January 2026

European Social Charter (revised)

European Committee of Social Rights

Conclusions 2025

GEORGIA

This text may be subject to editorial revision.

The function of the European Committee of Social Rights is to rule on the conformity of the situation in States with the European Social Charter. In respect of national reports, it adopts “conclusions”; in respect of collective complaints, it adopts decisions.

A presentation of this treaty as well as statements of interpretation formulated by the Committee appear in the General Introduction to the Conclusions.[1]

The European Social Charter (revised) was ratified by Georgia on 22 August 2005. The time limit for submitting the 17th report on the application of this treaty to the Council of Europe was 31 December 2024 and Georgia submitted it on 31 December 2024. On 12 June 2025, a letter was addressed to the Government requesting supplementary information regarding Articles 2§1, 5, 6§1, 6§2 and 6§4. No response was submitted by the Government.

The present chapter on Georgia concerns 7 situations and contains:

– 0 conclusion of conformity

– 7 conclusions of non-conformity: Articles 2§1, 4§3, 5, 6§1, 6§2, 6§4, 20

The next report from Georgia will be due on 31 December 2026.

[1] *The conclusions as well as state reports can be consulted on the Council of Europe's Internet site (www.coe.int/socialcharter).*

Article 2 - Right to just conditions of work

Paragraph 1 - Reasonable working time

The Committee takes note of the information contained in the report submitted by Georgia and in the comments by the Public Defender's Office of Georgia (PDO).

The Committee recalls that for the purposes of the present report, States were asked to reply to targeted questions for Article 2§1 of the Charter (see the appendix to the letter, whereby the Committee requested a report on the implementation of the Charter in respect of the provisions falling within Group 1).

The assessment of the Committee will therefore concern the information provided by the Government in response to the targeted questions.

Measures to ensure reasonable working hours

In the targeted question, the Committee asked for information on occupations, if any, where weekly working hours can exceed 60 hours or more, by law, collective agreements or other means, including information on the exact number of weekly hours that persons in these occupations can work; as well as information on any safeguards which exist in order to protect the health and safety of the worker, where workers work more than 60 hours.

In reply, the report states that standard working time is 40 hours per week. In enterprises with a certain production regime, working time is 48 hours per week.

In its comments, the PDO notes that platform workers may be subject to work more than 60 hours a week.

The Committee notes that workers performing specific functions in certain sectors and in exceptional circumstances may be allowed to exceed 16 daily working hours limit or 60 weekly working hours limit during short periods. However, certain safeguards must exist (Conclusions 2025, Statement of Interpretation on Article 2§1 on maximum working time).

The Committee also notes that platform workers are not among the specific functions and do not fall under exceptional circumstances where maximum working time limits can be exceeded. The Committee therefore considers that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 2§1 of the Charter on the ground that the maximum weekly working time may exceed 60 hours for platform workers.

Working hours of maritime workers

In the targeted question, the Committee asked for information on the weekly working hours of maritime workers.

With regard to maritime workers, the report states that their activities are regulated by the Law on Seafarers' Employment that entered into force on 1 July 2024. The working hours of maritime workers may not exceed 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week. The minimum rest time must not be less than 10 hours within a 24-hour period and not less than 77 hours in a seven-day period.

The Committee notes that, in order to be in conformity with the Charter, maritime workers may be permitted to work a maximum of 14 hours in any individual 24-hour period and 72 hours in any individual seven-day period. The maximum reference period allowed is one year. Adequate rest periods have to be provided. Records of maritime workers' working hours shall be maintained by employers to allow supervision by the competent authorities of the working time limits (Conclusions 2025, Statement of Interpretation on Article 2§1 on working time of maritime workers).

Law and practice regarding on-call periods

In the targeted question, the Committee asked for information on how inactive on-call periods are treated in terms of work or rest time on law and practice.

In reply, the report states that the issue is not specifically regulated at the legislative level.

The Committee notes that, with regard to inactive parts of on-call period during which no work is carried out and where the worker stays at home or is otherwise away from the employer‘s premises, under no circumstances should such periods be regarded as rest periods in their entirety. However, there are two situations that need to be addressed. Firstly, the situation involves a worker who is on-call away from the employer‘s premises (at home or at another designated place by the employer) and who is under an obligation to be immediately available or available at very short notice and on a recurring basis to the employer, and where there are serious consequences in cases of the failure to respond. Such on-call periods, including where no actual work is performed (inactive on-call), must be classified as working time in their entirety and remunerated accordingly in order to be in conformity with the Charter. Secondly, the situation involves a worker who is away from the employer‘s premises (at home or at another place designated by the employer) and who has a certain degree of freedom to manage their free time and is allowed time to respond to work tasks (i.e. they do not have to report for work immediately or at a very short notice or on a recurring basis). In these circumstances, the inactive on-call periods amount neither to full-fledged working time nor to genuine rest periods. In such cases the situation may be considered as being in conformity with the Charter if the worker receives a reasonable compensation. The Committee will assess the reasonableness of the nature and level of such compensation on a case-by-case basis and will take into account circumstances such as the nature of the worker‘s duties, the degree of the restriction imposed on the worker and other relevant factors (Conclusions 2025, Statement of Interpretation on Article 2§1 on on-call periods).

The Committee notes that because the issue of on-call periods is not regulated at the legislative level in Georgia, it is impossible to determine how inactive on-call periods are treated in terms of rest time and compensation. Moreover, because of the failure of the Government to answer the Committee’s additional questions, the Committee considers that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 2§1 of the Charter on the ground that it has not been established that inactive on-call periods during which no effective work is undertaken are not considered as rest periods.

Conclusion

The Committee concludes that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 2§1 of the Charter on the grounds that:

- the maximum weekly working time may exceed 60 hours for platform workers;
- it has not been established that inactive on-call periods during which no effective work is undertaken are not considered as rest periods.

Article 4 - Right to a fair remuneration

Paragraph 3 - Non-discrimination between women and men with respect to remuneration

The Committee takes note of the information contained in the report submitted by Georgia and in the comments by the Public Defender's Office of Georgia (PDO).

The Committee recalls that in the context of the present monitoring cycle, States were asked to reply to the targeted questions for Article 4§3 of the Charter (see the appendix to the letter, whereby the Committee requested a report on the implementation of the Charter in respect of the provisions falling within Group 1).

The assessment of the Committee will therefore concern the information provided in the report in response to the targeted questions.

The notion of equal work and work of equal value

In its targeted question the Committee asked the report to indicate whether the notion of equal work and work of equal value is defined in domestic law or case law.

The Committee recalls that under Article 4§3 in order to establish whether work performed is equal or of equal value, factors such as the nature of tasks, skills, educational and training requirements must be taken into account. Pay structures shall be such as to enable the assessment of whether workers are in a comparable situation with regard to the value of work. The value of work, that is the worth of a job for the purposes of determining remuneration should be assessed on the basis of objective gender-neutral criteria, including educational, professional and training requirements, skills, effort, responsibility and working conditions, irrespective of differences in working patterns. These criteria should be defined and applied in an objective, gender-neutral manner, excluding any direct or indirect gender discrimination.

The Committee considers that the notion of equal work or work of equal value has a qualitative dimension and may not always be satisfactorily defined, thus undermining legal certainty. The concept of "work of equal value" lies at the heart of the fundamental right to equal pay for women and men, as it permits a broad scope of comparison, going beyond "equal", "the same" or "similar" work. It also encompasses work that may be of a different nature, but is, nevertheless, of equal value.

States should therefore seek to clarify this notion in domestic law as necessary, either through legislation or case law (Conclusions XV-2, Article 4§3, Poland). No definition of work of equal value in legislation and the absence of case law would indicate that measures need to be taken to give full legislative expression and effect to the principle of equal remuneration, by setting the parameters for a broad definition of equal value.

The report refers to the State Concept of Gender Equality, adopted in December 2022, which, according to the report, although does not have a legislative force, is an umbrella document adopted by the Parliament that should influence the lawmaking process. The Concept focuses on the role of the State in strengthening the work in the following areas: elimination of invisible barriers for women in the labour market; ensuring equal opportunities for employment and professional development; ensuring equal rights in the pre-contractual period, at the workplace and upon the termination of the contractual relationship.

The report also refers to the State Concept for Women's Economic Empowerment, which was adopted in March 2023 and aims to promote the effective implementation of the principle of equal pay for equal work in the public service.

The report further indicates that as a result of the reform implemented in 2020, the Labour Code of Georgia provides for the obligation of the employer to ensure equal pay for male and female workers (Article 4(4)).

The Law of Georgia on Public Service also clarifies that the remuneration system for public officers is based on the principles of transparency and fairness, which imply equal pay for

equal work (Article 57(1)). In addition, the Law of Georgia on Remuneration in Public Institutions defines that the remuneration system is based on the principles of equality and transparency, which implies receiving equal remuneration in accordance with pre-established rules for performing equal work, taking into account the functional load of the post/position (Article 3). The notion of equal work and work of equal value is addressed using a standardised coefficient. Each position's functional load and responsibilities are thoroughly assessed, and based on this evaluation, an appropriate salary coefficient is assigned. The official salary is then annually calculated by multiplying this coefficient by a fixed base salary. Therefore, positions with similar responsibilities and functional loads receive a proportionate salary.

According to the report, by defining and applying these coefficients, the system ensures that the principle of equal work and work of equal value is maintained and workers are compensated fairly, based on objective criteria.

The Committee recalls that it has already examined these amendments to the Labour Code and considered that the situation was not in conformity with Article 4§3 (Conclusions 2022) on the ground that Article 4§4 of the Labour Code provides for equal pay for women and men for "equal work performed", not for "work of equal or comparable value". According to the Committee, this wording is narrower than the principle in the Charter.

The Committee notes from the Observation (CEACR) concerning the Convention No.100 (2024) that according to the CEACR, equal pay for men and women for work of equal "value" is not properly reflected in the legislation. Neither the Labour Code, nor the Law on the Public Service entitle workers to equal remuneration for work that is entirely different but nonetheless of equal "value". The CEACR urged the Government to amend the labour legislation, in cooperation with the social partners and the Council for Gender Equality, in order to give full legislative expression to the principle of equal remuneration for men and women for work of equal value.

The Committee notes from comments received from the Public Defender of Georgia that none of the discrimination cases examined by the court in the period 2021-2023 concerned equal pay.

The Committee considers that the parameters for establishing equal value are not laid down in either legislation or in case law. Therefore, the Committee considers that the situation is not in conformity on this point.

Job classification and remuneration systems

In its targeted question the Committee asked the report to provide information on the job classification and remuneration systems that reflect the equal pay principle, including in the private sector.

The Committee considers that pay transparency is instrumental in the effective application of the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. Transparency contributes to identifying gender bias and discrimination and it facilitates the taking of corrective action by workers and employers and their organisations as well as by the relevant authorities. In this respect, job classification and evaluation systems should be promoted and where they are used, they must rely on criteria that are gender-neutral and do not result in indirect discrimination. Moreover, such systems must consider the features of the posts in question rather than the personal characteristics of the workers (UWE v. Belgium, Complaint No. 124/2016, decision on the merits of 5 December 2019). Where gender-neutral job evaluation and classification systems are used, they are effective in establishing a transparent pay system and are instrumental in ensuring that direct or indirect discrimination on the grounds of gender is excluded. They detect indirect pay discrimination related to the undervaluation of jobs typically done by women. They do so by measuring and comparing jobs the content of which is different but of equal value and so support the principle of equal pay.

The Committee considers that States Parties should take the necessary measures to ensure that analytical tools or methodologies are made available and are easily accessible to support and guide the assessment and comparison of the value of work and establish gender neutral job evaluation and classification systems.

According to the report, civil service job classification and remuneration systems are designed to reflect the principle of equal pay. This is achieved through a structured system that categorises civil service positions into specific ranks and assigns remuneration based on a transparent coefficient framework. Positions within these ranks are evaluated and assigned based on the basis of responsibility, the level of complexity of duties, competencies, required qualification and work experience. This detailed classification system ensures that positions are assigned a hierarchical ranking based on their functional load, not on individual characteristics. The distribution of positions is based on the analysis undertaken by the public institution. This means that the public institution analyses the significance of each position based on its organizational context, taking into account the five factors (responsibility, the level of complexity of duties, competencies, required qualification, and work experience), and decides which category it can be placed in.

The remuneration system operates through a coefficient-based approach. Once a position is classified and assigned to a rank, it is given a specific salary coefficient. This coefficient reflects the functional load, complexity, and responsibilities of the position. The final salary is then calculated by multiplying this coefficient by a base salary established for the civil service.

This system ensures that remuneration is directly linked to the objective evaluation of the position's responsibilities, qualifications, competencies, and experience.

The report further states that as for the private sector, the classification of positions and remuneration systems are not regulated by law but are determined directly by the employer at each specific enterprise.

The Committee considers that in the absence of job classification and evaluation systems in the private sector, the situation is not in conformity with the Charter on this point.

Measures to bring about measurable progress in reducing the gender pay gap

In its targeted question the Committee asked the report to provide information on existing measures to bring about measurable progress in reducing the gender pay gap within a reasonable time.

The Committee considers that States are under an obligation to analyse the causes of the gender pay gap with a view to designing effective policies aimed at reducing it. The Committee recalls its previous holding that the collection of data with a view to adopting adequate measures is essential to promote equal opportunities. Indeed, it has held that where it is known that a certain category of persons is, or might be, discriminated against, it is the duty of the national authorities to collect data to assess the extent of the problem *(*European Roma Rights Centre v. Greece, Complaint No. 15/2003, decision on the merits of 8 December 2004, §27). The gathering and analysis of such data (with due safeguards for privacy and to avoid abuse) is indispensable to the formulation of rational policy (European Roma Rights Centre v. Italy,Complaint No. 27/2004, decision on the merits of 7 December 2005, §23).

The Committee considers that in order to ensure and promote equal pay, the collection of high-quality pay statistics broken down by gender as well as statistics on the number and type of pay discrimination cases is crucial. The collection of such data increases pay transparency at aggregate levels and ultimately uncovers the cases of unequal pay and therefore the gender pay gap. The gender pay gap is one of the most widely accepted indicators of the differences in pay that persist for men and women doing jobs that are either equal or of equal value. In addition, to the overall pay gap (unadjusted and adjusted, the Committee will also, where appropriate, have regard to more specific data on the gender pay gap by sectors, by

occupations, by age, by educational level, etc (University Women of Europe (UWE) v. Finland, Complaint No. 129/2016, decision on the merits of 5 December 2019, §206).

The Committee has held that where the States have not demonstrated a measurable progress in reducing the gender pay gap, the situation amounted to a violation of the Charter (University Women of Europe (UWE) v. Finland, Complaint No. 129/2016, decision on the merits of 5 December 2019).

According to the report, the Labour Code has defined the scope of the prohibition of discrimination in employment and pre-contractual relations. The Labour Inspection Service has conducted inspections to identify the cases of unequal pay. Inspections have not revealed any instances of discriminatory practices in this regard.

The report states nevertheless that the gender pay gap remains a serious problem. The gender pay gap amounted to 32.4% in 2020, 31.7 in 2022 and 32.1 in 2023. The Committee considers that the gender pay gap statistics provided in the report reflect the average monthly wages of men and women. It notes that this indicator is not comparable with the Eurostat gender pay gap indicator which reflects hourly wages. Nevertheless, the Committee observes that during the reference period there has been no improvement in the gender pay gap indicator, which demonstrates that no measurable progress has been made in reducing it. The Committee concludes therefore that the situation is not in conformity with the Charter on this point.

Conclusion

The Committee concludes that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 4§3 of the Charter on the grounds that:

- there is no definition of work of equal value in law or case law;
- there are no job classification or evaluation systems in the private sector;
- no measurable progress has been made in reducing the gender pay gap.

Article 5 - Right to organise

The Committee takes note of the information contained in the report submitted by Georgia as well as the comments submitted by the Georgian Young Lawyers' Association (GYLA)) and the Public Defender of Georgia.

The Committee recalls that in the context of the present monitoring cycle, States were asked to reply to the targeted questions for Article 5 of the Charter (see the appendix to the letter, whereby the Committee requested a report on the implementation of the Charter in respect of the provisions falling within Group 1).

The assessment of the Committee will therefore concern the information provided in the report in response to the targeted questions.

Positive freedom of association of workers

In its targeted question a), the Committee asked for information on measures that have been taken to encourage or strengthen the positive freedom of association of workers, particularly in sectors which traditionally have a low rate of unionisation or in new sectors (e.g., the gig economy).

In reply, the report limits its submission to indicate that there have been no changes at the legislative level in respect of the freedom of association of workers. It indicates that the 2020 amendments to the Law on Trade Unions lowered the minimum membership requirement for establishing a trade union to 25. This amendment, according to the report, received a positive assessment from the Committee of Experts (CEACR) of the International Labour Organisation.

The Committee recalls that it has previously considered that workers employed in emerging arrangements, such as the gig economy or the platform economy, who are incorrectly classified as self-employed, do not have access to the applicable labour and social protection rights and that as a result of misclassification, such persons cannot enjoy the rights and the protection to which they are entitled as workers (for instance, Conclusions 2022, Article 4§1, Albania).

The Committee notes that the report does not provide information on any specific measure taken to strengthen the positive freedom of association in low unionisation rate areas such as the gig economy, platform work, domestic work or self-employed persons. The Committee noted in Conclusions 2022, that the Defender of Rights has identified cases of discrimination on grounds of trade union membership in cases involving platform workers.

The Committee notes from outside sources (Fairwork, Georgia Ratings 2023), that platform workers, like delivery service couriers, face challenges in terms of recognition under the Labor Code. Platform companies categorise them as “independent contractors” rather than workers, effectively excluding them from many labour rights such as regulated working hours and vacation rights. According to these sources, current legislation provides social protection mechanisms for workers under the Labour Code. However, the Civil Code which is applicable to independent contractors such as platform workers does not provide any employment protection in the the context of contracts for such services.

In its third-party comments, the Public Defender of Georgia notes that the report does not provide any response to the Committee's request for information in its Conclusions 2022, as to whether platform workers are protected against discrimination on the basis of trade union membership and whether they enjoy the right to organise. The Public Defender notes that after having examined several cases relating to the violations of the rights of trade unions and alleged discrimination on the grounds of the trade union membership, on September 4, 2023, the Public Defender of Georgia addressed the Advisory Council of the Chief Labour Inspector of the State Labour Inspection Service with a general proposal to develop recommendations

aimed at the proper protection of collective labour rights and prevention of discrimination on the basis of trade union membership. This general proposal has not been yet followed-up.

In light of the above and in the absence of an answer to its targeted question, the Committee concludes that no measures have been taken to encourage or strengthen the positive freedom of association of workers, particularly in sectors which traditionally have a low rate of unionisation or in new sectors.

Legal criteria for determining the recognition of employers' organisations for the purposes of social dialogue and collective bargaining

In reply to the Committee's request for information concerning the legal criteria for determining the recognition of employers' organisations for the purposes of social dialogue and collective bargaining (targeted question b)), the report states that according to the Labour Code, the subjects of labour relations are an employer or an employers' association and a worker or a workers' association. The report states that under the domestic legislation, no specific criteria have been prescribed for determining the recognition of employers' organisations for the purposes of social dialogue and collective bargaining.

Legal criteria for determining the recognition and representativeness of trade unions in social dialogue and collective bargaining

In a targeted question, the Committee requested information on the legal criteria for determining the recognition and representativeness of trade unions in social dialogue and collective bargaining. It particularly requested information on the status and prerogatives of minority trade unions; and the existence of alternative representation structures at company level, such as elected worker representatives (targeted question c)).

In Conclusions 2022, the Committee took note that the Law on Trade Unions provides that trade unions and employers organisations must be registered in the Register of non-commercial entities and that the only requirement is the payment of a fee of 100 GEL (approximately € 31.64) (200 GEL for accelerated registration). Following the Labour Reform 2020, the minimum number of members required for the formation of a trade union was reduced from 50 to 25 members.

The report limits its submission to stating that there have been no changes at the legislative level since the previous monitoring cycle and does not provide any information on the status and prerogatives of minority trade unions, or on the existence of alternative representation structures at company level, such as elected worker representatives.

The Committee notes that under Article 70 of the Labour Code, workers must elect an authorised workers' representative for a fixed term, by a majority of votes, at a meeting that is attended by not less than half of the workers of the undertaking concerned. The number of authorised workers' representatives is directly determined by the number of workers (where there are between 50 and 100 workers in an undertaking, the workers shall elect at least 3 authorised workers' representatives, and where more than 100 workers are employed in an undertaking, the workers shall additionally elect 1 authorised workers' representative per 100 workers. Where there is a written request from at least 10% of the workers employed in an undertaking, the employer shall ensure the possibility of electing authorised workers' representatives).

In the absence of an answer to its targeted question on the status and prerogatives of minority trade unions, the Committee concludes that the situation is not in conformity with Article 5 on the ground that it has not been established that minority trade unions, i.e., those not deemed representative, may still exercise fundamental trade union prerogatives.

The Committee lastly notes in the comments submitted by GYLA, the adoption, in May 2024, of the Law on the Transparency of Foreign Influence and in April 2025, of the Law on Foreign Agents Registration. The Law creates a new category of organisation "pursuing the interests

of a foreign power", including in particular "non-commercial legal entities, which receive more than 20% of their total annual income from a foreign power". Employers' organisations and trade unions are not excluded from the scope of the Law. The Committee also notes that the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) of the ILO (Observation (CEACR) - adopted 2024, published 113rd ILC session (2025)) expressed concern about the stigmatisation that could occur against professional organisations described as pursuing the interests of a foreign power (as pointed out by the Venice Commission in its Urgent Opinion on the Law of Georgia on Transparency of Foreign Influence, issued on 21 May 2024) and about the risks of anti-union discrimination against members of these organisations and the possible obstacles to their participation in collective bargaining mechanisms that may result.

The right of the police and armed forces to organise

In a targeted question, the Committee requested information on whether and to what extent members of the police and armed forces are guaranteed the right to organise (targeted question d)).

The report states that the Constitution guarantees everyone's right to establish and join trade unions in accordance with the provisions established by organic law, thus making no exception for the servicemen of the Georgian Defence Forces.

The Committee recalls that in its Conclusions 2022, the Committee took note from the previous report that the Law on Trade Unions provides that the 'specific features of these sectors must be taken into account when establishing trade unions within these bodies', which in effect means that there may be restrictions on the establishment of trade unions in these sectors. It took note that according to the previous report, no restrictions on the establishment or right to join a trade union apply, and therefore members of the police, persons employed in internal affairs, customs and taxation, in judicial bodies and the office of the Public Prosecutor enjoy the right to organise. The Committee therefore asked whether in practice workers in the abovementioned sectors had established trade unions or had joined existing trade unions.

In its third-party comments, the Public Defender of Georgia explains that although under the Constitution everyone has the right to establish and join trade unions in accordance with the provisions established by organic law, thus making no exception for the servicemen of Georgian Defence Forces, the Law on Trade Unions points at special legislation for regulating the issue of trade unions in the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia. According to the Public Defender, yet, neither the Law on Police nor the Defense Code provides a legal mechanism for members of the police force and soldiers to exercise their right to organise. For the Public Defender, although the provisions of the Defence Code implies that those who serve in Defense Forces are not completely deprived of their right to organise, the exact scope of the right remains vague. As far as the police is concerned, the Defender of Rights states that the authorities have failed to provide the Committee with the information it has specifically requested as to whether police officers have actually formed or joined an existingtrade union.

In the absence of information in this regard in the current report, the Committee concludes that it has not been established that the police and armed forces are guaranteed the right to organise in practice.

Conclusion

The Committee concludes that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 5 on the grounds that:

- no measures have been taken to encourage or strengthen the positive freedom of association of workers, particularly in sectors which traditionally have a low rate of unionisation or in new sectors.

- it has not been established that minority trade unions, i.e., those not deemed representative, may still exercise fundamental trade union prerogatives.
- it has not been established that the police and armed forces are guaranteed the right to organise in practice.

Article 6 - Right to bargain collectively

Paragraph 1 - Joint consultation

The Committee takes note of the information contained in the report submitted by Georgia.

The Committee recalls that for the purposes of the present report, States were asked to reply to the targeted questions for Article 6§1 of the Charter (see the appendix to the letter, whereby the Committee requested a report on the implementation of the Charter in respect of the provisions falling within Group 1).

In its previous conclusions (Conclusions 2022), the Committee considered that the situation in Georgia was not in conformity with Article 6§1 on the grounds that joint consultation did not take place at several levels; did not cover all matters of mutual interest of workers and employers; and did not take place in the public sector including the civil service. The assessment of the Committee will therefore concern the information provided in the report in response to the targeted questions, including the previous conclusion of non-conformity as related to targeted questions.

Measures taken to promote joint consultation

In a targeted question, the Committee asked as to what measures are taken by the Government to promote joint consultation.

The report states that, in addition to the Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC), operating at the national level, a TSPC has been established in the autonomous republic of *Ajara* at the regional level to facilitate joint consultations; and a similar commission is planned to be established in the *Imereti* region.

In addition, on 13 August 2024, as a result of trilateral consultations supported by the ILO at project seminars held in November 2023 and February 2024, the three social partners represented in the TSPC and the ILO signed a Memorandum of Understanding for Georgia's first “Decent Work Country Program” outlining strategic priorities for 2024-2025 to improve social dialogue, promote collective bargaining, and ensure a fair and just transition to economic change through *inter alia* enhanced social dialogue at all levels, wider use of collective bargaining and strengthened capacity of employer and worker organizations. This program supports the “Georgia Development Strategy 2030” in ensuring compliance with the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework especially in the Sustainable Development Goal No. 8.

Issues of mutual interest that have been the subject of joint consultations and agreements adopted

In a targeted question, the Committee asked as to what issues of mutual interest have been the subject of joint consultation during the past five years, what agreements have been adopted as a result of such discussions and how these agreements have been implemented.

According to the report, the TSPC (at national level) has considered the following issues over the last five years:

- the adoption of national strategies and action plans for labor and employment promotion;
- aligning national legislation with the EU Association Agreement,
- addressing issues related to collective bargaining/mediation, and the approval of mediator registries;
- the role of businesses during the Covid-19 pandemic, including their support for vaccination efforts;
- the expediency of acceding to a number of ILO conventions and implementing the ILO's decent work program;
- the accession to non-ratified parts of the European Social Charter and recommendations from the European Council.

As a result, a major reform of the legislation relating to labour rights and occupational health and safety issues was carried out in 2020, incorporating both the requirements of the relevant European Directives and the recommendations of the ILO. The Labour Inspectorate, a body responsible for monitoring compliance with labour legislation, was established. An Advisory Council, established under the Chief Labour Inspector with the participation of the social partners, has been tasked to develop recommendations on the strategy, functioning and activities of the Labour Inspectorate.

The Action Plan of the Labour and Employment Strategy for 2019-2023 has been approved and implemented. A new strategy (2025 - 2029) and action plan (2025 - 2027) on employment promotion and labour policy has been drafted. Preliminary consultations have been held with various parties.

The Ordinance of the Government on the Approval of the Procedure for Consideration and Resolution of Collective Disputes through Conciliation Procedures has been amended, by clarifying the main duties and powers of the candidate for appointment of a mediator; the principles of activity of the appointed mediator; and regulating the obligations to protect the confidentiality of the parties involved.

In addition, Regulatory Impact Assessments on a number of ILO Conventions were prepared and introduced to social partners for review and an agreement was reached on the ratification of the ILO Convention No. 81 on Labour Inspection.

The Committee recalls that Article 6 §1 requires joint consultations to take place at the national, regional/sectoral and enterprise level (Conclusions 2010, Ukraine) and also to cover the public sector (Conclusions III (1973), Denmark, Germany, Norway, Sweden; Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (CGIL) v. Italy, Complaint No. 140/2016, decision on the merits of 22 January 2019, §107). The Committee reiterates that in its previous conclusion on this Article (2022), it considered that the situation in Georgia was not in conformity with Article 6§1 on the grounds that joint consultation did not take place at several levels; did not cover all matters of mutual interest of workers and employers; and did not take place in the public sector including the civil service.

The Committee notes that the report does not contain any information on the frequency of the meetings of the national TSPC, which would allow conclusions to be drawn on the effectiveness of joint consultations at national level. With regard to the regional level, the Committee observes that the report provides no information on the frequency of the meetings of the TSPC in the autonomous Republic of Ajara, or on the issues on its agenda. The Committee takes note of the plans of setting up a TSPC in the Imereti region, and notes the lack of information on concrete steps to implement these plans. The Committee also notes that the report contains no information on joint consultations having taken place in the public sector or on issues of specific interest for the public service, and that the Government has not provided any additional information in reply to the Committee's question in this regard.

The Committee also notes that before the ILO CEACR, the Georgian Trade Union Association had indicated in 2022 that the TSPC "was actually inactive and has not met at regular intervals despite the workers' organisations request" (Direct Request (CEACR) - adopted 2022, published 111st ILC session (2023).

According to other sources consulted by the Committee (the ILO in Georgia, 20 May 2024, Eurofound, Working life in Georgia, 20 December 2023), social dialogue remains weak in Georgia, despite the presence of a robust regulatory and institutional framework. According to these sources, the national TSPC does not meet regularly and is not consulted on all policy measures that affect the social partners. More informal consultations take place more regularly in the Working Group of the TSPC.

In light of the above, the Committee considers that it has not been established that joint consultations have been sufficiently promoted at the national and regional levels and in the public sector, including the public service.

Joint consultation on the digital transition and the green transition

In a targeted question, the Committee asked if there has been any joint consultation on matters related to (i) the digital transition, or (ii) the green transition.

According to the report, participants of the trilateral dialogue noted the need for professional development in order to better respond to the demands of the modern labour market. A special task of the country's Decent Work Program is to overcome digital barriers and adapt the Georgian economy to the needs of the transition to a green economy. Accordingly, this program includes activities in this direction.

Further, under the World Bank Human Capital Programme, the Ministry is working on the development of a special electronic platform "Worknet" which includes a job matching module. This model will also apply to green jobs, in order to better identify and meet the demand on the about market in terms of green economy.

The Committee notes that the Government have not replied to the Committee's request for additional information on joint consultations carried out on matters related to the digital transition or the green transition.

Conclusion

The Committee concludes that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 6§1 of the Charter on the ground that it has not been established that:

- joint consultations have been sufficiently promoted;
- joint consultations have been held on matters related to the digital transition and the green transition.

Article 6 - Right to bargain collectively

Paragraph 2 - Negotiation procedures

The Committee takes note of the information contained in the report submitted by Georgia.

The Committee recalls that, for the purposes of the present report, States were asked to reply to targeted questions for Article 6§2 of the Charter (see the appendix to the letter, whereby the Committee requested a report on the implementation of the Charter in respect of the provisions falling within Group 1).

In its previous conclusion, the Committee found that the situation in Georgia was not in conformity with Article 6§2 of the Charter on the grounds that the promotion of collective bargaining was not sufficient and that an employer was allowed to unilaterally disregard a collective agreement (Conclusions 2022). The assessment of the Committee will therefore concern the information provided in the report in response to the targeted questions asked, including the previous conclusion of non-conformity as part of the targeted questions.

Coordination of collective bargaining

In a targeted question, the Committee asked for information on how collective bargaining was coordinated between and across different bargaining levels. Specifically, the question sought details on factors such as *erga omnes* clauses and other mechanisms for the extension of collective agreements, as well as to the favourability principle and the extent to which local or workplace agreements could derogate from legislation or collective agreements concluded at a higher level.

The report states that the Labour Code does not contain any specific provisions on *erga omnes* clauses and other extension mechanisms. If over 50% of workers in an enterprise are members of the workers' association that signed the agreement, other workers may also request to adhere to it. If less than 50% of the workers belong to another association, they may negotiate a separate collective agreement with the employer. According to the Law on Trade Unions, collective agreements can be negotiated by the authorised representatives of the elected bodies of trade unions, federations of trade unions and primary trade union organisations on behalf of the workers on one side, and by authorised representatives of employers, confederations and authorised representatives of executive authorities and local self-government on the other side. Collective agreements may be concluded at the enterprise level or sectoral level.

Regarding the favourability principle, the report states that any provision contradicting the Labour Code is void; the parties involved in collective bargaining determine the terms of the agreement; collective agreements are binding on the parties involved; and the provisions of collective agreements are an integral part of the individual employment contracts.

The Committee notes that the favourability principle establishes a hierarchy among different legal norms and among collective agreements at different levels. Accordingly, it is generally understood to mean that collective agreements may not weaken the protections afforded under the law and that lower-level collective bargaining may only improve the terms agreed in higher-level collective agreements. The purpose of the favourability principle is to ensure a minimum floor of rights for workers.

The Committee considers the favourability principle a key aspect of a well-functioning collective bargaining system within the meaning of Article 6§2 of the Charter, alongside other features present in the legislation and practice of States Parties, such as the use of *erga omnes* clauses and extension mechanisms. These features are typically found in comprehensive sectoral bargaining systems with high coverage, usually associated with stronger labour protections.

At the same time, the Committee notes that some States Parties provide for the possibility of deviations from higher-level collective agreements through what may be termed opt-out,

hardship, or derogation clauses. The Committee applies strict scrutiny to such clauses, based on the requirements set out in Article G of the Charter. As a matter of principle, the Committee considers that their use should be narrowly defined, voluntarily agreed, and that core rights must be always protected. In any event, derogations must not become a vehicle for systematically weakening labour protections.

Promotion of collective bargaining

In a targeted question, the Committee asked for information on the obstacles hindering collective bargaining at all levels and in all sectors of the economy (e. g. decentralisation of collective bargaining). The Committee also asked for information on the measures taken or planned to address those obstacles, their timeline, and the outcomes expected or achieved in terms of those measures.

The report notes that several measures have been taken to promote collective bargaining, such as adopting enabling legislation and establishing a Labour Inspection Service. The report notes that Georgia is currently implementing a Decent Work Programme with support from the International Labour Organization (ILO), which aims to develop social dialogue and ensure a fair transition in adapting to economic changes.

The Committee notes, based on other sources, that collective bargaining coverage in Georgia is very limited, collective agreements are mostly signed at enterprise level and only one sectoral collective agreement has been concluded (European Commission. *Commission Staff Working Document: Georgia 2023 Report* (SWD(2023) 697 final). Brussels: European Commission, 8 November 2023). The number of collective agreements has decreased significantly over the last decade, which is attributed to weak social dialogue and low awareness among companies of the benefits of collective bargaining (Eurofound. (2023*). Working life in Georgia*). No collective bargaining coordination mechanisms or extension clauses appear to exist in Georgia.

The Committee notes that high and stable collective bargaining coverage is typically associated with collective bargaining systems based on multi-employer, mainly sectoral, agreements (OECD. (2025). *Membership of unions and employers' organisations, and bargaining coverage: Standing, but losing ground*. OECD Policy Brief, among others). Based on the information available, the Committee notes that the bargaining system in Georgia is primarily enterprise-based, characterised by relatively low and declining bargaining coverage, and lacks in meaningful coordination mechanisms. The report provides neither sufficient information regarding the operation of collective bargaining in practice, nor details on the measures taken to promote collective bargaining in line with Article 6§2 of the Charter. Notably, the report does not clarify whether the situation which led to a finding of non-conformity with Article 6§2 of the Charter on the ground that an employer may unilaterally disregard a collective agreement (Conclusions 2022), has been addressed. The Committee therefore reiterates its previous conclusion that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 6§2 of the Charter on the ground that the promotion of collective bargaining is not sufficient.

Self-employed workers

In a targeted question, the Committee asked for information on the measures taken or planned to guarantee the right of self-employed workers, particularly those who are economically dependent or in a similar situation to workers, to bargain collectively.

The report does not provide the requested information.

The Committee recalls that rapid and fundamental changes in the world of work have led to a proliferation of contractual arrangements designed to avoid the formation of employment relationships and to shift risk onto the labour provider. As a result, an increasing number of workers who are de facto dependent on one or more labour engagers fall outside the

traditional definition of a worker (*Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU) v. Ireland*, Complaint No. 123/2016, decision on the merits of 12 September 2018, §37). In establishing the type of collective bargaining protected by the Charter, it is not sufficient to rely solely on distinctions between workers and the self-employed; the decisive criterion is whether an imbalance of power exists between providers and engagers of labour. Where providers of labour have no substantial influence on the content of contractual conditions, they must be given the possibility of improving that imbalance through collective bargaining (*ICTU v. Ireland*, §38).

The Committee concludes that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 6§2 of the Charter on the ground that it has not been established that the right to collective bargaining in respect of self-employed workers, particularly those who are economically dependent or in a similar situation to workers, has been sufficiently promoted.

Conclusion

The Committee concludes that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 6§2 of the Charter on the grounds that:

- the promotion of collective bargaining is not sufficient;
- it has not been established that the right to collective bargaining in respect of self-employed workers, particularly those who are economically dependent or in a similar situation to workers, has been sufficiently promoted.

Article 6 - Right to bargain collectively

Paragraph 4 - Collective action

The Committee takes note of the information contained in the report submitted by Georgia and in the comments by the Georgian Young Lawyers' Association (GYLA) and the Public Defender of Georgia.

The Committee recalls that for the purposes of the present report, States were asked to reply to targeted questions for Article 6§4 of the Charter (see the appendix to the letter, whereby the Committee requested a report on the implementation of the Charter in respect of the provisions falling within Group 1).

In its previous conclusion (Conclusions 2022), the Committee held that the situation in Georgia was not in conformity with Article 6§4 of the Charter on the ground that the police are denied the right to strike. The assessment of the Committee will therefore concern the information provided by the Government in response to the targeted questions, including the previous conclusion of non-conformity as related to the targeted questions.

Prohibition of the right to strike

In its targeted questions, the Committee asked States Parties to indicate the sectors where the right to strike is prohibited as well as to provide details on relevant rules and their application in practice, including relevant case law.

According to the report, strikes are prohibited for police officers, workers of the Prosecutor's Office (with exclusion of persons working under an employment contract), workers of the Special Penitentiary Service (which is an agency subordinated to the Ministry of Justice) and military police officers.

The Committee recalls that restricting strikes in specific sectors essential to the community may be deemed to serve a legitimate purpose where such strikes would pose a threat to the rights and freedoms of others or to the public interest, national security and/or public health (Matica Hrvatskih Sindikata v. Croatia, Complaint No. 116/2015, decision on the merits of 21 March 2018, §114; Conclusions I (1969), Statement of Interpretation on Article 6§4). Even in essential sectors, however, particularly when they are extensively defined, such as "energy", "health" or "law enforcement", a comprehensive ban on strikes is not deemed proportionate, to the extent that such comprehensive ban does not distinguish between the different functions exercised within each sector (Matica Hrvatskih Sindikata v. Croatia, Complaint No. 116/2015, decision on the merits of 21 March 2018, §114).

Simply prohibiting workers of these sectors from striking, without distinguishing between their particular functions, cannot be considered proportionate to the aim of protecting the rights and freedoms of others or for the protection of public interest, national security, public health, or morals, and thus necessary in a democratic society (Conclusions XVII-1 (2006), Czech Republic). The imposition of an absolute prohibition of strikes to categories of public servants, such as police officers, prison officers, firefighters or civil security personnel, is incompatible with Article 6§4, since such an absolute prohibition is by definition disproportionate where an identification of the essential services that should be provided would be a less restrictive alternative (Matica Hrvatskih Sindikata v. Croatia, Complaint No. 116/2015, decision on the merits of 21 March 2018, §114; see also Conclusions XVII-1 (2006), Czech Republic). While restrictions to the right to strike of certain categories of civil servants, whose duties and functions, given their nature or level of responsibility, directly affect the rights and freedoms of others, the public interest, national security or public health, may serve a legitimate purpose in the meaning of Article G (Confederation of Independent Trade Unions in Bulgaria (CITUB), Confederation of Labour "*Podkrepa*" and European Trade Union Confederation (CES) v. Bulgaria, Complaint No. 32/2005, decision on the merits of 16 October 2006, §45), a denial of the right to strike to public servants as a whole cannot be regarded as compatible with the Charter (European Organisation of Military Associations (EUROMIL) v. Ireland, Complaint No. 112/2014, decision on the merits of 12 September 2017, §113, citing Conclusions I (1969),

Statement of Interpretation on Article 6§4). Allowing public officials only to declare symbolic strikes is not sufficient (Confederation of Independent Trade Unions in Bulgaria (CITUB), Confederation of Labour "*Podkrepa*" and European Trade Union Confederation (CES) v. Bulgaria, Complaint No. 32/2005, decision on the merits of 16 October 2006, §§44-46).

Having regard to the nature of the tasks carried out by judges and prosecutors who exercise the authority of the State and the potential disruption that any industrial action may cause to the functioning of the rule of law, the Committee considers that the imposition of an absolute prohibition on the right to strike may be justified, provided such prohibition complies with the requirements of Article G, and provided the members of the judiciary and prosecutors are have other means through which they can effectively negotiate the terms and conditions of employment, including remuneration.

The Committee notes that Georgia has made a clear distinction between appointed officials - prosecutors and the workers working in the Prosecutor's office under an employment contract according to their duties, functions and responsibilities.

As regards workers of the Special Penitentiary Service (prison officers) the Committee considers that the absolute ban goes beyond the limits permitted by Article G of the Charter.

Concerning police officers, an absolute prohibition on the right to strike can be considered to be in conformity with Article 6§4 only if there are compelling reasons justifying why such an absolute prohibition on the right to strike is justified in the specific national context in question, and why the imposition of restrictions as to the mode and form of such strike action is not sufficient to achieve the legitimate aim pursued (European Confederation of Police (EuroCOP) v. Ireland, Complaint No. 83/2012, decision on the admissibility and merits of 2 December 2013, §211). Where restrictions to the right to strike of police officers are so excessive as to render the right to strike ineffective, such restrictions will be considered to have gone beyond those permitted by Article G of the Charter. (European Confederation of Police (EuroCOP) v. Ireland, Complaint No. 83/2012, decision on the admissibility and merits of 2 December 2013, §211), This includes situations where police officers may exercise the right to strike, but only provided certain tasks and activities continue to be performed during the strike period, including the prevention, detection and documentation of criminal offences; arrests; regulation and control of road traffic; protection of people and property; border control and; prevention and handling of incidents at borders.(Conclusions 2022, North Macedonia).

The Committee recalls that in its previous conclusions it found that the situation in Georgia was not in conformity with Article 6§4 on the grounds that the police were prohibited from striking (Conclusions 2022).

The Committee notes that the situation has not changed therefore it concludes that the situation is not in conformity with Article 6§4 of the Charter on the ground that an absolute prohibition on the right to strike for the police goes beyond the limits set by Article G.

The Committee asked whether members of the armed forces have the right to strike or if not, whether the members of armed forces have other means through which they can effectively negotiate the terms and conditions of employment, including remuneration. No information is provided on these points.

The right to strike of members of the armed forces may be subject to restrictions under the conditions of Article G of the Charter, if the restriction is established by law, and is necessary in a democratic society for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others or for the protection of public interest, national security, public health or morals. This includes a requirement that the restriction is proportionate to the aim pursued. The margin of appreciation accorded to States in terms of the right to strike of the armed forces is greater than that afforded to States Parties in respect of the police (European Organisation of Military Associations (EUROMIL) v. Ireland, Complaint No. 112/2014, decision on the merits of 12 September 2017, § 114-116).

Having regard to the special nature of the tasks carried out by members of the armed forces, the fact that they operate under a system of military discipline, and the potential that any industrial action disrupting operations could threaten national security, the Committee considers that the imposition of an absolute prohibition on the right to strike may be justified under Article G, provided the members of the armed forces are have other means through which they can effectively negotiate the terms and conditions of employment, including remuneration (European Organisation of Military Associations (EUROMIL) v. Ireland, Complaint No. 112/2014, decision on the merits of 12 September 2017, §117; Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (CGIL) v. Italy, Complaint No. 140/2016, decision on the merits of 22 January 2019, §152; European Organisation of Military Associations (EUROMIL) v. Portugal, Complaint No. 199/2021, decision on the merits of 11 September 2024, §100).

The Committee concludes that the situation is not in conformity with the Charter on the grounds that members of the armed forces are denied he right to strike and it has not been established that they have other means through which they can effectively negotiate the terms and conditions of employment, including remuneration.

Restrictions on the right to strike and a minimum service requirement

In its targeted questions, the Committee asked States Parties to indicate the sectors where there are restrictions on the right to strike and where there is a requirement of a minimum service to be upheld, as well as to provide details on relevant rules and their application in practice, including relevant case law.

The report states that under Labour Code, workers cannot fully exercise their right to strike if they perform tasks which, if completely interrupted, would pose an obvious and imminent threat to life, personal safety or health. The sectors concerned are emergency medical assistance, electricity, water and gas supply, communications, civil aviation, railroad, maritime and land transport, defence, judiciary, and fire and rescue services. In these sectors, a minimum service is required to be maintained.

The Committee recalls that the introduction of a minimum service requirement in these sectors might be considered to be in conformity with Article 6§4 of the Charter, read in combination with Article G of the Charter (Matica Hrvatskih Sindikata v. Croatia, Complaint No. 116/2015, decision on the merits of 21 March 2018, §114, also Conclusions XVII-1 (2006), Czech Republic).

The Committee recalls that employers should not have the power to unilaterally determine the level of minimum service required to be maintained during a strike. The Committee notes from the report however that the minimum service level shall be set by the parties. In the absence of such an agreement, the court will determine the minimum services to be maintained during strike.

Prohibition of the strike by seeking injunctive or other relief

The Committee has asked the States Parties to indicate whether it is possible to prohibit a strike by obtaining an injunction or other form of relief from the courts or another competent authority (such as an administrative or arbitration) and if the answer is affirmative, to provide information on the scope and number of decisions in the past 12 months.

In its report, the Government states that according to the Labour Code, the court may postpone a strike or suspend a strike that already started only once, for the maximum period of 30 days, if life and health of the individuals, safety of environment or the work of the critical service providers is endangered.

Conclusion

The Committee concludes that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 6§4 read in conjunction with Article G of the Charter even taking into account the possibility of subjecting the right to collective action to restrictions under Article G, on the grounds that:

- the police are denied the right to strike
- prison officers are denied the right to strike;
- members of the armed forces are denied the right to strike and it has not been established that they have other means through which they can effectively negotiate the terms and conditions of employment, including remuneration.

Article 20 - Right to equal opportunities and equal treatment in matters of employment and occupation without discrimination on the grounds of sex

The Committee takes note of the information contained in the report submitted by Georgia and the comments submitted by the Public Defender's Office of Georgia.

The Committee recalls that in the context of the present monitoring cycle, States were asked to reply to the targeted questions for Article 20 of the Charter (see the appendix to the letter, whereby the Committee requested a report on the implementation of the Charter in respect of the provisions falling within Group 1).

The assessment of the Committee will therefore concern the information provided in the report in response to the targeted questions.

The Committee recalls that the right to equal pay without discrimination on the grounds of sex is also guaranteed by Article 4§3 and the issue is therefore also examined under this provision for States Parties which have accepted Article 4§3 only.

Women's participation in the labour market and measures to tackle gender segregation

In its targeted question the Committee asked the report to provide information on the measures taken to promote greater participation of women in the labour market and to reduce gender segregation (horizontal and vertical) as well as information/statistical data showing the impact of such measures and the progress achieved in terms of tackling gender segregation and improving women's participation in a wider range of jobs and occupations.

Under Article 20 States Parties should actively promote equal opportunities for women in employment, by taking targeted measures to close the gender gap in labour market participation and employment. They must take practical steps to promote equal opportunities by removing *de facto* inequalities that affect women's and men's chances. The elimination of potentially discriminatory provisions must therefore be accompanied by action to promote quality employment for women.

States must take measures that address structural barriers and promote substantive equality in the labour market. Moreover, the States should demonstrate a measurable progress in reducing the gender gap in employment.

In its assessment of national situations, the Committee examines the evolution of female employment rates as well as the gender employment gap and considers whether there has been a measurable progress in reducing this gap. The Committee notes, that according to Eurostat in 2025 the female employment rate in the EU 27 stood at 71.3%, up from 70% in 2023, compared to 81% and 80.3% for males, respectively, revealing a gender employment gap of around 10%.

As regards the measures taken to promote greater participation of women in the labour market and to reduce gender segregation the report refers to various initiatives applied by the Government.

In 2023, with UN Women's support, Georgia's Civil Service Bureau (CSB) conducted a Gender Impact Assessment (GIA) of the Law on Public Service, which highlighted two main barriers to women's career advancement: the lack of a gender-responsive work environment and underrepresentation in senior management.

The report states that since 2014, gender mainstreaming has been part of civil service reform in the first internal Gender Equality Strategy and Action Plan in 2022. Legislative amendments are being prepared to introduce paternity leave and ensure equal access to parental leave, fostering a more balanced and supportive work environment.

To support gender equality, the Civil Service Bureau (CSB), and UN Women, developed a guide for gender-responsive employment policies, created HR trainings and amended

professional development rules to mandate gender mainstreaming in public service training. These reforms embed gender considerations into the core of professional development, ensuring a sustained and systemic approach to equality across the civil service.

According to data contained in the report, from January to September 2024, women showed significant engagement with Georgia's state employment services. Registration on WorkNet, rose to 67%, 71% received individual consultations, 63.7% received intermediary services, 52,7 % employment services, and 80% vocational training. However, participation in the intensive programme dropped sharply to 3.5%.

The Committee notes from comments submitted by the Public Defender's Office of Georgia that as regards the women's participation in the labour market even though the percentage of women entrepreneurs increased in 2023, women living in rural areas still do not have information about existing programmes, or access to retraining and employment. Furthermore, transportation and access to childcare facilities hinder women's participation in the labour market.

The Committee notes from the Indicators of the Labour Force (Employment and Unemployment, I Quarter 2024) produced by the National Statistics Office of Georgia that the female employment rate increased from 36.8% in 2022 to 40.1% in the first quarter of 2024. As regards the gender employment gap, it amounted to 16% in 2022 and to 15.5% in 2024. The Committee considers that the female employment rate is very low, the gender employment gap is considerably above the EU average and therefore, there has been no measurable progress. Therefore, there situation is not in conformity with the Charter.

Effective parity in decision-making positions

In its targeted question, the Committee asked the national report to provide information on measures designed to promote an effective parity in the representation of women and men in decision-making positions in both the public and private sectors; the implementation of those measures; progress achieved in terms of ensuring effective parity in the representation of women and men in decision-making positions in both the public and private sectors.

Article 20 of the Revised European Social Charter guarantees the right to equal opportunities in career advancement and representation in decision-making positions across both public and private sectors. To comply with Article 20, States Parties are expected to adopt targeted measures aimed at achieving gender parity in decision-making roles. These measures may include legislative quotas or parity laws mandating balanced representation in public bodies, electoral lists or public administration.

The Committee underlines that the effectiveness of measures taken to promote parity in decision-making positions depends on their actual impact in closing the gender gap in leadership roles. While training programmes for public administration executives and private sector stakeholders are valuable tools for raising awareness, their success depends on whether they lead to tangible changes in recruitment, promotion, and workplace policies. States must demonstrate measurable progress in achieving gender equality by providing statistical data on the proportion of women in decision-making positions.

In its assessment of national situations, the Committee examines the percentage of women in decision-making positions in parliaments and ministries and considers whether a measurable progress has been made in increasing their share. The Committee notes from EIGE that 32.5% of the members of Parliaments were women in the EU27 in 2023 and 32.8% in 2025.

As regards the effective parity in decision–making positions in the public sector, according to the report, in 2023, with the support of UN Women, the Civil Service Bureau (CSB) carried out a Gender Impact Assessment of the Law on Public Service. This study identified two major barriers to women's career advancement within the civil service: the lack of a gender-responsive work environment and the underrepresentation of women in senior management.

In response, the CSB has pursued targeted measures to promote gender equality in leadership.

According to the report, in order to further support career progression and reconcile family and professional life, legislative amendments are being prepared to introduce paternity leave and ensure equal access to parental leave. Moreover, the CSB, in collaboration with UN Women, has developed a practical guide for gender-responsive employment policies, conducted pilot trainings for HR professionals, and amended professional development regulations to embed gender mainstreaming into public service training. These initiatives seek to create a systemic and sustained framework that supports women's advancement into managerial and leadership roles across the public administration.

Overall, both in the public and private sectors, Georgia has developed a range of measures to tackle structural barriers and to promote women's participation in leadership roles. While challenges remain, particularly in ensuring consistent outcomes across all economic sectors, the Committee finds that the reforms undertaken demonstrate a policy commitment to advancing effective parity in decision-making positions.

The Committee notes that the highest representation of women is in the Administration of the Government, where the number reaches 75.5 %. This is followed closely by the staff of the Parliament of Georgia (71.8 %) and the Courts and High Council of Justice (70.8 %), indicating substantial female presence in both legislative and judicial functions. Nevertheless, only 11 out of 87 members of the Parliament are women. The Committee notes from the publication Women and Men of Georgia (The National Statistics Office of Georgia, 2024) that in 2023 there were 19% of the members of the Parliament were women. As regards the composition of Government, there were 17% of female ministers in 2023.

The Committee notes from the comments submitted by the Public Defender of Georgia, that because of the introduction of mandatory gender quotas in 2021, the representation of women in municipality representative bodies Sakrebulo across Georgia increased by 11% compared to 2017, reaching 24.5%. Despite the increase in numbers, women are still underrepresented in representative bodies. According to the comments, due to the burden of work and care at home, and stereotyped and discriminatory attitudes towards women, it is also problematic for women to be in decision-making positions in some municipalities. Which in most cases is manifested in the employment of women in low-ranking positions and their performance of technical work only.

The Committee also notes that participation of women in the decision-making remains limited and no measurable progress has been demonstrated in this area. Therefore, the situation is not in conformity.

Women's representation in management boards of publicly listed companies and public institutions

In its targeted question the Committee asked the national report to provide statistical data on the proportion of women on management boards of the largest publicly listed companies and on management positions in public institutions.

The Committee considers that Article 20 of the Charter imposes positive obligations on States to tackle vertical segregation in the labour market, by means of, inter alia, promoting the advancement of women in management boards in companies. Measures designed to promote equal opportunities for women and men in the labour market must include promoting an effective parity in the representation of women and men in decision-making positions in both the public and private sectors (Conclusions 2016, Article 20, Portugal). States must demonstrate a measurable progress achieved in this area.

In its assessment of national situations, the Committee examines the percentage of women on boards and in executive positions of the largest publicly listed companies and considers whether a measurable progress has been made in increasing their share. The Committee

notes from EIGE the percentage of women on boards of large publicly listed companies amounted to 33.2% in 2023 and 35.1% in 2025 in the EU 27. As regards the percentage of female executives, it stood at 22.2% in 2023 and 23.7% in 2025.

The report states that in 2024 women accounted for 38.8% of all managerial positions in Georgia (2023 data) and that in 2024, women held 82,478 out of 267,027 (31%) managerial roles across companies of different sizes, with the vast majority in small enterprises.

The Committee notes the report does not provide information concerning women in leadership positions, such as their membership in the management boards of publicly listed companies or as executives. Therefore, the Committee considers that it has not been established that a reasonable progress has been made in promoting the representation of women on management boards of publicly listed companies.

Conclusion

The Committee concludes that the situation in Georgia is not in conformity with Article 20 of the Charter on the grounds that:

• the female employment rate is low and no measurable progress has been made in reducing the gender employment gap;

• no measurable progress has been made in promoting the effective parity in in decision-making positions;

• it has not been established that a reasonable progress has been made in promoting the representation of women on boards of publicly listed companies