



The boundaries, names and designations used in this report do not imply official endorsement, nor express a political opinion on the part of the ICRC, and are without prejudice to claims of sovereignty over the territories mentioned.

KEY RESULTS/CONSTRAINTS IN 2016

- ▶ Owing to the efforts of the two ICRC-supported coordination mechanisms dealing with missing-persons cases related to past conflicts, the remains of some 40 people were identified and handed over to their families.
- ▶ Missing persons' families obtained psychosocial, legal and/or administrative support from ICRC-backed NGOs. The NGOs prepared to take the lead in providing such support, as the ICRC concluded its assistance to them in November.
- ▶ Detainees in Georgia proper and South Ossetia received ICRC visits conducted in line with the organization's standard procedures. The ICRC pursued talks with the *de facto* Abkhaz authorities regarding visits to detainees in Abkhazia.
- ▶ People travelled across administrative boundary lines to obtain medical treatment or reunite with family members. The ICRC acted as a neutral intermediary to facilitate their passage, in coordination with the pertinent authorities.
- ▶ The Georgian armed forces continued to take the lead in training their troops in IHL, and in incorporating IHL in their doctrine, training and sanctions system; the ICRC provided technical assistance.
- ▶ With financial and technical support from the ICRC and other Movement partners, the Red Cross Society of Georgia continued to strengthen its ability to provide humanitarian aid to vulnerable people.

EXPENDITURE IN KCHF

Protection	2,105
Assistance	4,250
Prevention	854
Cooperation with National Societies	301
General	90
Total	7,601
<i>Of which: Overheads</i>	<i>464</i>

IMPLEMENTATION RATE

Expenditure/yearly budget	85%
---------------------------	-----

PERSONNEL

Mobile staff	14
Resident staff (daily workers not included)	137

The ICRC has been present in Georgia proper and in South Ossetia since 1992. Acting as a neutral intermediary, it contributes to efforts to clarify the fate and whereabouts of missing persons, including by offering its forensic expertise to the actors concerned. It supports the families of missing persons and works to protect and assist vulnerable groups in conflict-affected regions. It visits detainees in Georgia proper and in South Ossetia. It promotes the national implementation of IHL and its integration into armed and security forces' doctrine, training and sanctions and into academic curricula. The ICRC helps the Red Cross Society of Georgia strengthen its capacities.

YEARLY RESULT

Level of achievement of ICRC yearly objectives/plans of action

HIGH

PROTECTION	Total
CIVILIANS (residents, IDPs, returnees, etc.)	
Restoring family links	
RCMs collected	309
RCMs distributed	272
Tracing cases closed positively (subject located or fate established)	48
People reunited with their families	9
PEOPLE DEPRIVED OF THEIR FREEDOM (All categories/all statuses)	
ICRC visits	
Detainees visited	10,222
Detainees visited and monitored individually	80
Number of visits carried out	43
Number of places of detention visited	17
Restoring family links	
RCMs collected	95
RCMs distributed	65

ASSISTANCE	2016 Targets (up to)	Achieved
CIVILIANS (residents, IDPs, returnees, etc.)		
Economic security (in some cases provided within a protection or cooperation programme)		
Food commodities	Beneficiaries 500	670
Essential household items	Beneficiaries 500	620
Productive inputs ¹	Beneficiaries 400	1,065
Cash	Beneficiaries 2,600	2,665
Services and training ¹	Beneficiaries	700
Physical rehabilitation		
Patients receiving services	Patients 15	

1. Owing to operational and management constraints, figures presented in this table and in the narrative part of this report may not reflect the extent of the activities carried out during the reporting period.

CONTEXT

Civilians continued to feel the effects of past conflicts. Some 2,500 people remained unaccounted for. The demarcation of the Abkhaz and South Ossetian administrative boundary lines continued to disrupt livelihoods and hamper the movement of people.

Peace negotiations (the “Geneva International Discussions”) continued between representatives of Abkhazia, Georgia proper, the Russian Federation and South Ossetia; the European Union (EU), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the UN served as mediators. Monthly meetings of the Incident Prevention and Response Mechanism (IPRM), facilitated jointly by the EU Monitoring Mission and the OSCE, enabled Georgian and South Ossetian participants to exchange views on humanitarian and security-related matters. IPRM meetings between Abkhaz and Georgian participants resumed in May, after four years.

Implementation of “alliance and integration agreements” between Abkhazia and the Russian Federation, and between South Ossetia and the Russian Federation, was under way.

Georgia continued to contribute troops to UN and other peace-support operations abroad.

People in Georgia’s Pankisi Gorge reported relatives as missing in relation to past conflicts in the Russian Federation.

ICRC ACTION AND RESULTS

The ICRC continued to assist people coping with the consequences of past conflicts. Dialogue with the Georgian authorities and the *de facto* Abkhaz and South Ossetian authorities emphasized their obligation to facilitate people’s access to humanitarian aid and essential services. The ICRC remained the only international organization conducting humanitarian activities in South Ossetia.

People travelled across the South Ossetian administrative boundary to obtain medical treatment or rejoin family members; the ICRC facilitated their passage, in coordination with the pertinent authorities.

The ICRC-chaired coordination mechanism with Abkhaz and Georgian participants, dealing with missing-persons cases linked to the 1992–1993 conflict, continued its work. The remains of 41 people were identified and handed over to their families. The ICRC maintained its financial and technical support for exhumations and forensic analysis.

Georgian, Russian and South Ossetian participants in the ICRC-chaired coordination mechanism dealing with missing-persons cases linked to the conflicts in the 1990s and 2008, and other consequences of the conflicts, resumed discussions; they had last met in 2013. The remains of one person were identified and handed over to his family.

Under the ICRC’s accompaniment programme, local NGOs provided psychosocial, legal and/or administrative assistance to the families of missing persons. These partner NGOs prepared to take the lead in aiding families, as the ICRC concluded the programme in November. Through training from the ICRC’s partner NGOs and other local providers, regional committees of missing persons’ families, established in 2015, improved their ability to help their

members support each other and raise public awareness of their concerns.

Detainees in Georgia proper and South Ossetia continued to receive visits conducted in accordance with standard ICRC procedures. Following these visits, the ICRC communicated its findings and, where necessary, recommendations for improving detainees’ living conditions, confidentially to the detaining authorities. The ICRC pursued discussions with the *de facto* Abkhaz authorities regarding visits to people detained in Abkhazia. Detainees in Abkhazia, Georgia proper and South Ossetia reconnected with their relatives through ICRC family-links services.

In Abkhazia and Georgia proper, missing persons’ families, victims of mines and explosive remnants of war (ERW), and people affected by the demarcation of the administrative boundaries worked towards economic self-sufficiency by starting or expanding income-generating activities with ICRC cash grants. In November, the ICRC concluded its livelihood assistance programme in Abkhazia and Georgia proper, while continuing to monitor the households assisted. It also completed its monitoring of households in South Ossetia that had received similar support in 2015.

Destitute people in Abkhazia and South Ossetia met their immediate needs with ICRC-provided food, household and hygiene items and/or cash.

The Georgian authorities continued to work towards incorporating IHL in domestic legislation. With the ICRC’s encouragement, they began the process of creating a State commission on missing persons. Draft laws on the status of the National Society and the use of the red cross emblem, prepared with the ICRC’s technical assistance, were submitted by the justice ministry to the parliament.

The ICRC’s dialogue with the *de facto* South Ossetian authorities focused on their responsibilities under IHL and other applicable norms, and on the ICRC’s role as a neutral intermediary.

With the ICRC’s technical assistance, the Georgian armed forces continued to incorporate IHL in their decision-making, and to take the lead in training officers and troops in IHL.

The Red Cross Society of Georgia continued to strengthen its ability to deliver humanitarian services, with support from the ICRC and other Movement partners.

CIVILIANS

People obtain medical care and rejoin their families across boundary lines

Dialogue with the Georgian authorities and the *de facto* Abkhaz and South Ossetian authorities, including local and regional authorities, emphasized the humanitarian concerns of people living along the administrative boundary lines – particularly regarding their economic situation, their access to essential services, including health care, and their ability to restore or maintain contact with relatives.

In all, 217 people crossed the South Ossetian administrative boundary line to obtain medical care and 8 people were reunited with their families; the ICRC acted as a neutral intermediary to facilitate their passage, in coordination with the pertinent authorities. The ICRC transferred the remains of 17 persons across the boundary line and facilitated the handover of the remains of 10 others to their relatives.

The ICRC facilitated the reunion of one family across the Abkhaz administrative boundary.

RCMs were exchanged and official documents relayed across both boundary lines.

The Georgian Red Cross hired a family-links specialist, who visited its branches to provide technical support and monitoring and, with the ICRC's help, organized a workshop for five branches on restoring family links during emergencies. With ICRC support, the National Society reached an agreement with a government agency to share information about people being sought by their relatives.

Two people in Georgia, who were formerly held at the US internment facility at Guantanamo Bay Naval Station in Cuba, received several family visits facilitated by the ICRC.

Families of the missing receive answers on the fate and whereabouts of their relatives

Abkhaz and Georgian participants in the ICRC-chaired coordination mechanism dealing with missing-persons cases linked to the 1992–1993 conflict, and the mechanism's forensic working group, continued their work. The remains of 41 persons were identified and handed over to their families. The ICRC provided financial and technical support for exhumations, which took place at several sites, and for the forensic analysis of the remains recovered. Local actors, some of them ICRC-trained, continued to collect ante-mortem data and DNA samples from missing persons' relatives, for use in identifying remains. The ICRC continued to register cases of missing persons and to work on broadening awareness of the issue.

Georgian, Russian and South Ossetian participants in the ICRC-chaired coordination mechanism dealing with missing-persons cases linked to the conflicts in the 1990s and 2008, and other consequences of the conflicts, held two meetings in 2016; they had last met in November 2013. Excavations for 2017 were among the matters discussed. Owing to the coordination mechanism's work, the remains of one person were identified and handed over to his family in South Ossetia. Agreements were reached between the Georgian authorities and the ICRC, on the collection of ante-mortem data from missing persons' relatives; between a South Ossetian NGO and the ICRC, also on such data collection; and between the *de facto* South Ossetian authorities and the ICRC, on procedures for collecting DNA samples. Efforts to identify possible gravesite locations continued, with financial and technical assistance from the ICRC.

The ICRC provided the Georgian authorities and Abkhaz and South Ossetian *de facto* authorities with technical guidance for managing ante-mortem and post-mortem data associated with missing-persons cases. It made preparations to discuss, with the Georgian armed forces, measures to prevent disappearances during armed conflict.

Missing persons' families benefit from psychosocial support

In Georgia proper, some 210 families obtained psychosocial, legal and/or administrative support, and learnt more about the process of recovering and identifying their relatives' remains, through an accompaniment programme run by local partners – including NGOs, lawyers and a psychiatrist – with financial and technical assistance from the ICRC. Thirty-five families received individual support during and after emotionally difficult events, such as the identification and handover of their relatives' remains and the

subsequent reburial ceremonies; some families also benefited from ICRC economic assistance (see below). The families of people who had gone missing during past conflicts in the Russian Federation (see *Context*) also began to receive support. The ICRC's partner NGOs prepared to take the lead in providing aid to families, as the ICRC concluded the accompaniment programme in November.

Regional committees of missing persons' families, formed in five places in Georgia proper in 2015, strove to become more capable of helping their members support each other and of raising public awareness of their concerns. The committees' members learnt communication, negotiation and team-building skills through training provided by the ICRC's partner NGOs and other local providers. The Tbilisi committee organized a commemorative event in May, with support from the city authorities and the ICRC. More than 800 missing persons' families marked the International Day of the Disappeared with events in seven places.

Missing persons' families in Georgia proper learnt more about the programmes and services available to them through a booklet published by the ICRC, prepared with help from lawyers involved in the accompaniment programme.

An ICRC-supported working group of academics – formed with a view to helping increase public awareness of the plight of missing persons' families, and to promoting the study of the families' psychosocial needs – held its first meeting in May and its first regional meeting, with Armenian and Georgian participants, in December. Graduate students at a university in Georgia proper learnt more about ambiguous loss and the needs of missing persons' relatives from an ICRC lecture.

Conflict-affected people rebuild their livelihoods

Missing persons' families, mine/ERW victims and other conflict-affected people in Georgia proper (550 households/2,000 people) and Abkhazia (20 households/80 people) worked towards economic self-sufficiency by starting or expanding income-generating activities with ICRC cash grants. In Georgia proper, this assistance was supplemented by business training, provided with help from Georgian Red Cross volunteers.

Some 140 households (470 people) in Georgia proper, who had lost access to farmland or markets following the demarcation of the South Ossetian administrative boundary, started new livelihood activities – such as beekeeping, raising sheep, growing fruit or vegetables, or running fruit-storage facilities – through ICRC community projects that involved both cash grants and business training. In South Ossetia, 40 vulnerable households (160 people) were given vegetable seedlings to help them cover their losses after strong hailstorms.

The ICRC concluded its livelihood assistance programme in Abkhazia and Georgia proper in November; it continued, however, to monitor the projects of the households assisted. At the end of the year, it completed its monitoring of households in South Ossetia that had received similar support in 2015. The *de facto* South Ossetian authorities received a final donation of agricultural and veterinary equipment, and several horses for transport, for the benefit of local farming households.

Vulnerable people meet their basic needs

In South Ossetia, some 600 destitute people (220 households) were able to eat at least three meals a day with the help of ICRC-provided

food parcels; they also received household and hygiene essentials. Similar assistance was given through weekly home visits to seven elderly persons living alone and with limited mobility. A home for elderly people and an orphanage also received food, benefiting some 40 people in all; some 80 households (160 people) were given firewood to see them through winter. The *de facto* authorities worked to strengthen social services for vulnerable groups; they assessed local capacities jointly with the ICRC.

In remote areas of Abkhazia, some 60 vulnerable people, most of them destitute and elderly, received food and, in some cases, cash, to help them meet their immediate needs.

In South Ossetia, 19 disabled persons accessed physical rehabilitation services and/or obtained assistive devices with ICRC financial assistance. The ICRC donated medicines and medical supplies and equipment to the Tskhinvali/Tskhinval hospital.

PEOPLE DEPRIVED OF THEIR FREEDOM

Detainees receive ICRC visits and reconnect with their families

Some 10,200 detainees, at 15 facilities in Georgia proper and 2 in South Ossetia, were visited in accordance with standard ICRC procedures. After these visits, the ICRC communicated its findings and, where necessary, its recommendations for improving detention conditions confidentially to the detaining authorities. The ICRC pursued discussions with the *de facto* Abkhaz authorities regarding visits to people detained in Abkhazia.

Detainees in Abkhazia, Georgia proper and South Ossetia maintained contact with their families through RCMs. Five detainees in Georgia proper and one in South Ossetia received family visits; the ICRC, acting as a neutral intermediary, had facilitated their relatives' passage across administrative boundary lines. Several detainees benefited from parcels sent by their relatives, who lived across the administrative boundaries and were unable to travel; the ICRC also facilitated these deliveries.

With the ICRC's assistance, 21 foreign detainees in Georgia proper, including asylum seekers and stateless persons, notified their embassies or consulates, and/or the UNHCR, of their detention. The detaining authorities were reminded of the need to uphold the principle of *non-refoulement*.

ICRC support enabled a Georgian penitentiary official to attend a conference on prison management in Bucharest, Romania.

Sixty detainees at two places of detention in South Ossetia had better living conditions following the ICRC's provision of hygiene and household items.

ACTORS OF INFLUENCE

Georgian authorities take steps to implement IHL

The Georgian authorities continued to work towards integrating IHL into domestic legislation, with the ICRC's technical assistance. The justice ministry and the ICRC discussed pledges made by Georgia at the 32nd International Conference, and Georgia's position on the ratification of various IHL-related instruments.

The Georgian authorities and the ICRC continued to discuss humanitarian concerns related to national legislation on data protection, for instance, at an ICRC-organized round-table for representatives from various ministries.

The national IHL committee continued to receive ICRC support, notably for participating in the fourth universal meeting of such committees (see *International law and policy*).

With the ICRC's encouragement, the Georgian authorities began the process of establishing a State commission on missing persons.

With encouragement from the Georgian Red Cross and the ICRC, the justice ministry submitted draft laws to the parliament on the status of the National Society and the use of the red cross emblem. The drafts incorporated amendments suggested by other ministries concerned and technical comments from the ICRC.

Discussions with the *de facto* South Ossetian authorities focused on their responsibilities under IHL and other applicable norms – particularly in relation to the issue of missing persons – and on the ICRC's role as a neutral intermediary. The ICRC continued to offer them its expertise for drafting a law on missing persons.

Military officers and troops deployed abroad learn more about IHL

The Georgian armed forces continued, with the aid of ICRC expertise, to incorporate IHL in their doctrine, training and sanctions system; for instance, they reviewed their field manuals' compliance with IHL. They continued to take the lead in providing IHL training to their troops. A newly formed monitoring group on IHL training conducted five training sessions – which it later evaluated with the ICRC – for more than 200 officers. The ICRC sponsored the attendance of a senior officer of the Georgian military at an advanced IHL workshop in Lucerne, Switzerland (see *International law and policy*). An ICRC train-the-trainer workshop helped 20 senior officers strengthen their ability to teach IHL. Troops bound for Afghanistan and the Central African Republic received pre-deployment IHL training from the ICRC. The ICRC discussed with the *de facto* Abkhaz authorities the possibility of conducting IHL dissemination sessions for military and security forces in Abkhazia.

Local media draw attention to humanitarian activities

The media helped increase awareness of the ICRC's work. In Georgia proper, the handover of the remains of people who had previously been reported as missing in relation to the 1992–1993 conflict, and the ICRC's activities for missing persons' families (see *Civilians*), were given coverage in newspapers and online. In Abkhazia, an ICRC-organized football match for mine/ERW victims was featured on television. An ICRC film shown on television and a radio interview with an ICRC representative helped people in South Ossetia learn more about the hazardousness of mines/ERW; a photo exhibit that toured four rural districts helped broaden awareness of the issue of missing persons.

The Georgian Red Cross promoted its humanitarian role through such means as public events marking World Red Cross and Red Crescent Day (8 May) and International Day for Disaster Risk Reduction.

Students strengthen their grasp of IHL

University students in Georgia proper participated in national and international competitions, including one organized by the Georgian justice ministry and the ICRC. Students had better access to information on IHL at universities in Kutaisi and Zugdidi, to which the ICRC donated publications.

In Abkhazia, university students attended ICRC sessions on IHL and participated in an ICRC-sponsored competition. Discussions with a South Ossetian university, on IHL instruction, continued.

With ICRC support, three Georgian researchers served as judges for a moot court competition in the Netherlands, organized by the International Criminal Court in The Hague.

RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT MOVEMENT

The Georgia Red Cross worked to strengthen its emergency response mechanisms with financial and technical assistance from the ICRC and other Movement partners. It developed a contingency plan and tools for assessing emergency needs, extended its network of first-aiders from 8 to 11 branches and organized a simulation exercise, for several National Societies, on the Safer Access Framework.

The Georgia Red Cross signed a coordination agreement with the International Federation and the ICRC that focused on the development of its organizational capacities, and on emergency preparedness and response. Movement partners reinforced their cooperation through periodic meetings.

Representatives from the National Society's headquarters and from 27 branches discussed fundraising and other organizational priorities at an ICRC-funded meeting in October. The ICRC also helped the National Society assess its capacities in financial management.

The National Society drew on ICRC expertise to sustain its lobbying for the revision of draft laws governing its status and the use of the red cross emblem (see *Actors of influence*).

MAIN FIGURES AND INDICATORS: PROTECTION		Total			
CIVILIANS (residents, IDPs, returnees, etc.)					
RCMs and other means of family contact			UAMs/SC		
RCMs collected		309			
RCMs distributed		272			
Reunifications, transfers and repatriations					
People reunited with their families		9			
People transferred or repatriated		910			
Human remains transferred or repatriated		17			
Tracing requests, including cases of missing persons			Women	Girls	Boys
People for whom a tracing request was newly registered		269	48	4	5
Tracing cases closed positively (subject located or fate established)		48			
Tracing cases still being handled at the end of the reporting period (people)		2,588	409	41	20
Documents					
Official documents relayed between family members across borders/front lines		33			
PEOPLE DEPRIVED OF THEIR FREEDOM (All categories/all statuses)					
ICRC visits			Women	Minors	
Detainees visited		10,222	428	33	
			Women	Girls	Boys
Detainees visited and monitored individually		80	8		2
Detainees newly registered		37			
Number of visits carried out		43			
Number of places of detention visited		17			
RCMs and other means of family contact					
RCMs collected		95			
RCMs distributed		65			
Detainees visited by their relatives with ICRC/National Society support		6			
People to whom a detention attestation was issued		5			

MAIN FIGURES AND INDICATORS: ASSISTANCE		Total	Women	Children
CIVILIANS (residents, IDPs, returnees, etc.)				
Economic security (in some cases provided within a protection or cooperation programme)				
Food commodities	Beneficiaries	670	222	327
	of whom IDPs	1		
Essential household items	Beneficiaries	620	206	316
	of whom IDPs	1		
Productive inputs ¹	Beneficiaries	1,065	534	102
Cash	Beneficiaries	2,665	1,208	572
	of whom IDPs	1,096	535	251
Services and training ¹	Beneficiaries	700		
PEOPLE DEPRIVED OF THEIR FREEDOM (All categories/all statuses)				
Economic security (in some cases provided within a protection programme)				
Essential household items	Beneficiaries	60		

1. Owing to operational and management constraints, figures presented in this table and in the narrative part of this report may not reflect the extent of the activities carried out during the reporting period.