

Georgien: Zugang zu medizinischer Versorgung

Schnellrecherche der SFH-Länderanalyse

Bern, 28. August 2018

Diese Recherche basiert auf Auskünften von Expertinnen und Experten und auf eigenen Recherchen. Entsprechend den COI-Standards verwendet die SFH öffentlich zugängliche Quellen. Lassen sich im zeitlich begrenzten Rahmen der Recherche keine Informationen finden, werden Expertinnen und Experten beigezogen. Die SFH dokumentiert ihre Quellen transparent und nachvollziehbar. Aus Gründen des Quellenschutzes können Kontaktpersonen anonymisiert werden.

Impressum

Herausgeberin
Schweizerische Flüchtlingshilfe SFH
Postfach, 3001 Bern
Tel. 031 370 75 75
Fax 031 370 75 00
E-Mail: info@fluechtlingshilfe.ch
Internet: www.fluechtlingshilfe.ch
Spendenkonto: PC 30-1085-7

Sprachversionen
Französisch/Deutsch

COPYRIGHT

© 2018 Schweizerische Flüchtlingshilfe SFH, Bern
Kopieren und Abdruck unter Quellenangabe erlaubt.

1 Einleitung

Einer Anfrage an die SFH-Länderanalyse sind die folgenden Fragen entnommen:

- 1) Ist der Zugang zur allgemeinen Krankenversicherung für alle garantiert und besteht das Risiko, dass gewisse Personengruppen davon ausgeschlossen werden, insbesondere Personen mit bereits bestehenden Gesundheitsproblemen oder mit Gesundheitsrisiken?
- 2) Welche Behandlungen und Medikamente werden von der allgemeinen Krankenversicherung bezahlt? Sind zusätzliche Ausgaben zur Behandlung (Röntgenbilder, Analysen, Scans etc.) von Krankheiten wie Hepatitis C abgedeckt?
- 3) Sind medizinische Behandlungen, und insbesondere die Behandlung von Hepatitis C, in allen Regionen des Landes erhältlich oder gibt es bestimmte vernachlässigte Regionen?
- 4) Ist die medizinische Versorgung für die gesamte georgische Bevölkerung zugänglich oder gibt es ein Diskriminierungsrisiko (aufgrund von Ethnien, Rassen, Religionen etc)?
- 5) Hat eine Person mit psychischen Erkrankungen oder Verhaltensproblemen Zugang zu regelmässiger psychiatrischer Behandlung und insbesondere zu psychotherapeutischer Begleitung?

Die Informationen beruhen auf einer zeitlich begrenzten Recherche (Schnellrecherche) in öffentlich zugänglichen Dokumenten, die der SFH derzeit zur Verfügung stehen, sowie auf den Informationen von sachkundigen Kontaktpersonen.

2 Zugang zur allgemeinen Krankenversicherung und Deckung von Behandlungen und Medikamenten

Die allgemeine Krankenversicherung wurde 2013 eingeführt und steht der gesamten Bevölkerung ohne Prämienzahlungen offen. Der Grossteil der Bevölkerung (90 Prozent) sind ihr angeschlossen. Die georgische Regierung verabschiedete das allgemeine Krankenversicherungssystem «*Universal Health Care Program*» (UHCP), welches im Februar 2013 in Kraft getreten ist. Laut Weltbank (WB) ist die gesamte Bevölkerung ohne finanzielle Beteiligung durch UHCP versichert. Um davon Gebrauch machen zu können, müssen sich die Patient_innen einfach nur beim Leistungserbringer ihrer Wahl zur Erstversorgung registrieren (WB, Juni 2017). Gemäss einer E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH, die in einer georgischen NGO arbeitet, die auf Fragen der öffentlichen Gesundheit spezialisiert ist, steht das UHCP allen offen, unabhängig von ihrem Gesundheitszustand. Personen mit Vorerkrankungen oder Personen mit einem Gesundheitsrisiko sind ebenfalls versichert. Laut *Weltge-*

sundheitsorganisation (WHO) sind mehr als 90 Prozent der Bevölkerung durch UHCP versichert, die restlichen 10 Prozent haben eine private Krankenversicherung (WHO, 2017). Gemäss der im Bericht der Weltbank genannten Zahlen von 2015 hatten nur vierzehn Prozent der Bevölkerung eine private Krankenversicherung, von denen fast die Hälfte Staatsangestellte waren (WB, Juni 2017).

Steigende Ausgaben im öffentlichen Gesundheitswesen führten 2017 zu einer Reform des UHCP. Leistungsempfänger_innen wurden nach Einkommen eingeteilt, wodurch Personen mit hohen Einkommen ausgeschlossen wurden. Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* führte der massive Anstieg der Ausgaben im öffentlichen Gesundheitswesen von 69 Millionen GEL in 2013 (ungefähr 26.3 Millionen CHF beim Wechselkurs vom 22. August 2018) auf 575 Millionen GEL (219 Millionen CHF) in 2015 zu einer Reform des allgemeinen Krankenversicherungssystem in 2017, wobei insbesondere Leistungsempfänger_innen nach Einkommen eingeteilt wurden (Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, 16. Januar 2018). Laut Informationswebsite *FactCheck* wurde am 1. Mai 2017 der allgemeine Ansatz durch einen zielgerichteteren Ansatz ersetzt, mit dem die Ausgaben begrenzt werden sollen: es werden je nach Einkommen verschiedene «packages» angeboten:

- Laut *FactCheck* dürfen Personen, die mehr als 40 000 GEL (15'270 CHF) im Jahr verdienen, nicht mehr am UHCP teilnehmen (FactCheck, 6. Mai 2017). Gemäss *OC Media* befinden sich in dieser Kategorie der hohen Löhne ungefähr 32'000 Personen, die trotz ihrem Ausschluss aus dem UHCP noch an einigen Programmen teilnehmen können, wie der Behandlung von Hepatitis C oder der Gesundheitsversorgung für Schwangere (OC Media, 17. März 2017).
- Gemäss *FactCheck* gibt es eine zweite Kategorie für Personen, die monatlich mehr als 1000 GEL (380 CHF) verdienen, deren Jahreseinkommen aber 40'000 GEL nicht übersteigt und die keine private Krankenversicherung haben. Die Personen in dieser Kategorie können die «eingeschränkte Version» der UHCP nutzen. Sie erhalten weiterhin Rückzahlungen für onkologische Behandlungen und Behandlungen in der Schwangerschaft, inklusive Kaiserschnitt (FactCheck, 6. Mai 2017). Laut *OC Media* betrifft diese Kategorie bis zu 300'000 Personen. Sie erhalten vom UHCP 90 Prozent der Kosten einer Notfallbehandlung im Spital zurück. Für geplante Spitalaufenthalte, die mehr als 1000 GEL (382 CHF) kosten, werden 70 Prozent zurückerstattet. Die Personen in dieser Kategorie müssen jedoch zwischen UHCP und einer privaten Versicherung wählen (OC Media, 17. März 2017). Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH vom 24. Juli 2018 können Personen dieser Kategorie, die sich für eine private Krankenversicherung entschieden haben, immer noch dringende Behandlungen oder Krebsbehandlungen erhalten, doch haben sie hierfür einen unterschiedlich hohen Selbstbehalt («co-payment»).
- Laut *FactCheck* gibt es eine dritte Kategorie für Personen, deren Monatseinkommen 1000 GEL nicht übersteigt, für Personen mit unregelmässigem Einkommen und Selbständige. Menschen in dieser Kategorie haben weiterhin Zugang zu UHCP, wenn auch mit einigen Einschränkungen. Wenn diese Personen eine private Krankenversicherung abschliessen, erhalten sie nur noch Rückzahlungen für Notfallversorgungen, Krebsbehandlungen und Behandlungen im Zusammenhang mit Schwangerschaft, inklusive Kaiserschnitt (FactCheck, 6. Mai 2017). Diese Kategorie schliesst laut OC Media auch Personen am Rand von sozialer Verletzlichkeit ein sowie Kinder

zwischen sechs und 18 Jahren. Die Personen dieser Kategorie erhalten 100 Prozent der Kosten für Notfallbehandlungen im Spital zurückerstattet und 50 Prozent für geplante Spitalaufenthalte, wenn die Kosten dafür 500 GEL übersteigen (191 CHF). Sie können auch Zahlungen von UHCP erhalten und gleichzeitig privat versichert sein (OC Media, 17. März 2017).

- Laut *FactCheck* umfasst die letzte Kategorie Personen, die als sozial verletzlich gelten und diejenigen, die in der Datenbank als sozial verletzlich registriert sind und zwischen 70'000 und 100'000 Punkte erreichen, Kinder zwischen sechs und 18 Jahren, Lehrer_innen und Menschen mit Behinderungen. Diese Personen haben vollen Zugang zum UHCP und können sich gleichzeitig auch privat versichern (FactCheck, 6. Mai 2017). Diese Kategorie, welche die Hauptzielgruppe für die Regierung darstellt und fast 1,7 Millionen Personen umfasst, beinhaltet laut *OC Media* auch Pensionierte und Kinder unter fünf Jahren. Die Menschen in dieser Kategorie erhalten vollständigen Zugang zu UHCP und können sich gleichzeitig auch privat versichern (OC Media, 17. März 2017).

UHCP deckt alle Grund- und Sekundärversorgungen ab sowie eine begrenzte Menge an Medikamenten. Die «vertikalen» Programme, die unabhängig vom UHCP laufen, versichern Behandlungen für psychische Krankheiten oder spezifische Krankheiten (Hepatitis C, Diabetes etc.). Laut Weltbank deckt das UHCP alle primären und sekundären Gesundheitsversorgungen ab sowie eine begrenzte Menge an «essentiellen» Medikamenten (WB, Juni 2017). Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH vom 8. August 2018, die für die Stiftung *Curatio international Foundation (CIF)* arbeitet, eine georgische NGO, die auf das Gesundheitswesen spezialisiert ist, bezahlt UHCP nur die Notfallversorgung sowie Besuche beim Hausarzt vollständig. Alle weiteren primären oder sekundären Gesundheitsdienstleistungen müssen zum Teil von den Patient_innen selbst getragen werden («co-payment»). Laut WHO deckt UHCP geplante ambulante Gesundheitsdienstleistungen, die Notfallversorgung für stationäre oder ambulante Patient_innen, bestimmte chirurgische Eingriffe, Geburtshilfe und die Finanzierung von «essentiellen» Medikamenten ab (WHO, 2017). Laut *Lela Sulaberizde*, Researcherin von CIF, deckt das UHCP hauptsächlich die Erstversorgung von Patient_innen mit physischen Krankheiten ab. Psychiatrische Gesundheitsdienstleistungen für stationäre oder ambulante Patient_innen werden von einem separaten «vertikalen» Programm übernommen, dem «*State Programme for Mental Health (SPMH)*» (Lela Sulaberizde et al., 13. Februar 2018). Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH vom 8. August 2018, die für die CIF arbeitet, gibt es weitere «vertikale Programme» der Regierung (insgesamt 23), die sich um gesundheitliche Probleme kümmern (Diabetes, Hepatitis C, Kinderleukämie, Schwangerschaft, Tuberkulose etc.) und der gesamten Bevölkerung offenstehen. Hierfür müssen jeweils Zuzahlungen geleistet werden. Eines der Hauptprobleme des UHCP sowie anderen staatlichen Gesundheitsprogrammen sehen die WB und WHO bei der langfristigen Finanzierung, da sich die Gesundheitsausgaben zwischen 2012 und 2015 mehr als verdoppelt haben, von 4 auf 8,4 Prozent der gesamten öffentlichen Ausgaben (WHO, 2017; WB, Juni 2017). Für mehr Einzelheiten zur psychiatrischen Gesundheitsversorgung siehe Abschnitt 5 «**Zugang zu psychiatrischer Gesundheitsversorgung und psychotherapeutischer Begleitung**». Für mehr Einzelheiten zum Programm zur Beseitigung von Hepatitis C, siehe Abschnitt 3 «**Zugang, Verfügbarkeit und Geltungsbereich des Programms zur Beseitigung von Hepatitis C**».

Das UHCP verbessert den Zugang zu Gesundheitsdienstleistungen, hat aber wenig Auswirkung auf die durch Patient_innen zu zahlende Selbstbehalte. Das stellt ein ernsthaftes Armutsrisiko für Menschen mit geringem Einkommen dar. Laut WB sind die am stärksten benachteiligten Bevölkerungsgruppen diejenigen, die am meisten von der Einführung des UHCP profitieren konnten. Die Zahl der Arztbesuche von Kranken aus dieser Bevölkerungsschicht ist signifikant gestiegen. Insbesondere wurde bei der stationären Versorgung eine Verbesserung beim Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung für benachteiligte Personen festgestellt (WB, Juni 2017). Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH vom 24. Juli 2018, die für die CIF arbeitet, hat sich zwar der Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung durch das UHCP für Kranke verbessert, doch bei der Verarmung durch «*out-of-pocket payments*» oder durch die von den Patient_innen selbst zu tragende Kosten gab es gar keine Veränderungen. Zwischen 2012 und 2015 hat sich die Zahl der Haushalte, die von katastrophal hohen Gesundheitsausgaben betroffen sind, sogar um sechs Prozent von 28 auf 34 Prozent erhöht. Diese Erhöhung ist hauptsächlich auf die Ausgaben für Medikamente zurückzuführen. Laut WB bleiben die Kosten, die von den Patient_innen selbst getragen werden müssen, mit einem für 2015 geschätzten Anteil von rund 66 Prozent die Hauptfinanzierungsquelle für den Gesundheitssektor. Dies, obwohl die öffentlichen Gesundheitsausgaben zwischen 2012 und 2015 von 4 auf 8.4 Prozent erhöht wurden (WB, Juni 2017). Laut WHO bedeuten die hohen selbst zu tragenden Kosten einen ungleichen Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung und stellen eine starke finanzielle Last dar, insbesondere für niedrige Einkommen. Dadurch verschärft sich das Armutsrisiko und kann einen negativen Einfluss auf die Gesundheit haben (WHO, 2017). Laut WB sind die öffentlichen Ausgaben für Medikamente für ambulante Patient_innen besonders niedrig (weniger als 0.5 Prozent), was bedeutet, dass die Patient_innen ihre Medikamente meistens selbst kaufen müssen. Für fast 80 Prozent der Bevölkerung, und insbesondere für die ländliche Bevölkerung, hat das UHCP den Zugang zu Medikamenten nicht verbessert. Der Anteil der Haushalte, bei denen die Gesundheitsausgaben mehr als einen Viertel ihrer Gesamtausgaben ausmachten, blieb zwischen 2010 und 2015 stabil bei 10 Prozent der Gesamtbevölkerung (WB, Juni 2017). CIF stellte in einer Studie, die vom *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* zitiert wurde, fest, dass die Ausgaben für Medikamente eine der grössten finanziellen Belastungen für die Bevölkerung darstellte, die ungefähr zwei Drittel der Kosten für Patient_innen («*out-of-pocket payments*») und ungefähr 57 Prozent der gesamten Gesundheitsausgaben ausmachten (Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, 16. Januar 2018).

Durch die Reform des UHCP wurde 2017 ein Mechanismus zur finanziellen Unterstützung für den Medikamentenkauf eingeführt. Bei der Reform des UHCP in 2017 wurde eine Komponente zur Finanzierung von Medikamenten eingeführt. Laut *FactCheck* können seit Sommer 2017 Personen, die in der Datenbank als verletzte Personen registriert sind und deren Eintrag 100'000 Punkte nicht übersteigt, eine Rückzahlung für Medikamente für die folgenden Gesundheitsprobleme erhalten: Herz-Kreislauf-Probleme oder chronische Herzprobleme, chronische Lungenkrankheiten, Diabetes (Typ 2) und Schilddrüsenprobleme. Die Rückzahlung beträgt 90 Prozent der Medikamentenkosten, wenn sie mindestens 1 GEL (0.38 CHF) kosten. Auch wurde eine Liste mit 24 Medikamenten verabschiedet, deren Kosten durch das UHCP zurückerstattet werden. Die Regierung schätzt, dass zwischen 150'000 und 200'000 Personen vom Finanzierungsprogramm für Medikamente profitieren können. Das Budget dafür beträgt 3'360'000 GEL (1.2 Millionen Franken) für sechs Monate. Wenn 150'000 Personen davon profitieren können, bedeutet dies eine finanzielle Unterstützung von 3.7 GEL (1.4 CHF) pro Person und Monat. Die Regierung kündigte auch an, dass in Zukunft die Qualität ein wichtiges Kriterium beim Einkauf von Medikamenten sein werde (FactCheck, 6. Mai 2017).

3 Zugang, Verfügbarkeit und Geltungsbereich des Programms zur Beseitigung von Hepatitis C

Das 2015 begonnene Programm gegen Hepatitis C führte bis jetzt bei mehr als 44'000 Personen zur Heilung. Die Regierung sieht vor, in den nächsten drei Jahren 1.8 Millionen Menschen zu testen. Laut Regierung wurde im Jahr 2015 die Gesamtzahl der mit Hepatitis C infizierten Personen auf 150'000 geschätzt (Infektionsrate von 7,7 Prozent). Ziel der Regierung ist es, bis im Jahr 2020 Hepatitis C im ganzen Land auszumerzen (definiert als Reduktion der Infektionsrate um 90 Prozent) (Regierung Georgiens, 2015). Laut *Amiran Gamkrelidze*, Direktor des National Center for Disease Control (NCDC), der auf der Informationsseite *Agenda.ge* zitiert wurde, haben seit der Lancierung des nationalen Programms zur Eliminierung von Hepatitis C im Jahr 2015 bei einer Gesamtbevölkerung von 3,7 Millionen Personen mehr als 45'000 Personen eine Behandlung erhalten. Sie wurden zu 98 Prozent geheilt (*Agenda.ge*, 31. Januar 2018). Laut *Agenda.ge* sieht die Regierung vor, in den nächsten drei Jahren 1,8 Millionen Menschen zu testen (*Agenda.ge*, 31. Januar 2018). Für das *Center for Disease Control and Prevention der USA* (CDC), das an diesem Programm teilnimmt, liegen die grössten Herausforderungen für die Ausrottung der Krankheit bis im Jahr 2020 unter anderem darin, eine bessere Qualität der diagnostischen Tests sowie vereinfachte und günstigere Diagnosen zur Verfügung zu haben (HHS/CDC, Juli 2017). Für *Muazzam Nasrullah*, der für das NCDC arbeitet, ist eine breitere Umsetzung der Interventionen erforderlich, um den Zugang zu Diagnosen und Behandlungen zu verbessern, wenn die Regierung ihr Ziel bis 2020 erreichen möchte (Muazzam Nasrullah et al., 28. Juli 2017). Die *Europäische Vereinigung für die Leberforschung* (EASL) schätzte im April 2018, dass trotz des unbestreitbaren Fortschritts nahezu zwei Drittel der Patient_innen noch nicht diagnostiziert wurden (EASL, 13. April 2018).

Zugangsbegrenzungen zum Programm wurden im Juni 2016 aufgehoben. Seit Mai 2017 sind auch Inhaber_innen von neutralen Dokumenten, insbesondere Bewohner_innen der umstrittenen Gebiete Abchasien und Südossetien zugelassen. Bei der Lancierung des Programms im Jahr 2015 konnten nur Personen daran teilnehmen, die an einer Leberkrankheit im fortgeschrittenen Stadium litten. Im Juni 2016 wurden die Zulassungskriterien gelockert, und es wurden alle infizierten Personen eingeschlossen (Muazzam Nasrullah et al., 28. Juli 2017). Im Mai 2017 wurde der Gesundheitsminister *David Sergeenko* auf *Agenda.org* zitiert, dass das Behandlungsprogramm für Hepatitis C allen Bewohner_innen Georgiens offenstehen würde, auch denjenigen, die nur eine Identitätskarte oder ein neutrales Reisedokument besitzen (und keinen georgischen Pass). Die neutralen Dokumente werden von der Regierung an die Bewohner_innen der beiden umstrittenen Regionen Abchasien und Zchinvali (Südossetien) ausgestellt (*Agenda.ge*, 25. Mai 2017). Gemäss einem Bericht des *Staatssekretariats für Migration* (SEM), in dem zivilgesellschaftliche Vertreter_innen zitiert wurden, erhalten Drogenabhängige aufgrund ihrer Kriminalisierung keine Behandlung (SEM, 21. März 2018). Im März 2017 eröffnete die Regierung zusätzlich zu dem Zentrum in Tiflis ein zweites grösseres Zentrum für die Behandlung von Hepatitis C (*Centre for Hepatitis C Management*). Dieses neue Zentrum steht in der Stadt Zugdidi in der östlichen Region von Samegrelo in der Nähe der umstrittenen Region Abchasien. Das Zentrum besteht aus einem

einzigsten Schalter. Es werden dort alle Behandlungsschritte abgedeckt, und es ist auch für Bewohner_innen von Abchasien zugänglich (Agenda.ge, 22. März 2017). Zu Beginn des Programms im Jahr 2015 gab es insgesamt vier Behandlungszentren für Hepatitis C, die alle in Tiflis waren. Im Dezember 2016 gab es 27 Zentren, verteilt im ganzen Land (HHS/CDC, Juli 2017).

Medikamente für die Behandlung sind kostenlos, aber Patient_innen bezahlen je nach Einkommen für die Diagnose und die klinische Begleitung. Laut Website *Agenda.ge* werden dank einer Abmachung mit dem amerikanischen Pharmaunternehmen *Gilead* die Tests und Behandlungen kostenlos durchgeführt, obwohl die Behandlung normalerweise fast 110'000 Euro kostet (Agenda.ge, 31. Januar 2018). Gemäss dem *Center for Disease Control and Prevention der USA* (CDC) wird für die Diagnose und die klinische Begleitung eine sogenannte «gleitende Skala» eingesetzt. Die Patient_innen bezahlen die Kosten nach ihren Möglichkeiten, und die lokale Regierung oder das *Gesundheitsministerium* bezahlen die Differenz. Das Medikament (*Sofosbuvir*) wurde während der Behandlung von *Gilead* kostenlos zur Verfügung gestellt. Zusätzliche Medikamente (*Pegylated, Interferon* und *Ribavirin*) wurden von der Regierung bezahlt und allen zur Verfügung gestellt, die sie benötigten (HHS/CDC, 21. Oktober 2016). Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH vom 8. August 2018 wird seit 2016 die Diagnose und die klinische Begleitung durch das Programm oder die verschiedenen Lokalregierungen bezahlt. Laut der Schweizer Botschaft in Georgien, die in einem Bericht des SEM zitiert wurde, haben die Testkosten eine abschreckende Wirkung auf die finanziell benachteiligten Bevölkerungsgruppen (SEM, 21. März 2018).

4 Begrenzter Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung und Probleme der Diskriminierung

Beschränkte geografische Abdeckung durch Institutionen und Einrichtungen zur Gesundheitsversorgung. Laut einem Bericht der WB von Juni 2017 ist der Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung nicht überall im Land gegeben. Es gibt deutliche Unterschiede zwischen der Hauptstadt Tiflis und den ländlichen Gebieten. Ambulanzdienste bevorzugen die Bewohner_innen von Tiflis (WB, Juni 2017). Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* ist die geografische Verfügbarkeit des Gesundheitssystems ziemlich zufriedenstellend, zumindest was die Grundversorgung angeht. Allerdings befinden sich viele medizinischen Einrichtungen in Tiflis, wodurch sich geografische und finanzielle Hürden für Bewohner_innen der ländlichen Gebiete ergeben, wenn sie diese nützen müssen. In den von Minderheiten besiedelten Regionen (Achalkalaki, Ninozinda, Achmeta, Telavi, Kwareli und Lagodechi) gibt es zwar Spitäler, doch fehlt es ihnen häufig an angemessener medizinischer Ausrüstung, wodurch die lokale Bevölkerung gezwungen ist, für eine Behandlung in die Regionalzentren oder die Hauptstadt zu gehen (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 16. Januar, 2018). Laut *Lela Sulaberizde* gibt es in den abgelegenen, ländlichen Regionen Racha-Lechkhumi und Kwemo Svaneti keine psychiatrische Versorgung. Deshalb müssen Patient_innen grosse Distanzen zurücklegen, was teuer ist und den Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung einschränkt (Lela Sulaberizde et al., 13. Februar 2018).

Diskriminierung gegen ethnische Minderheiten hauptsächlich aufgrund deren schlechter Sprachkenntnisse in Georgisch. Fehlende aufgeschlüsselte Daten zu ethnischen Minderheiten verhindert Formulierung von Massnahmen zur Verringerung von Diskriminierung. Frauen von ethnischen Minderheiten besonders eingeschränkt im Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung. Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* führen die Lücken im Gesundheitsinformationssystem, insbesondere das Fehlen von Daten aufgeschlüsselt nach Zugehörigkeit zu marginalisierten Gruppen (Sexarbeiter_innen, Drogenabhängige, LGBTI etc.), ethnischen Gruppen, sozio-ökonomischem Status oder Wohnort dazu, dass fundierte Massnahmen, die sich auf tatsächliche Daten abstützen, formuliert werden, wodurch es zu Diskriminierungen im Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung kommen kann (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 16. Januar 2018). Der UNO-Ausschuss zur Beseitigung der Rassendiskriminierung (CERD) zeigt sich in seinem Bericht zu Georgien vom Juni 2016 ebenfalls besorgt über die fehlenden aufgeschlüsselten Daten zu den ethnischen Minderheiten und Nicht-Georgier_innen wie Jud_innen, Griech_innen und Assyrer_innen (CERD, 22. Juni 2016). Das *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* hält fest, dass trotz existierender Gesetze, die eigentlich jegliche Form von Diskriminierung auch beim Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung bestrafen, ethnische Minderheiten in ihren Menschenrechten eingeschränkt werden, so auch beim Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung und zu Sozialdiensten. Diese Einschränkungen werden durch ihre mangelnden Georgisch-Kenntnisse noch weiter verstärkt (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 16. Januar 2018). Im Juni 2016 stellte das CERD ebenfalls fest, dass die schlechten Georgisch-Kenntnisse der nationalen und ethnischen Minderheiten ihre Integration in der Gesellschaft erschwere (CERD, 22. Juni 2016). Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* sehen sich die Frauen von ethnischen Minderheiten mit besonders hohen Hürden beim Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung konfrontiert. Ausserdem gibt es keine fachärztlichen Dienste für Frauen. Zudem sind die Abtreibungsraten und Zahlen der ungeplanten Schwangerschaften bei Frauen in ländlichen Gebieten, bei wenig gebildeten Frauen und bei aserischen und armenischen Frauen höher, was den Schluss zulässt, dass der Zugang zur reproduktiven Gesundheitsversorgung nicht für alle gleich ist. Die Frauen der Roma-Gemeinschaft werden häufig nicht in Geburtskliniken aufgenommen und müssen oft alleine zu Hause gebären (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 16. Januar 2018).

Mitglieder der Roma-Gemeinschaft besonders von Diskriminierung und mangelndem Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung betroffen. Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* ist die Lage der Rom-Gemeinschaft besonders besorgniserregend. Sie werden stark marginalisiert und diskriminiert, weshalb sie von Armut, Arbeitslosigkeit und einem sehr eingeschränkten Zugang zu Bildung und Gesundheitsdienstleistungen betroffen sind. Viele besitzen auch nicht die nötigen Papiere, um Sozialhilfe erhalten zu können (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 16. Januar 2018). Das CERD äussert sich in seinem Bericht zu Georgien vom Juni 2016 besorgt darüber, dass viele Romas keine Identitätspapiere besitzen und dass nur wenige Kinder zur Schule gingen. Das CERD stellte auch fest, dass die Gemeinschaft weiterhin stark marginalisiert sei und dass sie in wirtschaftlich und sozial prekären Umständen lebe. Die NGO *Minority Rights International* (MRI) stellt in ihrem Bericht von 2014 ebenfalls fest, dass die Romas extrem marginalisiert seien und dass die Diskriminierung für sie ein ernsthaftes Hindernis für den Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung darstelle (MRI, Juni 2014). Laut *Giorgi Sordia*, einer Researcherin des *Europäischen Zentrums für Minderheitenfragen* (ECMI), die von der NGO *Human Rights House Foundation* (HRHF) zitiert wurde, sind in Georgien insgesamt 1500 Romas registriert. Die meisten von ihnen leben in Tiflis und Gachiანი im Landkreis Gardabani. Im Dorf Leninokka im Distrikt Dedoplistskaro lebt eine Roma-Gemeinschaft mit 133 Personen. Die meisten von ihnen haben keinen Zugang zu Bildung

oder zur Gesundheitsversorgung. Der Hauptgrund dafür liegt darin, dass sie keine Identitätspapiere haben, weshalb sie keinen Zugang zu staatlichen Dienstleistungen haben, so auch nicht zur allgemeinen Krankenversicherung. Da die meisten Kinder zu Hause geboren werden, werden sie nicht registriert und erhalten mit 16 Jahren keine Identitätskarte. Sie sind auch nicht über die staatlichen Sozialdienste oder Programme zur Gesundheitsversorgung informiert (HRHF, 8. Mai 2015).

Diskriminierung von Lesben, Schwulen, Bisexuellen, Transgender und Intersexuellen (LGBTI). Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* gehören LGBTI-Menschen zu den am meisten marginalisierten Gruppen im Land und sind unsichtbar. Trotz Massnahmen durch die Regierung werden sie regelmässig Opfer von Gewalt und Belästigungen, und zwar nicht nur durch die allgemeine Bevölkerung, sondern auch durch bestimmte Institutionen wie medizinische Einrichtungen. Diskriminierungen aufgrund von Verhalten und nonkonformer sexueller Identität kann zu Einschränkungen beim Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung führen, insbesondere bei der Krankenversicherung oder bei angemessener medizinischer Versorgung. Studien haben gezeigt, dass beim Gesundheitspersonal und den Dienstleistern von Gesundheitsdienstleistungen eine Praxis der Diskriminierung und Verletzungen des Rechts auf Privatleben und auf Schweigepflicht gegenüber LGBTI-Menschen besteht. Diese Praxis basiert häufig auf Unkenntnis oder Unwissen des medizinischen Personals zu den spezifischen medizinischen Bedürfnissen von LGBTI-Menschen sowie auf negativen Stereotypen gegenüber diesen Menschen. Deshalb verzichten LGBTI-Menschen häufig darauf, Dienste der Gesundheitsversorgung aufzusuchen oder machen bei den Ärzt_innen falsche Angaben. Das kann dazu führen, dass sie ungeeignete Behandlungen oder Medikamente erhalten (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 16. Januar 2018). LGBTI-Menschen, die Opfer von Diskriminierung werden, verzichten oft darauf, eine Klage einzureichen, da sie den Behörden nicht trauen und Angst haben, noch stärker von der Gesellschaft stigmatisiert zu werden (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, Dezember 2017). Das CERD zeigte sich in seinem Bericht zu Georgien vom Juni 2016 besorgt darüber, dass das Anti-Diskriminierungsgesetz von 2014 nur sehr lückenhaft umgesetzt wird. Zum einen wird dies den eingeschränkten Möglichkeiten des Büros des georgischen Ombudsmanns zugeschrieben, Diskriminierungsfälle zu untersuchen, da private Einrichtungen und Einzelpersonen nicht dazu verpflichtet sind, diesem wichtige Informationen dazu zu melden. Das CERD zeigt sich auch besorgt darüber, dass ein wirksames System der Nachverfolgung und Datensammlung zu Fällen von rassistischer Diskriminierung, die von den juristischen Behörden untersucht wurden, fehlt (CERD, 22. Juni 2016).

5 Zugang zu psychiatrischer Behandlung und psychotherapeutischer Betreuung

Psychiatrische Behandlungen werden seit 1995 durch das «State Programme for Mental Health» abgedeckt. Psychiatrische Behandlungen werden von 23 medizinischen Institutionen angeboten und sind normalerweise kostenlos. Bezahlen muss man für Behandlungen im Zusammenhang mit Alkohol- oder Drogenkonsum. Es werden nur ambulante psychiatrische Behandlungen angeboten. Das UHCP deckt hauptsächlich die Grundversorgung für Patient_innen mit physischen Problemen ab. Gemäss *Lela Sulaberizde* werden psychiatrische Behandlungen für stationäre oder ambulante Patient_innen durch ein separates Programm abgedeckt, das «State Programme for Mental Health (SPMH)». Es wurde im Jahr 1995 eingeführt und wird von der Agentur für Sozialdienste des *Ministeriums für Arbeit,*

Gesundheit und Soziales (MoLHSA) verwaltet. Psychiatrische Behandlungen stehen allen Georgier_innen offen und werden kostenlos von 23 psychiatrischen Einrichtungen im Land angeboten. Die Behandlungen für stationäre Patient_innen sind meistens umfassender als für ambulante Patient_innen und sind in neun Spitälern verfügbar sowie in drei psychiatrischen Einrichtungen, die auf Intensivbehandlungen spezialisiert sind und den Spitälern der Hauptstadt Tiflis angegliedert sind. Diese Behandlungen sind normalerweise kostenlos, ausser Behandlungen im Zusammenhang mit Alkoholproblemen (*Lela Sulaberizde et al.*, 13. Februar 2018). Laut Website der *Agentur für Sozialdienste von Georgien* werden bei psychischen Krankheiten oder Problemen, die durch psychoaktive Substanzen hervorgerufen wurden, nur 70 Prozent der Behandlungskosten zurückerstattet. Die Rahmenbedingungen dafür sind im Programm festgehalten (*Agentur für Sozialdienste von Georgien*, undatiert (abgerufen am 8. August 2018)). Laut *Lela Sulaberizde* können ambulante Patient_innen Behandlungen von Psychiater_innen und verschreibungspflichtige Medikamente in den zehn unabhängigen Ambulatorien oder Polikliniken oder in einer der acht psychiatrischen Kliniken, die ein Ambulatorium besitzen, erhalten. Angst- oder Zwangsstörungen werden nicht ambulant behandelt (*Lela Sulaberizde et al.*, 13. Februar 2018).

2013 verabschiedete das Parlament ein Gesetz zur psychischen Gesundheit, welches von einer Strategie und einem Aktionsplan begleitet wird. 2013 verabschiedete das georgische Parlament ein Gesetz zur psychischen Gesundheit, das «National Concept on Mental Health». Ziel dieses Gesetzes ist es, Probleme und Mängel im psychiatrischen Gesundheitssystem Georgiens zu beheben. Im Dezember 2014 wurden zum Gesetz eine nationale Strategie und ein Aktionsplan für die Jahre 2015-2020 ausgearbeitet (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 31. Mai 2016). Laut UNDP ist eines der Ziele des Aktionsplans die ausgewogene Verteilung des Budgets auf stationäre und ambulante Behandlungen auf Gemeindeebene (UNDP, 14. August 2015). Im August 2018 hat der Ausschuss für Gesundheit und soziale Angelegenheiten des georgischen Parlaments der nationalen Strategie und der Erhöhung des Budgets des SPMH auf 5 Millionen GEL zugestimmt (*Parlament von Georgien*, 7. August 2018).

Trotz der seit 2013 unternommenen Reformen gibt es weiterhin schwerwiegende Probleme beim Zugang zur psychiatrischen Gesundheitsversorgung. Es fehlt an Geld und Psychiater_innen, die Berufsausbildungsmöglichkeiten sind beschränkt, die Qualität der Dienstleistungen lassen häufig zu wünschen übrig. Trotz Anstrengungen der Regierung gibt es laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* weiterhin ernsthafte Probleme, insbesondere systemischer Art, beim psychiatrischen Gesundheitssystem in Georgien. Ein erstes Problem ist die mangelhafte Finanzierung dieser Gesundheitsdienste. Die ab 2006 beobachtbare Erhöhung der finanziellen Mittel für psychiatrische Behandlungen wurde hauptsächlich für stationäre Behandlungen eingesetzt, da hier eine Priorität des Staates liegt. In geringerem Umfang wurde in psychologische Rehabilitationsmassnahmen und ambulante Behandlungen investiert. Dieser Geldmangel führt laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* zu ungenügend ausgebildetem Personal, schlechter Versorgungsqualität oder ein Fehlen von psychosozialer Rehabilitation. Das therapeutische Umfeld ist ebenfalls unzureichend und es fehlen Einrichtungen in den Gemeinden. Den psychiatrischen Diensten fehlt es an Personal, in Georgien fehlen doppelt so viele Psychiater_innen wie im Rest von Europa (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 31. Mai 2016). Laut *Lela Sulaberizde* gibt es nur 3,92 Psychiater_innen auf 100'000 Personen in Georgien. Im Rest von Europa beträgt die Zahl 8,59 Psychiater_innen auf 100'000 Personen (*Lela Sulaberizde et al.*, 13. Februar 2018). Gemäss *Büro des georgi-*

schen Ombudsmanns lässt die Aus- und Weiterbildung von psychiatrischem Personal ebenfalls zu wünschen übrig, was einen negativen Einfluss auf die Versorgungsqualität hat. Es besteht ein Risiko für verbale oder sogar physische Gewalt gegenüber Patient_innen (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 31. Mai 2016). Laut *Curatio International Foundation* (CIF) führt der Personalmangel zu langen Wartezeiten, insbesondere für ambulante Patient_innen (CIF, Juni 2014).

Budget für psychiatrische Behandlungen ist unzureichend und wird prioritär für stationäre Patient_innen sowie Notfälle eingesetzt. Wenig Mittel für ambulante Behandlungen und chronisch Kranke. Das Budget 2018 wurde um fast 15 Prozent erhöht, wovon mindestens 35 Prozent für den Medikamentenkauf eingesetzt werden sollen. Die *Curatio International Foundation* (CIF) stellt trotz einer Erhöhung der Ausgaben für psychiatrische Behandlungen zwischen 2006 und 2011 fest, dass der Anteil der Ausgaben für diese Behandlungen im Vergleich zu den Gesamtausgaben im Gesundheitsbereich nicht wirklich erhöht wurde, sondern bei ungefähr 2,5 Prozent stagniert (CIF, Juni 2014). Laut *Lela Sulaberizde* erreicht diese Prozentzahl in Ländern mit hohem Einkommen (HIC) im Durchschnitt 5 Prozent (*Lela Sulaberizde et al*, 13. Februar 2018). Laut CIF wurde im Jahr 2011 der grösste Teil der Ausgaben, nämlich 71 Prozent, für stationäre psychiatrische Behandlungen aufgewendet. Laut *Entwicklungsprogramm der UNO* (UNDP) wurden 2014 nur 28 Prozent des Budgets für ambulante psychiatrische Behandlungen aufgewendet (UNDP, 14. August 2015). *Lela Sulaberizde* stellt fest, dass in den HIC dieser Prozentsatz eher bei 50 Prozent liegt (*Lela Sulaberizde et al*, 13. Februar 2018). Das CIF folgert daraus, dass in Georgien nur wenige Mittel für ambulante psychiatrische Dienstleistungen zur Verfügung stehen. Sie beschränken sich auf die Medikamentenabgabe, die häufig von schlechter Qualität sind und in unzureichenden Mengen abgegeben werden. Das hat zur Folge, dass die Patient_innen ihre Medikamente häufig selbst kaufen müssen (CIF, Juni 2014). Laut *Tengiz Verulava* beschränkt sich die Unterstützung der Regierung zum grossen Teil auf psychiatrische Notfallbehandlungen, und es gibt keine ambulante psychiatrische Versorgung für chronisch Kranke. (*Tengiz Verulava et al.*, April 2015). Im August 2018 gab der Gesundheitsausschuss des georgischen Parlaments an, dass das Budget für ambulante psychiatrische Behandlungen im Jahr 2018 um 14,5 Prozent erhöht (georgisches Parlament, 7. August 2018). Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer *Kontaktperson der SFH* vom 7. August 2018, die in einem georgischen universitären Forschungszentrum zur psychischen Gesundheit arbeitet, hat die Regierung auch verkündet, dass mindestens 35 Prozent des Budgets von 2018 für Medikamente reserviert seien, um die Zahlungen der Patient_innen zu reduzieren.

Fehlende Mittel und die Fragmentierung und Unzulänglichkeit der ambulanten Behandlungen schränken Möglichkeiten zur Nachfolgebehandlung von Patient_innen ein. Grosse Gefahr, die Kontinuität der Gesundheitsversorgung zu unterbrechen. Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* ist die Behandlung von akuten Zuständen der Patient_innen zu kurz (durchschnittlich zehn bis vierzehn Tage), um eine merkliche Verbesserung hervorzurufen, da die Remissionsphase nicht abgewartet wird. Dadurch steigt die Wahrscheinlichkeit, dass sich der Zustand der Patient_innen nach Austritt aus dem Spital schnell verschlechtert, da erforderliche Nachfolgebehandlungen aufgrund mangelnder Finanzen ausbleiben. Die ambulanten Behandlungen sind fragmentiert und unterentwickelt, wodurch ein grosses Rückfallrisiko und das Risiko einer Re-Hospitalisierung besteht (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 31. Mai 2016). Laut *Curatio International Foundation* (CIF) werden aufgrund des aktuellen Systems Patient_innen nach ihrer Entlassung aus dem Spital nicht weiter

psychiatrisch begleitet. Da es zu wenige ambulante psychiatrische Dienste gibt, werden Patient_innen, die einen Rückfall erleiden, häufig für lange Zeit hospitalisiert (CIF, Juni 2014). Gemäss *Lela Sulaberizde* erhalten die Patient_innen während drei Wochen intensive psychiatrische Behandlungen und werden danach entlassen oder in langfristige Behandlung überwiesen. Diese Zeitspanne wird aus finanziellen und nicht aus medizinischen Gründen gewählt und kann für patientenorientierte Behandlungen hinderlich sein. Stationäre Einrichtungen sind nach dem Austritt nicht in die Behandlung der Patient_innen involviert. Dies führt zu einem Unterbruch der Behandlungskontinuität (*Lela Sulaberizde et al.*, 13. Februar 2018).

Psychosoziale Unterstützung und Rehabilitation äusserst beschränkt. Gemäss den Informationen auf der Website der *Agentur für Sozialdienste Georgiens* gibt es sowohl für stationäre, als auch für ambulante Patient_innen psychosoziale Rehabilitation (*Agentur für Sozialdienste Georgiens*, undatiert, abgerufen am 8. August 2018). Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* gibt es trotz Anstrengungen der Angestellten und psychiatrischen Einrichtungen fast keine psychosoziale Unterstützung und Rehabilitations- und Reintegrationsangebote. Die Patient_innen werden in den meisten Fällen in keine Rehabilitationsprogramme aufgenommen, und es gibt keine psychosoziale Rehabilitation (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 31. Mai 2016). Laut CIF gab es 2014 nur drei Einrichtungen im Land, die eine psychosoziale Rehabilitation angeboten haben, und es konnten nur einige wenige Dutzend Patient_innen diesen Dienst in Anspruch nehmen (CIF, Juni 2014). Laut *Lela Sulaberizde* gab es 2018 in zwei ambulanten Zentren und in einem unabhängigen Zentrum psychologische Rehabilitationsdienste. Da die Psychiater_innen überarbeitet sind, beschränken sie sich häufig auf Konsultationen und bieten keine psychotherapeutischen Behandlungen an. Trotz einiger Fortschritte ist die Nachfrage für psychosoziale Rehabilitation weit grösser als das Angebot (*Lela Sulaberizde et al.*, 13. Februar 2018). Laut *Tengiz Verulava* ist es aus finanziellen Gründen fast unmöglich, Patient_innen mit psychiatrischen Problemen Rehabilitationsmassnahmen anzubieten. Patient_innen erhalten Rehabilitationsmassnahmen nur in sehr geringem Umfang (*Tengiz Verulava et al.*, April 2015). Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH vom 7. August 2018, die in einem georgischen universitären Forschungszentrum für psychische Gesundheit arbeitet, ist eine psychologische Behandlung und psychosoziale Rehabilitation für chronische Patient_innen in Georgien möglich, aber nur in sehr beschränktem Ausmass, insbesondere für ambulante Patient_innen. Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH vom 17. Juli 2018, die Mitglied des *Ausschusses für Gesundheit und soziale Angelegenheiten* ist, sind starke Verbesserungen bei der Qualität der psychiatrischen Dienste und angemessenen psychotherapeutischen Nachfolgebehandlungen nötig.

Schlechte Medikamentenqualität. Laut *Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns* haben die Knappheit der für die psychiatrische Versorgung bereitgestellten Mittel und das System für die öffentliche Auftragsvergabe zur Folge, dass Medikamente schlechter Qualität zu den niedrigsten Preisen gekauft werden (*Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns*, 31. Mai 2016). Laut *Lela Sulaberizde* können aufgrund der mangelnden Finanzen für psychiatrische Behandlungen keine qualitativ hochstehenden Behandlungen oder Medikamente angeboten werden. Deshalb ziehen es die meisten Menschen vor, ihre eigenen Medikamente zu kaufen, um Produkte besserer Qualität zu erhalten (*Lela Sulaberizde et al.*, 13. Februar 2018). Laut *Tengiz Verulava* haben der Einsatz von Medikamenten schlechter Qualität und die Tatsache, dass Patient_innen bessere Medikamente aus eigener Tasche bezahlen müssen, einen negativen Einfluss auf die Behandlung (*Tengiz Verulava et al.*, April 2015). Laut E-Mail-Auskunft einer Kontaktperson der SFH vom 7. August 2018, die in einem georgischen universitären For-

schungszentrum zur psychischen Gesundheit arbeitet, stammen die günstigen Psychopharmaka der ersten Generation, die den Patient_innen abgegeben werden, häufig aus Indien oder Georgien und sind oft unwirksam.

6 Quellen

Agentur für Sozialdienste Georgiens, kein Datum (Zugriff am 8. August 2018) :

« *The state program - Mental health - refers to increase of geographic and financial availability to psychiatric service by the Georgian population.*

What is covered by the state program - Mental health?

Outpatient service includes:

- *Service of the patients forwarded to the family doctor/district doctor, primary visit to psychiatric dispensary, and if the patient is unavailable to come to the psychiatric institution, home visit of a psychiatrist or other specialist in the field of psychiatry (the law of Georgia "On Psychiatric Assistance") to the patient, in case of approving of the nosologies provided by the program and the desire of the patient, fulfillment of outpatient surveillance of the patient;*
- *Service of the registered patients and the patients forwarded to the psychiatric inpatient institution, considering the nosologies provided by the program, visits to a doctor-psychiatrist, or if needed, with other specialists in the field of psychiatry (the law of Georgia "On Psychiatric Assistance"); according to the prescription of the doctor-psychiatrists, provision with the medicines; if needed, visits of the specialists in the field of psychiatry at home and consultations of other doctor-specialists (therapist and neurologist);*
- **Psycho-social rehabilitation;**
- *Mental health of children provides the service for emotional patients and patients with behavior disorders less than 18 years in the day inpatient department, who are characterized with modifications of psychical state and conduct, worsening of social functioning and disadaptation.*

Inpatient service, which covers inpatient service of the patients above 15 years with psychosis register disorders (on the basis of the order No.87/N of the Minister "On Approving of the Rule of Placement in the Psychiatric Inpatient Department", dated March 20, 2007), in particular:

- *Short-term inpatient service, that means cutting off the states progressing with acute psychotic symptoms (delay from 2 up to 8 weeks);*
- *Long-term inpatient service, that means prolongation of treatment after the short-term inpatient care, if needed, or treatment of those patients, to whom assistance is not available out of inpatient department for serious disturbances of psycho-social functioning;*

- *Treatment of those patients, to which the judicial resolution on placement of a person in inpatient department for involuntary psychiatric assistance, stipulated by the article 191st of the Criminal Code of Procedure of Georgia, refers;*
- *Additional assistance: provision of protection and security of those patients, to which the judicial resolution on placement of a person in inpatient department for involuntary psychiatric assistance, stipulated by the article 191st of the Criminal Code of Procedure of Georgia, refers;*
- *Provision of those patients with food and personal articles of hygiene, who are taking the inpatient service;*
- ***Rehabilitation service during the long-term inpatient treatment in accordance with the standards of psycho-social rehabilitation;***
- *Psychiatric inpatient service of the children, including the service of the patients less than 15 years with psychotic register disorders;*
- *Urgent medical service of the patients, including emergency medical service for the patients being in psychiatric, inpatient department on program service within the frameworks of the codes of nosologies defined by the urgent assistance program;*
- *Inpatient service of mental and behavior disorders caused by psychoactive substances.*

Psychiatric crisis intervention of adults (18 years and above) considers service for the persons with mental and behavior disorders within the administrative-territorial scopes of Tbilisi:

- *Psychiatric crisis intervention (crisis day beds) means intensive ambulatory care during crisis;*
- *Emergency ambulatory consultations in the day center;*
- *Fulfillment of crisis intervention by home care crisis mobile group at the place of residence of the patient and, if needed, his/her transmission in the crisis center or other appropriate psycho-social / psychiatric provider institution.*

Psychiatric inpatient service to be carried out by the mental inpatient institutions in Tbilisi, Rustavi and Kutaisi:

- *Inpatient service of the patients above 15 years with psychotic register disorders (order No.87/N of the Minister "On Approving of the Rule of Placement in the Psychiatric Inpatient Department", dated March 20, 2007), in particular:*
 1. *Short-term inpatient service, that means cutting off the states progressing with acute psychotic symptoms;*
 2. *Long-term inpatient service, that means prolongation of treatment after the short-term inpatient care, if needed, or treatment of those patients, who are not able to get assistance out of hospital, because of serious disturbances of psycho-social functioning;*

3. *Provision of those patients with the personal articles of hygiene and emergency surgical and therapeutic dental service, who are taking the inpatient service.*

- ***Rehabilitation service during the long-term inpatient care, in accordance with the psycho-social rehabilitation standards.***

Who is the beneficiary of the program?

The beneficiaries of the state program - Mental health - are:

- ***The citizens of Georgia, using outpatient and inpatient component of the program;***
- ***Both citizens of Georgia and other persons using involuntary inpatient service, as well as other persons placed in the "penitentiary and imprisonment institutions" notwithstanding possession of official document stipulated by the legislation on identification.***

How the state program is funded (is there any co-payment and how)?

The service provided by the program is funded by the state completely, except the inpatient care for mental and behavior disorders caused by the psychoactive substances.

The service provided by the sub-component of the inpatient care for mental and behavior disorders caused by psychoactive substances shall be reimbursed by the state by 70% of the actual cost, within the limits of the occurrences specified in the program.

Whom you have to apply for participation in the program?

Financing of the inpatient care for mental and behavior disorders caused by psychoactive substances shall be carried out through immaterialized medical vouchers. In order to get the service, you have to apply to the medical service-provider institution. » Quelle: Agentur für Sozialdienste Georgiens, State program - Mental health, kein Datum (Zugriff am 8. August 2018): http://ssa.gov.ge/index.php?lang_id=ENG&sec_id=808.

Agenda.ge, 31. Januar 2018:

« Around 45,000 people have gone through medical treatment for Hepatitis C in Georgia, 98 percent of which were cured, the head of Georgia's National Center for Disease Control and Public Health (NCDC) Amiran Gamkrelidze said.

Gamkrelidze encouraged everyone to be tested for Hepatitis C in order to understand whether they have the illness or not as the disease has no symptoms until late in its development.

We should screen the entire population – 3,7 million people, especially adults above 18”, Gamkrelidze said.

He said 1,800,000 people will be screened in the next three years, which is a unique chance to cure Hepatitis C as both the test and treatment are free of charge.

Georgia's Health Ministry launched a campaign titled *Cure Yourself* in order to encourage people to be tested for Hepatitis C last year.

Through the campaign #განკურნე (Geo. ganikurne, cure yourself) people can apply for screening in order to understand whether they have the illness or not, as the treatment of Hepatitis C is free of charge in Georgia.

Typically the treatment costs €110,000 per person, which is unaffordable for the majority of Georgians.

In partnership with the American company Gilead, Georgia launched a large-scale Hepatitis C Elimination Program in 2015. The program aims to make Georgia a Hepatitis C-free country by 2020.» Quelle: Agenda.ge, 98% of people in Hepatitis C elimination program cured, 31. Januar 2018: <http://agenda.ge/news/94808/eng>.

Agenda.ge, 25. Mai 2017:

« Those living in Georgia's occupied regions but do not hold a Georgian passport will be able to benefit from the free Hepatitis C treatment program Georgia offers its citizens.

Georgian Health Minister David Sergeenko announced this after a governmental meeting today.

Sergeenko said that a neutral ID card or a neutral travel document will be enough for Abkhazia and Tskhinvali region residents to engage in the free treatment program.

A neutral document is a document that Georgia's Justice Ministry issues to residents of either of Georgia's two Russian-occupied regions in case they don't hold a Georgian passport and apply for a neutral identification document.

Sergeenko said that the free treatment program was very attractive for many of those living in Abkhazia and Tskhinvali region but until now the treatment was only available to Georgian citizens.

In partnership with the American company Gilead, Georgia launched a large-scale Hepatitis C Elimination Program in 2015. The program aims to make Georgia a Hepatitis C-free country by 2020.

Sergeenko said that now Georgia signed a memorandum with Gilead envisaging the expansion of coverage and letting Abkhazians and Ossetians with a neutral document benefit from the program.

As of today, about 38,000 people have registered for the free Hepatitis C program. Of these, about 37,500 have started treatment while more than 29,000 have already completed the treatment course. Officials say that the cure rate is 98 percent.» Quelle: Agenda.ge, Georgia offers free Hepatitis C treatment to residents of occupied regions, 25. Mai 2017: <http://agenda.ge/news/80107/eng>.

Agenda.ge, 22. März 2017:

« **A new modern centre for Hepatitis C management has opened in the town of Zugdidi in Georgia's western Samegrelo region today.**

*The centre was opened by Prime Minister Giorgi Kvirikashvili, Health Minister David Sergeenko and United States Ambassador to Georgia Ian Kelly. **Locals will be able to receive all services relating to Hepatitis C, including screening, diagnosis, consultation, registration and getting medicine through a single-window principle at the new centre.***

Zugdidi is located close to Georgia's Russian-occupied Abkhazia region; Kvirikashvili said the new centre and its services will be available to Abkhazians as well. [...]

The first Hepatitis C Management Centre opened in the capital of Tbilisi last summer. Zugdidi centre will be the second of its kind, but it is significantly larger than the Tbilisi centre.

Authorities said Zugdidi was selected as the location for the second centre due to the high rate of the virus in the region. » Quelle: Agenda.ge, New Hepatitis C centre to serve Georgians and Abkhazians, 22. März 2017: <http://agenda.ge/news/76452/eng>.

Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, 16. Januar 2018:

« **The Georgian healthcare system covers both Primary Healthcare and Hospital Sectors. Its geographical availability for the basic care is satisfactory: medical facilities providing outpatient services (e.g. polyclinics, Family Medicine Centres) function in the same manner both in large cities, as regional centres. The institution of rural doctors is responsible for the provision of healthcare in villages. However, many medical facilities, especially specialized ones, are located in Tbilisi, which causes geographical and financial barriers for households as it increases direct and indirect costs such as fees for services, transportation and accommodation costs.**

*State healthcare programs are implemented by the Ministry of Labor, Health and Social Affairs (MoLHSA) that also comprising the following entities: LEPL Social Service Agency, LEPL L. Sakvarelidze National Centre of Disease Control and Public Health and LEPL Emergency Coordination and Urgent Assistance Centre. **Given that almost 95% of medical facilities are privately owned, MoLHSA is left with little regulation capacity in hand.** The Oxfam Research Report on Health-Care Reform in Georgia (2009) states, that the other ministries (such as the Ministry of Finance or Economy) and individuals are having great impact on the overall direction of health policy, thus, limiting MoLHSA's mandate with regard to direct service provision, purchasing, and some other aspects of regulation. [...]*

*The national health system was financed from the State budget through revenues, but it wasn't capable to keep pace with the growing financial needs created by the Universal Healthcare Program. **Government spending on healthcare through the Universal Healthcare Program increased from 69 million GEL in 2013, to 575 million GEL in 2015. This increase in costs required a change in the state's approach, resulting amending of the Universal Healthcare Program in 2017. Changes included categorization of beneficiaries based on their income and thus, providing different packages of services based on this categorization.** [...]*

*Despite the fact that State expenses have significantly increased since 2013 when the Universal Healthcare Program came into effect, their share in relation to the population's healthcare expenditure is still low (6.9% for 2015). As a result, **out-pocket payments remain high, representing almost 58.6% of total healthcare expenditures in Georgia in 2014. According to the Curatio Study on Health System,***

the most burdensome expenditures for the population are those associated with medicines, which represented 2/3 of out-of-pocket payments and amounted to 57,3% of total healthcare expenditures in 2015. [...]

According to the World Bank, the main challenge associated with healthcare system financing is non-efficient management of public funds. This is further compounded by the complex financing mechanisms due to different tariffs and co-payment schemes, coupled with a fragmented primary healthcare system and lack of motivation on the part of healthcare providers to stimulate proper PHC service delivery. [...]

In addition, the National Centre for Disease Control and Public Health of Georgia collects aggregated data from health facilities country wide. **The existing healthcare information system proved to have some shortcomings in practice, as the quality of information received through the system doesn't always correspond to standard.**

This is due to **lack of, or incomplete or non-disaggregated data, particularly regarding marginalized groups (such as sex-workers, men having sex with men, intravenous drug users, LGBTI, etc.), by geographic location, ethnicity, disability status, economic quintile, etc. This lack of comprehensive disaggregated data hinders the creation of evidence-based policies and practices and can lead to discrimination. [...]**

The Georgian Constitution states that all citizens of Georgia shall be equal in social, economic, cultural and political life, irrespective of their national, ethnic, religious or linguistic belonging. Protection from discrimination based on the ethnic origin of a person is also included in the Georgian anti-discrimination law. In addition, Article 6.1 of the Law on the "Rights of the Patients" explicitly states that "discrimination of the patient based on [...] national, ethnic origin should be prohibited".

Nonetheless, **persons belonging to ethnic minorities face obstacles in their access to rights, remedies, public services (e.g. healthcare, social assistance), employment and higher education, which seem to be enhanced by their lack of proficiency in the Georgian language.**

Women who are part of minority communities are particularly challenged in their access to healthcare facilities and medical services; as stated in a study conducted in 2014, "minority communities, and particularly minority women, do not have proper access to the healthcare system. Existing medical facilities do not allow for adequate medical services to be delivered." In addition, there are no specialized medical services for women.

Although hospitals operate in most of the areas residing by ethnic groups (Akhalkalaki, Ninotsminda, Akhmeta, Telavi, Kvareli, and Lagodekhi,) they often lack necessary medical equipment and hence the local population is forced to travel in order to visit larger medical institutions in regional centers or in the capital. This is an additional burden particularly for women and especially when they are in need of timely SRH services.

Higher abortion rates among rural women, less educated women, and women of Azeri descent suggest that access to services is unequal and that Georgia's family planning program needs to expand its reach to disadvantaged subgroups. Rates of unplanned pregnancy were higher among women with the lowest education level and those with the lowest wealth quintile. They were also higher among women with an Azeri (36.3) or Armenian (31.6) background than among Georgian women (24.7). [...]

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) persons represent one of the most marginalized and least visible groups in Georgia. Despite achieving a degree of success in recent years with the adoption of the Law on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (2014) with the explicit indication on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) as a prohibited ground of discrimination, **members of the group continue to face violence, oppression and harassment from the general public, as well as from specific institutions, including medical facilities and the workplace.**

Bias-motivated violence based on SOGI frequently goes unreported and, hence, remains without proper investigation and reparation.

Discrimination of marginalized groups and violations of sexual rights can lead to limited access to health and education because of an individual's non-conforming sexual behavior, expression, and identity. Physical aggression against LGBTI people creates insecurity, especially for poor and already powerless people.

Discrimination on the basis of SOGI in healthcare can prevent access to health insurance or proper medical care, which can leave many people outside social networks and may push them into poverty.

With regards to legislation on access to healthcare and non-discrimination, in addition to the Constitution of Georgia and the Law on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination, the prohibition of discrimination is also enshrined in the Law of Georgia on the Protection of the Right to Healthcare, according to which discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation or negative personal attitude is prohibited. Additionally, the Law of Georgia on the Rights of Patients, which aims to protect the rights of citizens in the healthcare system, further prescribes the respect for the dignity of all patients.

Nonetheless, several studies conducted in Georgia show existing practices of discrimination and violation of the rights to private life and confidentiality of LGBTI persons by health-care professionals and health service providers in general. A lack of awareness among medical personnel, existing negative stereotypes towards LGBTI persons, and ignorance of the specific medical needs of transgender persons constitute barriers for patients to get quality medical services.

According to such studies, members of LGBTI groups often refrain from seeking medical services and choose self-medication in order to avoid the negative attitudes of doctors. In certain cases, expectations of a negative or indifferent attitude from doctors result in destructive actions, such as giving incorrect information to doctors that would influence the medication or treatment methods chosen by them.

It is worth noting that healthcare needs of LGBTI groups are not analyzed and assessed by the State in Georgia.

Although homosexuality was removed from the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) by the World Health Organization in 1990, it is still considered a disease and deviation by some medical personnel in Georgia – individual representatives of the healthcare sector view homosexuality as a problem requiring medical intervention. Furthermore, some medical textbooks view homosexuality as a behavioral disorder.

Access to healthcare services for transgender persons is substantially limited due to the medicalization of “transgender” identity and stigma. Currently, the healthcare system in Georgia uses an internationally recognized classification system ICD-10, which classifies “transgenderism” as a mental disorder; thus, the existing healthcare system in Georgia assumes “a completely medicalized and pathological approach towards transgender persons and does not recognize its wide spectrum” and that not all transgender people want and/or need surgical interventions to be comfortable in their own body. Furthermore, “Terminological confusion of sex and gender is a prevailing problem in the ICD-10 Georgian publications, which is a key issue in the process of de-pathologization of transgenderism.”

Furthermore, national legislation does not address possibilities for sex change, but according to existing practice, medical interventions (including, sex reassignment surgery) are set as a prerequisite for changing the gender marker in identification documents. As a result, expensive and intrusive medical procedures are not at all financed by the state and more importantly, may be unwanted. Transgender people are thus left without identification documents which accurately reflect their gender identity, resulting in social exclusion violating their rights to health and privacy, and creating major obstacles to the enjoyment of many other fundamental human rights. [...]

A special emphasis should be placed on the situation of the Roma community in Georgia, who face extreme marginalization and discrimination, leading to poverty, unemployment, lack of access to education and healthcare. Due to a lack of access to proper documentation, Roma people are also excluded from social security programs.

Also, due to dense cohabitation, in areas inhabited by Roma communities there are often outbreaks of diseases among women and children. In such situations, access to treatment is rather discriminatory: Roma women often suffer from unequal treatment and are not admitted to maternity wards. They are forced to give birth at home, as hospitals do not accept them. » Quelle: Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, Human rights in the context of sexual and reproductive health and well-being in Georgia: Country assessment, 16. Januar 2018, S.34-37, 96-97, 101-102 : www.ombudsman.ge/uploads/other/5/5305.pdf.

Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, Dezember 2017:

« The realisation of the right to health care is linked with problems. The state programme of universal health care is not fully accessible for those who use private insurance schemes as of 1 January 2017. This limitation of technical nature, and based on a fixed date, is unjustified and requires revision. [...]

LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Queer) community is one of most vulnerable groups with their representatives facing discrimination in almost every sphere of social life. LGBTQ people do not feel safe when exercising fundamental rights such as the rights to education, employment, healthcare, et cetera. Yet, they often refrain from making instances of alleged discrimination against them public because of mistrust in state authorities and fears of being stigmatized by society. [...]

Representatives of LGBT community often face discrimination in obtaining services. There are instances when, according to applicants, they are subject to discrimination regardless of whether they belong to the LGBT community or not. This is mainly conditioned by their appearance, dressing style and behavior which is a matter of their personal autonomy and self-realization. [...]

The issue of legal recognition of the sex of transgender persons remains a problem in the reporting period. As a result, transgender persons are not allowed, on certain occasions, to use their identification documents whereas by using them they expose themselves to heightened risk of violence and discrimination. **Another problematic issue is the situation regarding a sexual and reproductive health of LGBTQ persons, which results from the absence of special guidelines and instructions tailored to the needs of LGBTQ representatives and especially, transgender persons.** » Quelle: Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, The Situation of Human Rights and Freedoms in Georgia 2017, 5. Dezember 2017, S. 14: www.ombudsman.ge/uploads/other/4/4957.pdf.

Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, 2017:

« At the moment there are no clear and detailed requirements with regard to the quality of care and the delivery of services at the privatized institutions. The only control or monitoring mechanism in place is the Office of the Public Defender, which has the right to monitor all closed institutions. **The Public Defender issued a very critical report on mental hospitals in 2015, however this has not had the desired effect i.e. a clear improvement in the quality of care delivered.** [...]

We regret to have to conclude that concerning the quality of treatment and care of the patients in Qutiri, the living conditions and the interrelation between staff and patients there was no sign of improvement since privatization. The improvements in Qutiri were material, e.g. upgrading the water and sewer-system and the renewal of roofs. Although the director said he had many plans to improve the buildings and facilities, he did not mention anything with regard to the improvement of treatment, the quality of care, the range of therapies provided and the attitudes and skills of staff.

In Batumi however, there was a palpable sense that their newly found independence would allow the clinical team to develop the standard of their care and freed them from bureaucratic delays and barriers.

Privatisation can be beneficial to well-led, motivated teams that believe in patient centred care. Equally it can free institutions to superficially improve their physical environments whilst making little or no improvement to the quality of care that their patients have a right to receive. » Quelle: Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, Privatization of Mental Health Care Facilities in Georgia – Assessment, Conclusions and Recommendations to the Georgian Government, 2017, S.31-33: www.ombudsman.ge/uploads/other/4/4590.pdf.

Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, 31. Mai 2016:

« In order to respond to the problems and challenges in a systematic way, **the Parliament of Georgia, in December 2013 adopted the 'National Concept on Mental Health'**. This is the main mental health policy document of the country. The document states that 'Georgia recognizes the importance of mental health'. Moreover, 'Georgia undertakes to organize delivery of mental health services within the country in the manner that people with mental disorders receive treatment in the least restrictive environment, to the extent possible in their own home or close by, based on their basic needs; to ensure maximum protection of their rights and dignity and their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others'. **To reach the goals identified in the National Concept, the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs has launched a national strategy and action plan for the years 2015-2020, which was approved in December 2014.**

This is definitely a step forward. Despite the declared government policy, the field of mental health is still in severe condition. The monitoring has identified a number of systemic problems.

First of all, the lack of funding for mental health must be pointed out, as the amount of funds allocated is directly related to the quality of psychiatric care. Since 2006, health care spending for mental health in Georgia follows the increasing trend, but the ratio of percentage of the costs of mental health in relation to the overall costs on public health has not changed significantly. A large portion of funds is spent on inpatient psychiatric services and this figure remains high for years. The state's priority is assigned to inpatient care funding, whilst funding for psychosocial rehabilitation stands stagnant and only a small part of available financial resources is allocated to the outpatient care. Along with the lack of funding, the methodology of funding the long-term and acute cases is also a problem. 840 GEL per case is allocated for acute cases and 450 GEL per month for cases of long-term treatment. The scarcity of funding ultimately leads to the problems with insufficiency of qualified personnel at mental health institutions, the absence of adequate therapeutic environment, quality of treatment, care, psycho-social rehabilitation, as well as length of stay at hospitals and the lack of community-based services.

Georgian mental healthcare system is severely understaffed and lacks human resources. The deficit of psychiatrists is twice higher than the average European index. A 2015 study on mental health professionals found that in total, number of psychiatric health care personnel in state-funded institutions is less than 40% of the total of the employees. The training and professional development of the personnel of mental health institutions is equally problematic. The lack of qualified staff, in turn, has a negative impact on the quality of psychiatric care, supervision of patients and safe and secure environment in the institutions. This situation increases undue physical restrictions and the risk of use of excessive force when applying such physical restrictions. In addition, extremely hard working conditions result in severe psychological state of the personnel and negative emotions can lead to ill-treatment of the patients.

The monitoring group has received numerous reports about physical and verbal abuse of patients during the visits at the mental health institutions. In addition, according to the monitoring group, patients are subjected to ill-treatment due to extremely bad conditions of stay, facts of physical and chemical restraints, the methods of physical restraints, administering injections in the presence of other patients, lack of access to timely and adequate treatment of somatic diseases, long-term hospitalization due to the neglect and involuntary medical intervention. The monitoring also revealed that there is a problem of due protection of safety in mental health institutions from the violence among the patients.

The monitoring revealed that the legislative requirements as regards the use of physical restraint are systematically breached. According to surveys of patients, it was found that they are often 'tied down' for lengthy periods of time and left without adequate oversight. It was obvious that most of the institutions do not carry out the registration of cases of application of physical restrictions and there is no clear system - in most cases the record of the use of physical restraints is made in general logs and not in the patient's medical records or vice versa. The requisite 15-minute interval monitoring record of the dynamics of the patient's condition is found nowhere in any records. Sometimes the time is not set at start and end of application of physical restraint. The reasons for the use of physical restraint are formulated in a manner that is not particularly informative.

In many cases, it could not be determined why the physical binding was necessary and whether other alternative measures could be used. It should be noted that neither the Law of Georgia on Psychiatric Care nor the above mentioned instructions specify the maximum term for the use of physical restraint, which is dangerous, because it can lead to repetitive application of physical restrictions for 4 hours. The said normative acts also fail to establish the obligation that the information about the physical restraint be included both in the patient's medical record, as well as a special journal (special register).

It is therefore important that the normative acts are brought to order, via including making changes to regulate those two issues.

*It is noteworthy that neither the law nor the instructions mention chemical restraint as a measure of restriction. **According to the assessment of Public Defender, the chemical restrictions are frequent and are often not documented properly. The institutions routinely apply physical restraint together with chemical restraint. There is no clear legal framework regulating chemical restraint and no justifications are provided for its application.***

This amounts to a violation of standards of international human rights law. The same guarantees of protection should be provided whenever chemical or mechanical means of restraint are used.

The interviews with patients and the inspection shows that the patients are placed in isolation rooms for more than a few days, and bearing in mind the conditions of the isolation rooms, such practice gives rise to concerns for the Public Defender. In the view of the Public Defender, the isolation rooms in the Republican Clinical Psycho-Neurological Hospital and Mental Health Center, as well as other mental health institutions are not specially and properly equipped and there is high risk of self-harm by patients in such rooms. In addition, the Public Defender considers that the bars on the door and the window are unacceptable, both in terms of safety, and the disruption of the therapeutic environment and its' association with the prison and the punishment cell. Hence, **placement of a person in such isolation room may amount to degrading treatment.**

*The Public Defender is also concerned about the fact that despite the requirements that the usage of the physical fixation and specialized isolation together with the duration of use of these measures, shall be duly reasoned and documented in accordance with Article 16 of the Law of Georgia on Psychiatric Care and similar requirements established by abovementioned instructions, **the isolation of the patient is not in reasoned, properly documented and is applied for a long time in violation of applicable laws.***

The Public Defender deplors the fact that the physical restrictions are applied equally to formally voluntary and involuntary patients, which is also contrary to the CPT's position, according to which patients treated on a voluntary basis should not be subject to restraint. If physical restraint is necessary, the legal procedure of the review of the patient's status (voluntary / involuntary) must be immediately initiated.

*It is important that patients are provided with the material conditions which will facilitate their recovery and prosperity. It should be noted that **some of the existing physical environment and sanitary conditions not only fail to contribute to a favorable therapeutic environment, but also create the situation, which in many cases amounts to inhuman and degrading treatment.** In particular, old infrastructure, extremely bad sanitary and hygienic conditions, living space that does not correspond to the standards, poor sanitation and impossibility of privacy, as well as disruptions with regards to central heating and ventilation were between major problems at some institutions. [...]*

The Ombudsman is concerned for vulnerable legal position of individuals who are hospitalised, actually involuntarily, based on formal informed consent. They are outside the control of the court, and thus unable to defend their rights and subjected to medical interventions and physical restriction against their will. Thus, the patients' right to personal liberty and security is violated, and being subject to conditions of arbitrary detention, in many cases, they are victims of inhuman and degrading treatment. [...]

Whilst examining standards for the treatment of people with mental disorders, the group found that in most institutions, managers, as well as staff, keep understanding of the treatment as reduced to pharmacological therapy only, which is not in compliance with the modern bio-psycho-social approach and evidence-based health care principles.

*Intensive pharmacotherapy method is expected to be associated in practice with emergency/high-risk departments, which aim to discharge the patient from the department as quickly as possible. According to the doctors of such emergency/high-risk cases departments, quick discharge of patients from such units is, unfortunately, not based on the medical evidence relating to severe accident management as it should be, but rather on the amount allocated for the treatment of such acute cases, as well as the period, which is optimal for spending the allocated funds. The Special Prevention Group also had the impression that the patient "Pharmacological activity" is actually the only way to control patients. **Psychiatric cases are mostly managed without any complex therapeutic structure, and the involvement of the patients in meaningful activities is not ensured.***

According to the Public Defender, the short period of management of the acute condition of the patient (10-14 days on average) is not enough to reach comparably solid improvements. Presumably, the improvements achieved as a result of intensive treatment start to deteriorate rapidly, as the remission stage is not achieved and the patient discharged from the hospital does not receive the due out-patient care at all, or due to lack of funding, treatment is limited much lower intensity. Out-patient services are fragmented and under-developed; therefore, none of these services are available to maintain the achieved improvements. Thus, there is a high risk of re-aggravation of the situation and repeated hospitalizations.

Monitoring shows that the purchase of high-quality medicines is prevented both by the scarcity of the resources allocated to the psychiatric care, as well as the legal framework governing public procurement. In particular, mental health institutions are buying medications through a simplified electronic tender. The winner of the tender will be the bidder, which offers the lowest price to the purchaser. Such a rule of purchase had a negative impact on the quality of the medication, because there are different producers offering the medicines with the same active substance, while the market price is directly related to the quality of the end product.

The monitoring demonstrated many shortcomings of the medical documentation. In some of the facilities, psychiatrists failed to regularly inspect the patients and thus the results their observation, are also irregularly reflected in the medical cards. Medical files did not contain data on individual treatment plan. Many entries are practically illegible because of the doctor's handwriting. In most of the institutions the records describing the condition of the patient, the so-called "cursus" are not regularly kept. These records are of mostly blanket nature. [...]

High patient mortality is of the issue of particular concern for the Public Defender. As it turns out the study of medical records of patients who died, there were many cases calling for appropriate

investigation and treatment of somatic health condition, but conduct of any such examination and treatment is not confirmed by medical documentation.

Despite the efforts of staff of mental health institutions, to help beneficiaries in social issues, **psychosocial support, rehabilitation and reintegration services in hospitals are barely developed.** In some cases, their existence is only a formality and can be considered as a day-activity.

The monitoring showed prolonged hospitalisation of the children, which according to the Public Defender is the result of the improper performance of the social workers' duties. No multidisciplinary work is conducted in N5 Clinical Hospital. Work towards resolution of psychological and behavioural problems is absent from the children's individual development plans, which sticks solely to the pharmacological treatment of mental disorders. Apart from this, there is no individual service plan for each beneficiary, the fulfilment of which would be monitored by the person responsible for the dynamics to ensure that the patient receives a complete package of services. The Public Defender believes that the therapeutic activities in the children's departments do not meet modern standards and guidelines for international intervention, intervention strategies need to be developed, appropriate competence of the personnel has to be improved etc. The Public Defender is concerned by the cases of placement of children in the hospital units for adults and urges the staff to prevent such practices in the future.

Patients subjected to forcible psychiatric care and those transferred from the penitentiary institutions to undergo involuntary treatment are subject to undifferentiated approach. Patients have limited contact with each other. This includes only pharmacotherapy. Patients are not involved in the rehabilitation and improvement of programs, sports and other activities. The monitoring group was left with the impression that no psycho-social rehabilitation work is being practiced with the patients, and the psychologist help is scarce. Days are not anyhow planned or structured by meaningful activities and they generally run in the drab, mundane manner. Patients often engage in conflicts.

There is no individual approach towards patients in the Forensic Psychiatry Department of the National Center for Mental Health. Their individual needs are not identified and the necessary team is not created to perform the relevant multidisciplinary work. **Patients are not involved in the treatment process.** Patients are managed through intimidation and aggression between injections. The risk assessment procedure is not in line with international standards. It is unclear what the evidence of credibility of the instrument is, or how the degree of risk is integrated into the treatment scheme, the treatments are held in uniform, broad blanket structure.

Finally, it should be noted in particular that there is a problem of proper monitoring of psychiatric care in mental health institutions supervised by state and of protection of patients' rights. In this regard, the activities of the National Preventive Mechanism are crucial, but the Public Defender considers that bearing in mind the specific nature of the mandate of the National Preventive Mechanism, it is important to ensure effective operation of other state control mechanisms at the same time. » Quelle: Büro des georgischen Ombudsmanns, National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) - Report on the monitoring of mental health institutions, 31. Mai 2016, S.7-13: www.ombudsman.ge/uploads/other/3/3694.pdf.

CERD, 22. Juni 2016:

« Tout en saluant l'adoption de la loi antidiscrimination en mai 2014 et la désignation du Défenseur public de la Géorgie comme l'organe chargé de l'égalité responsable de l'application de cette loi, **le Comité est préoccupé par le faible nombre de procès dans lesquels les**

dispositions de cette loi sont invoquées. En outre, le Comité note que contrairement aux organismes publics, les entités privées et les particuliers n'ont pas l'obligation de communiquer des informations pertinentes au Défenseur public en vertu de l'article 8 de la loi, ce qui limite la capacité du Défenseur public d'examiner efficacement les affaires de discrimination dans lesquelles des entités privées ou des particuliers sont mis en cause (art. 1^{er} et 6).[...]

10. Le Comité s'inquiète à nouveau du manque de données ventilées concernant les minorités raciales et ethniques et les non-ressortissants dans l'État partie, notamment les groupes les moins nombreux comme les Kistines, les Kurdes, les Juifs, les Grecs et les Assyriens (voir CERD/C/GEO/CO/4-5, par. 19) ainsi que les personnes d'ascendance africaine ou d'origine africaine. **Il est également préoccupé par l'absence d'un mécanisme de suivi et de collecte systématiques de données sur les affaires de discrimination raciale examinées par les autorités judiciaires en vertu du droit civil ou pénal (art. 2).** [...]

12. Tout en saluant les mesures que l'État partie a prises pour améliorer la situation des minorités nationales, notamment l'adoption du programme de quotas « 1 + 4 » et de la Stratégie pour l'égalité des citoyens et l'intégration et du plan d'action s'y rapportant, **le Comité est préoccupé par :**

a) Le faible niveau de connaissance du géorgien en tant que deuxième langue parmi les minorités nationales et ethniques, qui fait obstacle à leur intégration dans la société, à leur participation à la vie publique et politique et à leur représentation dans les fonctions de décision, en particulier au niveau de l'administration centrale, de même qu'à leur accès à l'éducation et à l'emploi ; b) Le peu de perspectives d'éducation et d'emploi des jeunes, notamment des filles, dans les zones reculées où vivent les minorités nationales et ethniques, comme la vallée de Pankissi, ce qui expose ces jeunes à la radicalisation et au recrutement par des groupes terroristes ; c) Le manque de programmes d'information pertinents et adaptés à destination des minorités nationales et ethniques (art. 2 et 5).[...]

14. Le Comité note les efforts déployés par l'État partie pour enregistrer les personnes d'origine rom et pour accroître le taux de scolarisation des enfants roms, mais il est toujours préoccupé par le fait que **de nombreux Roms ne possèdent pas de papiers d'identité et que la scolarisation des enfants reste faible, en particulier au-delà de l'enseignement primaire. Il note également avec préoccupation :**

a) La marginalisation de la communauté rom et les conditions économiques et sociales précaires dans lesquelles vivent ses membres ; b) Les cas d'enfants roms qui vivent et travaillent dans la rue et l'absence de mesures stratégiques visant à s'occuper de cette situation ; c) Les cas de mariages d'enfants ou de mariages forcés dans la communauté rom (art. 2 et 5). » Quelle: UNO-Ausschuss zur Beseitigung der Rassendiskriminierung (CERD), Observations finales concernant les sixième à huitième rapports périodiques de la Géorgie*, 22. Juni 2016, S.2-5: <http://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=6QkG1d%2fPPRI-CAqhKb7yhsuh9J2cqmL1NA4hM%2b%2fajGw4Rc6TFptQCZp9%2feNG-kEDPtXB4CdwVjkepQxj7ZqhW5MF47Cij4tRqVfi7cOmE%2f%2bezqfZhgXovXziskAE%2f0DUr>

CIF, Juni 2014 :

« Public Health allocations on mental health in Georgia had a tendency to increase during 2006-2011, however the share of mental health expenditures (%) in the total public health expenditures has not experienced substantial change and stays at about 2.5%,² which is much lower than the same indicator of the countries with the similar economic development.

At the same time Per capita expenditure on the mental health in Georgia significantly differs from that of the countries with the similar development level, where more money is spent on mental health services.

A large portion of the funds allocated to the mental health care is spent on inpatient mental health services (71 %) in Georgia and this figure has remained stably high over the years (from 2006 to present). The developed European countries spend 9-31% on the inpatient mental health services, while having much higher expenditures on community services. It is worth mentioning that the deinstitutionalization process and the development of community-based services is a result of long-term endeavor in these countries, and Georgia will need decades to achieve the same level, however the first steps should be taken today. For example, Australia began to implement similar reforms as far back as in 1950s, and the United Kingdom has been implementing the reforms since 1980s.

In Georgia, the high share of expenditures on the inpatient services poses a significant problem to the development of outpatient services: a) Existing resources for satisfying outpatient programs needs are scarce, b) Until 2014, funds among service providers were distributed according to a “historic budget”, which put institutions in unequal conditions – per registered beneficiary expenditures varied from 4 to 17 GEL. Weakness of the patient registration system is considered one of the causes of the above-mentioned inequality. Overall scarcity of the financial resources allocated from the budget to the Mental Health Care fail to create a favorable environment for service providers for delivering better services. Namely, the competence of outpatient facilities is basically limited to prescription and distribution of drugs, which are of poor quality, and, in some cases, fails to comply with quantitative requirements. As demonstrated by the study findings, some facilities experience drug shortages for a certain period of a month that result in out-of-pocket expenditures by the patients.

Currently 18 outpatient mental health care providers operate throughout the country, while only five are authorized to provide psychosocial expertise to persons with disabilities. According to the established procedure of granting the status, repeated assessment is carried out with a pre-determined frequency, that creates geographical barrier to the service accessibility and affects the patient’s financial state. It should also be noted that the facility does not receive additional financial benefit for providing expertise service.

In light of the scarce resources, there is a certain type of service – a crisis intervention component, which absorbs 20% of the budget allocated for the outpatient clinics and is available only in 4 regions, while some districts are not covered even by basic outpatient services. The psycho-social rehabilitation service, which, in its essence, is aimed to maximally promote the social integration and adaptation conditions for persons with mental disorders,

is presently limited to only three institutions and the number of beneficiaries does not exceed a few dozen.

Long-term hospital beds are occupied by the patients that require shelter or community residential services. Therefore, in some cases, the access to necessary services becomes limited for the beneficiaries.

*It is known that the funding models create financial incentives for service providers. **The existing funding models on one hand stimulate reduction of length of stay and high bed utilization (acute hospitalization), while on the other hand - maximum bed occupancy (long-term hospitalization), that ultimately leads to an inefficient use of the program funds.***

*Analysis of cases of 10 months from 2013 program data demonstrates that length of stay in acute inpatient service provider institutions is 14-20 days, consequently, the bed turnover rate is high. Data from the developed countries shows that acute beds length of stay fluctuates in approximately the same range as in Georgia. However, these countries have a developed unified system of treatment/care, the most important components of which are the non-hospital based services. The latter ensures the treatment continuation and constant supervision of the patient's health. It is interesting that in such systems re-hospitalization is estimated at 30 days and is used as an indicator for the quality of the non-hospital based services. **In Georgia the setting is different. In particular, the system in Georgia is fragmented - there is no close interaction between hospitals and outpatient services, while the re-hospitalization term of 7 days is considered a problematic issue among the psychiatrists.***

Based on the international experience, it can be stated that the re-hospitalization term of 7-days is inappropriate under such a fragmented system. It does not fulfill its purpose. Furthermore, this regulation might encourage an institution to manipulate with a patient's hospitalization date.

The program design does not consider involvement of a hospital in patient's supervision after discharge. As a result of inadequate outpatient services, some patients return to the hospital. Within the 'conditional' time-frames established under the influence of the financial model, some patients' health state cannot be improved sufficiently to enable them to return to the society, therefore, after receiving acute hospitalization services, these patients become beneficiaries of the long-term hospital service. All these factors result in additional costs to the program. The funding of hospital services is unevenly distributed, for example, the funding of long-term services fails to cover the existing needs, while the acute hospitalization services are relatively adequately funded. The issue is exacerbated by the lack of criteria for acute and long-term hospitalization at the regulations level.[...]

The staff are heavily overloaded due to the shortage of human resources. At the outpatient level, beneficiaries indicate the existence of long queues, while at the hospital level the major part of the doctors' working time is devoted to such routine activities as maintaining of patients' medical records and preparation of various supplementary documents. Computerization of these functions, or delegation of those to the low-skilled staff would help to decrease the existing deficit in human resources.

Lack of the personnel on one hand and limited financial resources on the other result in the absence of multidisciplinary services at the outpatient level. Again, there are problems with the personnel qualification, especially in the regions, and particularly with psychologists and nurses. Due to lack of financial incentives, the psychiatric field is not attractive to young doctors. Also the existing funding models do not contribute to the work quality improvement.

The above mentioned problems are further exacerbated by the fact that the state has not yet developed a vision/strategy for supplying the field with human resources in the future, which would encourage young medical staff to work in this field. » Quelle: Curatio International Foundation (CIF), Mental Health Care in Georgia: Challenges and Possible Solutions, Juni 2014, S.4-10: www.gip-global.org/files/mental-health-policy-brief-eng-web.pdf.

EASL, 13. April 2018:

« The world's first hepatitis C elimination programme was initiated in Georgia in collaboration with the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and with a commitment from Gilead Sciences to donate DAAs. The programme was initiated in April 2015,³ and the results from its first 2 years in action were presented today at The International Liver Congress™ 2018 in Paris, France.

'In Georgia, we have set out to achieve 90-95-95 targets by 2020, which means that we want to diagnose 90% of all HCV-infected individuals, we want to treat 95% of those diagnosed, and we want to cure 95% of those treated', explained Professor Tengiz Tsertsvadze from the Infectious Diseases, AIDS and Clinical Immunology Research Center in Tbilisi, Georgia. 'We had previously estimated that there were around 150,000 adults with HCV infection living in Georgia, which represents a prevalence in our population of 5.4%'.⁴

Hepatitis C screening programmes began in Georgia in 2015 and, by the end of April 2017, 43,989 individuals (29.3% of the estimated total population) had been diagnosed with HCV infection and registered with the elimination programme. A total of 33,673 individuals had initiated treatment with DAAs, and 24,273 individuals had achieved a sustained virological response (SVR), i.e. were cured.

'In the first 2 years of this programme, we have diagnosed more than one-quarter of our HCV-infected adults in Georgia, we have treated 77% of those diagnosed, and cured over 95% of those completing treatment', said Prof. Tsertsvadze. 'Our priorities now are to develop innovative strategies to increase awareness, expand access to high-quality screening, and remove diagnostic and treatment barriers'. [...]

'These two HCV elimination programmes in two different settings show promising results', said Prof. Markus Cornberg from the Hannover Medical School, Germany, and EASL Governing Board Member. 'However, the programme in Iceland is unique and special because it is a defined (or better delimited) situation on an island with a defined target population. If elimination of HCV is possible without a vaccine, it will surely be possible in Iceland. **The programme in Georgia still has a long way to go, as three quarters of patients are not yet diagnosed**'.

» Quelle: European Association for the Study of the Liver (EASL), Hepatitis C virus elimination programs report encouraging results: Is elimination within reach?, 13. April 2018: www.eurokalert.org/pub_releases/2018-04/eaft-hcv041318.php.

Eurasianet, 8. Mai 2017:

«Thousands of Georgians have been cured of hepatitis C as a result of a giant experiment, in which the ex-Soviet nation tests the effectiveness of an aggressive public-health strategy.

In the unprecedented project, all Georgians suffering from hepatitis C – an estimated 130,000 individuals – are being treated with expensive American medications free of charge. The program has entered its third year this May, and by 2020, Georgia hopes to be the first country in the world virtually free of the infectious liver disease.

The project is being undertaken by the US Centers for Disease Controls, the Georgian Ministry of Health and Gilead Sciences Inc., the American pharmaceuticals giant that developed the medications. Starting in 2015, Gilead's medication, dubbed Sovaldi, was administered to 5,800 Georgian hepatitis patients with severe complications like advanced liver fibrosis and cirrhosis. The following year, a newer drug developed by Gilead, called Havroni, was given to anyone with an active infection.

Georgian officials and epidemiologists reported a full recovery rate of over 90 percent among a total of 30,000 citizens who have been treated during the first two years of the program. "We naturally had better results last year because most patients involved did not have significant liver damage, and we had a new, combined drug to give," said Dr. Maia Butsashvili, an infectious disease specialist at Neolab, a clinic participating in the program.

The success rate was 80 percent in patients with severe liver damage, and 97 percent for those with a less-advanced stage of the disease, said Butsashvili, who is also a director of Health Research Union, a non-profit working on prevention and treatment of viral infections.

In the United States, Gilead Sciences charges \$1,000 for a single Sovaldi pill. A 12-week Havroni protocol costs about \$84,000. **Gilead's largesse in the Georgian experiment is an investment: if the project succeeds, it could help the company make a case for internationally and nationally funded programs to eliminate hepatitis C worldwide by making the cure available to everyone who needs it.** Gilead representatives did not respond to emailed questions by the time this story was published.

Georgia was chosen as a proving ground due to its manageable population size and its high prevalence of hepatitis C. Georgia has the third highest rate of infection in the world after Egypt and Mongolia. Surveys from the early 2000s estimated that 6.7 percent (almost 200,000 people) of Georgia's total population was infected with hepatitis C.

The disease spread in Georgia as the country regained independence following the Soviet collapse in 1991 and was plunged into a prolonged period of civil war and economic instability. Sterilization practices were substandard and intravenous drug use was rampant at that time. "The big contamination of the 1990s is catching up with us now. We have lots of men in their 40s who now face life-threatening liver conditions," Butsashvili said. » Quelle: Eurasianet, Georgia Serves as Proving Ground for Experiment to Eradicate Hepatitis C, 8. Mai 2017: <https://eurasianet.org/s/georgia-serves-as-proving-ground-for-experiment-to-eradicate-hepatitis-c>.

FactCheck, 6. Mai 2017:

« Four years since its launch, important changes have been enacted within the universal healthcare programme. The state replaces the universal principle with a targeted approach. Moreover, a medication component has been added to the state healthcare programme.

Since launching the universal healthcare programme, healthcare experts, governmental opposition, NGOs, media and FactCheck as well have been constantly emphasising the ineffectiveness of the programme alongside its excessive spending. Our recommendation was to make the programme more targeted and focused on those people with the least access to healthcare. Providing funds for medicine within the framework of the healthcare programme was also important because more than half of healthcare expenses is spent on medication.

Another recommendation was to have private insurance companies implementing the state healthcare programme. In this case, the state purchases health insurance packages from a private insurance company and, in so doing, faces no financial risk. Statistics of the last years (2014-2016) demonstrate that the state is unable to cap universal healthcare programme expenses. In spite of this, no changes have been made to the universal healthcare programme. **The Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Affairs will try to limit expenses through the use of differentiated packages and selective contracting of the hospitals.**

Differentiated packages of the universal healthcare system

Since 1 May 2017, Georgian citizens with a higher income level whose annual income exceeds GEL 40,000 cannot use the universal healthcare programme.

Citizens with a medium level income, whose monthly income is more than GEL 1,000 but does not exceed GEL 40,000 annually and do not have private health insurance, can use the limited package of the universal healthcare programme. People in this category (even if they have a private insurance package) still have access to funding for oncologic diseases as well as childbirth/caesarean section.

Low income (less than GEL 1,000) citizens, self-employed individuals and persons with irregular income will retain access to the universal healthcare programme; although, with some limitations. If people in this category purchase a private insurance package, they will be entitled to funds only for urgent and oncologic services together with childbirth/caesarean section.

Socially vulnerable citizens and persons who are registered in the database of socially vulnerable people whose rating points are between 70,000 and 100,000 as well as children from the ages of six to 18 years, teachers and people with limited capabilities will be fully entitled to all of the services provided by the universal healthcare programme. Additionally, they are not restricted from using a private insurance package at the same time.

A medication funding component has been added to the universal healthcare programme

From summer 2017, citizens registered in the database of socially vulnerable families whose rating points do not exceed 100,000 will receive funding for medication for chronic ailments. Namely:

Medication for chronic heart and cardiovascular diseases

Medication for chronic lung diseases

Medication for diabetes (type 2)

Medication for thyroid diseases

A programme beneficiary has to be a co-payer and pay 10% of the total value of the medication(s) which should not be less than GEL 0.05 and more than GEL 1.

According to the ordinance of the Government of Georgia dated 25 April 2017, the list of medications which would be funded by the universal healthcare programme was also determined. **In total, 24 types of medication will be funded within the framework of the programme.**

List of medications:

Enalapril
Losartan
Amlodipine
Metoprolol
Amiodarone
Isosorbid
Dinitrat
Varparin
Clopidogrel
Digoxin
Furosemide
Spironolactone
Atorvastatin
Metformin
Gliclazide
Glimepiride
Thiamazole
Levothyroxine
Budesonide (inhalation suspension)
Budesonide (inhalation aerosol)
Albuterol
Salmeterol/fluticasone
Salbutamol
Tiotropium Bromide
Methylprednisolone

According to the calculation of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Affairs, **the number of people who might benefit from the medication programme is approximately between 150,000 and 200,000.**

The Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Affairs has already announced a tender to purchase the medicines. The main emphasis for purchase will be on the quality of the medication. As FactCheck was informed by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Affairs, it is expected that **citizens will be able to use this programme from July 2017.**

The budget for the medication programme is set at GEL 3,360,000. This budget is calculated for a period of six months. As the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Affairs assumes that at least 150,000 persons will use this programme, it means that an average of GEL 22.4 is allocated per person for the six months which works out to GEL 3.7 per person on a monthly basis. **The expected amount of programme beneficiaries and the programme's budget do not correspond with each other. Therefore, at the end of the year, we will see that programme's budget is insufficient or a much lesser number of people will actually benefit from this programme.** » Quelle: FactCheck, What are the changes in the universal healthcare?, 6. Mai 2017: <http://factcheck.ge/en/article/what-are-the-changes-in-the-universal-healthcare/>.

Georgisches Parlament, 7. August 2018:

« The Health Committee, within the Parliamentary oversight held the **hearing on strategic document for mental health sphere and implementation of the state program.** The Deputy Health Minister, psychiatrists, field experts and Directors of the Hospitals introduced the information about the challenges in mental health sphere and future visions.

“We consider the significant program within the Parliamentary oversight. It is noteworthy that **the Committee has unanimously supported increase of financing for the program with 5 ml GEL thus expressing our support to the reform.** Today, we heard the information about implementation of the strategic document and state program, allowing us getting cognizant with the outcomes and measures to be undertaken”, - the Chair, Akaki Zoidze stated.

The Deputy Health Minister, Maia Lagvilava introduced the presentation on **Mental Health Development Strategic Document and Action Plan for 2015-2020.** The financing of all the components have increased in 2018 conditioning establishment of the new services, increase of the mobile teams and facilitation to in-patient and out-patient services. Out-patient service funding has increased with 14.5% and allocations have been directed to mental service for the children with mental disorder. The reporter stated that if there were 3 mobile teams in 2017 in Tbilisi, the number increased to 11 in 2018 covering other regions as well. “We have made significant steps though the challenges remain. I hope we achieve all objectives under the strategy for 2020”, - she noted. » Quelle: Georgisches Parlament, The Health Care and Social Issues Committee discussing the Mental Health Strategic Document and State Program implementation, 7. August 2018: www.parliament.ge/en/saparlamento-saqmianoba/komitetebi/djanmrtelobis-dacvisa-da-socialur-sakitxta-komiteti-149/axali-ambebi-iandacva/djanmrtelobis-dacvisa-da-socialur-sakitxta-komitetis-sxdomaze-fsiqikuri-djanmrtelobis-sferos-strategiuli-dokumentisa-da-saxelmwifo-programis-shesrulebis-mimdinareobaze-imsdjeles.page.

HHS/CDC, Juli 2017:

« HCV screening programs began in January 2015, before the launch of the program, and screening services continue to be provided at various settings at no cost (Table). During January 2015–December 2016, a total of 472,890 HCV screening tests* were conducted, 50,962 (10.8%) of which were positive for HCV antibody. The highest rate of HCV antibody–positive screening tests (45.0%) was among persons who

attended programs providing services for persons who inject drugs; the lowest rate (0.4%) was among women attending antenatal clinics (Table). Persons who screen positive for HCV antibody are referred to the treatment program for confirmation of chronic HCV infection using polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing for detection of HCV RNA. Once chronic HCV infection is confirmed, the person is invited to enroll in the treatment program.

When the treatment program began on April 28, 2015, four treatment centers operated in Georgia, all located in Tbilisi, the capital and largest city. By December 2016, the number of treatment centers had increased to 27 nationwide. From the start to December 31, 2016, a total of 58,223 persons with positive HCV antibody test results sought confirmation of chronic HCV infection through the treatment program, among whom 38,113 (65.5%) initiated a diagnostic evaluation, including confirmation of HCV infection by PCR testing; of those who initiated a diagnostic evaluation, 30,046 (78.8%) were confirmed as having chronic HCV infection and completed the diagnostic workup, and 27,595 (91.8%) of whom began treatment. Men accounted for 23,062 (83.6%) of all persons starting treatment, including 9,180 men aged 40–49 years, representing one third of all persons who initiated treatment (Figure 1). The average number of persons starting treatment each month increased nearly 300% from April 2015–May 2016 (661 per month) to June–December, 2016 (2,619 per month), peaking in September 2016 at 4,595. A decline occurred from October through December 2016 (Figure 2). During the initial phase of the program (April, 2015–May, 2016), when treatment was prioritized for persons with more severe liver disease, most patients initiating treatment (9,088 of 9,259; 98.2%) had advanced liver disease (\geq F3 METAVIR fibrosis score or FIB-4 score $>$ 3.25). After the expansion of treatment criteria to allow treatment for all persons with HCV infection (beginning June 1 through December 31, 2016), most persons initiating treatment (14,368 of 18,336; 78.4%) had less severe liver disease ($<$ F3 METAVIR fibrosis score or FIB-4 score $<$ 1.45) (Figure 2).

As of December 31, 2016, a total of 19,778 persons completed treatment, and 6,366 (32.2%) eligible patients received testing for SVR (undetectable HCV RNA \geq 12 weeks after treatment completion) (5). SVR was observed for 5,356 (84.1%) persons tested, indicating that they were cured of their infection. Among the 75.0% (4,774/6,366) who received sofosbuvir (without ledipasvir) treatment regimens, 3,793 (79.5%) achieved SVR, and among the 25.0% (1,592 of 6,366) who received ledipasvir/sofosbuvir-based treatment regimens, 1,563 (98.2%) achieved SVR. Among 537 (1.9%) persons who did not complete treatment, 371 (69.1%) died from their liver disease or another cause during the course of treatment, and the other 166 (30.1%) discontinued treatment for other reasons. [...]

Despite notable progress during the first 20 months of the Georgia HCV elimination program, **challenges to Georgia achieving the national targets for HCV elimination by 2020 remain. High-quality screening, innovative linkage-to-care strategies, and cost-effective and simplified diagnostic and treatment regimens are needed. Provision of free-of-charge services for HCV screening, diagnosis, care, and treatment in settings serving populations at high risk for HCV infection and in primary care settings can decrease barriers to access of treatment services.** MoLHSA is working with CDC and other international partners to address challenges and introduce innovative strategies. Pangenotypic direct-acting antiviral drugs that are effective across the different genotypes of HCV, point-of-care HCV RNA testing, and HCV core antigen testing are likely to be introduced in late 2017 or 2018 and could have a substantial impact on improving access and simplifying diagnosis and treatment. Information systems capable of linking screening and treatment data are being developed to improve efficiencies. **With increased access to HCV treatment services and full implementation of the country's strategic plan, Georgia can achieve the goal for HCV elimination in 2020.** Lessons learned from this program can inform similar initiatives in other countries and help curb the global epidemic of viral hepatitis (8). » Quelle: US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC),

The Role of Screening and Treatment in National Progress Toward Hepatitis C Elimination — Georgia, 2015–2016, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 28. Juli 2017, www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6629a2.htm.

HHS/CDC, 21. Oktober 2016 :

« Initially, four treatment centers located in Tbilisi (Georgia’s capital) provided HCV treatment to program participants. By April 27, 2016, the number of treatment centers had increased to 17 and they were located throughout the country, with staff members that included 95 physicians and infectious disease specialists or gastroenterologists providing HCV treatment services. All patients had access to point-of-care and laboratory-based HCV antibody testing, viral load determination, and genotyping. Noninvasive tests used to determine the degree of hepatic fibrosis included the following: FIB-4 score, which combines age and standard blood tests (platelet count, alanine aminotransferase, aspartate aminotransferase) (3), and ultrasound or transient elastography, which measures the decrease in tissue elasticity that accompanies liver fibrosis (4,5). Genotyping was performed for all patients who tested positive for HCV by PCR. Six major genotypes of HCV are recognized worldwide, and treatment of HCV infection varies by genotype (6). Patients with advanced liver disease (F3 or F4 by METAVIR† fibrosis score) were prioritized to receive treatment during the first year of the program.

A sliding-scale approach was used for diagnostics and clinical monitoring, with patients charged based on their ability to pay and the local government or MoLHSA paying the balance. All program participants received sofosbuvir-based treatment regimens, provided free-of-charge by Gilead Sciences; the Georgian government purchased additional medications (i.e., pegylated interferon and ribavirin) and provided them at no cost to patients for whom such treatment was indicated.» Quelle: US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Progress Toward Hepatitis C Elimination — Georgia, 2015–2016, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 21. Oktober 2016, S. 1132: www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/wr/pdfs/mm6541a2.pdf.

HRHF, 8. Mai 2015:

« According to official information about 1500 Roma are registered in Georgia. Their big part lives in Tbilisi and Gachiani. In accordance to the survey conducted by the project researcher at the European Center for Minority Issues [ECMI] Giorgi Sordia, compact settlements of Roma people are in Leninovka village of Dedoplistskaro district, in Gachiani village of Gardabani municipality, in Telavi, Kutaisi, Kobuleti and in Isani-Samgori district and Lilo settlement in Tbilisi. The oldest and most traditional settlement of Roma people is in Leninovka where 18 Roma families/133 people live. Residents of this settlement have one common problem: majority of them have no access to education and healthcare services. [...]

Co-founder of the nongovernmental organization “Disarmament and No to Violence” Irma Gelenava said Roma people cannot involve state programs because they do not have ID cards. “Majority of Roma people are impoverished. Without ID cards they cannot get various social services under state programs.”

“Roma, who does not have ID, cannot enjoy universal insurance program. There is Medical Center for Mothers and Children in Mitskevich Street, Tbilisi. Coordinator for Minority Issues in this Center Ketevan Gabruashvili assists us with medicines. We provide many Roma people with primary medical care with those medicines,” Veneral Martkoplshvili said.

Irma Gelenava said during illness Roma rarely go to doctors because they do not have documents. Many elderly Roma people cannot get pension because of the same problem.

Project Assistant at the ECMI Elene Proshikian is ethnic Roma and has been working on the Roma problems for years. "Since Roma children are born at home, they cannot get ID cards at the age of 16. Romas do not know which institution they can apply to resolve their problems. They are not informed about state social and healthcare programs. They cannot write applications because they are illiterate. Lack of education is the barrier which is the biggest obstacle for Roma to integrate into the society."

Elene said birth at home damages children's health conditions. "Pregnant women do not apply to doctors for monitoring or treatment; that means during pregnancy nobody takes care of the embryo. Consequently, many children are born with grave health problems," Elene said.

According to Elene Proshikyan, children from Leninovka village have IDs with the support of the ECMI.

Council under the auspices of the State Minister for Reintegration, which worked on the Roma issues, functioned only several months and then closed. According to the researchers, the Ministry of Justice should be very active in the defense of Roma's rights that means to register Roma and issue ID documents on them. » Quelle: Human Rights House Foundation (HRHF), Roma Population in Georgia, 8. Mai 2015: <https://humanrightshouse.org/articles/roma-population-in-georgia/>.

Lela Sulaberidze et al., 13. Februar 2018:

« Georgia has transformed healthcare financing and has undertaken a number of health system reforms over the last two decades, including in the mental health sector. The Universal Health Coverage Programme (UHCP), a state funded programme introduced in 2013, mainly provides primary care for individuals with physical health problems, but includes some limited mental health disorders. Specialist in-patient and outpatient psychiatric services are covered separately by the State Programme for Mental Health (SPMH), which was introduced in 1995 and managed by the Social Service Agency as part of the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs (MoLHSA). As such, outpatient and acute and long-term inpatient psychiatric care is available free of charge to all citizens of Georgia through 23 mental health services distributed across the country. Services include outpatient consultations with a psychiatrist, and subsequent prescriptions, either in one of 10 independent ambulatory centres or polyclinics, or in one of eight psychiatric hospitals that have an established outpatient department. Outpatient care also covers psychosocial rehabilitation services, which are offered at 2 outpatient centres and 1 independent facility, and psychiatric crisis resolution, which is provided at 4 hospitals with outpatient services. Currently, a number of common mental disorders, such as anxiety and obsessive-compulsive disorders (OCD), are excluded from any outpatient treatment.

In-patient care includes a broader range of services compared to outpatient care, and whilst most inpatient care is provided free, care provided for alcohol-related psychiatric disorders are subject to a sizable co-payment. Care is also provided to those living in supported housing (a combination of accommodation and support services to maintain independent living). There are 9 standalone hospitals throughout the county and 3 inpatient psychiatric units integrated into the general hospitals in the

capital city, which only provide acute inpatient care services. The reallocation of psychiatric hospital beds from large institutions to newly opened psychiatric departments within general hospitals in 2011 was seen as one of the most significant reforms within the mental health system in Georgia.

The financing mechanisms for delivering services differ according to the type and setting of the services provided.

Outpatient services are financed directly through the historic allocation of funds from the SPMH budget, whilst long-term inpatient services are reimbursed through a standard per-diem or monthly tariff. The exception is for alcohol-related disorders where case-based payment is used. Although there is much discussion about modernizing the delivery of mental health services to ensure equity of access to treatment, there are no studies documenting barriers to care. The only study among the Internally Displaced Population found that utilization of psychiatric services for common mental disorders is unsatisfactorily low and one of the major barriers in service utilization are costs related to drugs and services. [...]

Health expenditure data showed that Georgia has seen a substantial increase in the proportion of GDP spent on healthcare since 1995 (Fig. 1), with an 83% increase between 1995 and 2011. This was similar to EUR-A group countries, where increasing health expenditure trends are also seen. Expenditure decreased rapidly in the period 2009–2013. Even so, in 2014 Georgia's health expenditure as a proportion of GDP stood at 7.4%, which was still greater than CIS and EUR B + C countries.

An analysis of per capita total health expenditure in PPP \$ (Fig. 2) shows that, although the proportion of GDP spent on health was relatively high in Georgia, actual health expenditure (PPP \$) was lower than in the other groups.

Mental health expenditure as a percentage of total government health expenditure was compared between a number of countries (Fig. 3). Whilst Georgia's mental health expenditure of 2.83% of total health expenditure is higher than the 2.32% median mental health expenditure of UMCs, this is still nearly half the amount of the median value for HICs at 5.1%, indicating that Georgia has a long way to go.

An analysis of the distribution of resources between outpatient and in-patient care was further undertaken through comparing expenditure on mental hospitals as a percentage of the total mental health spending for 2011 (Fig. 4). It can be seen that this distribution varies greatly across countries. Georgia spent 71.14% of its total mental health budget on inpatient care in 2011, a value similar to the median of other lower middle-income countries and UMCs (73% and 74%, respectively). However, an almost equal distribution of resources between inpatient and outpatient care is observed in HICs, with a median of 54% allocated to inpatient care.

Due to limited data availability, further detailed analysis of international comparators was not possible. However, local data allowed some comparison between different mental health institutions within Georgia. Analysis revealed that there are twenty-three individual facilities that offer a range of services from long-term in-patient care to supported accommodation. Across these facilities, 18 offer outpatient services; 12 offer long-term in-patient services with a capacity of 1207 beds; 10 offer acute in-patient services; four provide crisis intervention; three provide psycho-rehabilitation; and only one provides supported accommodation (Table 3). The total number of psychiatrists working across these services was estimated at 176 (3.92 psychiatrists per 100,000 people). In addition to the services on offer, Table 3 also demonstrates the huge variations between regions in terms of the

availability of services. Due to the extreme topographical nature of Georgia, straight-line distances do not accurately reflect the true distance between populations and services. While services are, as one would expect, most often located in the populous cities of the region, some regions are still left underserved. [...]

The results present a broad range of **barriers to the development and implementation of reforms within the current mental health system** in Georgia. [...]

These barriers include information barriers, insufficiency of resources, resource distribution, resource inappropriateness, resource inflexibility and resource timing.

At a patient level, there is a **lack of information about the free treatment available for those with mental health conditions**. The absence of explicit policies or guidelines for the consistent identification and on-ward referral to mental health services following a diagnosis of a mental health disorder propagates the ineffective and costly (to the patient) treatment of patients.

Information barriers at the system level include barriers to the transmission of information about best practice at a clinician/organisational level, but also the lack of local evidence available to policy-makers about the effectiveness of the SPMH. Furthermore, whilst there are relatively sophisticated systems in place for collecting data about patients and their treatment through electronic patient records, there is no overall monitoring of services to identify the most effective care models/pathways that could be used in the planning and commissioning of services by policymakers.

This is further highlighted by the **lack of any quality measures or indicators that allow benchmarking of services and opportunities for transparent oversight and scrutiny of the delivery of services, which are reported as being highly variable**. In addition to this, the **lack of awareness of public procurement procedures among facility managers is one of the barriers that leads to low quality drugs procurement at outpatient mental health facilities**.

Insufficiency of resources

A major problem facing many LMICs is that of allocative planning for mental health. The majority of LMICs, especially those in Africa and Asia, spend less than 1% of their total health budget on mental health. **Lower middle-income countries, such as Georgia and some other FSU countries, spend an average of 2.62% of their total health budget on mental health, compared with higher-middle-income countries and high-income countries, which spend 4.27% and 6.88% respectively**. As demonstrated by the logarithmic scale for the relationship between the budget for mental health (as a proportion of total health budget) and GDP, the poorer the country the less is spent on mental health. Knapp et al. identified the following reasons for resource insufficiency: poor economic conditions; the low priority attached to mental health by the government or other key funders; low willingness to seek or pay for treatment; and poor stewardship.

In terms of prioritisation by the government, the picture is mixed. Following the introduction of the SPMH, mental health services and medications have been provided free at the point of care, addressing one of the major barriers to improving mental healthcare. **Although healthcare expenditure in Georgia has increased, the allocation of funding for mental health has only seen a modest rise, which is insufficient to deliver effective and efficient services. This is exemplified by the low quality of medica-**

tions provided by many facilities, where patients often prefer to purchase their medications privately, outside the SPMH, to access higher-quality medications. The existence of independent procurement practices and restricted budgets at each facility does not allow the purchase of high quality drugs at a lower price.

*A unified procurement mechanism might solve this problem. Furthermore, **due to their high workload, psychiatrists are restricted in the amount of time available for consultations, limiting the possibility of delivering psychological therapies.** Nevertheless, even with limited resources, there seems to be potential to improve allocative and technical efficiency by better integrating services and setting standards to improve the quality of drugs.*

Resource distribution

*In Georgia, the highest population density is seen in the capital, **Tbilisi, which has the highest number of acute facilities (five) but a relatively small number of long term acute beds.** Conversely, **the Racha-Lechkhumi & Kvemo Svaneti region, a particularly remote and sparsely populated rural area, has no provision of mental health services. As a result, patients are often required to travel large distances. This can be prohibitive due to the costs/time involved and creates a barrier to accessing treatment.***

***As there are currently no reliable data on the prevalence of mental disorders across the regions of Georgia, it is extremely difficult to effectively plan services that meet the needs of the population.** Instead, budgetary distributions to facilities are based on historic allocations. This highlights a particular problem faced by those proposing reform of mental health services. In order to develop a comprehensive mental health policy and subsequent programme, a needs-based policy assessment is required [14]. This would necessitate a more rigorous understanding of the needs of patients through epidemiological surveys of the disease burden, and also a wide-ranging assessment of the needs of a range of stakeholders including service providers, patients and their caretakers. **In addition to the geographical location of facilities, the existence of unequal tariffs has been reported where different facilities receive between 4 GEL (2.5 USD) to 17 GEL (10.6 USD) per patient despite providing the same outpatient services.** This naturally affects the resources available to provide these services.*

***There is currently a lack of provision for some common mental disorders, especially anxiety and OCD,** as is the case in a number of European countries [15]. A comprehensive mental health system would ensure that all conditions diagnosed are included within the health care programme. There may however be an alternative route to integrate anxiety disorders with physical healthcare under the provision of the UHCP introduced in 2013.*

Moreover, the concept of public mental health, especially relating to preventative health or risk reduction, is not currently seen as a priority and currently no programmes exist to ensure the wellbeing of the population.

Resource inappropriateness

*The balanced care model highlights the need for the provision of mental health services balanced appropriately between inpatient and outpatient/community care and the management of conditions using a balance of pharmacological and psychological treatments [16]. **The current mental healthcare budget allocates more than 70% of resources to hospital care, whilst less than 30% is assigned to outpatient***

services. Whilst there has been some diversification of services with the introduction of psycho-social rehabilitation and crisis intervention, current demand far outstrips supply. The current provision of community teams is extremely limited, with few resources allocated to this area and restrictive budgets preventing their development. Furthermore, only one supported housing service is provided in the whole of the country, with just 100 places, meaning that many patients that could be discharged from long-term care often remain in hospital due to a lack of social support, increasing the risk of institutionalisation.

Although de-institutionalisation seemed to have been the direction of travel of many FSU and post-communist countries, there has been some concern that a reduction in psychiatric beds can shift the patient burden to other sectors representing a re-institutionalisation of mental health care, as first proposed by Penrose [17]. Recent evidence has suggested that this does not seem to be the case in the majority of FSU countries [18]. Despite this, re-institutionalisation has been observed in a number of Western European countries [19].

Moreover, the SPMH lacks an integrated approach, which results in separate funding for the different levels of mental health care. **Inpatient facilities are not involved in patient supervision after discharge. As a consequence, the continuum of care is not ensured.**

Another issue that has been identified is that of the designation of all new admissions as acute care patients, for whom a higher tariff is paid than for long-term care patients. The classification of these 'acute care patients' is an administrative classification i.e. due to their recent admission, not based on their actual clinical need and resource requirements, which leaves the system open to manipulation. Developing the financial models that encourage providers to create and maintain a continuum between different levels of mental health services and discourage policy makers from separating budgets according to the type of care may support the development of a 'fairer' system.

Furthermore, **the three-week time period during which an acute crisis should be resolved and the patient either discharged or transferred to long-term care, has been arbitrarily set based on financial rather than clinical need and may act as a barrier to the delivery of patient-centred care.**

Resource inflexibility

Strict public finance management rules and "silo budgeting" do not allow facility managers to appropriately reallocate resources based on needs. This acts as a barrier to innovation and the diversification of services at a facility level. **At the patient level, complications emerge due to restrictive policies that prevent an individual patient simultaneously receiving inpatient treatment from more than one programme; thus treatment covered by the SPMH cannot occur concurrently with treatment for a physical healthcare condition. This has a significant effect on those with co-morbidities, requiring discharge from one programme before patients are eligible for treatment within another.**

Resource timing

Knapp et al. broadly outline resource timing to include areas such as training, supply and capacity; **in the context of the mental health system in Georgia, a number of barriers were identified within this domain. These barriers mainly focus on capacity within the system, both in terms of clinical care and resources within the system to plan and monitor the delivery of health services. The low numbers of psychiatrists, especially those in training, and the lack of specialist mental health nurses**

were identified as major challenges to the health system, both currently and for the future. Whilst there are currently only 3.92 psychiatrists per 100,000 people, which is higher than the median for lower middle income countries (0.54 per 100,000), this number falls significantly short of the European median of 8.59 per 100,000 [5]. In addition, the limited mental health human resources are not adequately used. Psychiatrists spend inadequate amounts of time with patients, as most of their time is taken up by paper work.

Shifting responsibilities between doctors and nurses and introducing electronic patient records would free up psychiatrists' time for patients [20, 21]. **With relatively low salaries and perceived poor working conditions, many medics have limited interest in pursuing a career in psychiatry.** Without effective monitoring and workforce planning, this is unlikely to change. In addition to the lack of diversity of services, there is also a lack of diversity of human resources, with mental health facilities almost solely staffed by psychiatrists and general nurses. If a diversification of service provision is pursued, as is hoped by many, a concomitant diversification of the workforce is also required to ensure that the right skills and competencies are also developed. » Quelle: Lela Sulaberidze, Stuart Green, Ivdity Chikovani, Maia Uchaneishvili, George Gotsadze, Barriers to delivering mental health services in Georgia with an economic and financial focus: informing policy and acting on evidence, 13. Februar 2018, S.2-11: <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1186%2Fs12913-018-2912-5.pdf>.

OC Media, 17. März 2017:

« Georgia's Minister of Labor, Health, and Social Affairs, Davit Sergeenko, announced a 'second wave' of public universal healthcare on 16 March, which would provide differentiated packages for universal healthcare users. The proposals would deprive roughly 32,000 high income citizens of medical services currently covered by the universal healthcare programme.

Sergeenko outlined several categories of probable healthcare users:

- **The target group, consisting of: people with disabilities, socially vulnerable people (as defined by the Social Services Agency), children under five, students, teachers, and pensioners.** The group consists of roughly 1.7 million Georgian citizens. The group will maintain the current coverage of universal healthcare services and will continue to be able to benefit from universal healthcare services and private insurance packages simultaneously.
- Citizens with high income rates would be divided into two sub-categories:
 - **Citizens with incomes of more than ₾40,000 (\$16,000) a year — around 32,000 people — will no longer receive medical services under the universal healthcare programme, but will still benefit from some programmes (hepatitis C treatment, maternity services, etc.).**
 - **Citizens with annual incomes of ₾10,800–40,000 (\$4,300-16,000) — around 300,000 people — will have 90% of their costs covered for urgent hospitalisation. For planned hospitalisation, where the cost of treatment exceeds ₾1,000 (\$400), 70% of the costs will be covered.** Georgian citizens in this category will have to choose between private insurance and the public healthcare system.

- *Citizens with low or irregular incomes:*
 - *Citizens with monthly incomes of less than €900 (\$360) and self-employed citizens — around 1.2 million people.*
 - *Citizens on the margins of social vulnerability (as defined by the Social Services Agency) — around 102,000 people.*
 - *Children aged 6–18 — around 503,000 people.*

Citizens with low or irregular incomes will continue to be fully covered for urgent hospitalisation, and will still be able to benefit from universal healthcare services and private insurance packages simultaneously. For planned hospitalisation they will be fully covered if the cost of treatment exceeds €500. They will receive 50% coverage for outpatient care.

According to the minister, offering differentiated healthcare packages was first envisioned in March, after the universal healthcare programme was first renewed.

In Georgia, healthcare is provided by both public and private healthcare systems. After the collapse of Soviet Union, Georgia abolished its universal healthcare system, leading to mass privatisation of clinics and a shift to a market-dominated system.

After the change of government in 2013, a universal healthcare system was reintroduced, which started providing healthcare to, according to the Georgian Parliament and media reports, more than 90% of the population. The programme operates alongside a system of private medical facilities and private insurers.

The programme is considered by many to be the crowning achievement of the Georgian Dream government, and was one of their main pre-election promises in 2012. However, it has faced some criticism for ‘unfair financing’, ‘poor management’ and ‘ineffective control of expenses’.

The programme’s budget has increased annually, from €470 million (\$190 million) in 2015, to €570 (\$228) million in 2016, and according to Georgia’s 2017 budget, €660 million (\$264 million) this year. » Quelle: OC Media, Georgian ‘universal healthcare’ reforms to strip 32,000 people of coverage, 17. März 2017: <http://oc-media.org/georgian-universal-healthcare-reforms-to-strip-32000-people-of-coverage/>.

MRI, Juni 2014 :

« Roma communities face extreme marginalization and discrimination, leading to poverty, unemployment, lack of access to education and health care. Due to a lack of access to proper documentation, they are excluded from social security programmes. » Quelle: Minority Rights International (MRI), Partnership for all? Measuring the impact of Eastern Partnership on minorities, Juni 2014, S.17: <http://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/old-site-downloads/download-1373-Policy-paper-English.pdf>.

Muazzam Nasrullah et al., 28. Juli 2017:

« Georgia, a country in the Caucasus region of Eurasia, has a high prevalence of hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection. In April 2015, with technical assistance from CDC, Georgia embarked on the world’s first program to eliminate hepatitis C, defined as a 90% reduction in HCV prevalence by 2020 (1,2). The country committed to identifying infected persons and linking them to care and curative antiviral therapy, which was

provided free of charge through a partnership with Gilead Sciences (1,2). From April 2015 through December 2016, a total of 27,595 persons initiated treatment for HCV infection, among whom 19,778 (71.7%) completed treatment. Among 6,366 persons tested for HCV RNA ≥ 12 weeks after completing treatment, 5,356 (84.1%) had no detectable virus in their blood, indicative of a sustained virologic response (SVR) and cure of HCV infection. **The number of persons initiating treatment peaked in September 2016 at 4,595 and declined during October–December. Broader implementation of interventions that increase access to HCV testing, care, and treatment for persons living with HCV are needed for Georgia to reach national targets for the elimination of HCV.**

In 2015, an estimated 5.4% of the adult population of Georgia (approximately 150,000 persons) had chronic HCV infection, and of those, nearly two thirds were unaware of their infection (Georgia Ministry of Labour, Health, and Social Affairs [MoLHSA], unpublished data, 2016). Populations with the highest rates of HCV infection include men, persons aged 30–59 years, persons with a history of injection drug use, and persons with a history of receipt of blood products (MoLHSA, unpublished data, 2016). Initially, when the program was launched in April 2015, national guidelines limited treatment to HCV-infected persons with advanced liver disease, defined as one or both of the following: F3 or F4 by METAVIR fibrosis score (a system used to assess the histological extent of hepatic inflammation and fibrosis in patients with hepatitis C infection) on transient elastography or FIB-4 score (a noninvasive test based on a combination of biochemical values and patient age) > 3.25 (3,4). In June 2016, treatment eligibility criteria were expanded to include all HCV-infected persons, regardless of disease severity. » Quelle: Muazzam Nasrullah et al., The Role of Screening and Treatment in National Progress Toward Hepatitis C Elimination — Georgia, 2015–2016, 28. Juli 2017: www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6629a2.htm?s_cid=mm6629a2_w.

Regierung Georgiens, 2015:

« **With an HCV prevalence of 7.7% and an estimated 150,000 persons living with chronic HCV infection, Georgia has one of the highest burdens of HCV infection in the world.** New cases of HCV also are on the rise, with most occurring among persons who inject drugs (PWID). HCV is a preventable and curable blood-borne infection. However, because acute infection is often asymptomatic, most persons remain unaware of their infection status until decades later, when they experience life-threatening complications (e.g., liver cancer and cirrhosis). **In response to this HCV epidemic, the Government of Georgia committed to eliminating HCV in their country by 2020 (defined as 90% reduction in infection prevalence), a goal that is now achievable due to recent availability of highly effective, direct acting antivirals (DAAs) capable of curing $> 90\%$ of persons treated.** In addition, the country proposed the following elimination goals: a) testing 90% of HCV-infected persons for their infection; b) treating 95% of people with chronic HCV infection; and c) curing 95% of persons treated of their HCV infection.

Georgia began laying the groundwork necessary to meet these ambitious HCV elimination goals in 2015 by establishing HCV testing and treatment sites throughout the country and treating those found to be infected with curative DAAs made available free of charge by pharmaceutical company Gilead Sciences. Furthermore, the Government of Georgia (including the Ministry of Labour, Health, and Social Affairs [MoLHSA] and the National Center for Disease Control [NCDC]) convened a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) composed of international experts in the field of viral hepatitis (e.g., representatives from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], World Health Organization [WHO], and other international partners). The group, which first met in November 2015, was tasked with developing strategies, objectives, and actions that would help Georgia eliminate HCV. One of TAG's primary recommendations was development of a strategic HCV Elimination Plan accompanied by targets and indicators to promote program monitoring and evaluation. » Quelle: Regierung Georgiens / Ministerium für Arbeit, Gesundheit und Soziales, Strategic plan for the elimination of hepatitis C virus in Georgia, 2016–2020,

2015, S.8: http://moh.gov.ge/uploads/files/2017/akordeoni/failebi/Georgia_HCV_Elimination_Strategy_2016-2020.pdf.

SEM, 21 März 2018 :

« Ab Programmbeginn im Jahr 2015 bis Mitte 2017 haben fast 40'000 Personen die Behandlung mit neuen antiviralen Medikamenten begonnen, so die WHO. Fast 32'000 von ihnen schlossen die Behandlung erfolgreich ab, das heisst, sie wurden von Hepatitis C geheilt. Laut dem Direktor der georgischen NGO Health Research Union lag die Erfolgsrate bei Patienten mit schwerer Lebererkrankung bei 80 %, bei Patienten mit weniger fortgeschrittener Krankheit bei 97 %.

Die WHO lobt das georgische Angebot für Diagnostik und Therapie von Hepatitis C. Auch die im medizinischen Bereich aktive georgische Zivilgesellschaft beurteilt das Programm grundsätzlich positiv. Aktivisten fordern den Staat auf, die gesamten Kosten für alle notwendigen Tests zu übernehmen, da diese Kosten eine finanzielle Hürde für einen Teil der Bevölkerung darstellen. **Die Schweizerische Botschaft in Georgien bestätigt, dass sich die Kosten für die Tests abschreckend auf finanziell benachteiligte Bevölkerungsgruppen auswirken. Aus der Zivilgesellschaft wird zudem bemängelt, die Kriminalisierung von Drogensüchtigen halte infizierte Süchtige davon ab, sich behandeln zu lassen.**» Quelle: Staatssekretariat für Migration (SEM), Focus Georgien - Reform im Gesundheitswesen: Staatliche Gesundheitsprogramme und Krankenversicherung, 21. März 2018, S.13: www.sem.admin.ch/dam/data/sem/internationales/herkunftslaender/europa-gus/geo/GEO-reform-gesundheitswesen-d.pdf.

Tengiz Verulava et al., April 2015:

« According to the representatives of medical institution, the number of patients with mental health problems is increasing annually; correspondingly, the state funding for mental health does not cover their needs. **Due to lack of funding, less expensive and less new generation of medicines are used. The patients are given low cost older drugs not sufficient for the whole month, but only 15 days' supply. As a result, the patient is forced to buy the remaining days' supply of medications. This negatively affects the treatment outcomes.** Poor treatment increases the frequency of exacerbations of the disease. According to experts, the financing scheme is not favorable neither for medical service providers nor for beneficiaries. **After the state funding limit (single voucher for 840 GEL) for treatment of a patient with acute psychosis is used the medical institution tries to get rid of the patient, or the patient is transferred for the treatment of short and long term care that gives patient possibility for continuation of the treatment.**

There are cases when number of clinics avoids covering treatment expenses themselves and discharging a patient even with acute or nonstable psychotic condition. Also **the amount allocated for outpatient care per patient is very low on average of 10-15 GEL per day (it includes all expenses: food, utilities, staff salaries, clothing, hygiene costs, etc.). Very scarce funding makes it practically impossible to provide the rehabilitation course. Obviously, in such a situation it is impossible to provide a full service and the patients cannot receive expensive rehabilitation course. Medical institution is forced to deliver only small scale rehabilitation course to patients. [...]**

Another problem is related to the tenders announced on the procurement of materials. According to experts, the hospital has to design a plan in advance for procurement during the year and submit it to the National Procurement Agency. Practically it is impossible to pre-define the volume of medicines which will

be needed by the hospital during the year. **Besides, the quality of drugs purchased under the tender are very low since as a rule the tender is won by a company proposing the lowest price. Eventually very often low quality medicines are provided with less therapeutic effect. [...]**

Although the number of patients with mental health problems is annually increasing, the volume of funding for state mental health program does not increase. Due to the lack of funding the patients themselves have to cover the costs for certain services (e.g., Drugs), which negatively effects treatment outcomes. Often the medical institution itself is forced to bear the costs of the treatment. The problem of re-hospitalization still remains acute. The state program finances only urgent medical cases, which poses a challenge to both patients and hospitals. The funding does not cover the costs of quality services. Salaries of medical personnel are quite low. Part of the patients doesn't require hospital treatment, but because they do not have private property, remain at a psychiatric hospital for years. There is no outpatient medical service for chronic patients. The rights of patients are violated (including property rights). The court also supports the healthy plaintiff rather than a patient. The level of medical service in Tbilisi and the regions is not similar. Particularly, in regions the qualification of doctors is rather low. Awareness of the patients or their relatives about the course of treatment is low.

» Quelle: Tengiz Verulava et al., Accessibility to Psychiatric Services in Georgia, 7. April 2015: www.omicsonline.org/open-access/accessebility-to-psychiatric-services-in-georgia-Psychiatry-1000278.php?aid=52622.

UNDP, 14 August 2015:

« **Despite these changes, Georgia still has a long way to go in mental healthcare reform. The five-year National Action Plan, developed by over 70 mental health professionals and experts including Dr. Chkonia with help from the UNDP takes further steps toward the deinstitutionalization of large psychiatric hospitals and diversification of services available to patients.**

"It is going to be a long process which will require new ways of thinking and excellent coordination throughout the healthcare and social service systems," Dr. Chkonia says. Moving from her office to a ward for chronic female patients, I didn't know what to expect. Standing in front of an iron door leading to the ward, I remember feeling nervous – the only psychiatric hospitals I'd ever seen were in movies. When a door opened, I saw a huge corridor and the patients peering out of their rooms to see what was going on. They seemed pleased with having guests. As I learned later, most of them had been living there for years and not many enjoyed regular contact with the outside world. Isolation and social stigma are two major challenges to people with mental health disorders in Georgia, and can sometimes prevent them either from seeking professional help or reintegrating into society following treatment. One solution to these issues is to expand community-based services for mental healthcare users, providing them with more opportunities to access services and prevent longer-term hospital stays. This can include crisis intervention centers, dispensary clinics, social services, and a mobile team of doctors and psychologists who visit patients at home. "The #1 goal of the National Action Plan is to create a balanced system of mental health service, transitioning from a hospital-only system to a balanced system of psychiatric treatment which includes community services," says Nino Agdgomelashvili, project manager at the Global Initiative on Psychiatry – Tbilisi (GIP-T), a local foundation that provided technical guidance to the Action Plan elaboration process. In 2014, 70 percent of mental health financing in Georgia was put toward hospital care. 28 percent was dedicated to out-of-hospital services, although the majority of these services were still focused on specialized, institutional care. Only 4.5 percent of state funding went toward modern, community-based services like crisis intervention and mobile clinics. The new Action Plan envisions that by 2020, a more balanced system will be in place, with 50 percent of funding dedicated to hospital care, and 50 percent devoted

to community care. » Quelle: Programme des nations-unies pour le développement (PNUD), How Georgia is Reforming Mental Healthcare, 14. August 2015: www.ge.undp.org/content/georgia/en/home/ourperspective/ourperspectivearticles/2015/08/14/how-georgia-is-reforming-mental-healthcare.html.

WB, Juni 2017:

« Georgia has made significant progress in improving access to health services under the UHC Program. The introduction of the UHC Program in February 2013, aimed at improving the general population's access to good quality health care, has benefited more Georgians, particularly those relatively less well-off, by improving access to health services when ill and reducing the likelihood of impoverishment or catastrophic out-of-pocket (OOP) spending on health care.

The recent overruns in health spending have, however, highlighted a key challenge that the government faces in maintaining the sustainability of the UHC Program. Since the implementation of the UHC Program, health spending has risen sharply (from 4.0 percent to 8.4 percent of total government spending between 2012 and 2015). Notwithstanding these increases, it is still almost the lowest share of government spending among European states and below the European Region middle income country average of 10.5 percent in 2014 (WHO 2016). [...]

*In February 2013, the Government of Georgia launched the UHC Program. Universal health coverage is, by definition, about addressing many of the goals referred to above. The UHC Program marked a significant shift in how health care is financed and health services are purchased in Georgia, as well as the culmination of nearly two decades of health system reforms in Georgia. **The UHC Program extended publicly financed entitlement to health care coverage to the entire population. The nature of the program is noncontributory, in the sense that Georgians do not have to contribute for enrollment. Enrollment involves registering with the primary care provider of choice. The benefits package covers a range of primary and secondary care services and limited essential drugs (Table 2.1). Administratively, the reform transferred responsibility for purchasing health care services from private insurance companies to the SSA under MoLHSA, thus putting in place a platform to shift from passive to active purchasing.***

The health financing reforms introduced since 2013, and backed up by significant increases in public health spending, have moved Georgia closer to European norms. These include: (i) near universal population entitlement to publicly financed health care; (ii) free visits to family doctors; (iii) referral and prescribing systems; (iv) a single purchasing agency; and (v) higher public spending on health (WHO 2016). Sustaining the coverage achieved to date and deepening coverage through better financial protection against OOP costs are the policy priorities for the Government of Georgia. [...]

*There has been a substantial increase in the government's budget allocation to health in recent years due to the implementation of the UHC. **Between 2012 and 2014, the public share of total health spending increased substantially from 19 percent to 28.2 percent, with much of the increase associated with the introduction of the UHC Program. From 2012 to 2015, the health budget more than doubled, increasing from 4.0 percent to 8.4 percent of total government spending, and as a percentage of GDP from 1.3 percent to 2.8 percent.** In this respect, Georgia is experiencing a steep increase in its health sector spending, which is consistent with other middle-income countries' experience at the time of UHC introduction.*

Table 2.1: Summary of UHC Benefits and User Charges (2015)

Type of Benefit	User Charges			
	Former Medical Insurance Program (MIP) Beneficiaries	Former Beneficiaries of the Program for Pensioners etc.	Veterans	All Others (Previously Uninsured)
Planned outpatient care	Free	Free	Free	Free
Outpatient specialist visits	Free	Free	Free	30% copayment
Essential drugs (around 50)	Covered up to GEL 50 per year (GEL 200 for pensioners). 50% copayment	Covered up to GEL 100 per year for pensioners (GEL 50 for children 0-5 years). 50% copayment.	Covered up to GEL 50 per year	Not covered
Diagnostic tests (basic lab tests)	Free	Free	Free	30% copayment
Diagnostic tests (ultrasound, ECG, x-ray)	Free	Free for most. 10-20% copayment for CT scans.	Free	30% copayment
Normal delivery	Covered up to GEL 500	Covered up to GEL 500	Covered up to GEL 500	Covered up to GEL 500
C-section	Covered up to GEL 800	Covered up to GEL 800	Covered up to GEL 800	Covered up to GEL 800
Elective surgery	Covered up to GEL 15,000 per year	Covered up to GEL 15,000 per year. 10% copayment (pensioners). 20% copayment (children 0-5 years, people with disability, students, teachers).	Covered up to GEL 15,000 per year	Covered up to GEL 15,000 per year. 30% copayment.
Chemotherapy, hormone and radio therapy	Covered up to GEL 12,000 per year	Covered up to GEL 15,000 per year. 10% copayment (pensioners). 20% copayment (children, students, teachers, people with disability).	Covered up to GEL 12,000 per year	Covered up to GEL 12,000 per year. 20% copayment.
Emergency outpatient care	Free	Free	Free	Free
Emergency inpatient care	Free	10% copayment (pensioners). 20% copayment (children 0-5, people with disability, students, teachers).	Free	Covered up to GEL 15,000 per case. 30% copayment.

Source: WHO, World Bank and USAID (2016).

[...]

Public spending on health is allocated largely to curative care services provided at hospitals. Over three-quarters of public spending on health is on curative care and, in particular, inpatient curative care accounted for 55 percent in 2014. Moreover, 67 percent of total public spending was on hospitals

and 25 percent on ambulatory care providers (MoLHSA 2016). Similarly, the bulk of UHC Program spending was on emergency inpatient care. These shares have risen over time—reflecting the priority given to adequately covering curative care, particularly hospital services under the UHC Program. **The share of public spending devoted to outpatient drugs is exceptionally low (less than 0.5 percent), leaving much of this to be purchased out-of-pocket** (Annex 2 provides a more detailed breakdown of spending on the UHC and vertical programs). Compared to most OECD countries, the share of public spending on curative care is higher and that on medicines considerably lower in Georgia, reflecting wide coverage of outpatient drugs in most OECD health systems. [...]

Private health insurance remains modest. In 2015, half a million people (14 percent of the population) had PHI coverage, mostly through corporate policies provided by employers. This includes around 214,000 state employees (about 6 percent of the population) who have PHI paid for by the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Internal Affairs in addition to being covered by the UHC Program. The MoLHSA estimates that demand for PHI has risen since 2015 as people look for ways to cover expenses not covered by the UHC Program (WHO 2016). Since private insurance companies are not obliged to report to the SSA, there have been concerns about the duplication of services by private insurers and the UHC Program. Appendix 4 reviews the role of PHI in Georgia in light of the international evidence on PHI. A key point to note is that no country in the world has achieved UHC by relying on voluntary PHI alone.

2.20. Despite rising public spending on health, **OOP remains the dominant source of financing for health in Georgia, filling the void of health spending that is not covered through public sources (Box 2.2). OOP spending in Georgia is estimated to be 66 percent of all health spending, far higher than other countries in the region (Figure 2.5). High OOP payments are inimical to the goals of UHC, which can create barriers to accessing needed health services and absorb household resources that could otherwise be used for more productive purposes and potentially impoverish households.** [...]

Although the UHC Program has been associated with a reduction in the OOP share of total health spending (73 percent in 2010 to 66 percent 2015), Georgia still has one of the highest shares of OOP in the region. This is attributable to the following factors:

Limited coverage of outpatient drugs in the UHC Program: While medicines are provided free of charge to patients through MoLHSA's vertical programs and for inpatient use, **the UHC Program has a very limited outpatient drug benefit. Selected groups (the poor, veterans, and pensioners) are eligible for 50 percent reimbursement, while other groups are not eligible for the drug benefit at all.** The annual claim limit per person is low, and prescriptions from rural doctors are not accepted—requiring patients to visit family doctors instead. Spending on outpatient medicines has consistently comprised less than 0.01 percent of total UHC Program costs.

Complex copayments policy: **The copayments policy does not provide anyone with adequate depth of coverage due to the presence of the annual cap on benefits.** In addition, for those beneficiaries who are not eligible for free care, the patient copayment at the hospital is calculated as 30 percent of the hospital price or the maximum SSA tariff, whichever is lower. Patients also have to pay hospitals any difference between the SSA tariff and the hospital's price. To add to this complexity, hospitals' prices vary widely and different entitlements and rules that apply for copayment waivers for different groups cause confusion and undermine transparency (WHO 2016). [...]

Outpatient visit and hospitalization rates in Georgia have both increased in recent years, reflecting the increase in public spending and coverage for these services. **Overall, people in Georgia are more likely to seek care when ill today, than they were five years ago.** In 2014, 79 percent of those who were ill in the previous six months consulted a health care provider—a slight increase from 75 percent in 2010 (WHO, World Bank and USAID 2016). On average, there were 4.0 outpatient visits per capita per year in 2015 compared to just 2.3 in 2012, and hospitalization rates have seen a steady increase since 2012. This could largely be explained by the introduction of the UHC Program that offered coverage to a vast number of people in Georgia who were previously uninsured. [...]

In terms of equity outcomes, **introduction of the UHC Program was followed by a significant increase in utilization among poorer households** (WHO, World Bank and USAID 2016). For instance, **the largest increase in consultations among those who reported being ill occurred among lower- and middle-income households.** These households were less likely to have had insurance coverage before the introduction of the UHC Program. **Geographical variation in outpatient contacts suggests, however, that there may be serious inequities in access to care across the country: there is a huge discrepancy between rural areas and Tbilisi. Ambulance care also favors people living in Tbilisi** (WHO 2016).

Financial access has improved for inpatient care, but not necessarily for medicines. The decline in financial barriers to accessing inpatient care was steep among the poorest and the third and fourth income quintiles. As a result, the level of unmet need for inpatient care among the bottom 20 percent of the population is now closer to the level of unmet need experienced by richer people. Financial barriers to accessing medicines fell overall between 2010 and 2014, but the decline was only statistically significant for people in urban areas and the top quintile of the population. **These findings suggest that the UHC Program has not improved access to medicines for 80 percent of households and people in rural areas, although the substantial increase in public spending on inpatient care has helped improve coverage in this area.** [...]

OOP payments for health are “impoverishing” to households. If a household has total consumption expenditures including OOP above the poverty line, while total nonmedical consumption excluding OOP below the poverty line, they could be considered to have suffered impoverishment due to OOP for health. Figure 2.18 shows this graphically based on 2015 data. Households are ranked along the horizontal axis by total consumption. The vertical drip lines represent OOP for health, and the poverty threshold is indicated by the horizontal line. Applying this approach to 2015 household survey data and using an international poverty line of US\$2.50/day, it has been estimated that an additional 6.6 percent of Georgian households were poor as a result of OOP for health. In 2010, an additional 6 percent of households were poor due to OOP, implying that **risk of impoverishment due to OOP payments has remained unchanged following the introduction of the UHC Program.**

The proportion of households facing “catastrophic” health care costs has changed little from 2010-15. While impoverishing OOP puts the emphasis on crossing the poverty line irrespective of the size of payments, catastrophic health expenditures occur when they exceed some threshold of total expenditure. The choice of threshold is somewhat arbitrary, but 25 percent of total expenditure is commonly used. **In both 2010 and 2015, 10 percent of households had health spending over 25 percent of total expenditure. This ratio remains one of the highest relative to comparator countries.** At the lower threshold of 10 percent of total expenditures, the share of households experiencing catastrophic spending has increased from 28 percent to 34 percent over the same period and probably reflects increased spending on pharmaceuticals. » Quelle: Weltbank (WB), Georgia public expenditure review - Building a sustainable

future, Juni 2017, S.26-49: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/630321497350151165/pdf/114062-PER-P156724-PUBLIC-PERFINAL.pdf>.

WHO, 25. August 2017:

« In Georgia, about 150 000 people (or 1 in 20), were affected by hepatitis C in 2015. That same year, the country became the first in the WHO European Region to set the goal of eliminating hepatitis C as a public health threat. Two years later, 32 000 people have been successfully cured. On World Hepatitis Day 2017, on 28 July, national and international experts met in Tbilisi with representatives of WHO/Europe to assess progress and challenges of the Georgia hepatitis C elimination programme.

Opening the meeting, Dr Nedret Emiroglu, Director of the Division of Health Emergencies and Communicable Diseases, WHO/Europe, commended Georgia for its ambitious elimination goal. She continued: “Georgia’s hepatitis C elimination programme is an example of an effective public–private partnership that secures access to services to all, particularly the vulnerable ones, in the spirit of universal health coverage”.

An exemplary journey

Georgia set its hepatitis C elimination goal in 2015 with the support of WHO, the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other partners, and signed a memorandum of understanding with a pharmaceutical manufacturer with the objective of providing new highly effective treatment for hepatitis C.

A year later, **a long-term strategy for 2016–2020** was adopted to eliminate the disease from the country. This strategy **has driven improvements in monitoring and surveillance, infection control and prevention; it has also expanded access to hepatitis C screening, diagnosis and treatment services.**

Since the launch of the programme, almost 40 000 patients have started treatment with new antiviral medicines, out of which almost 32 000 have already completed the treatment successfully. Large-scale activities are taking place to ensure at-risk groups are screened, including key populations, medical personnel and all hospitalized people.» Quelle: World Health Organization (WHO), Georgia’s hepatitis C elimination programme setting an example in Europe, 25. August 2017: www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/communicable-diseases/hepatitis/news/news/2017/08/georgias-hepatitis-c-elimination-programme-setting-an-example-in-europe.

WHO, 2017:

« Since 2013, Georgia has laid the foundation for health policy that is oriented towards public health and welfare. In February 2013, it implemented a universal health care insurance programme to provide state-funded medical care (20). More than 90% of the population participates in the programme; the remaining 10% is covered by private medical insurance.

The programme covers planned outpatient, emergency in- and outpatient services, elective surgeries, cancer treatments, obstetrical care and funding for essential drugs. Georgia's universal health care reform has improved access to health services and reduced financial barriers and out-of-pocket costs for the population.

The proportion of private household out-of-pocket expenditure has decreased since 2000, and was 58.6% in 2014. However, the 2014 expenditure was almost twice the average for the WHO European Region. This likely results in inequitable access to health care and financial hardship for many households – especially poorer households – which may in turn exacerbate poverty and have a negative impact on health.

WHO estimated that Georgia's total expenditure on health (as a percentage of GDP) slightly increased between 2000 and 2014 to 7.4%. This level of expenditure was close to the average for the CIS (6.6%) and a little below the average for the WHO European Region (8.2%).

The number of physicians in Georgia has been increasing since 2006, and is notably higher than the averages for the WHO European Region and the CIS. In contrast, the number of nurses has been decreasing since 1998 and is much lower than the averages for the WHO European Region and the CIS (Table 2). [...]

*Over recent decades, the Government of Georgia has shown a commitment to health policy that embraces the Health 2020 value of equity. As a result, **Georgia has made notable progress in improving the health status of the entire population while addressing major risk factors and threats to health.***

The Government has implemented a series of health reforms that have included establishing a state-based health insurance programme to provide equitable and universal access to health care and to protect citizens from catastrophic health expenditure; introducing and improving data collection systems; committing to the elimination of hepatitis C; and adopting a health promotion strategy that includes tobacco control measures. Going forward, it will be essential to closely monitor progress towards the goals of these programmes, and to ensure their positive impact on the health of the population.

Despite these actions, Georgia faces significant challenges related to the sustainability of its programmes and the health of its population. Maternal and infant mortality, cancer, cardiovascular diseases and the high rate of tobacco smoking among males all pose threats to health and well-being in the country. Premature mortality has been reduced in the past 20 years, but is still higher than the average for the WHO European Region.

*To overcome these challenges, **the country must establish a sustainable health financing system** and continue to address key health issues, including both communicable diseases and NCDs. » Quelle: World Health Organization (WHO), Georgia - Highlights on Health and Well-being, 2017, S.11-14: www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/351697/WHO_GEORGIA_HIGHLIGHTS_EN.pdf?ua=1.*

Die Schweizerische Flüchtlingshilfe SFH setzt sich dafür ein, dass die Schweiz das in der Genfer Flüchtlingskonvention festgehaltene Recht auf Schutz vor Verfolgung einhält. Die SFH ist der parteipolitisch und konfessionell unabhängige nationale Dachverband der Flüchtlingshilfe-Organisationen. Ihre Arbeit finanziert sie durch Mandate des Bundes sowie über freiwillige Unterstützungen durch Privatpersonen, Stiftungen, Kantone und Gemeinden.

SFH-Publikationen zu Georgien und anderen Herkunftsländern von Asylsuchenden finden Sie unter www.fluechtlingshilfe.ch/herkunftslander.

Der SFH-Newsletter informiert Sie über aktuelle Publikationen. Anmeldung unter www.fluechtlingshilfe.ch/newsletter.