

GEORGIA



EXPENDITURE (IN KCHF)	
Protection	2,411
Assistance	7,160
Prevention	1,662
Cooperation with National Societies	744
General	-

► **11,978**
of which: Overheads 731

IMPLEMENTATION RATE	
Expenditure/yearly budget	86%

PERSONNEL	
Expatriates	23
National staff (daily workers not included)	202

KEY POINTS

In 2011, the ICRC:

- where possible working with the National Society, helped 28,562 people, including 1,428 IDPs, recover from the effects of the 2008 hostilities by providing them with support to improve or restore their livelihoods
- in addition to visiting detainees, piloted with the Georgian authorities a model primary health-care project in 2 detention sites, contributing to the adoption of a national prison health-care strategy and action plan at year-end
- facilitated the work of coordination mechanisms to clarify the fate of persons missing from the 2008 hostilities and earlier conflicts, while working with local partners to extend psychological and other support to affected families
- as a neutral intermediary, facilitated family contacts (including family reunification and, for detainees, family visits), access to life-saving medical care, and the repatriation of human remains across administrative boundaries
- pursued efforts to promote IHL across Georgia, facilitating the establishment of a national IHL committee, the integration of IHL into military manuals, and universities' organization of and participation in IHL competitions
- by signing a Movement coordination agreement with the Red Cross Society of Georgia and the International Federation, contributed to strengthening the National Society's capacity to deliver quality humanitarian services

The ICRC has been present in Georgia since 1992. It supports the families of missing persons and protects and assists displaced people and other vulnerable groups in conflict-affected regions. It visits detainees throughout Georgia, including in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and provides expertise on health-related issues in places of detention. It promotes the national implementation of IHL and its integration into armed and security forces' doctrine, training and sanctions and into academic curricula. In cooperation with Movement partners, the ICRC helps strengthen the capacities of the Red Cross Society of Georgia.

CONTEXT

The lingering effects of the 2008 international armed conflict between Georgia and the Russian Federation and earlier conflicts, combined with worsening socio-economic conditions, continued to be felt by the civilian population living along the Abkhaz and South Ossetian administrative boundaries, which were still patrolled by Russian border guards. Restrictions on movement continued to have serious repercussions for the population. These ranged from arrest for attempting to cross the administrative boundaries to severed family links and economic paralysis.

The peace negotiations ("Geneva Talks") between Georgian, Russian, Abkhaz and South Ossetian representatives continued, with the UN, the European Union (EU) and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) mediating. The Incident Prevention and Response Mechanism facilitated by the EU Monitoring Mission and the OSCE helped resolve humanitarian problems, including the exchange of 13 prisoners held by Tbilisi for 13 others held by Tskhinvali/Tskhinval.

In Georgia, anti-government demonstrations led to arrests in May. In Abkhazia, the sudden death of the *de facto* president prompted early elections in August, resulting in the instatement of Abkhazia's third *de facto* leader. November's *de facto* presidential elections in South Ossetia resulted in a political crisis, leading to a re-run being scheduled for March 2012.

ICRC ACTION AND RESULTS

The ICRC continued to follow up the situation of civilians in Abkhazia, central and western Georgia and, as the only humanitarian organization present, in South Ossetia. Where possible, the Red Cross Society of Georgia remained its main operational partner in meeting the material, psychological and other needs of conflict-affected civilians.

Of key concern were the families of missing persons, whose right to receive answers on the fate of their relatives was at the core of the ICRC's dialogue with the parties to past conflicts. Acting as a neutral intermediary, the ICRC chaired two tripartite meetings regarding people missing in connection with the 2008 hostilities, which led to the recovery of the remains of two people. It welcomed the decision of the parties to include missing persons from the 1991–92 hostilities in their discussions. In the framework of the bipartite mechanism set up in 2010 to address the issue of persons missing from the 1992–93 Georgian–Abkhaz conflict, the forensic working group met three times under ICRC auspices.

Main figures and indicators	PROTECTION	Total		
CIVILIANS (residents, IDPs, returnees, etc.)				
Red Cross messages (RCMs)			UAMs/SCs*	
RCMs collected		459		
RCMs distributed		355		
Reunifications, transfers and repatriations				
People reunited with their families		36		
People transferred/repatriated		72		
Human remains transferred/repatriated		4		
Tracing requests, including cases of missing persons¹			Women	Minors
People for whom a tracing request was newly registered		46	9	6
People located (tracing cases closed positively)		25		
Tracing cases still being handled at 31 December 2011 (people)		78	15	10
Documents				
Official documents relayed between family members across borders/front lines		34		
PEOPLE DEPRIVED OF THEIR FREEDOM (All categories/all statuses)				
ICRC visits			Women	Minors
Detainees visited		4,907		
Detainees visited and monitored individually		109	7	1
Detainees newly registered		59	2	1
Number of visits carried out		86		
Number of places of detention visited		35		
Restoring family links				
RCMs collected		54		
RCMs distributed		58		
Detainees visited by their relatives with ICRC/National Society support		17		
People to whom a detention attestation was issued		2		

* Unaccompanied minors/separated children

1. not including people missing as a consequence of the 1992-93 Georgian-Abkhaz conflict and 1991-92 Georgian-Ossetian conflict

Main figures and indicators	ASSISTANCE	Total	Women	Children
CIVILIANS (residents, IDPs, returnees, etc.)				
Economic security, water and habitat				
Food	Beneficiaries	558	42%	15%
	<i>of whom IDPs</i>	28		
Essential household items	Beneficiaries	635	43%	16%
	<i>of whom IDPs</i>	32		
Agricultural, veterinary and other micro-economic initiatives	Beneficiaries	28,562	43%	20%
	<i>of whom IDPs</i>	1,428		
Water and habitat activities	Beneficiaries	5,381	40%	20%
	<i>of whom IDPs</i>	666		
WOUNDED AND SICK				
Physical rehabilitation				
Centres supported	Structures	2		
Patients receiving services	Patients	163	26	76
New patients fitted with prostheses	Patients	8	2	
Prostheses delivered	Units	20	3	
	<i>of which for victims of mines or explosive remnants of war</i>	5		
New patients fitted with orthoses	Patients	77	8	63
Orthoses delivered	Units	169	16	144
Crutches delivered	Units	44		

In Abkhazia, after ICRC-provided training, the collection began of ante-mortem data from families of missing persons. In Georgia, this was still being discussed. In Georgia and Abkhazia, the families received psychological support and legal assistance from ICRC-funded local providers, while in South Ossetia such service providers were being identified.

Vulnerable people in Abkhazia and South Ossetia still received food and essential household items from the ICRC. To aid longer-term recovery, the ICRC offered access to income-generating projects to people across Georgia, including the families of missing persons and victims of mines/explosive remnants of war (ERW), and continued to upgrade water supply systems along both sides of the South Ossetian administrative boundary. Infrastructure renovation projects helped improve living conditions and sanitation in collective centres housing IDPs. To extend access to health

care in South Ossetia, the ICRC monitored the needs of rural health centres, donated supplies and equipment, and ensured medical attention and home help for elderly people without family support. With the relevant authorities' permission, it acted as a neutral intermediary, reuniting family members separated by conflict and facilitating the transport of seriously ill people to hospital across the administrative boundaries. Working with authorities and, where possible, the National Society, it aimed to consolidate the collection and management of mine/ERW data and to address the needs of victims.

The ICRC continued to monitor individual detainees arrested on security charges, including those arrested for crossing the administrative boundaries and following anti-government demonstrations in May. Families were able to visit detained relatives across administrative boundaries in western and central Georgia and

South Ossetia. After taking over the TB control project in prisons, the Ministries of Health and of Correction and Legal Assistance piloted a model primary health-care programme for detainees, in partnership with the ICRC.

The ICRC pursued longstanding efforts to promote IHL and other applicable norms among political authorities and armed forces, facilitating the establishment of a national IHL committee and providing relevant training for military lawyers, officers and troops. Widespread media coverage prompted by ICRC initiatives raised public awareness of humanitarian issues. Universities drew on ICRC funding to develop IHL research and teaching, including by staging or participating in national and international IHL competitions. The education authorities took over the running of the cooperation programme to teach IHL norms in secondary schools.

The ICRC continued to provide the Georgian Red Cross with financial, technical and material input, in coordination with other Movement partners, including through a Movement coordination agreement.

CIVILIANS

The situation of civilians living in areas affected by the August 2008 hostilities was closely monitored by the ICRC. Dialogue with all parties focused on their obligations under IHL and other relevant norms to protect civilians and to meet their basic needs.

To help mitigate the effects of movement restrictions, the ICRC offered its services as a neutral intermediary to facilitate people's passage across administrative boundaries for humanitarian reasons (see below).

Civilians get relief and income-generating opportunities

Vulnerable people living on both sides of the Abkhaz and South Ossetian administrative boundaries benefited from relief items, agricultural support and micro-economic initiatives provided by the ICRC, where possible jointly with the Georgian Red Cross; 16 National Society volunteers were trained in project monitoring.

In central and western Georgia and Abkhazia, 7,237 IDPs, returnees and affected residents (2,336 households) maximized their harvests with ICRC-donated seed and agro-chemicals and with potato nursery projects. In South Ossetia, 16,455 similarly vulnerable people (5,485 households) received inputs for their orchards and vegetable gardens, including help with irrigation (see below).

In central and western Georgia and Abkhazia, 2,946 vulnerable people (807 households), including households whose breadwinner was missing or who lived in mine/ERW-contaminated areas, participated in micro-economic projects. They increased their incomes using ICRC funding and materials and, in 945 cases, underwent business training to help them start up livestock, bee-keeping or craft ventures. In South Ossetia, 674 vulnerable people (358 households) participated in similar projects; earlier beneficiaries received additional guidance in sustaining their projects. In addition, 1,250 people (417 households) in South Ossetia were assisted in transporting flour and sugar supplies from the market back to their isolated villages.

As found during renewed ICRC assessments, vulnerable groups in South Ossetia still required household basics and regular or ad hoc food supplies to cover immediate needs. They included IDPs, returnees in rural areas, isolated elderly people, households

affected by weapon contamination, and flood and fire victims. Residents of Abkhazia's remote Kodori valley required similar assistance. In total, 635 people received essential household items and 558 received food rations.

Communities enjoy better water supply and sanitation

People living in conflict-affected areas continued to struggle owing to the destruction or neglect of infrastructure. Overall, 5,381 people, including 666 IDPs, benefited from ICRC renovation/infrastructure projects and provision of expertise and materials to authorities and water boards.

Communities on both sides of the administrative boundaries had more and better-quality water through the refurbishment of their water supply networks. Georgia's water supply company received training and testing equipment to check the quality of well water.

Living conditions improved for IDPs in five collective centres in western and central Georgia with the installation of new roofs, doors and windows, and in two centres in South Ossetia thanks to renovation and sewage disposal projects. Others stood to benefit from extensive building work to provide alternative housing. The South Ossetian water board continued to refurbish public infrastructure, including the sewage system in Tskhinvali/Tskhinval, upgraded five health and social service facilities and relied on the ICRC's direct intervention to provide a suburb with piped water. The irrigation department received a second excavator to restore irrigation networks, while the recipients of agricultural inputs benefited from ICRC improvements to irrigation systems.

To prevent a calamity, the ICRC alerted local and international stakeholders to the urgent need to repair an earth dam near Tskhinvali/Tskhinval.

Mine/ERW-affected communities helped in reducing risks

In central and western Georgia, Red Cross staff and volunteers developed skills to address weapon contamination through ICRC-provided training and by gathering first-hand information on incidents and victims' needs. The data were then fed into the information management system for mine action and shared with the authorities and other stakeholders. Survivors were referred to physical rehabilitation services (see *Wounded and sick*). In Abkhazia, ICRC staff started collecting data after receiving training and assessment forms translated into Russian.

In central and western Georgia, Abkhazia and South Ossetia, families affected by mines/ERW participated in micro-economic and agricultural projects (see above), and communities were alerted to mine/ERW-related dangers.

Families and authorities benefit from ICRC expertise in family links and missing persons

Family members separated by conflict continued to communicate with or search for relatives through the tracing and RCM services; in 36 cases they were reunited across administrative boundaries by the ICRC, with clearance from the relevant authorities. Families also had the remains of four relatives returned to them, while official documents and medication were similarly relayed between family members. With the ICRC acting as a neutral intermediary, 72 people also crossed administrative boundaries, including 20 for emergency medical care.

The Georgian Foundation for Prosthetic Orthopaedic Rehabilitation conducted a clinical assessment, with ICRC funding, and further offered physical rehabilitation treatment, including transport, board and lodging, for mine/ERW victims.

Abkhazia's Gagra Orthopaedic Centre acquired prosthetic/orthotic materials, with ICRC funding and services to facilitate import and transport, and computer equipment for patient management.

Without donor funding, the regional support project planned by the ICRC Special Fund for the Disabled was cancelled.

AUTHORITIES

Discussions with the Georgian and the Abkhaz and South Ossetian *de facto* authorities focused on their responsibilities under IHL and other relevant norms, and they were briefed on ICRC operations and role as a neutral intermediary. Their dialogue with the ICRC regarding civilians centred on the missing persons issue, including the need for relevant legislation, and durable solutions to the difficulties faced by IDPs. Drawing on ICRC expertise and sponsorship respectively, Georgia established a national IHL committee and sent a delegation to the 31st International Conference where it made six pledges.

International actors discussed with the ICRC ways of addressing regional humanitarian issues, such as the consequences of weapon contamination, including through advocacy.

ARMED FORCES AND OTHER BEARERS OF WEAPONS

Georgia's Ministry of Defence, and particularly the relevant working group, continued to integrate IHL into military training, including field manuals, and operations, requesting ICRC expertise and participation in three field exercises. Joint Staff teachers, infantry officers and military lawyers honed their IHL teaching skills at week-long instructors' courses. Troops going to join coalition forces in Afghanistan were briefed on IHL and the ICRC.

In Abkhazia, administration and military representatives attended a presentation on the Movement and IHL basics, while officers received training to coach troops in IHL.

In South Ossetia, military and security personnel, including Russian contingents, familiarized themselves with the ICRC's mandate and IHL through regular dissemination sessions.

CIVIL SOCIETY

Journalists, including a participant in the ICRC's Young Reporter Competition, used ICRC-provided resources to report accurately on humanitarian issues and ICRC activities, mainly for detainees and missing persons, across Georgia; online news agencies posted interviews with ICRC delegates on these topics. In South Ossetia, the public learnt about the ICRC's work through a radio series.

Countrywide, local government officials, Special Forces servicemen and EU, media and NGO representatives were briefed on ICRC action.

Education authorities and universities worked to stimulate interest in IHL teaching and research, using ICRC-donated materials and expertise; seven Georgian law faculties offered an IHL option. Tbilisi State University and the Caucasus Law School sent two student teams to the Jean Pictet IHL competition in France and helped organize a national IHL competition. With ICRC funding,

a young IHL expert participated in an IHL course in Poland. Meanwhile, the South Ossetian University reintroduced an IHL course, Sukhumi/Sukhum University held an IHL competition and training for students, while Zugdidi University consolidated cooperation with the ICRC through a written agreement.

Georgia's Education Ministry took over the running of the IHL schools programme, initiated by the ICRC in 1995.

In western Georgia, for the second year running an ICRC-coordinated project brought together lecturers, students, school-children and representatives of local authorities, NGOs and the media to learn about IHL via a team competition.

RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT MOVEMENT

During the Movement's 2011 statutory meetings, the National Society signed a Movement coordination agreement with the International Federation and the ICRC aimed at strengthening its capacity to deliver humanitarian services. Year-round, Movement partners met regularly to coordinate both aid efforts and support to the Georgian Red Cross, focusing on developing family-links, emergency response and social welfare programmes. The last enabled the Georgian Red Cross to assist 4,780 vulnerable elderly people, including through home visits and help with accessing social benefits. With European first-aid certification in mind, the National Society built its first-aid capacities in cooperation with the French Red Cross, using the Georgian-language version of an ICRC first-aid manual.

The Georgian Red Cross and the ICRC worked together to assist people affected by the consequences of the 2008 hostilities in the form of micro-economic initiatives, agricultural support and activities to address weapon contamination (see *Civilians*).

The Georgian Red Cross further reinforced links between its headquarters and 33 branches, and completed an audit of its 2010 accounts and a review of its communication strategy. Five historically owned assets were legalized and registered in its name.

The Red Cross in Abkhazia and the ICRC developed their cooperation by designing a database enabling them to identify the neediest families with children, whom they then provided with second-hand winter clothes.