



DGI – Directorate General of Human Rights and Rule of Law
Department for the Execution of Judgments of the ECHR
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex
France

E-mail:

dgl_execution_just_satisfaction@coe.int

dgl-execution@coe.int

Sent by email

Rule 9 (1) and Rule 9 (2) submission to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe concerning the implementation of A. D and others v. Georgia (App. nos. 57864/17, 79087/17 and 55353/19)

By

The European Human Rights Advocacy Centre (EHRAC), the Women's Initiatives Support Group (WISG), the Georgian Young Lawyers' Association (GYLA), ILGA-Europe and Trans Europe and Central Asia (TGEU)

22 July 2026

I. Executive Summary

1. This submission is made in advance of the Committee's examination of the case of *A.D. and Others v. Georgia* at its 1569th meeting (September 2026) (DH) and responds to the Government's Action Report of 29 June 2026. More than three years after the judgment became final, none of the three applicants has been afforded legal gender recognition. The 2024 Law "On the Protection of Family Values and Minors" continues to prohibit such recognition, bars the domestic courts from giving effect to foreign recognition decisions, and has thereby rendered *restitutio in integrum* legally impossible. The Government's Action Report provides no new information on individual measures, referring the Committee back to the Action Plan of April 2025, and reiterates in substantially identical terms the assertions concerning the absence of European consensus and the primacy of national values which the Committee implicitly rejected in its decision of September 2025. The submission of an Action Report, an instrument by which a State is meant to report on progress made, in circumstances of clear total non-implementation and further regression is itself indicative of no intention to comply.
2. The introduction of the absolute ban on legal gender recognition is not only the product of legislative inertia but clearly reflects a targeted state policy of the highest State organs, as confirmed by the public statements of the Prime Minister, the Speaker of Parliament and the Chairman of the Legal Issues Committee, and by the Government's own written response to the OSCE Moscow Mechanism report. That posture reproduces the pattern of rejection of the Court's findings condemned by the Grand Chamber in *Ilgar Mammadov v. Azerbaijan* and is incompatible with the unconditional obligation under Article 46 § 1. The violation has, moreover, been entrenched and aggravated: protections based on gender identity have been dismantled, gender-affirming healthcare criminalised, and the civil society organisations supplying the Committee with information now operate under threat of criminal liability. The signatory organisations accordingly invite the Committee to schedule the case for its earliest examination and to adopt an interim resolution recognising the refusal to execute the judgment and the Committee's intent to consider stronger measures, urging the immediate amendment of the applicants' records, the repeal of the relevant provisions of the "Family Values Law", and intensified engagement with the Georgian authorities by all other member States.

II. Introduction & Background

3. This submission is made in advance of the Committee of Ministers' examination of the case of *A.D. and Others v. Georgia* at its 1569th meeting (September 2026) (DH). It responds to the Government's Action Report of 29 June 2026¹ and provides an update following the Committee's decision adopted at its 1537th meeting in September 2025.² This submission should be read together with our previous Rule 9 submissions in this case of July 2025, August 2024 and October 2023.³
4. In its September 2025 decision, the Committee deeply regretted that, more than two years after the judgment became final, the applicants had still not been provided with *restitutio in integrum*, deplored the introduction of a ban on legal gender recognition by the 2024 Law "On the Protection of Family Values and Minors" (hereinafter – the "Family Values Law"),

¹ DH-DD(2026)821, Action Report of the Government of Georgia, 29 June 2026.

² CM/Del/Dec(2025)1537/H46-13, 17 September 2025.

³ DH-DD(2025)894, Rule 9.2 communication, 24 July 2025; DH-DD(2024)911, Rule 9.2 communication, 2 August 2024; DH-DD(2023)1299, Rule 9.2 communication, 16 October 2023.

strongly underlined the pressing need for legislative changes to lift the ban without delay, and invited the authorities to ensure the direct application of Convention standards pending the adoption of a clear legal framework.⁴

5. The Government's Action Report of 29 June 2026 responds to none of these points. As regards individual measures, it merely refers back to the Action Plan of 16 April 2025 and provides no new information whatsoever.⁵ As regards general measures, it reiterates, in identical terms, the assertions which the Committee has already had before it and has implicitly rejected, namely that there is no uniform European practice and that any decision should be taken in accordance with national interests and traditional values.⁶ The submission of an Action Report, a document which by its nature signals that the Government considers the execution process complete, in circumstances of total non-implementation, is itself indicative of the authorities' position that they do not intend to comply with the judgment.
6. In June 2026, in its resolution on the situation in Georgia, the Parliamentary Assembly has likewise called on the Georgian authorities to fully implement the general measures required in *A.D. and Others v. Georgia*, together with those required in other leading judgments pending execution.⁷

III. Individual Measures - Continued Non-Compliance

7. The situation of all three applicants remains entirely unchanged since our previous submission of July 2025. Georgia continues failing to ensure legal gender recognition with respect to any of the three applicants, and the Government's Action Report contains no individual measures update at all: paragraph 40 of the Report simply refers the Committee back to the Action Plan submitted on 16 April 2025.⁸ It becomes evident therefore that the Government did not take any further steps to remedy the applicants' respective situations for well over a year, notwithstanding the Committee's express regret in September 2025 at the absence of *restitutio in integrum*.⁹
8. The "Family Values Law" applies to all three applicants: it prohibits legal gender recognition in Georgia and, by Article 7(4), bars the domestic courts from giving effect to foreign recognition decisions, making it impossible for the applicants to secure their legal gender recognition in Georgia. A.D. accordingly remains in Georgia without recognition and in continuing fear and humiliation, no step of any kind having been taken in his respect by the Public Service Development Agency or the Ministry of Justice; A.K. remains in legal limbo, his Belgian recognition without effect and his two sets of identity documents contradictory; and Mr Nikolo Ghviniashvili remains in exile in Belgium, where he sought asylum. None of them can be required, as the Government suggests, to institute afresh proceedings which the Court has already found ineffective and which are now barred by statute.

⁴ CM/Del/Dec(2025)1537/H46-13, 17 September 2025, paras. 2-5.

⁵ DH-DD(2026)821, para. 40.

⁶ Ibid., para. 41; cf. DH-DD(2025)455, paras. 6-7.

⁷ Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Resolution 2664 (2026), The functioning of democratic institutions in Georgia, adopted 24 June 2026, para. 11. Available at: <https://pace.coe.int/en/files/36232/html>

⁸ DH-DD(2026)821, para. 40, referring to DH-DD(2025)455E.

⁹ CM/Del/Dec(2025)1537/H46-13, para. 2.

9. In its decision of September 2025, the Committee has considered that the requisite further individual measures are closely linked to the general measures.¹⁰ The signatory organisations respectfully emphasise that this linkage now operates entirely to the applicants' detriment: since the general measures are not merely unimplemented but have been rendered legally impossible by the “Family Values Law”, the applicants are left with no avenue whatsoever towards *restitutio in integrum*. The continued and distressing uncertainty which the Committee has twice called to be brought to an end has thus been converted, by legislative act, into a permanent condition.¹¹ The individual measures in this case remain clear, uncontested and capable of immediate execution: the amendment of the name and gender marker of all three applicants in accordance with their original requests. With the adoption of the “Family Values Law”, the Government has made it clear that it refuses to comply with the required individual measures in this case.

IV. General Measures - Continued and Aggravated Non-Compliance

4.1. The Government's continued failure to respond to Committee's calls amid explicit legislative ban on legal gender recognition

10. In its decision adopted at its 1537th meeting in September 2025, the Committee identified with precision the general measures required for the execution of this judgment. It deplored the introduction of the ban on legal gender recognition by the the “Family Values Law”, strongly underlined the pressing need for legislative changes to lift the ban without delay, and invited the authorities to ensure the direct application of Convention standards by all relevant administrative and judicial authorities pending the adoption of a clear and foreseeable legal framework governing legal gender recognition.¹²
11. The Government's Action Report of 29 June 2026 responds to none of these elements. Legal gender recognition remains banned in Georgia. The Report reiterates, in substantially identical terms, the two assertions which were already before the Committee at its September 2025 examination and which the Committee's decision implicitly rejected, namely that there is no uniform European approach to legal gender recognition and that the matter should be resolved in accordance with national interests and traditional values.¹³
12. Article 7 of the “Family Values Law” continues to prohibit the indication in identity documents and civil acts of a sex other than that assigned at birth, as well as access to gender-affirming medical care.¹⁴ The OSCE Moscow Mechanism fact-finding mission, whose report was published on 10 March 2026, confirmed that the ban remains operative and recommended that the Law be repealed, referring specifically to the prohibition of gender-affirming care and of the change of sex markers in identity documents and civil acts.¹⁵ The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, in its report of 27 April 2026, likewise recommended that the Government review the gender-related legislative amendments adopted in 2025, having found that legislative amendments affecting more than fifteen laws had replaced gender-related terminology and that

¹⁰ CM/Del/Dec(2025)1537/H46-13, para. 2.

¹¹ CM/Del/Dec(2024)1507/H46-8, para. 2; CM/Del/Dec(2025)1537/H46-13, para. 2.

¹² CM/Del/Dec(2025)1537/H46-13, para. 2.

¹³ DH-DD(2026)821, para. 41; cf. DH-DD(2025)455, paras. 6-7.

¹⁴ Law of Georgia on the Protection of Family Values and Minors, adopted 17 September 2024, Articles 7(1) and 7(2).

¹⁵ Grzebyk P., Report on Developments in Georgia in Respect of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms since Spring 2024, ODIHR.GAL/9/26, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw, 10 March 2026, para. 94 and Recommendation 3 (About legislative reforms).

references to gender identity had been removed from the list of prohibited grounds of discrimination, from the aggravating circumstances for hate crimes and from provisions on incitement to hatred and violence.¹⁶ The legislative environment surrounding legal gender recognition has therefore not merely stagnated since the Committee's decision; it has regressed further. Additionally, during Georgia's Universal Periodic Review of 26 January 2026, numerous States called for the repeal or amendment of the "Family Values Law", citing its adverse impact on the rights of LGBTI persons, and further delegations urged Georgia to address anti-LGBTI discrimination, stigmatisation and hate crimes by strengthening anti-discrimination protections. Georgia noted, that is to say rejected, each of those recommendations.¹⁷

13. The maintenance of the ban is not the product of legislative inertia. It reflects a settled and repeatedly articulated position of the highest State organs. In February 2026, in meetings with the Rapporteur appointed under the OSCE Moscow Mechanism, both the Prime Minister and the Speaker of Parliament defended the Law and dismissed the relevance of the Court's case-law on the ground that the judgments concerned had not been delivered against Georgia.¹⁸ The submitting organisations observe that this position is untenable on its face in the context of the present case: *A.D. and Others v. Georgia* is a final and binding judgment delivered against Georgia, and the obligation to execute it under Article 46 § 1 does not depend on any further pronouncement by the Court. The Rapporteur, for her part, characterised the authorities' claim that the Law is compatible with Georgia's international obligations as amounting to a bad faith interpretation of the Convention.¹⁹
14. The submitting organisations further recall that arguments of this nature are directed not at the modalities of execution but against the judgment itself. The margin of appreciation and the absence of European consensus were the core of the Government's defence on the merits, and the Court found a violation notwithstanding.²⁰ Under Article 46 § 1 of the Convention, the obligation to abide by a final judgment is unconditional; a respondent State may not reopen before the Committee questions which the Court has definitively resolved, nor make execution contingent on its continued disagreement with the judgment. In *Ilgar Mammadov v. Azerbaijan*, the first proceedings brought under Article 46 § 4 of the Convention, the Grand Chamber held that the execution of the Court's judgments must take place in good faith and in a manner compatible with the conclusions and spirit of the judgment concerned, and found a failure to fulfil the obligation under Article 46 § 1 precisely because the national authorities, up to the highest judicial level, had rejected the Court's findings rather than eliminated the consequences of the violation.²¹
15. On 19 June 2026, ten days before the submission of the Action Report, the Chairman of the Legal Issues Committee of Parliament, the parliamentary organ which would be responsible for any legislative amendment lifting the ban, publicly rejected the call of the Council of

¹⁶ Cooperation with Georgia, Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, A/HRC/62/58, 27 April 2026, paras. 17 and 56(c).

¹⁷ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Georgia, A/HRC/62/14, Human Rights Council, Sixty-second Session, 13 April 2026, paras. 148.17, 148.24, 148.35, 148.43-148.51, 148.66, 148.165, 148.252, 148.270, 148.295-148.301; Addendum, A/HRC/62/14/Add.1, 19 June 2026, table of recommendations and general comments, par. 4.

¹⁸ Grzebyk P., ODIHR.GAL/9/26, para. 95.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 221.

²⁰ *A.D. and Others v. Georgia* [ECtHR], App. nos. 57864/17, 79087/17 and 55353/19, 1 December 2022, paras. 55, 71 and 74-76.

²¹ *Ilgar Mammadov v. Azerbaijan* (infringement proceedings) [ECtHR, GC], App. no. 15172/13, 29 May 2019, paras. 214-217; see also: Information Note on the Court's Case-Law, No. 229, Council of Europe/European Court of Human Rights, May 2019, 3-4.

Europe Commissioner for Human Rights for the repeal of the Law, stating that no legal basis for such criticism exists and that every amendment adopted fully complies with the Georgian Constitution and the Convention.²² In the same statement, he defended the Law by invoking the prohibition of what he termed ‘LGBT propaganda’ and rhetorically associated the demands for repeal with the removal of the provision banning incest. The submitting organisations draw the Committee’s particular attention to the fact that the official directly responsible for initiating the legislative changes which the Committee found to be pressingly needed has publicly dismissed such an idea, in terms which themselves reproduce the stigmatising equation of transgender identity with incest that the Venice Commission and the Moscow Mechanism Rapporteur have condemned as degrading.²³

16. The Government's own written response, annexed to the Moscow Mechanism report, places the matter beyond doubt. In it, the Government states that the Law and the ensuing legislative amendments are based on the principle of legal recognition of only two sexes, and describes legal gender recognition procedures based on self-determination as an ideology against common sense.²⁴ This is an official acknowledgement, in a formal State document, that the maintenance of the ban is deliberate, principled and intended to be permanent, as they have also emphasized in their action reports to the Committee.
17. All the above makes it very clear that the Georgian authorities do not intend to lift the ban or otherwise comply with the Court’s judgment. The submitting organisations invite the Committee to draw clear, strong conclusions as to Georgia’s failure to comply with its Article 46 obligations, taken together with the proposals set out in Section V below.

4.2. Refusal of meaningful co-operation and premature submission of an Action Report as an indication of no intention to execute Court’s judgments

18. The execution process established by Article 46 of the Convention rests on the sincere co-operation of the respondent State with the Committee. Within that process, the Committee's working methods draw a clear functional distinction between the two forms of State reporting: an action plan sets out the measures the State intends to take, whereas an action report is submitted when the State considers that all the measures necessary for execution have been adopted and that the case is ripe for closure.²⁵ The choice of instrument is not a formality; it is a formal representation by the State of where it considers the execution process to stand.
19. The Commissioner for Human Rights, having warned the Chairman of Parliament against the adoption of the Law, concluded after his January 2025 visit that, by prohibiting access to legal gender recognition altogether, the authorities had acted "in clear opposition to the Court's ruling", and recommended the immediate rescission of the Law and the full and swift implementation of the Court's judgments concerning LGBTI persons.²⁶ That

²² MP Gorduladze: O’Flaherty demanded repeal of family values law; his criticism has no legal backing, First Channel, 19 June 2026, <<https://1tv.ge/lang/en/news/mp-gorduladze-oflaherty-demanded-repeal-of-family-values-law-his-criticism-has-no-legal-backing/>> [05.07.2026].

²³ Venice Commission, Opinion on the Draft Constitutional Law on Protecting Family Values and Minors, CDL-AD(2024)021, Strasbourg, 25 June 2024, paras. 68-70; Grzebyk P., ODIHR.GAL/9/26, para. 214.

²⁴ Grzebyk P., ODIHR.GAL/9/26, Annex, Response of the Government of Georgia, Section V.

²⁵ Committee of Ministers, Action Plans - Action Reports: Definitions and Objectives, CM/Inf/DH(2009)29rev, Strasbourg, 3 June 2009.

²⁶ O’Flaherty M., Memorandum on the Human Rights Situation in Georgia, CommHR(2025)9, Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Strasbourg, 10 March 2025, paras. 54, 56 and 64.

recommendation was publicly rejected in June 2026 by the Chairman of the Legal Issues Committee, in the terms set out in paragraph 15 above. The same posture is recorded across the Identoba and Others group of cases, in which the persistent absence of progress led the Committee to adopt an Interim Resolution in March 2025 calling for the repeal of the Law.²⁷ The line thus runs, without deviation, from professed readiness to co-operate in 2023 to declared refusal in 2026.

4.3. Broader deterioration of the environment for trans people in Georgia and the resulting violation of Article 46 of the Convention

20. According to WISG's qualitative study based on 30 interviews with queer people who left Georgia, their departure is rarely explained by a single incident or by the pursuit of better economic opportunities alone. Respondents described a cumulative environment of systemic social, institutional and interpersonal homophobia, including violence and verbal abuse, the persistent fear of attack, pressure to conceal their identities and the resulting chronic stress, anxiety and depression. These conditions are reinforced by the political instrumentalisation of gender and sexuality, which produces alienation and powerlessness and prevents many queer people from imagining a safe and dignified future in Georgia. Economic insecurity, discrimination in employment and limited opportunities for personal and professional development further deepen this sense of hopelessness. The study therefore presents queer emigration as a decision located between choice and coercion: for many respondents, leaving Georgia was an immediate necessity and an act of physical and psychological self-preservation rather than an ordinary search for better opportunities abroad.²⁸
21. First, the protective legal framework surrounding trans persons has been stripped away. Further to the "Family Values Law", references to gender identity have been removed from the list of prohibited grounds of discrimination, from the list of 'aggravating circumstances' for hate crimes under Article 53¹ of the Criminal Code, and from the provisions on incitement to hatred and violence; the Law on Assemblies and Demonstrations now contains restrictions based expressly on sexual orientation and gender identity; and the Parliamentary Gender Equality Council has been abolished.²⁹ The removal of the bias-motive 'aggravating circumstance' is of particular significance for the Committee's supervision, since the effective investigation of transphobic violence, including proper examination of the underlying bias motive, is precisely the general measure required in the Identoba and Others group, whose execution the Committee has been supervising in parallel.³⁰
22. Secondly, the practical situation of trans persons has deteriorated in ways that are documented at first hand. The Law criminalises the provision of gender-affirming

²⁷ CM/ResDH(2025)31, Interim Resolution, Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, Identoba and Others v. Georgia group of cases, adopted 6 March 2025; O'Flaherty M., CommHR(2025)9, para. 63.

²⁸ Mchedlishvili N., Otherness and the Cost of Promised Freedom: A Study on Queer Emigration from Georgia, Tbilisi, Women's Initiatives Supporting Group (WISG), 2025, pp. 15–16, 25–27, 48, 73–74. Available at: <https://wisg.org/en/publication/327>

²⁹ Cooperation with Georgia, Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, A/HRC/62/58, 27 April 2026, para. 17; Grzebyk P., Report on Developments in Georgia in Respect of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms since Spring 2024, ODIHR.GAL/9/26, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw, 10 March 2026, para. 98.

³⁰ CM/ResDH(2025)31, Interim Resolution, Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, Identoba and Others v. Georgia group of cases, adopted 6 March 2025.

healthcare, exposing health professionals to up to four years' imprisonment.³¹ Testimony received by the OSCE Moscow Mechanism Rapporteur records that, as a consequence, trans persons undergo such care in improvised, home settings, without medical supervision, at risk to their physical safety.³² The Commissioner for Human Rights found, already before the gender-related amendments of 2025 took effect, that the impact of the Law was felt on the ground in the form of reduced access to health and other basic services, increased fear of hate crimes and exacerbated stigma,³³ and the Rapporteur concluded a year later that many LGBTI persons feel compelled, for the sake of their physical safety, to conceal their sexual orientation or gender identity.³⁴ The Committee has underlined the need to bring to an end the prolonged state of uncertainty in which the applicants have been left;³⁵ The intervening period has instead extended that uncertainty to the entire trans community and converted it into physical danger.

23. Thirdly, the deterioration of the situation for LGBTI communities and those supporting them has now also impacted the execution process of ECtHR judgments as well. The organisations, including those supporting LGBTI members, which supply the Committee with the information through Rule 9 submissions operate under the Foreign Agents Registration Act and the amended Law on Grants, with the threat of criminal liability. Georgian human rights organisations have traditionally relied predominantly on funding from international donor organisations to carry out their activities, including litigation, legal aid and Rule 9 submissions. Article 319¹ of the Criminal Code now criminalises the receipt or use of foreign grants without governmental consent, including for broadly defined activities intended to influence public authorities or policy, and provides for penalties of up to six years' imprisonment.³⁶ Consequently, the principal source of funding on which these organisations depend may expose them and their representatives to criminal liability, including in connection with their work on Rule 9 submissions.
24. OHCHR has recorded that some civil society organisations have reduced their activities for fear of violating the new legislation, alongside reports of intimidation and hostile rhetoric from prominent members of the ruling party.³⁷ In June 2025, courts ordered at least eight leading human rights organisations to disclose an inordinate volume of documents, including sensitive and confidential information about survivors of human rights violations, including trans people, who had received pro bono legal aid, and in August 2025 the accounts of seven prominent organisations were frozen in connection with a criminal investigation. The compatibility of these measures with the Convention is now under review by the Court.³⁸ Trans persons seeking legal assistance, and the lawyers providing it, must now weigh the risk that the fact of that assistance will itself be surrendered to the State. These developments are not isolated obstacles to judgment execution but part of a broader State policy weakening civil society and shielding governmental action from scrutiny. In doing so, they deprive the supervision process of a vital source of information.

³¹ O'Flaherty M., Memorandum on the Human Rights Situation in Georgia, CommHR(2025)9, Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Strasbourg, 10 March 2025, para. 52.

³² Grzebyk P., ODIHR.GAL/9/26, para. 270.

³³ O'Flaherty M., CommHR(2025)9, paras. 59 and 61.

³⁴ Grzebyk P., ODIHR.GAL/9/26, para. 276.

³⁵ CM/Del/Dec(2024)1507/H46-8, para. 2.

³⁶ Article 319¹ of the Criminal Code of Georgia (introduced by the Law of Georgia of 4 March 2026 on Amendments to the Criminal Code).

³⁷ Cooperation with Georgia, Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, A/HRC/62/58, 27 April 2026, paras. 10-11; World Report 2026: Georgia, Human Rights Watch, <<https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2026/country-chapters/georgia>> [05.07.2026].

³⁸ World Report 2026: Georgia, Human Rights Watch.

25. Taken together, these developments show that the respondent State has not merely failed to remedy the violation found by the Court; it has deliberately entrenched and intensified it. Instead of establishing an accessible legal gender recognition procedure, the authorities have taken targeted systemic steps to deprive trans people from their basic rights and needs: it banned legal gender recognition, criminalised the relevant medical care, dismantled existing protections and exerted pressure on those assisting affected persons. This course of conduct is incompatible with the obligation under Article 46 § 1 to abide by the Court's final judgment. The Moscow Mechanism Rapporteur's conclusion that the State apparatus appears indifferent at best and supportive at worst towards the climate of stigmatisation³⁹ confirms that this aggravation is not incidental but reflects the same settled position documented in paragraphs 13 to 17 above.

26. The submitting organisations anticipate the objection that the developments described in this section exceed the scope of supervision in the present case. They do not. The Committee's decisions in this case have consistently situated the legislative ban within its broader context, where the ban on legal gender recognition is a part of it, and the requirement that general measures be capable of preventing the repetition of the violation is inherent in the execution obligation whose implementation those decisions supervise.⁴⁰

V. Recommendations to the Committee of Ministers

We reiterate our submissions and recommendations made in previous submissions since 2023. In addition, the Committee is requested to adopt an interim resolution that would address the following issues:

Concerning Individual Measures:

I. Urge the Government to ensure that the LEPL Public Service Development Agency amends, without further ado, name and gender marker of all three applicants according to their original request.

Concerning General Measures:

I. Schedule the case for the next examination at the Committee's earliest convenience;

II. Adopt an interim resolution:

- a. Recognising that the adoption of the anti LGBTI legislation, which bans legal gender recognition, amounts to a refusal to comply with the Court's judgment in the respective case, and that stronger measures shall be considered;
- b. Urging the Government of Georgia to take immediate steps to reverse the "Family Values Law", in particular Articles 2(c), 6, 7(2), 7(4), 8, and 9, and ensure other necessary legislative amendments as identified by the Court in *A.D. and Others*; to publicly apologise to the LGBTI community and to cease all further anti-LGBTI actions.

³⁹ Grzebyk P., ODIHR.GAL/9/26, para. 278.

⁴⁰ CM/Del/Dec(2025)1537/H46-13, para. 2; CM/Del/Dec(2024)1507/H46-8, para. 2.

III. Urge the adoption of an action plan realistically detailing the swift adoption of a legal gender recognition law aligned with Council of Europe standards, ensuring meaningful civil society involvement, the removal of any medical, procedural or discriminatory barriers; training relevant administrative staff, and public awareness campaigns.

IV. Invite the Committee of Ministers to examine the execution of this judgment and the adoption of the Law on Family Values within the broader context of the continuing repression and erosion of Convention rights and values in Georgia, and to call upon the other 45 Council of Europe member States to substantially increase their bilateral political and diplomatic engagement with the Georgian authorities in order to secure concrete and verifiable progress in the execution of this judgment.

On behalf of the signatory organisations,

Ketevan Bakhtadze



Strategic Litigation Lawyer

Women's Initiatives Supporting Group (WISG)