

**The Order № 19/N of 16 March, by The Minister of Education, Science, Culture and  
Sports of Georgia**

**On making amendments to the Order № 99/N of the Minister of Education and Science of Georgia of  
October 1, 2010 on Approval of the Authorization Provision and Fee of Educational Institutions**

Based on Article 2(1) and (8) the law of Georgia N3024-RS of 5 July 2018 on making amendments to the Law of Georgia on the Structure, Authority and Rules of Operation of the Government of Georgia, based on Article 20(4) and Article 32<sup>1</sup> of the Organic Law of Georgia on Normative Acts,

**I hereby order:**

Article 1. Make an amendment to the Order № 99/N of the Minister of Education and Science of Georgia of October 1, 2010 on Approval of the Authorization Provision and Fee of Educational Institutions (LEPL - Legislative Herald of Georgia 01/10/2010; 126) and make following edition to the Educational Institutions Authorization Provision (Annex N1) approved by the first paragraph of the order:

**a) the paragraph 1<sup>1</sup> shall be added after paragraph 1 of Article 64 with the following content:**

“1<sup>1</sup>. “In the case of indicating in the authorization application of the joint higher educational program envisaged by Article 49<sup>1</sup> of Law of Georgia on Higher Education, in addition to the documentations stipulated in the first paragraph of this article, the document that confirms an agreement with the center about the draft agreement to be signed with the implementer institutions and the agreement signed between the implementers of the higher educational program, considering the agreed draft shall also be submitted in order to implement a joint higher educational program.”

**b) Article 66:**

**b.a ) 4<sup>1</sup> and 4<sup>2</sup> paragraphs with the following content shall be added after paragraph 4:**

“4<sup>1</sup>. If necessary, the institution is entitled to submit changes about the information reflected in the self-evaluation form or/and about attached documentation to the center within 20 calendar days after receiving individual administrative-legal act described in paragraph 4 of this article. In addition, if the change considers the need for substitution of any document, the institution shall submit a written description / explanation of the changes together with the mentioned document. After expiration of this deadline, changes to the information reflected in the self-evaluation form and in the attached documentation are inadmissible.

4<sup>2</sup>. After expiration of the term envisaged in the paragraph 4<sup>1</sup> of this article, the changes made to the self-evaluation form and attached documentation shall not be taken into account.”

**b.b) paragraph 5 shall be elaborated with the following edition:**

“5. If the authorization status-seeker does not pay an authorization fee within 15 calendar days after getting familiar with the individual administrative-legal act about recognition as the applicant, the Center shall issue an individual administrative-legal act on termination of administrative proceedings.”

**c) the paragraph 4 with the following content shall be added to the article 69:**

“4. Within the scope of a preparatory meeting held before the authorization visit, the authorization expert panel draws up additional issues to be studied during the visit in order to compose a report;”

**d) In Article 70:**

**d.a) the paragraph 4 shall be removed;**

**d.b)the paragraph 8 shall be edited as follows:**

“8. If the institution interrupts the authorization experts panel to implement its activities, the center is entitled to issue an individual administrative legal act about termination of the administrative proceedings.”

**e) the paragraph 6<sup>1</sup> with the following content shall be added after the paragraph 6 of Article 73:**

„6<sup>1</sup>. In case of submission of a reasoned position provided for in paragraph 5 of this Article, the report drawn up by the panel of experts shall include information on whether the reasoned position is shared by the panel of experts or not.”

**f) In Article 75:**

**f.a)the first paragraph shall be edited as follows:**

“1. The term of office of the Authorization Council of Higher Education Institutions is one year. Permanent and invited members of the council shall be paid for their work (are given honorarium) from the Center's own revenues. Rules and amount of remuneration for the council members (for honorarium) shall be determined by an individual administrative legal act of the center’s director. The members of the Authorization Council are appointed and dismissed by the Prime-Minister of Georgia upon nomination of the Minister of Education, Science, Culture and Sport of Georgia.

**f.b) the paragraph 3 shall be edited as follows:**

“3. In selecting candidates for the members of the Authorization Council of higher education institutions, the requirements and criteria set by the World Federation of Medical Education in relation to the composition of the Council shall be taken into account.

**f.c) paragraph 3<sup>1</sup> shall be added after the paragraph 3 with the following content:**

“3<sup>1</sup>. The rule for selecting the candidates for permanent and invited members of the authorization council of the higher education institutions shall be approved by the individual administrative legal act of the Minister of Education, Science, Culture and Sports of Georgia.”

**f.d) the paragraph 4 shall be edited as follows:**

“4. Based on the specificity of the field, no more than 2 persons with right to deliberate vote determined by the council chair may participate during the council's decision making process.”

**f.e) the sub paragraph “f” of the paragraph 5 shall be edited as follows:**

“f) based on the presentation of the center or/and the ministry”

**g) Article 76:**

**g.a) paragraph 5 shall be edited as follows:**

“5. A member of the Appeals Council is obliged to declare about conflict of interests with an institution and on self-recusal before the review of the case starts. Conflict of Interests could be any circumstance stipulated in the Article 92 of the General Administrative Code of Georgia.

**g.b) The 5<sup>1</sup> and 5<sup>2</sup> paragraphs with the following content shall be added after paragraph 5:**

“5<sup>1</sup>. In the event of a conflict of interest referred to in paragraph 5 of this Article, the member of the council shall not participate in the discussion, decision-making and voting processes of the issue to be reviewed at the council meeting.

5<sup>2</sup>. The member of the council is not authorized to represent a position of the interested party- the institution- at the council meeting.”

**h) In Article 77:**

**h.a) the paragraph 2<sup>1</sup> shall be added after the paragraph 2 of this article with the following content:**

“2<sup>1</sup>. If the decision envisaged in the paragraph “b” and “c” of the first paragraph of this article is made during an academic year, the authorization council of the higher education institutions is authorized, with mediation of respective educational institution and considering the lawful interests of the students, in order to maintain continuity of the academic process, despite the remaining term of the authorization, to allow students to complete the ongoing academic year at respective educational institution upon proper decision and indicate no later than the end of the ongoing academic year as the date of entering the decision on cancellation of authorization or refusal to re-authorization into force;

**h.b) paragraph 3<sup>1</sup> shall be added after the paragraph 3 with the following content:**

“3<sup>1</sup>. The decision referred to in paragraph 1 and 2 of this Article shall be made by the council on the basis of secret ballot. Furthermore, the minutes of the council meeting ensure publicity of the ballot results;”

**h.c) paragraph 7 shall be edited as follows;**

“7. Within 10 business days upon making a decision, it is published on the web-page of the Center. Together with publication of the decision, a filled out form of the self-evaluation submitted by the institution and the report of the panel of experts are also published on the center’s website.”

**i) the paragraph 6 of Article 79 shall be removed;**

**j) Article 79<sup>1</sup> shall be added after the article 79 with the following content:**

**“Article 79<sup>1</sup>. The decision on submission of the report about fulfillment of the recommendations provided for the higher education institution**

1. The term for submission of the report referred to in Article 79(5)(b) by the council shall not exceed one year. Countdown of the term for submission of the report starts from the day the decision enters into force.

2. A form of the report on fulfillment of the council’s recommendations shall be approved by the individual administrative legal act of the Director of the Center.

3. Within 3 business days, the center shall examine compliance of the report submitted by the institution with the requirements envisaged by the paragraph 2 of this article.

4. If the institution won’t submit the report or the attached documentation referred to in the paragraph 2 of the article to the center, the center shall set at least 5 and no more than 15 business days for the educational institution in order to resolve the shortcoming.

5. In order to examine the report submitted by the institution according to the rule provided for by the paragraph 2 of this article, the center shall issue an individual administrative legal act on creation of the authorization expert panel.

6. The authorization expert panel shall be composed by the members of the expert pool - administrative / academic staff and student of other higher education institutions, the composition may also include a student, an employer and other persons with relevant qualifications .
7. Panel of authorization experts is headed by the Chair.
8. Upon request from the expert panel envisaged by the paragraph 5 of this article, the center is authorized to request respective documentation from the institution.
9. As a result of the examination of the report, as well as, of the documentation referred to in paragraph 8 of this Article, if necessary, a panel of experts shall draw up a draft report.
10. A form of the report on fulfillment of the recommendations submitted by the institution shall be approved by the individual administrative legal act of the Director of the Center.
11. The center shall establish formal compliance of the report drawn up by the expert panel with the form envisaged by the paragraph 10 of this article. If necessary, in order to ensure formal compliance, the report is returned back to the authorization expert panel.
12. The report drawn up by the authorization expert panel shall be submitted to the council and also to the respective educational institution for introduction.
13. The report submitted by the educational institution and report of the authorization expert panel shall be reviewed at the council meeting. The Council is authorized to take a report as a note or address the Center for examination of the authorization conditions, with a motion on the implementation of monitoring at the educational institution, which will be reflected in the minutes of the session.
14. The decision envisaged by the paragraph 13 of this article shall be made within 90 calendar days after the individual administrative legal act of the center envisaged by the paragraph 5 of this article is issued.

**k) Article 80:**

**k.a) paragraph 5 shall be added after paragraph 4 with the following content:**

“5. The form of the report referred to in the paragraph 2 of this article shall be approved by the individual administrative legal act of the Director of the Center.”

**l) Article 83 shall be edited as follows:**

**“Article 83. Legal Results for refusing authorization or cancellation of authorization**

1. In case of refusing authorization or cancellation of authorization:

- a) an institution will not obtain a status of higher education institution or will lose such status from the date when respective decision enters into force;
- b) according to Article 77(2<sup>1</sup>) of this provision, the higher education institution continues its educational activities for the term established by the authorization council, within this term it is restricted to admit students/vocational students/entrants/MA candidates/doctoral candidates/applicants;
- c) according to Article 77(2<sup>1</sup>) of this provision, a student has right to continue studies at the same HEI for the term set by the authorization council or to transfer to other respective higher education institution;
- d) according to Article 77(2<sup>1</sup>) of this provision, a status of a student is suspended for 5 years after expiration of the term (if any) established by the authorization council, after the decision of refusing authorization or cancellation of the authorization made by the authorization council enters into force and he/she is authorized to exercise the right of mobility;
- e) an entrant who successfully passed the Unified National Examinations and obtained a right to be enrolled to the Higher Education Institution according to the ranking document approved by the LEPL National Assessment and Examinations Center, shall be authorized to exercise the right of mobility;
- f) a candidate of MA, who has been listed in the ranking document with the coefficients of the master's exams shall be authorized to exercise the right of mobility;

2. In case of making decision on refusing the authorization or cancellation of authorization, a legal entity is entitled to submit an authorization application to the Center 1 year after the decision of refusal of authorization or cancellation of authorization is made.

**m) Article 85 shall be edited as follows:**

**“Article 85. The rules of procedure for submission and evaluation of HEI's self-evaluation report**

1. For the purpose of monitoring the authorization conditions, a higher educational institution is obliged to submit a self-evaluation report to the Center at least once in three years. Terms for submission of the self-evaluation report shall be determined by an individual administrative-legal act of the Center Director, which will be published publicly.

2. The self-evaluation report can be submitted through the electronic document management system or in material form, at which time the accreditation self-evaluation report and the accompanying documentation are submitted to the Center via the electronic information carrier.

3. Submission of a self-evaluation report envisaged by this article shall not be obligatory for the following educational institutions:

a) the higher education institution which was granted with authorization based on the decision envisaged by Article 79(5)(c) of this provision;

b) the higher education institution which was granted with authorization and where authorization conditions were examined based on the motion of the council according to the article 88 of this provision.

c) the higher education institution which was granted with the authorization based on the HEI authorization standards that existed before the Authorization Standards of the Higher Education Institutions envisaged by the order N77/n of 5 May 2017 of the Minister of Education and Science of Georgia on making amendments to the order N99/n of October 1 2010 of the Minister of Education and Science of Georgia on Approval of the Authorization Provision and Fee of Educational Institutions entered into force;

d) the higher education institution, which is subject of an administrative proceedings about an authorization application during the period of submission of the self-evaluation report envisaged by the individual administrative-legal act of the Center's director referred to in the first paragraph of this article.

4. The form of self-evaluation report is approved by the individual administrative-legal act of the Director of the Center, which is published publicly.

5. Within 3 business days, the center shall examine compliance of the self-evaluation report submitted by the institution with the requirements envisaged by the paragraphs 2 and 4 of this article.

6. In order to examine a self-evaluation report, the center shall issue an individual administrative legal act on creation of an authorization expert panel and on evaluation of the self-evaluation report.

7. Composition of authorization expert panel created for the purposes of examination of the self-evaluation report includes members of the expert pool- administrative/academic/scientific/invited staff of other higher educational institutions, also composition may include a student, employers. If HEI carries out a regulated educational program the composition may include- also representatives of relevant regulatory body or/and professional association and other persons having relevant qualification.

8. Panel of authorization experts is headed by the Chair.

9. Based on the request from the authorization expert panel, the center is authorized to request respective documentation from an institution.

10. As a result of the examination of the self-evaluation report, as well as, if necessary, of the documentation referred to in paragraph 9 of this Article, a panel of authorization experts shall draw up a draft report.

11. The Center defines formal compliance of the draft report elaborated by the Authorization Experts Panel with the requirements set by individual administrative-legal acts of the Center Director defined under the Article 67(3) and (19) of this provision. Upon determination of the compliance, the draft report is sent to the institution.

12. If necessary, in order to ensure the formal compliance of the authorization expert panel's draft report, the draft report is sent back to the authorization experts panel.

13. Within 10 calendar days upon familiarization with the draft report of the authorization expert panel, the higher education institution may submit reasoned position related to factual circumstances stated in the draft report to the Center. The reasoned position is sent to the expert panel.

14. In case of submission of the reasoned position provided in paragraph 13 of this article, after its examination or in case of non-submission of the reasoned position, after the expiration of the period envisaged in paragraph 13 of this Article, the authorization expert panel prepares the final version of the report and submits to the center.

15. In case of submission of a reasoned position provided for in paragraph 13 of this Article, the report drawn up by the panel of experts shall include information on whether the reasoned position is shared by the panel of experts or not.”

16. The Center shall send the report of the authorization expert panel to the higher education institution within 90 calendar days after the issuance of the individual administrative-legal act of the Center provided for in the paragraph 6 of this Article.

17. The results of the assessment of the self-evaluation report provided for in this Article shall be used by the Center to facilitate the establishment of systematic self-evaluation process within the higher education institutions , to facilitate the development of internal quality assurance mechanisms and planning of evolutive and supportive activities based on the needs of higher education institutions.

18. Failure to submit the self-evaluation report within the prescribed time-frame provided for in this article may serve as a basis for examination of fulfillment of the authorization conditions by the higher education institution according to Article 77 of this provision.

19. The Form of report of the Authorization Expert Panel and the requirements set by it shall be approved by the individual administrative-legal act of the Director of the Center.

**n) The paragraph 3 of the Article 86 shall be edited as follows;**

“3. An application to be submitted for addition of an educational program shall include information on educational program implementing personnel and relevant resources, also the information on internal mechanisms of quality assurance of the educational program. Educational program/programs and syllabi shall be attached to the application as well.”

**o) In Article 87:**

**o.a) paragraph 2 shall be edited as follows:**

„2. In case the changes in the number of academic and scientific personnel has reached 20% since the moment of granting authorization to the higher education institution, the HEI shall notify the Center on the matter within 30 calendar days after such changes are made.

**o.b) paragraph 4 shall be edited as follows:**

“4. In the case of implementation of the changes envisaged by the paragraphs 1-3 of this article, also in the case of failure to fulfill the obligations envisaged by the same paragraphs, the center is authorized to examine the authorization conditions via monitoring according to the article 88 of this provision”.

**p) Article 88 shall be edited as follows:**

**“Article 88. Examination of authorization conditions via monitoring**

1. Examination of the fulfillment of authorization conditions by the HEI is carried out via scheduled and/or unscheduled monitoring.
2. Scheduled monitoring is done by mediation of the council and/or by initiative of the center.
3. The methodology for drawing up the plan for scheduled monitoring, the criteria for selection of educational institutions, are approved by the individual administrative legal act of the center’s director.
4. Annual plan for scheduled monitoring of the higher education institutions shall be approved by the individual administrative legal act of the director of the center, which shall be sent to the respective higher education institution within 10 business days after its publication.
5. Unscheduled monitoring is implemented by the mediation of the council, based on the complaint submitted to the center about fulfillment of the authorization standards of the HEI and/or by the initiative of the center.
6. The complaint referred to in the paragraph 5 of this article may be submitted to the center by the interested person (a student, academic, scientific, invited or/and administrative staff and others) who believes that the authorization standards of HEI defined by this provision are breached. In addition, the form of the complaint, the methodology for drawing up and reviewing the complaint shall be approved by the individual administrative legal act of the center's director.
7. For the purpose of examination of fulfillment of authorization conditions, during implementation of the scheduled or/and unscheduled monitoring, the Center is authorized to request relevant documentation from the institution and/or issue relevant individual administrative-legal act on the creation of Authorization Expert Panel and/or on scheduled or/and unscheduled monitoring visit to the institution.
8. In the case of the Center’s request of relevant documentation/information from the institution, if as a result of examination of the documentation/information an additional need for examination of fulfillment of authorization conditions is identified, the Center shall issue an individual administrative-legal act on the creation of Authorization Expert Panel and on scheduled/unscheduled monitoring at the institution by visiting or/and examining the documentation, while otherwise, the council terminates the administrative proceedings started about the monitoring based on the motion of the center.
9. In the case of examination of the fulfillment of authorization conditions via scheduled or/and unscheduled monitoring, the authorization expert panel shall include the members of the expert pool -

the administrative/academic/scientific/invited staff of other higher education institutions, also it may include a student and employer. If HEI carries out a regulated educational program the composition may include- also representatives of relevant regulatory body or/and professional association and other persons having relevant qualification.

10. Panel of authorization experts is headed by the Chair.

11. An individual administrative legal act of the center's director on creation of the authorization expert panel and implementation of scheduled monitoring at the institution via visit or/and examination of the documentation, shall be submitted to the institution at least 10 business days prior to the commencement of the process of visit/evaluation.

12. An individual administrative legal act of the center's director on creation of the authorization expert panel and implementation of unscheduled monitoring at the institution via visit or/and examination of the documentation, shall be submitted to the institution at the time of commencement of the visit/evaluation process or at least 5 calendar days prior to commencement of the visit/evaluation process.

13. The matters of self-recusal or/and recusal of the expert/experts shall be regulated according to the paragraphs 5-10 of Article 68 of this provision. Using the right to recusal by the higher education institution does not hinder the implementation of the visit.

14. In case of establishment of authorization expert panel, authorization expert panel's draft report is elaborated and submitted to the Center.

15. The Center defines formal compliance of the draft report of the authorization expert panel with the requirements established by the individual administrative legal acts of the center's director envisaged by the Article 67(3) and Article 73(9) of this statute. In case of defining the compliance, the draft report is sent to the higher education institution. If necessary, in order to ensure the formal compliance of the authorization expert panel's draft report, the draft report is sent back to the authorization experts panel.

16. Within 10 calendar days upon familiarization with the draft report of the authorization experts panel, the higher education institution may submit reasoned position related to factual circumstances stated in the draft report to the Center.

The reasoned position is sent to the experts panel and to Authorization Council.

17. In case of submission of the reasoned position provided in paragraph 16 of this article, after its examination or in case of non- submission of the reasoned position, after the expiration of the period envisaged in paragraph 16 of this Article, the authorization expert panel prepares the final version of the report and submits to the center.

18. In case of submission of a reasoned position provided for in paragraph 16 of this Article, the report drawn up by the panel of experts shall include information on whether the reasoned position is shared by the panel of experts or not."

19. The center sends the authorization expert panel report to the institution.

20. As a result of examination of the fulfillment of authorization conditions, the council is authorized to make a decision on cancellation of the authorization if the institution is assessed in relation to one of the standards as "not in compliance with the requirements of the standard", or the institution violates the norms of the education legislation in Georgia regarding the origin, suspension or termination of the student status of the higher education institution.



21. In the case of identification of a violation, the council is authorized to provide higher educational institution with reasonable period of no more than 60 days for resolution of the shortcoming, except for the case, when it is apparent that it may not have actual results.
22. In the case of failure of the higher education institution to fulfill respective recommendations within the terms defined under the paragraph 21 of this article, the council shall be entitled to make a decision on cancellation of the authorization in accordance with the rules of procedure envisaged by this document.
23. As a result of examination of fulfillment of the authorization conditions by the HEI, in the case of the evaluation envisaged by the sub-paragraphs “d” and “e” of Article 79(5) of this provision, also by the paragraph 7 of the same article, the council is authorized to make a decision envisaged by the article 80 of this provision.
24. If the HEI manages to resolve respective shortcoming by more than 50% within the terms defined by the paragraph 21 of this article, and provided that none of the standards are evaluated as “not in compliance with the standard requirements”, the council shall be authorized to set a term for the institution for submission of the report on fulfillment of the remaining recommendations or address the center with motion on implementation of the monitoring. The rules of procedure for submission and review of the report envisaged by this paragraph shall be determined according to the Article 79<sup>1</sup> of this provision.
25. If the examination of the authorization conditions establishes that the institution has fulfilled all the recommendations, the council shall make a decision to terminate the administrative proceedings related to the monitoring.
26. In the case of addressing the center via motion on examination of the fulfillment of the authorization conditions, the council shall define the period for implementation of the monitoring, the form of the implementation of such monitoring and the scope of the monitoring.
27. Respective decision of the council on performance of authorization conditions by higher education institution shall be made within 90 calendar days upon issuing an individual administrative-legal act by the Center Director. The latter term is deemed suspended during the term determined by the authorization council for resolution of the shortcoming.”

**q) In Article 95:**

**q.a) paragraph 2 shall be edited as follows:**

“2. The members of the Appeals Council are appointed and dismissed by the Prime Minister of Georgia. The term of office of the Appeals Council is set at two years. Members of the Appeals council cannot be public servants, members of Authorization or Accreditation Councils.

**q.b) paragraph 2<sup>1</sup> shall be added after the paragraph 2 with the following content:**

“2<sup>1</sup>. The rule for selecting the members of the appeals council shall be approved by the individual administrative legal act of the Minister of Education, Science, Culture and Sports of Georgia.”

**q.c) the sub-paragraph “g” of the paragraph 5 shall be edited as follows:**

“g) based on the presentation of the center or/and the ministry;”

**r) The 5<sup>1</sup> and 5<sup>2</sup> paragraphs with the following content shall be added after paragraph 5 of Article 96:**

“5<sup>1</sup>. In the event of a conflict of interest referred to in paragraph 5 of this Article, the member of the appeals council shall not participate in the discussion, decision-making and voting processes of the issue to be reviewed at the appeals council meeting.

5<sup>2</sup>. The member of the appeals council is not authorized to represent a position of the interested party-educational institution- at the appeals council meeting.”

**s) the paragraph 2<sup>1</sup> shall be added after paragraph 2 of Article 101 with the following content:**

“2<sup>1</sup>. The decision referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article shall be taken by the appeals council on the basis of secret ballot. Furthermore, the minutes of the appeals council meeting ensure publicity of the ballot results;”

**t) Article 102<sup>1</sup> shall be added after the article 102 with the following content:**

**“Article 102<sup>1</sup>. The rules of procedure for review of complaints related to the authorization process**

1. An authorization seeker educational institution or/and other stakeholder that participates in the authorization process shall be authorized to submit a complaint to the center about the authorization process within 10 calendar days after occurrence of a specific circumstance during the authorization process or after its completion, if the employee/employees of the center or/and the member/members of the accreditation expert panel violate the requirements established by this provision, by Article 12(3) and Article 35(3) and by the individual administrative legal act of the center’s director envisaged by Article 67(3) of this provision, by the Code of Ethics of Authorization and Accreditation Experts approved by the individual administrative legal act of the center’s director or/and by the internal regulations of the center.

2. A complaint which is submitted against the member/members of the authorization expert panel, shall be reviewed according to the rules of procedure established individual administrative legal act of the center’s director envisaged by the Article 12(3), Article 35(3) and the article 67(3) of this provision.

3. A complaint which is submitted against the employee/employees of the center, shall be reviewed according to the rules of procedure established by the center’s internal regulations.

4. The form of the complaint envisaged by this article, the methodology for drawing up and reviewing the complaint shall be approved by the individual administrative legal act of the center's director.”

**u) paragraph 1<sup>1</sup> shall be added to the article 103 and elaborated as follows:**

“1<sup>1</sup>. During the transitional period, within the administrative proceedings related to the implementation of regulated academic higher educational program envisaged by Article 75(2)(b) of Law of Georgia "On Higher Education, the functions and duties of the authorization experts of the higher education institutions provided for by this provision may be implemented in a partially remote manner, which implies evaluation of the HEI's material resources, clinical bases and laboratories by the authorization experts (except for the international expert) through a site visit. In addition, this implies that an international expert/experts will evaluate the HEI's

material resources, clinical bases and laboratories remotely via modern electronic communication means, which shall be technically ensured by the authorization seeker.”

**Article 2.**

The term of office of the members of the Council of Authorization of Higher Education Institutions and the Council of Appeals defined by this Order shall be extended from 2022.

**Article 3.**

This order, except for the Article 1(b.a) and paragraph “d”, shall enter into force upon its publication.

**Article 4.**

The regulations envisaged by Article 1(b.a) and paragraph “d” of this order shall enter into force from 1 September 2021.

**Mikheil Chkhenkeli**