a highly corrupt public body. In 2011, the government began to restore some such functions, but given the track record of corrupt practices of the old labour inspectorate, Georgia will need to be vigilant. Importantly, Georgia reformed its entire inspection system starting in 2005, with the objective of downsizing the number of state inspectorates, streamlining inspection rules and making them more business-friendly, non-corrupt and transparent.
EU approximation. In 2013, Georgia amended the labour code in order to comply with relevant EC directives on labour law, anti-discrimination and gender equality. As a result of legislative reform, the main anti-discrimination and gender-equality principles (including defensive measures for pregnant women) stipulated by the directives are already reflected in labour legislation, as well as among others provisions on notification before firing, collective redundancies, overtime working remuneration and fixed working hours. The main outstanding challenge arises with the directives on fixed-term and part-time contracts, which are considered restrictive.

While anti-discriminatory provisions already existed in the Labour Code, in 2017 new changes to the Code were elaborated taking into account the main principles of the Directive 2000/43/EC on equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial and ethnic origin and the Directive 2000/78/EC on establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation. In particular, an additional norm will be introduced, related to prohibition of discrimination during the vacancy announcement and recruitment process.

Regarding the protection of women’s rights, changes to the Labour Code were adopted in May 2017 for victims of violence, including domestic violence. Currently a package of laws related to anti-discrimination and gender are under discussion in parliament. While the existing laws on Gender Equality and on Elimination of all Types of Discrimination cover the main provisions of Directive 2004/113/EC on equal treatment of men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services, changes were elaborated for more clarity, taking into account the provisions of the Directive 2000/43/EC on equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial and ethnic origin and Directive 2000/78/EC, establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation. Changes to the Georgian Law on Public Service, which are also under discussion in the parliament (in the same package), obliges public organisations to introduce anti-discriminatory provisions in internal rules of organization and ensure their effective implementation.

The 26 directives on health and safety envisaged for approximation represent the most difficult challenge, with sizeable compliance costs, even if the implementation periods are long (seven to ten years). The best scenario is for these standards to be gradually introduced, for example when they are embodied in the technology of a new investment. Otherwise, in cases of sharply increased costs, apart from the financial burden, there would be risks of increased corruption.
in order to avoid compliance costs. The approximation of these directives has already started. Institutional reform has been undertaken to supervise health and safety at work, with the creation in 2015 of the Work Conditions Monitoring Service under the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs. The Service inspects work conditions in state and private companies under the framework of the working conditions inspection programme, which has been approved annually since 2015. During 2015-17, more than 500 companies and more than 500 establishments were inspected on working conditions, forced labour and labour exploitation and around 6, 469 recommendations were issued by labour inspectors.

In May 2017 a joint decree of the ministers of Labour, Health and Social Affairs and of Economy and Sustainable Development was issued according to which occupational safety standards are inspected in hazardous and harmful working places without the consent of the employer.

The law on Occupational Safety was drawn up according to the Directive 89/391/EEC, to be implemented within five years, and currently discussions are ongoing in the parliament. The law defines general principles of basic requirements and preventive measures related to occupational safety in the workplace, existing and anticipated risks, prevention of accidents and occupational diseases. According to the law, a company carrying out hazardous and harmful work should be registered. Employers are obliged to implement various activities to ensure the safety of workers, prevent accidents and mitigate the risks of professional sickness. Employers became obliged to hold consultations with workers and their representatives regarding matters of health and safety, give them remunerated free time for implementation of their responsibilities and equip them with all necessary equipment. Sanctions and penalties for the violation of provisions are defined by the same law. Compliance costs for the implementation of obligations will be high for companies, while it could require investment to introduce new technologies for the improvement of working infrastructure, provide individual and collective protective equipment, and train employees.
Fundamental reform of the Georgian Labour Code began in 2006, which led to the adoption of the major ILO conventions, with more recent reforms in 2013 already implementing the requirements of many EU directives on key issues of labour law and anti-discrimination.

The directives on health and safety standards are costly. Georgia started approximation to those standards and drafted the Law on Occupational Health and Safety, which will apply to hazardous and potentially harmful work. It will incur significant compliance costs for businesses.
Education and training

The Association Agreement sets out certain aims for the education system, notably its reform and modernisation, and convergence in the field of higher education in the Bologna process, which includes the enhancement of the quality and relevance of higher education.

In 2004, Georgia embarked upon Bologna-related reforms, formally joining the Bologna Process in 2005, leading to adoption of the three-tier higher education system (with bachelor, master and doctorate qualifications). In 2005, a new law on Higher Education was adopted. Since then, further extensive reform efforts were initiated to bring the Georgian education system closer to European and more broadly Western standards. New mechanisms of quality control were established. Higher education institutions were granted more autonomy. The Diploma Supplement and ECTS system\(^{138}\) has also been introduced. Currently, bachelor programmes should include no less than 240 ECTS credits, master programmes are expected to comprise no less than 120 ECTS, and doctoral programmes no less than 180 ECTS. Currently, there are 71 authorised higher education institutions in Georgia.

In 2006, an independent National Centre of Education Accreditation was established, which became an official authority responsible for defining equivalence and authenticity of educational

\(^{138}\) European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
credentials. A National Curriculum and Assessment Centre, and a Centre for Teachers’ Professional Development were established. In 2010, the National Centre of Education Accreditation was reorganised and replaced by the National Centre for Educational Quality Enhancement.

One of the major milestones in reforming the education system was the introduction of Unified National Exams, which eradicated the old Soviet-style admission rules coupled with deeply rooted corruption. Unified National Exams are conducted in a centralised manner and tests are confidential, electronic and conducted through a transparent and merit-based system. The system provides standardised selection methods, and government grants to best performing students.

In particular Georgia introduced a merit-based funding scheme based on the principle of ‘money follows students’, whereby the state funds students, not education institutions. The amount of state funding depends on the scores of students in Unified National Exams, whereby students with higher scores receive higher funding, up to the level of the highest tuition fees of state universities. Students are free to use the funding at public and private universities equally, which means that universities compete for well-performing students. As a result of this competition, the quality of higher education has increased in recent years. Currently, approximately 35% of students study at private universities in Georgia, funding at least part of their tuition through state scholarships.

By the end of 2017, new standards for the authorisation of higher education institutions and for the accreditation of higher education programmes were adopted to bring them into compliance with the EU quality insurance standards and guiding principles.

Georgia has also reformed its vocational, primary and secondary education systems, among others introducing voucher financing, where funding is given to students and not education institutions, but grant beneficiaries are students applying to public education/vocational training institutions only. This system creates unfair competition between public and private vocational institutions, which cannot receive students with state funding, unlike higher education institutions. The EU–Georgia Association Agreement promotes concrete measures such as implementing the European Credit System for Vocational Education and Training. Cooperation extends to efforts to improve transparency and the mutual recognition of qualifications.
Work on reform in vocational education, related to the establishment of modular and dual vocational programmes with active participation of private sector is ongoing. During 2017, more than 80 professional standards and about 50 programmes were developed. With EU technical support, the concept of institutionalisation of vocational education was elaborated, along with the national qualification framework. A new draft law on vocational education, based on the principle of Life Long Learning (LLL) was elaborated.

In the field of exchanges, the EU’s major contribution is through the Erasmus+ programme, which has a total budget for the EU plus third countries of €4.7 billion for the period of 2014 to 2020. Since 2015, more than 2,000 Georgian students, researchers and academic staff benefited from Erasmus through scholarships, teaching, training activities and study visits, and the number of beneficiaries is expected to increase in the years ahead.

Georgian higher education institutions are among the consortia of five EU-funded capacity-building projects with a budget exceeding €4 million. The following areas are covered:

- higher education interdisciplinary reform in tourism management and applied geo-information curricula;
- creation of graduate curricula in peace studies in Georgia;
- advocacy enhancement for students through an ombudsman position;
- investing in entrepreneurial universities in Caucasus and Central Asia (EUCA-INVEST)
- development of programmes for disadvantaged groups of people and regions to improve their access to higher education.

**Culture**

Cultural cooperation between Georgia and the EU is based on exchanges and the mobility of arts and artists. Georgia participates fully in the EU’s Creative Europe programme for the cultural and creative sectors, signing an agreement to this effect with the European Commission in February 2015. In the framework of Creative Europe 10 projects from Georgia won competitions. An online portal Creative Georgia (http://creativegeorgia.ge/) was created and relevant information, including financing opportunities, projects, guides, scientific publications etc., are available for interested parties.
The EU and Georgia also pledge to cooperate in the framework of UNESCO and the Council of Europe, to sustain cultural diversity and valorise cultural and historical heritage. Georgia has already elaborated a Culture Strategy 2025 and the government reiterates its commitment to strengthening all-inclusive cultural policies and supporting the capacities of culture operators in the country.

Projects for cultural cooperation are being implemented under the Culture Programme II launched in September 2015 for the Eastern Partnership countries. The Culture Programme II builds upon the experience of the first programme, and aims at further strengthening cultural policies, as well as the capacities of the culture sector and the culture operators. It seeks to develop cultural and creative industries as vectors of cultural, social and economic development, and create synergies between public and private actors for a more efficient cultural sector.

The programme has a budget of €4.95 million and has two components. A first one is EU support for capacity building and the inclusion of culture on the political agenda. The second is a joint EU and Council of Europe project supporting 6-12 historic towns for the development of urban strategies with the revival of heritage. This Community-led Urban Strategies in Historic Towns (COMUS) project aims not only at preserving and rehabilitating cultural heritage, but also the objective of stimulating social and economic development. In the framework of the COMUS project, pilot cities were selected, basic plans developed, needs for the development and relevant measures identified.

Under the aegis of the Culture Programme II, the Georgian Ministry of Culture and Sports implements a ‘Diversity in Culture and Heritage’ project with the participation of young people from Eastern Partnership countries, also to take an active part in the work of the Eastern Partnership Culture Forum. In the framework of the project ‘Diverse Georgia’ different activities are implemented to facilitate a more active social inclusion of ethnic minorities in Georgia, increasing the level of cultural education and developing creative skills.

By the end of 2017, due to structural changes within the government of Georgia, the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia and the Ministry of Sports and Youth Affairs

---

were merged. Currently the responsibility of cultural policies lies with the Ministry of Culture and Sports.

In the framework of Culture for Development Indicators (CDIS) project implemented under the EU-Eastern Partnership programme ‘Culture and Creativity’, specific indicators were developed to identify the role of culture in seven different areas according to the UNESCO methodology.

Education, training and culture at a glance

Since 2004, Georgia has been implementing a set of reforms in the education sector to increase competition and quality in public and private education and prevent corruption, notably in the area of higher education.

Basic education reforms are supported in the Association Agreement, notably for higher education through the Bologna Process and European Higher Education Area, and with concrete programmes such as Erasmus+ benefiting large numbers of Georgian students.

Georgia is reforming its vocational education system, gradually moving closer towards EU standards and educational quality requirements.

Georgia has joined the EU’s Culture Programme with its ‘Creative Georgia’ project, with an agreement signed in February 2015 and has started to implement projects under this framework.
The Association Agreement sets out wide-ranging objectives for cooperation in the area of science and technology, aiming to strengthen research capacities, human potential and the sharing of scientific knowledge. It intends to facilitate the involvement of Georgia in the European Research Area.

In April 2016, Georgia became an associate member of the EU’s Horizon 2020 (H2020) programme, which is the centrepiece of the EU’s scientific and research activity, endowed with very substantial funds (€80 billion) for the period 2014–20. Horizon 2020 offers access to world-class scientific networks and research teams and data, with increased mobility that is essential to the process of Georgia’s modernisation and European integration. The National Contact Point (NCP) system for H2020 is established and the activities are coordinated by the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia.

Horizon 2020 encourages the EU and Georgia to implement joint research projects, conduct training courses and increase the mobility of scientists and researchers. Through cooperation with the EU, Georgia has an opportunity to strengthen its research institutions. The areas eligible for project funding by Horizon 2020 cover both the natural and social sciences (see Table 25.1 below).

Table 25.1 Main thematic priorities of Horizon 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent science</th>
<th>Industrial leadership</th>
<th>Societal challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Research Council (ERC)</td>
<td>Leadership in enabling and industrial technologies (LEITs):</td>
<td>Health, demographic change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future and emerging technologies</th>
<th>nanotechnologies, materials, biotechnology, manufacturing, ICT and space</th>
<th>Food security, sustainable agriculture, marine research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions</td>
<td>Access to risk finance</td>
<td>Energy, transport, climate action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research infrastructures</td>
<td>Innovation in SMEs</td>
<td>Europe in a changing world; protecting freedom and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including e-infrastructure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With associate membership of Horizon 2020, Georgia has the possibility to participate in the programme on the same basis as EU member states, including participation in the governing structures of the fund. Membership entails financial contributions proportional to its GDP compared with that of the EU, but with substantial rebates. So far 20 projects with participation of Georgian institutions were selected and funded under the H2020, for a total of €1,937,492.

A web-page [www.horizon2020.ge](http://www.horizon2020.ge) was created to share information about new calls for participation in programmes as well as about various activities under Horizon 2020. An online manual for participation in competitions, documents, and other useful information are placed on the portal.

Georgia had already participated in the predecessor of Horizon 2020, the Framework Programme 7 (FP7) for Research and Development, and demonstrated a strong performance in project implementation. Over seven years Georgian institutes took part in 59 FP7 projects and received funding of €5.49 million in total, among which are the following examples:

- the Chain Reaction project on a sustainable approach to inquiry-based science education;
- a multi-gigabit European research and education network, and associated services;
- the European grid initiative, a pan-European infrastructure for researchers in Europe;
- a high-performance computing infrastructure for research communities;
- a pan-European infrastructure (PESI) for the management of biodiversity in Europe;
- coastal networks of marine-protected areas, with sea-based wind energy potential;
• cooperation on bridging the gap between energy research and energy innovation;
• agri-food research results and innovation; and
• a pan-European infrastructure for ocean and marine data management.

Based on its performance, Georgia is judged to have a strong potential in ICT and in areas such as energy, raw materials and environment-related issues.

Georgia participates in the Horizon 2020 programme GN4-2 Research and Education Networking – GÉANT, which serves as the research and education networking community in Europe, helping to deliver innovative networks, technologies and services for research and education. Several Georgian universities are connected to the network. Georgian Research and Education Networking Association – GRENA, which is a member of GÉANT, implements projects related to cyber security, educational roaming etc.

Currently, 13 Georgian universities and research institutes successfully participate in the European Cooperation for Science and Technology Framework Programme “COST”, which is part of H2020.

In order to stimulate cooperation between researchers of the EaP countries and EU member states and thus encourage active participation in the Horizon 2020, the Commission set up a project called ‘STI International Cooperation Network for EaP Countries Plus (EaP PLUS).’ The project consist of five actions from supporting policy dialogue:

1. Strategic priority through supporting EU-EaP policy dialogue and maximising the impact of association to H2020
2. Stronger interaction between researchers and participation in H2020, grants for networking
3. Promotion of the research-innovation interface supporting communities of excellence: clustering schemes, promotion of the technology platforms concept to EaP countries
4. Optimal framework conditions and increasing coordination in policies and programmes through training seminars, etc.
5. Communication and outreach through innovative actions.

140 https://www.eap-plus.eu/.
Science and technology at a glance

In accordance with the Association Agreement, it is envisaged that Georgia will become a full participant in the EU’s main research funding instrument, Horizon 2020, with 20 projects selected for support so far.

Over seven years Georgian institutes took part in the EU’s previous programme (FP7) with 59 FP7 projects, receiving total funding of €5.49 million.

Georgian researchers produce high-quality research in nanotechnology, biotechnology and pharmaceuticals, health, agriculture and engineering. These are the domains that could serve as a strong base for closer cooperation with the EU.
The EU operates 46 ‘agencies’, which are semi-autonomous and specialised bodies funded and controlled by the EU, with the objective of supporting the functioning of EU policies. There are also around 45 ‘programmes’, most of which (but not all) are funded and administered by the European Commission. Of these a considerable number are open to participation by Georgia as a partner under the Association Agreement, notably the 20 agencies and 19 programmes listed in Boxes 26.1 and 26.2. The text in bold indicates the agencies and programmes with which Georgia already has cooperation at different levels (projects, seminars, study visits, etc.).

**Box 26.1 EU agencies open to Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia**

- European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA)
- European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders (FRONTEX)
- European Asylum Support Office (EASO)
- European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA)
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC)
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC)
- European Chemicals Agency (ECHA)
- European Defence Agency (EDA)
- European Environment Agency (EEA)
- European Fisheries Control Agency (EFCA)
- European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)
**Deepening EU-Georgian Relations: What, why and how?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (EUROFOUND)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European GNSS Agency (GSA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Police College (CEPOL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Police Office (Europol)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union’s Judicial Cooperation Unit (EUROJUST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Bold type denotes those agencies with which Georgia already has ongoing cooperation at different levels (projects, seminars, study visits, etc.).
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**Box 26.2 EU programmes open to Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia**

Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund  
Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME)  
Copernicus, European Earth Observation Programme  
**Creative Europe, Programme for the cultural and creative sectors**  
Customs 2020  
Erasmus+  
European Maritime and Fisheries Fund  
European Statistical Programme  
European Territorial Cooperation  
European Union Civil Protection Mechanism  
Fiscalis 2020 (tax administration support)  
Galileo and EGNOS Programmes, Global satellite navigation system  
**Health for Growth**  
Hercule III Anti-fraud Programme  
**Horizon 2020**  
Internal Security Fund  
Life Programme  
Environment and climate change  
Pericles 2020, Programme for the protection of the euro against counterfeiting  
SESAR JU, Air Traffic Management modernisation

* Bold type denotes those programmes with which Georgia already has ongoing cooperation at different levels (projects, seminars, study visits, etc.).
Such participation offers a useful means of in-depth integration of professional experts and administrative organisations with EU counterparts, and aids reform processes.

Membership in an agency requires negotiation of a specific international agreement, and a decision on the financial contribution of the partner. Cooperation with a programme is carried out on the basis of a protocol or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), stating the details of participation. Participation in these EU agencies and programmes is subject to regular dialogue and review.

Membership of the agencies and inclusion in programmes gives full access to the infrastructure and governing bodies, but also involves costs in some cases. To ease the financial burden, the EU is providing support to Georgia to participate in some programmes, such as Horizon 2020 and Creative Europe, by funding 50% of membership fees, in addition to which temporary rebates may be negotiated. The process of participating in various programmes can be extremely competitive, such as for research projects under Horizon 2020, but Georgian institutes will normally be joining consortia and counterparts in EU member states in these initiatives.

Georgia has ongoing cooperation at different levels (projects, participation in seminars, study visits, etc.) with the following agencies:

**European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA).** Cooperation between Georgia and the EASA reflects a shared interest in a high level of civil aviation safety and environmental compatibility. Within this framework several working groups are active, including the pan-European partnership group (EASA–PANEP). In 2011, Georgia and the EU started implementing a twinning project on harmonisation with EU norms of legislation and standards. In 2014, Georgia became the 40th member of the European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL), which will help the integration of Georgian air navigation systems into the European system.

**European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA).** The cooperation between Georgia and the EMSA seeks to ensure a high, uniform and effective level of maritime safety and security, and to prevent and respond to sea pollution. EMSA organises training seminars and supports analysis, research and other projects that envisage the protection of the environment, port control, vessel traffic management and state flag control. As a result, Georgia has considerably improved its education, training and certification of seafarers, and regained the EU recognition of certificates for Georgian seafarers that had been revoked in late 2010.
**European Fisheries Control Agency (EFCA).** In the framework of the multilateral cooperation on fisheries in the Black Sea, EFCA is providing support for capacity building of fisheries inspectors; Georgia has recently requested such training.

**European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA).** Georgia is in the process of developing frameworks to improve workplace health and safety and in this respect the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs has been largely supported by the EU-OSHA in providing expertise to improve occupational safety and health through sharing EU experience and improving risk assessment capacity. Cooperation with the EU-OSHA follows from the obligations in the Association Agreement to bring its legislation in this field in line with EU directives.

**European Defence Agency (EDA).** There is significant potential to cooperate between Georgia and EDA, although this has not yet been reflected in practice. The government is currently considering specific opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation with the Agency.

**European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA).** Georgia has cooperated with the EMCDDA since 2015. The MoU signed by the Ministry of Justice and the EMCDDA aims to help Georgia implement its commitments under the Association Agreement. By applying evidence-based, scientific practical methodologies, Georgia has considerably improved the collection and analysis of information. The parties will regularly exchange information on illegal trafficking of drugs and psychotropic substances, and on their production and use.

**European Police College (CEPOL).** Cooperation with the European Police College involves sharing experience and importing the best practices of advanced European training institutions. Since 2013, the Ministry of Internal Affairs has been actively engaged in an exchange programme with the European Police College, which enables the ministry’s officials to visit the law enforcement agencies of partner states. The programme offers experience-sharing in the fields of illegal migration, human trafficking, cybercrime, organised crime and human rights.

**European Union’s Judicial Cooperation Unit (EUROJUST).** Since January 2015, Georgia has been officially included in the priority country list of EUROJUST, which triggers the process of concluding a cooperation agreement with EUROJUST.

**European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders (FRONTEX).** In 2013, FRONTEX and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia signed a cooperation plan
for the period of 2013–15, providing for participation in training seminars and operations in various European countries. For 2014-17, FRONTEX implements a project on Integrated Border Management Capacity, which aims to improve the training capacity of border agencies in Georgia and all six Eastern Partnership states. The Common Integrated Risk Analysis Model methodology, developed by FRONTEX, has been translated into Georgian.

**European Environment Agency (EEA).** Cooperation between Georgia and the EEA has been underway since 2010 within the framework of the project on extending the Shared Environment Information System to the European Neighbourhood Policy Countries (SEIS). In 2015 this project was extended to 2016–19, and involves the sharing of best practices in analysing, storing and managing environmental information; enhancing capacity in data reporting mechanisms; and producing National State of the Environment Reports.

**European Centre for Prevention and Disease Control (ECDC).** Georgian epidemiologists and Public Health Practitioners have been taking part as external participants in the MediPIET training modules.

**European Police Office (Europol).** In April 2017, Europol and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia signed the Agreement on Operational and Strategic Cooperation. The Agreement aims to expand cooperation in combating terrorism, as well as serious and organised cross-border criminal activities, such as drug trafficking, organised property crime, cybercrime and migrant smuggling.

**EU Civil Protection Mechanism.** DG ECHO and Emergency Management Service (EMS) of Georgia are close to signing an administrative arrangement with respect to disaster risk management cooperation. This arrangement provides the necessary framework for various activities to be undertaken, including trainings, projects and peer reviews.

**The European Training Foundation (ETF)** helps Georgia in capacity development for stakeholders in the vocational education and training (VET) dialogue at national and sector levels. It also supports the EU delegation in its actions on employment and VET enforcement.

Of all the EU programmes, Georgia is most actively engaged in the **Horizon 2020**, the **Erasmus+** (on which see the chapters on science and education respectively) and the new **Creative Europe** programmes. Creative Europe enables professionals and organisations in the cultural, artistic and creative sectors from Georgia to work throughout Europe, address new audiences and implement projects with European partners.
The EU agencies and programmes at a glance

There are extensive possibilities for inclusion in EU agencies and programmes, with the potential to develop institutional capabilities and advance reforms.

Georgia is taking up a considerable number of these possibilities, which relate to important aspects of Georgia’s modernisation and integration with Europe, for example health and safety standards, policing and justice, research, education and culture.

The EU offers financial assistance to contribute to the costs of participation.
27. CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION

While Georgia does not have a land border with the EU, it shares a border with two fellow Eastern Partnership countries, namely Armenia (219 km) and Azerbaijan (428 km). The EU assists both Georgia–Armenia and Georgia–Azerbaijan cross-border cooperation through the Eastern Partnership Territorial Cooperation (EaPTC) programme, which establishes and strengthens contacts between the neighbours with the aim of addressing common challenges. Stakeholders in the programme include local and regional authorities, hospitals, educational and communal services as well as non-state actors and SMEs.

In particular, the EaPTC seeks to support the social and economic development of Georgia’s border regions with Armenia and Azerbaijan in three priority areas. First, it works to improve the living conditions of cross-border local communities through joint projects. Second, it addresses common challenges arising over such issues as the environment, employment and public health. Third, through education, sports and cultural exchanges, the programme supports ‘people-to-people’ contacts.

In this framework, the Kakheti and Kvemo Kartli regions of Georgia cooperate with two economic zones in Azerbaijan: Ganja-Qazakh and Sheki-Zagatala. Regions participating in Georgian–Armenian cooperation are Kvemo Kartli and Samtskhe Javakheti in Georgia and Lori, Shirak and Tavush in Armenia. The funding from the EU has an indicative amount of €1.35 million for Georgia–Armenia cooperation, and a similar amount for Georgia–Azerbaijan cooperation.
The requests for grants can range between a minimum of €20,000 and a maximum of €250,000.

Since the official launch of the Georgia-Armenia Cooperation Programme (2014), the European Commission awarded grants to 9 cross-border territorial cooperation projects involving 33 organisations from both countries to address common challenges in the targeted border regions of Georgia and Armenia (see Box 27.1). These projects are implemented in the fields of agriculture, tourism, business, environment, education, culture and sport.

Box 27.1 Selected Georgia–Armenia cross-border projects
- Addressing Common challenges in youth employment through cross-border tourism development;
- Better Together: Joint Action for Conservation of the Javekheti–Shirak Eco-Region
- Biking and rural combined cross-border tourism
- Improvement of Solid Waste Management Services in Ijevan and Bolnisi
- Cross-border Economic Development
- Fairy-Tales Teaching Trust
- Sustainable Forest and Energy Solutions
- Young Traveller
- Youth voices for change and development

Six cross-border projects between Georgia and Azerbaijan received funding from the EaPTC programme (see Box 27.2).

Box 27.2 Selected Georgia-Azerbaijan cross-border projects
- Civil society development for increasing tourism potential in the bordering regions of Azerbaijan and Georgia
- Employability skills for young people in Sheki and Telavi municipality
- Introducing environmentally friendly pest control for bio-protection of agricultural crops in the border areas of Azerbaijan (Sheki-Zagatala) and Georgia (Lagodekhi)
- Strengthening partnership in provision of new social services for children with disabilities in Ganja-Gazakh region of Azerbaijan and Kvemo Kartli region of Georgia
- Young Entrepreneurs Synergy (YES!) network for Georgia - Azerbaijan cross-border cooperation
- Youth empowerment through living values
Cross-border tourism and youth. Addressing common challenges in youth employment through cross-border tourism development is one of the major projects to have received support from the European Commission. The project runs for 12 months, with funding for its implementation of €183,248. The cooperation between the communities in the Tavush (Armenia) and Kvemo Kartli (Georgia) regions aims to improve living conditions in cross-border areas by developing of tourism, facilitating youth contacts across the border and highlighting issues related to the environment. The project targets young workers in the beneficiary regions.

The project set up networks of tourist offices, information centres and hotels. Cross-border tourist routes and tour packages are offered to facilitate cross-border tourism. The project also works to improve the quality of local providers and train youth working in the sector. Sustainable cooperation is set up between civil society organisations and young people as well as between the local and regional media. Specific actions of the project include vocational training for tourist guides, maintaining the quality of services and cleaning tourist sites. The project publishes tourist materials, develops mobile applications and produces videos.

Youth entrepreneurship. Young Entrepreneurs Synergy (YES!) is one of the projects in the area of Georgia-Azerbaijan cross-border cooperation. The project lasts 14 months, with a total EU funding of €236,430. It aims to create an enabling environment for enhanced economic cooperation and community relations between four communities of Georgia (Sagarejo and Gardabani) and Azerbaijan (Gazakh and Ağstafa).

The YES! project envisages a joint cross-border action plan for the economic revitalisation of border regions and capacity-building training for young entrepreneurs in target areas to increase their capacity to develop and grow businesses. The project also aims to engage young entrepreneurs in cross-border trade and economic cooperation.

Cross-border cooperation at a glance

While Georgia has of course no land border with the EU itself, the EU supports Georgia’s cross-border cooperation with Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Several small-scale projects are operational, with an emphasis on boosting cross-border tourism, economic cooperation and youth contacts.
Georgia’s civil society has long been in the forefront of change in the country. Following the Rose Revolution in 2003, many NGO leaders moved to work in the government in high-level positions. Generally, compared with its peer countries, the government in Georgia has demonstrated relatively greater openness to cooperation with civil society.

Currently, there are around 20,000 NGOs registered in Georgia, but only a much smaller number are active. The NGOs cover issues such as democracy and human rights, anti-corruption, elections, development, social services, youth and culture.

In 2017, the international Think Tank Index Report identified 26 think tanks in Georgia as excelling in research, analysis and public engagement on a wide range of policy issues.\textsuperscript{141}

The EU has long supported Georgian civil society, which has played the role of a pressure group vis-à-vis the government, and among others a driver of change. For the period 2014–17, 5% of the EU’s budget support to Georgia is allocated to support civil society organisations.

However, one of the relative weaknesses of Georgia’s civil society is the deficiency of local funding and hence overdependence on

\textsuperscript{141} See James G. McGann, “2017 Global Go To Think Tank Index Report”, TTCSP Global Go To Think Tank Index Reports, Paper No. 13, 2018 (https://repository.upenn.edu/think_tanks/13/).
foreign funding, which in turn results in a lack of responsiveness to the domestic agenda, because the latter is often donor-driven.

The formal frameworks of cooperation between civil society in Georgia and the EU consist mainly of three initiatives that should work in parallel: the multilateral Civil Society Forum (of all six Eastern Partnership countries), the bilateral Civil Society Platform and the Domestic Advisory Group on sustainable development issues. There is also some confusion with the overlap of names and functions of these three initiatives, which remain to be resolved.

**(Multilateral) Civil Society Forum.** One of major avenues for the EU to engage with Georgian civil society has been the multilateral Civil Society Forum of the Eastern Partnership, which was established in 2009, prior to the signature of the Association Agreement. The Forum brings together members of civil society from all six countries included in the Eastern Partnership, each with their individual country platforms. The Georgian National Platform was founded in November 2010, consisting of 95 civil society organisations. The members of the Platform actively participate in the working groups and sub-groups of the Civil Society Forum.

In November 2015, the Georgian government and the Georgian National Platform signed a Memorandum of Cooperation, pledging to strengthen cooperation between the government and civil society on the implementation of the Association Agreement. In the framework of this Memorandum, a series of joint sectorial meetings were held in the course of 2017.

The National Platform now comprises over 140 members and has four working groups, which further divide into a number of sub-groups. Some of the civil society organisations consider the National Platform have too many ineffective NGOs and only a few active members. The recruitment process of new members to the platform has also been a subject of controversy.

Nonetheless, the 2017 National Action Plan\(^{142}\) is an example of this cooperation, since its content reflects recommendations put forward by the Georgian National Platform members and the coalition of the Open Society Georgia Foundation (OSGF).

**(Bilateral) Civil Society Platform.** The Association Agreement provides for a bilateral Civil Society Platform (Art. 412(2)). This sets out

\(^{142}\) See the National Action Plan for the Implementation of the Association Agreement between Georgia, on the one part and the European Union on the other part, and the Association Agenda between Georgia and the European Union.
a long list of general goals, from fostering civil society cooperation so as to familiarise the societies of the EU and Georgia with each other, through to the involvement of the NGOs in the implementation process of the Agreement. On the EU side, the platform comprises three members of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC), plus six representatives of major European organisations representing civil society. On the Georgian side, it is made up of nine members also representing trade unions, employers and other civil society organisations, as well as nine associate members.

According to the report “Implementation of EU-Georgia Association Agenda 2014-2016 – Assessment by Civil Society”, published by the OSGF in 2017, Georgia has carried out significant reforms envisaged in the document, though more progress should be demonstrated by the country in justice, media, education, labour rights, environment and other areas.

On the EU side, the platform comprises three members of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC), plus six representatives of major European organisations representing civil society. On the Georgian side, it is made up of nine members also representing trade unions, employers and other civil society organisations, as well as nine associate members.

**Domestic Advisory Group.** Georgian civil society also participates in monitoring the implementation of Trade and Sustainable Development chapter of DCFTA through a Domestic Advisory Group. The Commission’s Directorate-General for Trade has made it a general practice to consult civil society organisations over its free trade agreements. The Domestic Advisory Group includes NGOs working on social and environmental issues, and representatives of employers and workers’ organisations. They are expected to meet once a year in a Joint Civil Society Dialogue Forum to discuss issues related to trade and sustainable development.

**DCFTA Advisory Group.** The government of Georgia closely cooperates with civil society in the process of DCFTA implementation through the DCFTA Advisory Group (DAG), which proved to be a successful platform for consultations for the representatives of the government of Georgia and employers’ and business associations, trade unions and other NGOs. It is noteworthy that creation of a DAG is not envisaged by the Agreement but was created anyway by the Minister of Economy and Sustainable Development in 2016. It is made up of representatives of the Ministry, all major business associations and organisations and representatives of the Eastern Partnership Civil
Society Forum – Georgian National Platform. At its sessions, DAG reviews all DCFTA related issues including planned and already implemented reforms and provides relevant recommendations.

Although the Agreement encourages the exchange of views on the implementation of the DCFTA, the technical know-how on such matters of the civil society organisations is limited. There are nonetheless civil society experts who were engaged in the negotiations of the Association Agreement, including the DCFTA. Still, as the DCFTA covers a wide spectrum of issues, capacity building is needed.

To better reach out to civil society and the population at large the DCFTA.gov.ge web-portal was launched by the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development in 2017 with the financial support of the EU through GIZ, where interested parties can find all DCFTA related information. All draft legislative acts are posted on the web-portal in order to receive comments and proposals from stakeholders, which makes the legislative process more transparent and predictable. The web-portal has a special page – DCFTA for Business - where interested persons can find useful information about EU internal market, services provided by government entities in order to support export from Georgia to the EU, guidelines for export procedures, product safety requirements, etc.

**Russian interventions.** In recent years Moscow has increased its presence in Georgia through funding certain civil society organisations, which have become progressively active in developing anti-EU and anti-NATO discourse in the capital and the regions. The goal is to seed discontent at the grassroots level over the Association Agreement, including the DCFTA, and to influence public opinion about Georgia’s foreign policy, security and economic arrangements. The most used methodology consists of targeted, warped information flows, which portray European values as contradicting Georgia’s cultural and religious heritage.

The exact number of the Russian-funded NGOs is unknown, mostly due to their unrevealed sources of funding. Nonetheless, on the basis of observed activity there are two major organisations: the Eurasian Institute and the Eurasian Choice. The latter is a partner of the International Eurasian Movement, led by Alexander Dugin, a prominent advocate of Kremlin expansionist policy. Both organisations

---

143 Displaying the source of funding is not mandatory, unless requested to do so by government agencies.
sponsor smaller-scale NGOs that express quasi-nationalistic sentiments and also spread xenophobic and homophobic ideas. In 2013, the Gorchakov Fund, a Kremlin-favoured organisation, launched projects in Tbilisi. It operates through a locally based Russian–Georgian Public Centre, and offers free tuition in the Russian language, organises meetings with Russian experts and public figures, and puts a particular emphasis on engaging students.

Declaring its adherence to democratic values, the government abstains from direct interference. Instead, in order to counter Russian propaganda, it has increased efforts on strategic communication across the country, and has expressed interest in increasing cooperation with civil society organisations that are actively engaged in the democracy-building process.

Civil society at a glance

Civil society in Georgia has been active in advocacy of democracy and human rights since the country’s independence.

The EU supports Georgian civil society organisations, considering them both a driver of democratic change and a watchdog of the government’s activities.

In the framework of the AA/DCFTA process Georgia has developed various mechanisms aimed at a more intensive involvement of the business community and other interested parties in the implementation process of the Agreement.

---

See Initiative Group, “Russian influence on the Georgian non-governmental organizations and the media”.

---
PART IV.
LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS
29. DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

The Agreement has two different dispute settlement mechanisms (DSM), one that covers disputes related to the Agreement in general but excluding the DCFTA, and another more detailed one that covers the DCFTA itself.

The general dispute settlement mechanism

This mechanism is defined in quite simple terms in Arts 421 and 422 of the Agreement. It concerns disputes over the interpretation, application or implementation of the non-DCFTA parts of the Agreement. It is based on a traditional ‘diplomatic’ approach, under which the Association Council has the key role.

A party can initiate this DSM by sending a formal request to the other party and the Association Council. The parties shall then try to resolve the dispute by entering into good faith consultation within the Association Council or other relevant bodies (i.e. the Association Committee or a specific subcommittee). The Association Council can eventually settle the dispute, after a consultation period, by way of a binding decision. Because the Association Council takes decisions “by agreement”, both the EU and Georgia would need to approve the decision to resolve the dispute.

As long as the dispute is not resolved, it will be discussed at every meeting of the Association Council. If an agreement cannot be reached in the Association Council after three months, the complaining party is allowed to take “appropriate measures”, such as the suspension of parts of the Agreement, but not of the DCFTA part

---

145 See Art. 408(3) of the EU–Georgia Association Agreement.
(except in the special case of violations of the ‘essential elements’ of the Agreement – see further below). In the selection of appropriate measures, priority shall be given to those that least disturb the functioning of the Agreement.\textsuperscript{146}

The ‘essential elements’ clause. As in other Association Agreements concluded by the EU, the EU–Georgia Agreement includes a suspension clause (in Art. 422(3)) relating to ‘essential elements’ of the Agreement (defined in Art. 2). This refers to “[r]espect for democratic principles, human rights and fundamental freedoms” as defined in several international agreements and conventions, and countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

In the event of violation of these fundamental principles, the complaining party can immediately suspend the Agreement, including rights and obligations under the DCFTA.

In practice, the EU very rarely uses these suspension clauses. If a reaction of the EU is required to address a specific human rights situation in the territory of the partner country, the EU prefers to act through diplomatic means (e.g. in the Association Council or annual summit meetings), or by using limited restrictive measures, such as arms embargoes, the freezing of assets or visa bans. Total suspension or termination of the Agreement is viewed as the ‘nuclear’ option, best not used.

The DCFTA dispute settlement mechanism

Arbitration. For disputes concerning the interpretation and application of DCFTA provisions, a separate and more sophisticated DSM is laid down in a long and detailed chapter (Arts 244-270) of the DCFTA. The mechanism is largely inspired by the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding. If there is a dispute regarding the interpretation and application of DCFTA provisions, the parties will first seek to come to an agreement through consultations.

If these consultations fail, the complaining party may request the establishment of an arbitration panel to rule on the dispute. The panel will be composed of three arbitrators chosen by the parties. The

\textsuperscript{146} The requirement of a three-month consultation period and the condition that the measures may not include the suspension of any DCFTA rights or obligations do not apply in the case of violation of the essential elements, referred to in Art. 2 of the Agreement (and further explained below).
arbitrators must be independent, serve in their individual capacity, not take instructions from any government and comply with a Code of Conduct annexed to the Agreement. One party cannot block the establishment of an arbitration panel, because if the parties cannot agree on the composition of the panel, the panellists will be drawn by lot from a permanent list of arbitrators.147

Rulings of the arbitration panel shall be binding and each party must take the necessary measures to comply with them. If the party to whom the complaint was addressed fails to comply without offering at least temporary compensation, the other party is entitled to suspend obligations arising from the DCFTA at a level equivalent to the violation (e.g. by reinstating the MFN tariff on specific products). Again, in practice the EU very rarely relies on the DSM in its free trade agreements to resolve a trade dispute. It prefers instead to use diplomatic means (e.g. by discussing this in bilateral meetings, such as the Association Council or in unilateral statements) or, in some cases, the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding.

This DCFTA DSM is without prejudice to possible dispute settlement under the WTO. However, the Parties are not allowed to pursue dispute settlement under both systems at the same time.

The DCFTA DSM includes several specific features. First, some elements of the DCFTA are excluded from this DCFTA DSM, such as parts of the chapter on trade remedies, and competition. Second, as regards energy disputes, the DCFTA DSM foresees quicker procedures if one party considers that dispute settlement is urgent because of an interruption of the transport of gas, oil or electricity, or a threat thereof. This procedure should allow the parties to react in a swift manner to potential energy disputes. Third, there is a procedure that obliges the arbitration panel to ask the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) for a binding preliminary ruling when there is a dispute concerning the interpretation and application of EU law (i.e. EU legislation annexed to the Agreement).148 This procedure aims to ensure a uniform interpretation and application of the Agreement’s annexed EU legislation without jeopardising the exclusive jurisdiction of the CJEU to interpret EU law.

147 The Trade Committee has to establish a list of 15 experts who are willing and able to serve as arbitrators. Each of the parties has to propose five individuals and the two parties shall also select five individuals who are non-nationals of either party and one who shall act as a chairperson of the arbitration panel.

148 See Art. 267 of the EU–Georgia Association Agreement.
Mediation. A separate lighter mechanism is included (in Annex XIX) for ‘mediation’ rather than ‘arbitration’, and which the parties can use to tackle market access problems, including non-tariff measures. This mechanism functions through the appointment of a single mediator who can advise and propose a non-binding solution within 60 days. The aim of the mediation is not to review the legality of a measure, but to find a quick and effective solution to market access problems without recourse to litigation. If the solution is agreed by the two parties it will be adopted as a decision of the Trade Committee. This mediation mechanism does not exclude the possibility, if a solution is not agreed, to have recourse to the dispute settlement mechanism with arbitration.

Transparency. In addition, the DCFTA includes a chapter on transparency (in Arts 219 to 226). Georgia has to establish “an effective and predictable regulatory environment for economic operators and efficient procedures, including for small and medium-sized enterprises, taking due account of the requirements of legal certainty and proportionality”. For example, laws, regulations, judicial decisions and administrative rulings that have an impact on the Agreement (i.e. measures of general application) must be published and communicated in a proper and timely manner. A contact point has to be established that responds to enquiries from interested persons regarding such measures of general application (proposed or in force). This chapter also includes rules on administrative and “review and appeal” procedures. According to the latter, each party shall establish or maintain impartial and independent courts, or other independent tribunals or procedures, for the purpose of the prompt review and, where warranted, correction of administrative actions in areas covered by the DCFTA.

While these mechanisms are well developed, there has been no need so far to make use of them.
Dispute settlement, mediation and transparency at a glance

There are two basic mechanisms for dispute settlement – a ‘general’ one applicable to all parts of the Agreement except the DCFTA, and a second one applicable to the DCFTA itself.

The general mechanism relies on the two parties finding a mutually agreed solution in the Association Council, failing which the aggrieved party may take ‘appropriate measures’.

For DCFTA-related disputes there is a more elaborate system that provides two alternative tracks: either binding arbitration or softer mediation for consensual solutions.

There has been no need so far to make use of these mechanisms.
For the most part, the EU-Georgia Association Agreement has been provisionally applied since 1 September 2014 and entered fully into force on 1 July 2016. The institutional arrangements for reviewing and controlling the implementation of this Agreement are well developed.

Ratification and provisional application. After the Association Agreement was signed on 27 June 2014, several procedural steps were required before the Agreement could enter into force. Not only had the European Parliament to give its consent (which it did on 18 December 2014), but it also had to be ratified by all 28 EU member states because the Agreement is a ‘mixed agreement’, i.e. it includes provisions falling under the competences of EU member states. In order to avoid ratification delays, the EU and Georgia agreed to apply large parts of the Agreement ‘provisionally’ since 1 September 2014, namely most provisions that fall within the Union’s competences, such as almost the entire DCFTA and many chapters on general principles, political dialogue, the rule of law and numerous items of sectoral cooperation. After ratification by all the EU member states, the EU itself and Georgia, the Agreement entered into force on 1 July 2016.

Institutional framework. The Agreement establishes a comprehensive institutional framework, which will play a crucial role in the monitoring and implementation process.

The key institution is the Association Council, composed of members of the Council of the European Union and the European Commission, on the one hand, and members of the Georgian government, on the other. The Association Council meets at least once
a year at ministerial level, and is the core institution to monitor the application and implementation of the Agreement. In addition, it examines all other major issues in the relationship between the two parties. The Association Council did already meet four times since the agreement’s entry into force. In addition to discussing Georgia’s progress in implementing the Association Agreement and DCFTA, specific issues of mutual interest are being discussed. For example, during the last Association Council meeting in February 2018, the 2017 local elections in Georgia, constitutional reforms and the recent developments with regard to the occupied territories of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia were discussed. 149

The Association Council can take ‘binding’ decisions where provided by the Agreement. This means that the EU (and its member states) and Georgia are obliged to implement these decisions. It can also adopt non-binding recommendations. Both decisions and recommendations are taken by consensus between the parties.

The Association Council is assisted by an Association Committee, composed of representatives of the parties at senior official level and which in turn is assisted by specific subcommittees. The Association Council adopted rules of procedure for itself, the Association Committee and its subcommittees and established Subcommittees on Freedom, Security and Justice and on Economic and Sector Cooperation. 151 The Agreement has already established a Trade Committee to address all issues related to the DCFTA, complemented by several subcommittees (e.g. on SPS, customs and trade and sustainable development).

The Agreement also established a Parliamentary Association Committee which already met six times, the last meeting as of the moment of writing held on 26 April 2018.

Last but not least, the Agreement established a Civil Society Platform which allows civil society organisations from both sides to monitor the implementation process and prepare their

---

149 Joint press release following the 4th Association Council meeting between the European Union and Georgia, 5 May 2018.

150 See Decision 1/2014 of the Association Council adopting its Rules of Procedure and those of the Association Committee.

151 See Decision 2/2014 of the Association Council adopting on the establishment of two Subcommittees.

152 See Art. 408(4) of the EU–Georgia Association Agreement.
recommendations to the relevant authorities both in Georgia as well as in the EU (chapter 28).

**Dynamic approximation.** These joint institutions also play a crucial role in the process of Georgia’s (dynamic) approximation to EU legislation (i.e. the continuous updating of the list of EU directives or regulations in the many annexes to the Agreement in the light of the relevant legislative developments in the EU itself). As indicated in the previous chapters, numerous EU acts listed in the annexes of the Agreement have already been replaced or amended in the EU. Therefore, the Agreement allows the Association Council to update or amend the annexes, “including in order to reflect the evolution of EU law”.153 However, because the Association Council decides by consensus, both the EU and Georgia need to agree on the updating of the Annexes. Several chapters of the DCFTA include specific provisions to update the annexed legislative approximation commitments (e.g. on SPS, services and public procurement). The Association Council delegated to the Trade Committee the competence to amend or update the DCFTA annexes related to export duties, safeguard measures on passenger cars, TBTs, customs and trade facilitation, services and public procurement.154

Since the provisional entry into force of the agreement, the annexes related to EU agricultural products, foodstuffs and spirit drinks to be protected in Georgia (Annex XVII-C/D)155 and the list of the EU sanitary, phytosanitary (SPS) and animal welfare *acquis* (the SPS Roadmap) (Annex XIB) have been updated.156

While the Association Council thus has broad powers to amend the annexes, it cannot change the main body of the Agreement, since, being a Treaty, this would require once again the complex procedures of ratification according to the internal procedures of both the EU and Georgia.

---

153 See Art. 406(3) and 418 of the EU-Georgia Association Agreement.
154 See Decision 3/2014 of the Association Council on the delegation of certain powers by the Association Council to the Association Committee in Trade configuration.
155 Decision No 1/2016 of the Geographical Indications Sub-Committee of 18 October 2016 amending Annexes XXX-C and XXX-D.
156 Decision No 1/2017 of the EU-Georgia Sanitary and Phytosanitary Sub-Committee of 7 March 2017 modifying Annex XI-B to the Association Agreement.
Institutional provisions at a glance

The Association Agreement has largely been provisionally applied since 1 September 2014, entering fully into force on 1 July 2016.

A comprehensive and joint institutional framework will monitor the implementation of the Agreement and provides a platform for political dialogue.

The Association Council has a broad competence to amend the annexes of the Agreement, but not the main body of the Agreement.

These institutional arrangements have been working effectively since the Association Agreement entered into force.
These Handbooks offer a one-stop guide to the Association Agreements – the authors have painstakingly analysed the incredibly complex Agreements to deliver a compact and accessible overview to all those who need to grasp their contents. The national teams also shed light on the salience of the content for domestic reforms. Even though the Handbooks are not meant to be read like a book, the reader who does so is rewarded with a panoramic overview of the sheer scale and ambition of the AA-DCFTA. The Handbooks offer a plethora of pivotal insights into the Agreements while at the same time they throw up a number of important questions. A ‘bible’.

— Kataryna Wolczuk, Centre for Russian, European and Eurasian Studies, University of Birmingham

For Georgia, the signing of the Association Agreement and the DCFTA with the European Union in 2014 was an act of strategic geopolitical significance. Of all the EU’s eastern partners, the country has distinguished itself since the Rose Revolution of 2003 by pushing ahead with a radical liberalisation and economic reform agenda. Georgia is also unique among the countries in the region for having largely cleansed its economy and political system of corruption.

The purpose of this Handbook is to make the complex political, economic and legal content of the Association Agreement readily understandable. This second edition, published two years into the Agreement’s implementation, adds new value. The Handbook now reflects Georgia’s progress in putting the Agreement into effect.

Two teams of researchers from leading independent think tanks, CEPS in Brussels and Reformatics in Tbilisi, collaborated on this project, with the support of the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida). This Handbook is one of a trilogy examining similar Association Agreements made by the EU with Ukraine and Moldova.

MICHAEL EMERSON is Associate Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for European Policy Studies in Brussels.

TAMARA KOVZIRIDZE is co-founder of Reformatics in Tbilisi.