



AS/Mon(2011)24 rev3

26 January 2012

amondoc24r3_2011

or. Engl.

Committee on the Honouring of Obligations and Commitments by Member States of the Council of Europe (Monitoring Committee)

Honouring of obligations and commitments by Georgia

Information note by the co-rapporteurs on their fact-finding visit to Tbilisi and Batumi (11 – 14 October 2011)¹

Co-rapporteurs: Mr Kastriot ISLAMI, Albania, Socialist group, and Mr Michael Aastrup JENSEN, Denmark, Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe

¹ This information note has been made public by decision of the Monitoring Committee dated 23 January 2012.

I. Introduction

1. We visited Georgia from 11 to 14 October 2011. The aim of this visit was to familiarise ourselves with the follow-up given by the authorities to Parliamentary Assembly Resolution 1801 (2011) and its recommendations, with special attention to the administration of justice. Also, in view of the upcoming parliamentary elections in October 2012, we discussed electoral reform and the preparations for these elections.

2. Following a recommendation by the committee that co-rapporteurs should also visit the regions –and not only the capital– of the countries under their responsibility, a visit to Batumi was included in the programme. Batumi is the capital of the Adjara region, which has an autonomous status in Georgia. Under the current government, the development of the Adjara region has been a priority and its economic development, especially of Batumi, has been nothing but spectacular. In addition, Batumi was one of the first beneficiaries of the decentralisation of central government institutions that was initiated by the current authorities. As a result, the Constitutional court was moved from Tbilisi to Batumi.

3. During this visit, we met, inter alia, the Speaker of the Parliament of Georgia, Mr David Bakradze; the Secretary of the Security Council, Mr Giorgi Bokeria, and his Deputy, Ms Tamar Kintsurashvili; the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Grigol Vashadze; the Chairman of the Constitutional Court, Mr Giorgi Papuashvili; the Deputy Minister of Justice, Ms Tina Burjaliani; the Deputy State Minister for Reintegration, Mr Irakli Porchkhidze; the Deputy Minister of Corrections and Legal Assistance of Georgia, Mr Giorgi Arsoshvili; the Public Defender of Georgia, Mr George Tugishi; the Mayor of Batumi and the Vice Chairman of the Regional parliament; the Chairman and members of the Georgian delegation to the Assembly; representatives of the extra-parliamentary opposition; as well as representatives of civil society and the international community in Georgia. In addition, we visited two prisons, one in Tbilisi and one in Batumi. The programme of our visit is attached as an appendix.

4. We would like to thank the Parliament of Georgia and the authorities in Adjara, as well as the Head of the Council of Europe Office in Tbilisi and her staff, for the excellent programme, and the hospitality and assistance given to our delegation.

II. Electoral reform

5. After the local elections in May 2010 –which showed marked progress but also revealed continuing shortcomings– David Bakradze the Speaker of the Georgian Parliament, proposed to resume the work of the interparty working group on electoral reform, as recommended by, inter alia, the Assembly. However, due to lack of agreement between the main parties on, inter alia, decision-making procedures, the group was not reconstituted.

6. On 4 October 2010, eight opposition parties published a joint proposal for electoral reform and called for negotiations with the ruling party on their proposal. The opposition parties had all, except one, participated in the local elections and they included the main parliamentary opposition party, the Christian Democratic Movement. In their proposal, the parties called for a mixed proportional – regional proportional election system. In the proposed system, half of the seats would be allocated via a proportional system based on open party lists in a single national constituency system, while the other half of the mandates would be allocated on the basis of a regional multi-constituency proportional system. In addition, the proposal also foresaw a central election commission (CEC) that would be reduced in size and composed on a parity basis of representatives of qualifying parties, and called for the introduction of a biometric voting system to reduce the possibility for electoral fraud and manipulation.

7. Following the publication of their proposal, the ruling party and twelve opposition parties came to an agreement, on 10 November 2010, to establish an electoral working group (EWG) to draft a proposal for the electoral reform. This working group consisted of qualifying parties that had agreed to participate in its work. International (non governmental) organisations were involved as observers in the work of this group, as were local NGOs, on the basis of a formula agreed between the parties in the working group. Moreover, it was agreed that all decisions would be made on the basis of consensus.

8. Regrettably, the negotiations in the EWG turned out to be protracted and difficult. On 9 March 2011, the ruling United National Movement made its counter proposal for electoral reform to the EWG. In this proposal, the United National Movement proposed to increase the number of majoritarian MPs, instead of introducing a regional-proportional election system. The ruling party accepted the principle of drawing up the voters' lists on the basis of biometric data, but for technical reasons, initially in Tbilisi only. In addition, it

proposed that the opposition parties would be given the chance to check the voters' lists after they were compiled and suggested that this process should be funded from the state budget.

9. However, the eight opposition parties felt that the ruling party proposals fell short of expectations and did not sufficiently address their concerns. As the parties could not come to an agreement, the work in the EWG was effectively suspended. On 5 April 2011, the opposition parties, in order to resurrect the talks, made a compromise proposal with regard to the election system. They accepted to maintain the mixed proportional-majoritarian system, but demanded that the total percentage of mandates gained by a party could not surpass the percentage of the votes gained by that party in the proportional contest. If a party would win more majoritarian seats than it should according to the proportional elections, these surplus seats would be deducted from the mandates gained in the proportional elections. In addition, the opposition parties proposed a 50% threshold, instead of 30%, for the majoritarian races.

10. This proposal was deemed unacceptable for the United National Movement. This resulted in a near collapse of the talks that continued until 27 June 2011. At that date, the United National Movement made a new proposal, in which they offered to increase the number of seats from 75 to 107 for the proportional seats and from 75 to 83 for the majoritarian seats. Moreover, they proposed that the voters' list be checked by a committee to be chaired by the opposition, that funding for election advertising be given to political parties and that the governmental Inter-Agency Task Force for Free and Fair Elections, which had functioned successfully during the local elections, be reconstituted.

11. The eight opposition parties split over this proposal. The Christian Democratic Movement and the New Rights Party accepted the proposal, while the 6 other parties rejected it. With the unity between the opposition parties broken, the proposal of the United National Movement was formally tabled in parliament and sent to the Venice Commission for opinion. The 6 opposition parties that rejected the proposal formed an opposition coalition, which broke down on 5 October 2011, due to differences over the strategy to be followed.

12. Following the agreement between the United National Movement and four opposition parties, a complete new election code was proposed in parliament. We welcome that the authorities have followed the recommendation of the Assembly to draft a completely new election code and not to further amend the already heavily amended existing election code. This will greatly improve the internal coherency of the electoral legislation. In addition, this draft election code addresses a number of recommendations made by the Venice Commission in previous opinions on the electoral framework in Georgia. We welcome this and hope that also the remainder of the recommendations of the Venice Commission will be addressed before the law is adopted in final reading.

13. At the same time, while we welcome the decision to draft a completely new election code, we wish to emphasise that the drafting of an electoral code should be an inclusive process and be based on an as wide as possible consensus between the electoral stakeholders. This is necessary to ensure the prerequisite public trust in the electoral system and the conduct of the elections. Especially in countries with a polarised political climate, the drafting of an election code is a *de facto* part of the electoral process itself. It is therefore regrettable that no consensus could be reached on the new election code and especially on the election system by which the new parliament is to be elected.

14. The Venice Commission, as well as the Assembly, have strongly criticised the difference in size of the majoritarian constituencies in the current election system. The difference exceeds by far the maximum allowable variance of 10% to 15%² and is in contradiction with the principle of the equal weight of each vote. The election system that has now been adopted upon the proposal of the United National Movement does not address this shortcoming satisfactorily. This means that the new election system is not fully in line with European standards. The argument of the authorities that the current district boundaries are needed to ensure that regional minorities are represented in parliament does not hold sway in our opinion. Far better mechanisms exist to ensure minority representation in a parliament that are in line with with European democratic standards. We urge the authorities to promptly address this issue.

15. According to the authorities, the new election system will result in a more pluralist and balanced composition of the parliament after the next elections in 2012. This was disputed by other interlocutors, who anticipated that the existing distribution of power would not change dramatically in the new parliament, with the United National Movement in all likelihood returning with a constitutional majority. Aside from the issue of the unequal size of the majoritarian election districts, the election system that is currently being proposed in the draft Election Code is adequate for the conduct of democratic elections. However, in our view, other

² The variance between the smallest and largest constituencies is over 2500%.

election systems, such as a regional propositional system that was recommended by the Assembly on a number of occasions, would create a more competitive election environment in the current circumstances.

III. Administration of Justice

16. In Resolution 1801 (2011), the Assembly expressed its concern with regard to shortcomings in the administration of justice, as well as with regard to the lack of credible investigations –within the meaning of the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)– into alleged abuses by the police forces and other politically sensitive cases. As mentioned in our report, these are crucial issues that touch directly upon such issues as possible selective application of justice, allegations of politically motivated charges and convictions, the right to a fair trial and the independence of the judiciary.

17. The progress made in the reform of the judiciary by the current authorities is undeniable, but shortcomings nevertheless remain. Problems in the administration of justice are reportedly mostly noted with regard to criminal and administrative justice where the state might have a vested interest. No problems were reported with regard to the administration of civil justice.

18. Since our last resolution, the conviction rate in Georgia has gone up from an already unnaturally high 99.8% to 99.9%³. Claims that this is the result of the high policing and investigation standards do not seem credible and are also belied by the case law of the ECtHR in Strasbourg. In practical terms, it means that a person charged by the prosecution is practically certain to be convicted. This is especially of concern in the context of the high number of cases (reportedly around 90%) that are resolved through a plea bargain. While we have no problem with the principle of a plea bargain itself –plea bargaining is indeed in use in other countries– we are concerned that, in Georgia, the decision by a defendant to enter into a plea bargain may be influenced by the high conviction rate and by a lack of trust in the possibility to receive a fair trial.⁴

19. The high conviction rate is the result of the (still) prosecution driven justice system in Georgia. During our visit, we received several reports that judges side with motions of the prosecution without justifying their decisions, as well as of cases where judges accept and base judgments on questionable evidence provided by the prosecution and the police. Moreover, the system as such is biased in favour of the prosecution. For example: we were informed that the revenue service can freeze the assets of a company without a court order for up to a month in an investigation. Questions were also raised regarding the fact that the recently adopted Criminal Procedure Code would introduce the possibility for the authorities to monitor the bank accounts of persons convicted of a crime with little oversight of the courts and for in theory an unlimited amount of time. However, on the basis of information provided by the Georgian authorities it would seem to us that judicial oversight, including with regard to the time limit, is sufficient.

20. The main mechanism of the authorities to address problems with regard to the administration of justice has been the new and improved Criminal Procedure Code. In addition, as mentioned in our last report, ex-parte communications with judges have been criminalised. That said, the result of these efforts has not yet become visible and the current efforts may well not be enough. We urge the authorities to take all necessary steps to address these shortcomings, including through further training of the judiciary and through the strengthening of the bar in Georgia. In addition, it is important that the authorities are fully transparent towards the public with regard to the problems encountered, and the actions taken to address them, in order to further improve the public trust in the fairness of the justice system.

21. The authorities are rather sensitive regarding possible shortcomings in the justice system and seem reluctant to investigate possible wrongdoings by law enforcement and state officials. We emphasised in all our meetings that any country or administration can –and eventually will– make mistakes, but that the willingness to investigate credibly and address any alleged mistakes and shortcomings demonstrates the real extent of democratic consolidation of a country. Addressing the reported shortcomings, in our view, is also in the best interest of the Georgian authorities themselves: they have come a very long way with regard to justice reform and are in many respects an example for the region and beyond. It would be regrettable should the reluctance to address the problems in the administration of justice undermine the success of the major reforms that have been implemented in this field by the Georgian authorities.

³ The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) disputes this figure. According to the MoJ, the correct figure is 98.3 %, excluding partial acquittals. The difference with the figure given to us by several other sources may lay in the inclusion or not of the partial acquittals.

⁴ We welcome that a number of recent public opinion polls have indicated an increase of public trust in the judiciary in general.

22. On 30 June 2011, the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Mr Thomas Hammarberg, published the report on his visit to Georgia in April 2011. The main topics for his visit were the administration of justice and protection of human rights in the justice system in Georgia. While welcoming the many efforts and marked progress in the reform of the justice system, the Commissioner expressed his concerns about the administration of justice, the challenges to the independence of the judiciary and the right to a fair trial.

23. As regards the independence of the judiciary, the Commissioner welcomed the many reforms to strengthen the legal independence of the judiciary, but, like us, noted that the prosecution continues to have a dominant position in the justice system. Moreover, despite the improvements in the new Criminal Procedure Code, the justice system in his view continues to reveal an imbalance in favour of the prosecution. In this respect, the Commissioner expressed his concerns about credible reports of persons having been prosecuted and convicted despite procedural violations in the investigation or on the basis of doubtful evidence. In addition, he expressed his concern about the reported harassment of, and pressure on, lawyers in politically sensitive cases. In line with our findings, he also noted the lack of effective investigations into cases dealing with law enforcement officials or in other (politically) sensitive cases, and expressed his concern about the resulting sense of impunity.

24. On 26 April 2011, the ECtHR delivered its judgment in the case of Enukidze and Girgvliani v. Georgia (application no. 25091/07). In its judgment, which concerned the abduction and killing of a man by senior law enforcement officials and the subsequent lack of credible and effective investigations and appropriate punishment⁵, the Court found that Article 2 (right to life), as well as Article 38 (obligation to co-operate with the Court) had been violated. The finding under article 38 indicates that the Court saw clear intent in the actions of the authorities to subvert the course of justice, including with respect of the Court itself. In its judgment, it condemned the Georgian authorities in harsh terms, noting *“with particular concern how the different branches of State power –including the Ministry of the Interior, the prosecution authority, the domestic courts and the President of Georgia– had all acted in concert in preventing justice from being done in that gruesome homicide case.”*

25. This case underscores our concerns about the lack of credible and effective investigations in politically sensitive cases. The above-mentioned case is politically sensitive as it involves high level officials from the Ministry of the Interior and because of its political connotations. During the discussions, the authorities stressed the sensitive nature of this case, also as a result of its politicisation by the opposition. The authorities are currently in discussion with the relevant departments in the Council of Europe with regard to the execution of the judgment of the Court. The authorities also stressed that they would fully co-operate with the Council of Europe and implement any measures ordered.

26. On 25 May 2011, the police broke up an opposition protest on Rustaveli Avenue. This protest had been going on for several days and threatened to interfere with the official independence day commemorations, including a military parade, that were scheduled to take place on Rustaveli Avenue.⁶ When the organisers refused to relocate to a reasonable alternative location, a decision was taken to break up the protest. While the legitimacy of this decision is beyond question, the police, according to credible reports, used excessive and disproportionate force to disperse the protesters. We made a public statement following the incidents on 26 May, in which we called for a credible and effective investigation into all allegations of excessive or disproportionate use of force by the police. Moreover, we called upon the authorities to make the results of this investigation public, in order to allow for full transparency and public scrutiny.

27. During our visit, we were informed that an internal police investigation had been conducted and that disciplinary measures had been taken against a number of police officers. We were informed that the results of the internal investigation were reported on the website of the police service. The prosecution service of Georgia did conclude that no criminal offences were committed during the break up of the protest and closed its investigation into this matter. We are not aware if the investigation has been made public. Several interlocutors questioned the results of the investigations conducted by the police and prosecutors office and no formal independent investigation has taken place. It therefore seems to us that a credible and effective investigation into the events on 26 May 2011 has not taken place along the lines we recommended. In addition, the investigations into the attacks on protesters, as well as into the alleged excessive use of force by the police during the protest in 2007 and 2009, are still ongoing and have not yet produced any results. This is undermining the credibility of these investigations and puts into question the willingness of the

⁵ The defendants were given unusually light prison sentences that were subsequently cut in half following a Presidential pardon.

⁶ Rustaveli Avenue is one of the main avenues in Tbilisi which passes in front of the Parliament. As such, it is often used for demonstrations as well as official celebrations and parades.

authorities to conduct an effective investigation into these events. This too could lead to a sense of impunity among the police forces. Again, the authorities claim that internal investigations by the police have been conducted, and that a number of police officers have been punished. We wish however to emphasise that only full transparency and accountability will counter any sense of impunity.

28. In our view, one of the most appropriate mechanisms to address the issue of ineffective investigations would be the establishment of an independent mechanism to investigate complaints into the behaviour of the police. We would therefore like to call upon the authorities to consider setting up such an independent police complaint mechanism, in line with the recommendations made by the Human Rights Commissioner for such mechanisms and their functioning.

IV. Prison conditions

29. During our visit, we visited the prison in Batumi as well a pre-trial penitentiary institution in Tbilisi. The conditions in the prison in Batumi, which is seriously overcrowded, are outright bad and have been the issue of a number of reports of the CPT, as well as the Georgian Public Defender (Ombudsman). The authorities fully acknowledge the problems with regard to the prison in Batumi. This prison is slated for closure as soon as the new prison complex that is being developed in co-operation with the Council of Europe –and with the help of the Council of Europe Development Bank– has been completed in 2013/2014. Despite the acknowledgement by the authorities of the inadequate prison conditions in older prisons⁷, no special measures seem to have been taken that could improve the situation for persons detained there, such as, for example, increasing the airing time for prisoners. We would recommend that the authorities look into the possibilities for such relatively simple measures.

30. In contrast, the conditions in the pre-trial detention centre in Tbilisi are excellent and this centre is in many ways a model for the prison conditions that the authorities intend to establish all over the country. The Public Defender cautioned us that, despite genuine efforts by the authorities, the conditions in the prison we visited in Tbilisi are not yet representative for the overall prison system.

31. A key concern raised by the Public Defender is the health situation in the prison system and the still inadequate healthcare facilities in penitentiary institutions. Healthcare facilities are mostly inadequate in older prisons. These prisons also suffer from overcrowding. The combined result has been an alarming rise in tuberculosis infection among inmates. The authorities fully recognise the gravity of the situation and are making commendable efforts to establish comprehensive healthcare services within the penitentiary system. The healthcare facilities in the prison we visited in Tbilisi are a model of the services the authorities intend to establish, in due course, in all prisons in the country. While the Human Rights Defender welcomed the attention paid by the authorities to this problem, he felt that the number of inmates suffering from tuberculosis or other infectious diseases could be considerably reduced by regular health screening of all inmates, and not only upon their arrival in detention or when infection outbreaks are detected.

32. We welcome the efforts of the authorities to reform the prison system and to establish penitentiary institutions that fully comply with European norms and standards. We also recognise the financial constraints that the authorities face in this context. However, we would like to emphasise, as we did in the Assembly's last resolution, that prison reform will be very difficult to achieve without a change in sentencing guidelines and practices, which to date are resulting in an ever increasing prison population.

V. Repatriation of the Meskhetian Population

33. The Meskhetian Associations we met in Strasbourg have reported that, since the adoption of Resolution 1801 (2011), their relationship with the Georgian authorities has improved markedly and regular contacts have been established. The Ministry for Reintegration informed us that a special council has been set up, composed in its majority by Meskhetian representatives, to judge on repatriation requests from persons who can not prove their family's deportation with documentary evidence. A considerable number of applications received to date do not have all the requisite papers. The applicants concerned have been given 4 months to correct their application and to provide possible missing papers. At the time of our visit, 75 applications for repatriation were granted. We were subsequently informed that, by 1 December 2011, this number had increased to 199. No repatriations have yet taken place.

34. The ethnic Meskhetian population was originally expelled from the Samtskhe region, which is now an area predominantly inhabited by ethnic Armenians. There is a great deal of hostility among this community to

⁷ The authorities informed us that 87,4 % of all inmates are serving their sentence in newly constructed prison institutions.

the idea of repatriation. These concerns need to be addressed especially in view of the tensions that, at times, have surfaced in this region. This underscores the need for the development of a comprehensive repatriation strategy, as recommended by the Assembly. In our talks with the authorities during our visit, we could not discern any such strategy being developed, despite the fact that the first requests for repatriation have now been granted. After our return, we were informed by the authorities that an inter agency council was tasked with preparing such a draft strategy. The authorities intend to conduct a fully fledged evaluation of the repatriation application process, as soon as it has been finalised, with a view to measures to ensure its success. This should be welcomed. We intend to follow the developments in this area closely.

VI. Other

35. In July 2011, the Georgian parliament adopted legislation with a view to granting legal status to religious denominations and faiths other than the Georgian Orthodox Church. These amendments were opposed by the Georgian Orthodox church as well as by some opposition parties. For our part, we strongly welcome these amendments, which are very much in line with the recommendation of the Assembly to the Georgian authorities to draft a proper law on religions (§ 19.1 of Resolution 1801 (2011), and which deal with a very sensitive issue in Georgian society. We expect that the legal status for all denominations will soon be complemented by legislative measures to resolve the issue of the restitution of historic religious properties as mentioned in § 19.2 of Resolution 1801 (2011).

36. In the framework of this visit, we also discussed the modalities for the preparation of the information note on the developments with regard to the consequences of the war that we and the rapporteurs for Russia are tasked to draft for the Monitoring Committee, in accordance with the decision⁸ of the Committee of January 2010.

37. We intend to make a further visit to Georgia in the framework of the ongoing monitoring procedure in the first half of next year, in order to familiarise ourselves with the developments in the run up to the elections that will take place in autumn next year.

⁸ **Proposal of the Chair on the manner in which the Monitoring Committee should continue its work on this file, approved by the Committee at its meeting of 27 January 2011**

In line with Resolution 1683 (2009), the Monitoring Committee remains seized of this matter and decides that:

- the consequences of the war, as well as the implementation of Assembly recommendations and demands made on Georgia and Russia in the relevant resolutions on this issue, will be followed by the respective co-rapporteurs for Georgia and Russia in the framework of the ongoing monitoring procedures for both these countries;
- the co-rapporteurs, under the responsibility and co-ordination of the Chairperson of the Monitoring Committee, will present on an annual basis a joint information note to the Committee, in which they will outline the relevant developments with regard to the conflict and their findings with regard to the implementation of Assembly demands as expressed in its resolutions on this subject;
- this information note will be discussed by the Committee in a specific sitting in which it will also be updated, inter alia, on relevant developments in other international fora.

In addition, the Committee will be informed about possible activities of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population with regard to the humanitarian situation.

APPENDIX

Programme of the fact-finding visit to Tbilisi and Batumi (11-14 October 2011)

Mr Kastriot ISLAMI, member of Parliament
Mr Michael Aastrup JENSEN, member of Parliament
Mr Bas KLEIN, Secretary of the Monitoring Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly

Tuesday, 11 October 2011

- 12:30 Briefing by Ms Caterina BOLOGNESE, Head of the Office of Council of Europe in Georgia
- 14:00 NGO roundtable on human rights and democracy situation (*)
- 15:30 NGO roundtable on electoral reform (*)
- 16:30 Meeting with opposition parties (*)
- 17:30 Meeting with independent media experts on the media reform (*)
- 20:00 Dinner with members of the diplomatic community (*)

Wednesday, 12 October 2011

- 10:30-12:00 Meeting with representatives of Georgian think-tanks
- 12:15-13:15 Meeting with the editorial working group on the Election code
- 13:20 Meeting with the Chairman of the parliament of Georgia, Mr David BAKRADZE
- 15:30 Meeting with the Deputy Secretary of the National Security Council of Georgia, Mrs Tamar KINTSURASHVILI (on repatriation of deported persons issues)
- 16:30 Meeting with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Grigol VASHADZE
- 17:30 Visit to prison in Tbilisi
(delegation accompanied to prison by the Deputy Minister of Corrections and Legal Assistance of Georgia, Mr Giorgi ARSOSHVILI)
- 19:00 Meeting with the Head of Analytical Department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia, Mr Shota UTIASHVILI
- 20:30 Dinner hosted by the Georgian delegation to the PACE

Thursday, 13 October 2011

- 10:00-11:00 Meeting with the Public Defender of Georgia, Mr George TUGUSHI
- 11:15-12:15 Meeting with the Deputy Minister of Justice of Georgia, Mrs Tina BURJALIANI
- 12:30 Meeting with the Deputy State Minister for Reintegration, Mr Irakli PORCHKHIDZE
- 13:30 Lunch with the Secretary of the National Security Council of Georgia, Mr Giorgi BOKERIA
- 14:30 Visit of the construction site of the Parliament in Kutaisi
Meeting with members of the regional administration in Kutaisi

Friday, 14 October 2011

- 10:00-10:45 Meeting with the Chairman of the Constitutional Court of Georgia, Mr George PAPUASHVILI

- 11:00 Meeting with the Chairman of the Government of the Autonomous Republic of Adjara, Mr Levan VARSHALOMIDZE
- 13:30 Lunch hosted by the Chairman of the Parliament of the Government of the Autonomous Republic of Adjara
- 15:00 Visit to Batumi Justice House
- 16:30 Visit to Prison in Batumi
(delegation accompanied to prison by the Deputy Minister of Corrections and Legal Assistance of Georgia, Mr Giorgi ARSOSHVILI)

(*) Meetings organised by the Council of Europe office in Georgia