



Ending Torture. Seeking Justice for Survivors

THE REDRESS TRUST LIMITED

Board of Trustees' Report & Financial Statements

FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST MARCH 2014

THE REDRESS TRUST LTD
87 VAUXHALL WALK, GROUND FLR.
LONDON, SE11 5HJ
UNITED KINGDOM

TEL: +44 (0)20 7793 1777
FAX: +44 (0)20 7793 1719

WEB: WWW.REDRESS.ORG

CHARITY NUMBER: 1015787; COMPANY NUMBER: 2774071

CONTENTS

Messages from the Chair and Director	3
About REDRESS	5
Our Strategies.....	5
Programmes	6
1. Casework.....	6
2. Justice in the Context of Mass Victimisation	10
<i>Victims' Access to Justice</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Advocacy before the International Criminal Court</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Measures to Address Sexual Violence during Conflict</i>	<i>12</i>
3. Influencing national laws and institutions.....	13
4. Promoting International Standards.....	14
<i>UN Human Rights Bodies.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>African Commission of Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR).....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>European Institutions</i>	<i>15</i>
Communications	16
Our Plans for the Future.....	16
Our Supporters	17
Financial Review	19
Statement of Financial Activities for the year ended 31st March 2014 (incorporating the Income & Expenditure account)	24
Who's who at REDRESS.....	37
Publications this year.....	39

Messages from the Chair and Director

Message from the Chair, Sir Emyr Jones Parry GCMG, PhD, FInstP

I find it difficult to believe that this is my sixth contribution to an Annual Report of REDRESS' activities over the past year. Yet today the situation on global human rights is no better than in 2008.

The number of refugees and displaced persons has now leapt to over 50 million. Shamefully torture is all too prevalent. It may be illegal and counterproductive, but we increasingly witness it, particularly in areas of conflict. Its use is an affront to us all and strikes at the core of human rights. So sadly there has been no diminution in the work of REDRESS. Indeed our case load continues to increase as REDRESS has further established itself as a champion of torture survivors, recognised for the quality of its work, and active across continents and legal institutions.

This year saw REDRESS working in more than 25 countries and with about 850 individual survivors. We had a notable victory at the Inter American Court where Mr Garcia Lucero won his 40 year battle for justice for the torture he endured in Chile under the Pinochet regime. We have welcomed positive steps by the British Foreign Secretary in galvanising support for his Prevention of Sexual Violence Initiative. But at the same time we note sadly that the ICC Prosecutor has found it necessary to re-open a preliminary examination into the allegations of systematic detainee abuse at the hands of British soldiers in Iraq, because she was unpersuaded by the actions being taken domestically in the UK to investigate and prosecute the range of allegations. All governments need to match words and deeds in the fight to eliminate the scourge of torture.

Again, REDRESS is indebted to our staff for their talent and unflagging efforts on behalf of survivors and to combat torture. This is recognised as high quality work, delivered by a small dedicated team. It has been a pleasure to welcome back our director, Carla Ferstman, after her sabbatical year in Washington. Funding REDRESS is an ongoing challenge, so our warmest thanks to all those donors who support us and ensure that we have the resources to do our work, and to our patrons, old and new, for their encouragement. Working with partners increases our effectiveness and we also greatly appreciate that collaboration.

We have become more vocal about communicating the details of our work, thanks to the commitment of our Communications Officer Eva Sanchis. This Annual Report describes our activities and sets out our financial performance. I commend it to you. My personal thanks go to my fellow trustees, and to our director and to our loyal staff.

Emyr Jones Parry

Message from the Director, Carla Ferstman

As always, it is an honour and a pleasure to lead the committed and talented team of professionals at REDRESS, to work with some of the most dynamic civil society groups around the world and to have the opportunity to make a difference in the lives of some of the most vulnerable people who have suffered so much.

Our work is neither for the faint-hearted nor for those who crave quick solutions or easy results. But a review of this Annual Report will show that patience can bring rewards. More and more of our clients are receiving positive judgments from human rights courts and related tribunals. More and more survivors and lawyers working on their behalf in all regions of the world have joined forces with REDRESS to pursue remedies for torture and related international crimes. Impunity remains a deep-seated problem in many countries where we work but with the combined efforts of REDRESS and other organisations, it is a problem that can be confronted and can be overcome.

I am grateful to the trustees of REDRESS for their continued support. Many have been with REDRESS for a long time which has given an important continuity to the organisation. I am also grateful to our founder and Honorary President Keith Carmichael for his vision in establishing REDRESS more than 20 years ago and to the staff for their daily efforts to give justice to this vision.

REDRESS is fortunate to work with a range of lawyers, academics, students and volunteers all of whom are invaluable to our efforts. Thank you as well to the range of foundations, institutions, governments and individuals who continue to see value in funding our work.

About REDRESS

REDRESS is an international human rights organisation with a mandate to seek justice and reparation for survivors of torture and related international crimes. It was established on 10 December 1992. The organisation was founded to ensure that survivors' rights to justice and reparation are capable of being enforced in practice.

REDRESS is based in London, and works both locally and globally in partnership with a range of counterparts. In the United Kingdom, REDRESS works directly with torture survivors who are based in the United Kingdom and front-line service providers on a variety of legal and associated support needs. REDRESS carries out research, policy and advocacy work to make certain that the UK and other governments comply fully with their international obligations to prohibit torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment and punishment and afford redress to torture survivors. Internationally, REDRESS works at the grassroots level with victims' communities, with governments, legal practitioners and civil society groups in a range of countries, and regularly influences policies and debates regionally and internationally. Its direct involvement with victims' efforts to seek justice provides it with important insights into endemic barriers that it works to overcome internationally.

REDRESS has received awards for its work; its research is cited regularly by international and national policy makers, academics, activists and increasingly the media. REDRESS' legal casework has led to positive judgments for torture survivors; this has not only given a measure of acknowledgment and redress to the individuals concerned, but has also helped to fuel the global efforts of lawyers, civil society groups and the victims themselves to call upon their governments to afford justice and reparation for torture. What was once a small movement by a dedicated few, has spring-boarded into a global movement to break the cycles of impunity for torture and seek effective remedies for its many victims.

Key values that continue to distinguish REDRESS as an organisation and that have enabled it to successfully develop and grow over the past twenty one years include its commitment to victim-centred casework, advocacy and capacity building, ensuring the principle of 'do no harm' alongside the provision of high quality scrupulous research, legal advice and policy guidance. REDRESS offers a comparative advantage to others because of its commitment to working in partnership with like-minded organisations, both those working in countries where torture and related international crimes are endemic as well as those working globally in areas connected to REDRESS' work. The establishment and maintenance of partnerships, whether informal or formal, can be very resource-intensive, but is considered a priority for REDRESS because joining forces builds strength and widens the potential for lasting impact. REDRESS' global network of collaborative relationships enables it to work flexibly and in a timely manner on issues over which it has a specific expertise, while sharing knowledge and helping to reinforce the important work of its partners on the ground.

Our Strategies

We pursue our objectives through three mutually reinforcing strategies involving litigation, research-based advocacy and capacity building, designed to strengthen the conditions necessary to end impunity for torture and afford survivors redress.

Casework

- We provide direct legal assistance to individuals and communities that have suffered torture and related international crimes in securing their rights. We provide legal advice, litigation support and representation to survivors in all regions of the world.

Advocacy

- We seek to positively influence policies, practices, laws and standards to enable justice and reparation for survivors.

Capacity Building

- Working in partnership with like-minded organisations, REDRESS provides technical assistance and support to civil society organisations and networks as well as national authorities around the world to combat torture and help survivors.

Programmes

We work along four broad programme areas to advance our mission:

- **Casework:** to provide direct legal support to torture survivors to obtain justice and redress
- **Justice in the Context of Mass Victimation:** to obtain justice and redress for torture survivors in situations of violent conflict, or in those societies emerging from, or having emerged from, a period of mass human rights violations
- **Influencing National laws and institutions:** working collaboratively to promote strong national legal frameworks and institutions that reflect international standards and are enforced in practice
- **Promoting International Standards:** to promote and strengthen international standards and regional and international institutions that reflect survivors' rights to justice and reparation

1. Casework

Helping torture survivors is central to REDRESS' mandate. We provide wide-ranging legal advice and support to survivors to help them achieve adequate and effective remedies. The types of cases taken by REDRESS include: criminal complaints against alleged perpetrators; civil claims for compensation and other remedies; claims for consular support and the exercise of diplomatic protection; administrative claims against public bodies relating to the failure to carry out diligently their mandates; support to survivors to access national human rights commissions and/or other inquiry processes operating in the country. REDRESS also uses its good offices to assist survivors to make contact with government officials, whether to obtain apologies or other measures or to assist them to access primary support. Internationally, REDRESS uses regional and international courts and related quasi- and non-judicial mechanisms when local remedies fail. In addition to direct litigation work, REDRESS provides support and advice to local and/or international lawyers on points of law and the development of legal strategies and frequently acts as amicus curiae (friend of the court) on areas in which it has expertise.

These cases are important to the individuals and communities directly concerned; they also serve the additional purpose of advancing the rule of law and the fight against torture worldwide.

At present, REDRESS has approximately 132 live cases concerning about 850 survivors. These concern women, men and child survivors of torture, committed during relative peace and in times of conflict. The survivors can be suspects of ordinary crimes, tortured to obtain confessions. They also concern human rights defenders, protesters and others tortured to quash dissent, or persons from marginalised ethnic, religious or other minorities tortured to keep them in submission. Torture is indiscriminate. It affects all strata of society.

Currently REDRESS' caseload (aside from general assistance work) is broken down as follows:

UN Human Rights Committee	19
International Criminal Court	4
European Court of Human Rights	8
UN Special Procedures	12
Inter-American System	7
African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights	7
Cases before domestic courts	67
Other	8

466 of these relate to survivors in Africa; 290 in Asia; 31 in Eastern Europe; 43 in Latin America and the Caribbean and 19 in the Western Europe and Other States grouping.

A few case highlights in 2013-4

Landmark judgment for Pinochet-era torture survivor

Don Leopoldo Lucero García has been a client of REDRESS for more than a decade. In 1973, he was detained in the notorious National Stadium in Santiago, and then in other concentration camps. He was repeatedly tortured. He lost all his teeth, his face was disfigured and his spine severely damaged. He has been disabled since then. In 1975, Pinochet's government forcibly expelled him and put him on a plane to the United Kingdom, where he received refugee status. Mr García and his family left behind all their relatives, friends and possessions. After a long legal battle, in August 2013 the Inter-American Court of Human Rights ruled that Mr García's rights were violated as a result of the continuing lack of justice, forty years after the crimes. The Court ordered Chile to finalise a criminal investigation "within a reasonable time", and to pay him £20,000 in compensation for moral damages. It also urged Chile to provide adequate funding to Mr. García to cover the costs of his treatment in the UK for continuing medical and psychological ailments. On 7 February 2014, at a private ceremony at the Chilean Embassy in London, Mr García received his compensation directly from Chilean officials. In a crucial symbolic apology, embassy representatives said that "saying sorry does not erase physical or psychological pain; neither does it relieve the suffering of relatives and loved ones. However, it is an act of contrition. It makes us confront our shameful past acts, come to repent them, and ensure that they are never repeated."

British aid worker obtains admission from FCO to failings in consular assistance

In 2011 REDRESS was approached by a UK national who was raped by a military officer in Egypt at a checkpoint. She sought assistance both with finding out whether the alleged perpetrator had been prosecuted in Egypt, and in pursuing a complaint against the Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO). She believed that not only did she not receive proper support from the British consulate in the country concerned, the acts of the consulate in fact put her in further danger and risk of traumatisation. REDRESS assisted her with locating information on her case within the Egyptian military court system, and when information suggested that the perpetrator had been convicted and sentenced, but that his case was on

appeal, liaised with Egyptian organisations to ensure that - in a first for such a case - submissions could be made to the court on her behalf. REDRESS also assisted with the conduct of her complaint through the FCO's internal procedures. The FCO admitted that aspects of the complaint had been substantiated, and committed to improving training on handling complaints of rape and sexual assault, and updating the global guidelines issued to staff on sexual assault and mistreatment and torture, after belatedly recognising that the complainant was a victim of torture. However, at the conclusion of the internal complaints procedure a significant number of issues remained unresolved. REDRESS prepared a complaint on her behalf to the UK Parliamentary & Health Services Ombudsman.

The Ombudsman upheld the complaint in full. The Ombudsman's report, laid before Parliament in November 2013, found multiple instances of maladministration by the FCO, including that: i) The complainant was not given any advice about the support that the FCO could provide her, in particular that they could help arrange a medical examination, and could accompany her to report the crime; ii) She was given incorrect advice about forensic evidence; iii) Even when the consular staff said they would come to meet her, they failed to follow-through, leaving her fearful of arrest by the military; iv) These failures had a serious impacts on the complainant: leading to a lengthy and traumatic experience of reporting the crime on her own (where she was held against her will for a number of hours), fear of arrest by the military, and the need to go through two medical examinations, rather than one. According to the Ombudsman, had the FCO provided appropriate support, her "experience of reporting the crime and receiving medical treatment would have been shorter and less traumatic;" v) Their complaints handling was defensive and lengthy, when what she needed was a prompt, complete response to her complaint so she could complete her dealings with the FCO and focus on her recovery. The Ombudsman recommended, and the FCO accepted, to provide a full apology, £1000 in compensation, and to carry out a full review of the handling of the case. On the release of the report, Parliamentary Ombudsman, Dame Julie Mellor said: *This is a prime example of how one individual coming forward to complain can lead to significant changes. Having the courage and persistence to seek justice can have an impact, not just for the individual, but for other people who may need to complain in future.*

REDRESS challenges state immunity in the case of photojournalist tortured and killed in Iran

Zahra Kazemi was a Canadian-Iranian photojournalist who was tortured to death in Iran. She was arrested during a visit to Iran in June 2003 while taking photographs of a protest outside Evin prison. While in detention, she was interrogated, beaten and sexually assaulted. Following the torture, Ms Kazemi was taken to hospital as she was suffering intestinal bleeding and a brain injury. Eventually Ms Kazemi's family was made aware that she was in a critical condition in hospital, but were denied access to her and requests for an independent medical examination and treatment, and for her to be allowed to be transferred to Canada for treatment, were denied. She was later declared brain-dead with no possibility of recovery, and was buried in Iran, despite many requests of her family to repatriate her body to Canada. Neither Iran nor the officials responsible for her torture and death have been held accountable.

In 2006 Ms Kazemi's son brought a civil claim in the Québec courts against Iran and three officials he alleges were responsible for his mother's torture and death. Iran argued that it and its officials are immune from suit and that the claims should be dismissed under the Canadian State Immunity Act. In January 2011, the Québec Superior Court allowed Stephan Hashemi's claim to proceed, on the basis of a specific exception in the State Immunity Act that allows claims for injuries suffered in Canada. However, the claims of Ms Kazemi's estate were dismissed on the ground that Iran and its officials were protected by state immunity. Both sides appealed to the Québec Court of Appeal, and in May 2011 REDRESS was granted leave to appear in the proceedings as an intervener. In August 2011, it filed a submission to the Court on the international law of state immunity as it applies to state officials, and the independent rights of family members of torture victims to remedy and redress. In August 2012 the Court of Appeal handed down its judgment, finding in Iran's favour that state immunity barred both claims. The claimants sought leave to appeal to the

Supreme Court of Canada, and this was granted in March 2013. REDRESS was granted leave to intervene in the appeal, and filed its factum on 14 November 2013. The Supreme Court heard oral argument in the case on 18 March 2014, and reserved its judgment. REDRESS is represented *pro bono* in the proceedings by Azim Hussain and Rahool Agarwal of Norton Rose Fulbright.

REDRESS challenges Lithuania and Poland over allegations of secret detention and torture

Mr al-Hawsawi faces capital charges before a U.S. Military Commission in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba. The charges relate to his alleged involvement as media organiser and financier in the September 11, 2001 attacks. He is characterised as a High Value Detainee (HVD).

Detailed analysis of publicly available evidence suggests that Mr al-Hawsawi may have been secretly held in CIA black sites in Poland from 7 March 2003 to 22 September 2003 and in Lithuania for an unknown period between March 2004 and September 2006. REDRESS filed complaints with authorities in both countries seeking the opening of an investigation. In September 2013, REDRESS and the Human Rights Monitoring Institute (HRMI) submitted in Lithuania asking the Lithuanian prosecutor to conduct an investigation into the suspected criminal offenses committed in Lithuania against Mr al-Hawsawi. The Prosecutor initially refused to do so however after a successful appeal to the Vilnius Regional Court, the Prosecutor-General's office announced in February 2014 that it had opened an investigation.

In November 2013 Polish lawyer Bogumil Zygmunt filed an application on REDRESS's behalf to Polish prosecutors seeking victim status for Mustafa al-Hawsawi in the ongoing Polish investigation into allegations of CIA rendition and secret detention in the country. Like the Lithuanian complaint, the Polish complaint relies on an analysis of publicly available evidence including flight data and suspected movement of other detainees of a similar profile, which points to a strong likelihood that Mr al-Hawsawi was transferred through, and secretly held in, Poland. On 28 March 2014 the Prosecutor rejected the application for victim status. The reasons for the decision were notified to REDRESS on 18 April 2014, but under Polish criminal procedure they cannot be publicly disclosed. On 25 April 2014, REDRESS appealed the decision to the District Court of Szczytno. The prosecutor is now considering whether to amend the decision or contest the appeal. As part of that process, the Prosecutor called REDRESS to provide further information at a hearing in Kraków on 12 June 2014.

Important victory for REDRESS before African Commission

REDRESS welcomes the decision by Africa's regional human rights treaty body that holds Sudan responsible for the arbitrary arrest, detention, torture and ill-treatment of 88 Internally Displaced Persons. The 88 are Sudanese nationals who, having fled from Southern Sudan, Darfur and other parts of Sudan, became internally displaced persons (IDPs) living in the Soba Aradi camp in Khartoum. In May 2005, a team of police officers and soldiers entered the camp, sealed off parts of it and sought to forcibly relocate several thousand resident families. The residents resisted and violence broke out, resulting in the killing of several police officers and IDPs. Over the next few weeks, the police arrested and detained at least 684 persons in connection with the incident. The 88 were held for more than twelve months without any charges being brought against them, were not provided with any custodial safeguards, such as access to a lawyer, to family members and to medical care, and were not allowed to challenge the lawfulness of their detention. At the Khartoum police headquarters, applicants were subjected to beatings with sticks and whips and to falaqa (beating on the sole of the feet causing excruciating pain) and death threats. They were also not given food for two days and deprived of medical care. The treatment was inflicted ostensibly as punishment for the riots and as a means to extract confessions. After their transfer to Kober prison, the applications were held incommunicado, were denied access to toilet facilities and were subjected to forced standing and whippings. Most applicants were released without charges in June and July 2006. Subsequent

complaints to the Sudanese authorities concerning the ill-treatment and torture did not result in any investigations.

REDRESS fights for justice for victims of military injustice in Egypt

On 9 March 2011, Samira Ibrahim Mohamed Mahmoud and Rasha Ali Abdel Rahman, two female Egyptian citizens, were arrested by military officials in Tahrir Square for their participation in a protest during the Egyptian Uprising. After their arrest, they allege that they were held in a military prison, beaten and subjected to electroshocks. They claim that they were both, in separate incidents, stripped naked in full view of male military officers. Following this, a military doctor subjected them to forced genital examinations. No explanation was given for the examinations.

In March 2012, a military court found the doctor accused of performing the forced genital examinations innocent of all charges. In the wake of this decision, Samira and Rasha, decided to bring the case before the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, as the main regional human rights mechanism. Their cases were filed with the assistance of the Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights and Interights. REDRESS joined the case in December 2013, arguing that the forced genital examinations constituted rape and torture.

Intervention in Shestopalov v The Russian Federation

In 2004, a Russian teenager, Mr Shestopalov, was questioned by police in relation to the sexual assault of a former classmate. Mr Shestopalov was beaten and strangled until he signed a statement admitting to voluntary sexual intercourse with the rape victim. The victim later confirmed that Mr Shestopalov did not rape her. Mr Shestopalov brought a complaint against the police for the treatment he experienced while in detention. During the police investigations into the complaint, Mr Shestopalov was able to identify a police officer that took part in the torture. However, these investigations were later suspended on the grounds that it was not possible to identify the alleged perpetrators. In 2008, a Russian court awarded Mr Shestopalov 50,000 rubles (approximately EUR €1,030) in compensation for his treatment, but no further investigations were carried out. At the European Court of Human Rights Mr Shestopalov complained that: no effective investigation against the police took place, and the compensation he received was insufficient to redress the infringement of his rights.

In January 2014 the European Court of Human Rights granted REDRESS permission to intervene in the case as a third party. On 18 February 2014, REDRESS filed its comments in the case. REDRESS' intervention laid out international standards and comparative jurisprudence on two issues; 1) the effectiveness of investigations where several law enforcement officials have been involved; and 2) the factors to be taken into consideration when determining the adequacy of damages for torture and ill-treatment.

2. Justice in the Context of Mass Victimisation

Countries currently facing, or emerging from, situations of massive human rights violations – face particular challenges in affording justice and redress to victims. The context in which torture occurs, the scale of the crime, who perpetrates it, why and how it is perpetrated and who are the victims can also differ significantly from that of relatively peaceful or stable environments. In an immediate post-conflict context, there may be distinct opportunities to progress justice and accountability. However, transitional justice approaches may not always address the deep-seated causes and consequences of victimisation. Furthermore, the political context in which such measures are developed may result in ad hoc or partial responses which may not always result in effective and adequate forms of reparation. REDRESS' focus on justice for victims is vital to bring to the debate, given that this perspective may be absent from other

external interventions, and its internal articulation could be very weak in the wake of major societal conflict.

Victims' Access to Justice

REDRESS has been working to build capacity and encourage the development of law and policy on transitional justice and reparations in numerous conflict affected countries. Our work has centred on promoting victims' access to justice processes. Within Africa, REDRESS has used the NGO side meeting processes at the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights to foster awareness and increase collaboration amongst civil society groups working on mass crimes cases across the continent.

In the **Democratic Republic of the Congo**, REDRESS has been working with victims' groups in the East of the country. It has provided training and facilitated numerous outreach meetings with groups in Ituri and North Kivu throughout the year. These have focused on building awareness about ongoing legal proceedings at the International Criminal Court, including explaining court processes and decisions and assisting groups to engage with the Court. Also we have sought to identify gaps in local justice delivery for victims of mass crimes, including by working with local lawyers and other justice actors to assess efforts to prosecute alleged perpetrators of mass gender based violence and afford reparation to the victims. In this context, we have held workshops with lawyers in Goma, North Kivu, on the challenges for victims to access justice before local courts. We have also engaged United Nations bodies, such as the Committee on the Elimination of Violence Against Women and the Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review process, to raise awareness about the need for justice system strengthening in the DRC.

In **Kenya**, REDRESS, in partnership with the local NGO Kituo Cha Sheria, has organised workshops on victims' rights and domestic accountability mechanisms operating in the country. The focus of meetings has been the efforts to establish an International Crimes Division within the High Court of Kenya and the implementation of the Truth, Justice and Reconciliation Commission's (TJRC) recommendations and related advocacy strategies to strengthen victims' rights to justice and reparation in the context of those processes. Also, we have worked to foster information-sharing on the International Criminal Court's involvement in the investigation and prosecution of post-election violence cases, and the roles for victims to engage in such proceedings. REDRESS and Kituo Cha Sheria published and disseminated a guide on victims and the ICC in Kenya, and also facilitated discussions on a draft statement to be undersigned by participating civil society organisations on victims' rights in relation to the Kenyan International Crimes Division.

In **Uganda**, REDRESS is working with local groups to engage with transitional justice processes within the country. Within the year, we facilitated discussions with victims' networks on reparations, building on from experience in other countries. We co-organised a two-day workshop to help further discussions of civil society on the issue of "interim reparations". We also co-hosted a round-table with officials of the International Crimes Division in Kampala, in collaboration with the Uganda Victims' Foundation and the Ugandan Coalition for the ICC. The agenda included updates on the work of the ICD, including recent hearings in the Thomas Kwoyelo case; exchanges on victims and witnesses issues arising in the ICD legal framework; and specific discussions on protection and outreach.

In **Rwanda**, we worked with the Survivor's Fund (SURF) and other actors to provide information on comparative approaches to reparations, which have helped invigorate advocacy campaigns relating to reparations within the country.

REDRESS also provided training and capacity building to groups affected by massive or systematic human rights violations and conducted related advocacy regarding transitional and other justice measures in diverse countries, including **Bahrain, Ivory Coast, Libya, Nepal, Syria, Sudan and Tunisia**.

Advocacy before the International Criminal Court

The International Criminal Court is a key mechanism with the potential to address some of the worst modern-day atrocities and afford justice to the many victims. REDRESS has a longstanding interest in the progressive development of the International Criminal Court as an institution and its capacity to deliver justice for international crimes. Our work on the International Criminal Court focuses on:

- **Advocating for strong procedures at the International Criminal Court to ensure victims' access to justice and reparation**

REDRESS continues to coordinate the Victims' Rights Working Group, an informal global network of experts and advocates working to promote justice for victims at the ICC, operating under the auspices of the NGO Coalition for the International Criminal Court. The Working Group currently comprises about 500 members including individuals and groups located in countries affected by ICC investigations and prosecutions. During the year, REDRESS helped to organise and disseminate joint position papers of the Working Group, issued newsletters and jurisprudence updates on victims' rights and coordinated advocacy initiatives aimed at the Assembly of States Parties and ICC officials. As part of this work, REDRESS helped to convene an independent panel of experts to advise the Registry and other organs of the Court on strategies to ensure meaningful and effective victim participation.

In addition, REDRESS issued a number of policy papers aimed at considering in detail some of the challenges to give effect to victims' rights at the ICC. It also provided comments to the Office of the Prosecutor on its Draft Policy Paper on Sexual and Gender Based Crimes.

- **Ensuring that victims affected by ICC proceedings have access to the Court to express their views and concerns, and that the local organisations and lawyers assisting them on the ground have the wherewithal to do so effectively**

REDRESS works with victims, grassroots intermediary organisations providing support to victims on the ground and legal representatives for victims. REDRESS has provided help to victims and intermediaries to apply to participate in proceedings and has helped to convey certain challenges faced by victims during the application process. It has also raised concerns about the need to protect victims and witnesses and to support intermediaries and continues to engage with the Registry to improve the system of legal representation for victims.

Measures to Address Sexual Violence during Conflict

Sexual violence as a form of subjugation and punishment or as a means of destroying an opposing community is a common weapon in conflict, affecting women and girls, who are particularly vulnerable, but also men and boys. REDRESS has been working to draw attention to the plight of victims of such crimes and their needs for justice and reparation. The challenges to access justice are compounded in conflict and post-conflict contexts, and made more acute by discriminatory attitudes and cross-cutting marginalisation affecting many victims of gender-based and sexual violence.

- In March 2014, REDRESS provided commentary and input to the United Nations' Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on its draft analytical study on "Human rights and transitional justice". Our submission focused on ways to ensure the effective participation of victims of sexual and gender-based violence in justice processes in conflict and post-conflict situations. In doing so, it considered participation in both ordinary domestic justice systems, and transitional justice mechanisms.

- REDRESS was a member of the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office's Preventing Sexual Violence Initiative (PSVI) working group on documentation. The role of the working group was to provide guidance to the FCO on its Protocol for Preventing Sexual Violence. REDRESS actively participated in the Summit leading to the adoption of the Protocol.
- In October 2013, REDRESS released the thematic report Redress for Rape, which considers the international jurisprudence on rape as a form of torture or other ill-treatment.

REDRESS is also working with victims of sexual and other forms of gender based violence and their lawyers to access hybrid, regional and international tribunals, including through documentation and assistance with victim application processes, engagement with prosecutors and/or related support and third party interventions. In particular, we are actively pursuing cases relating to conflict era sexual violence in the **Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Sudan**.

3. Influencing national laws and institutions

REDRESS works to ensure that international standards relating to the prohibition of torture and reparation for survivors of torture and related international crimes are applied at the national level. We strive to inform and influence policies and practices through expert analysis and recommendations on a range of thematic issues linked to the prohibition of torture and survivor's rights.

Internationally, REDRESS works to overcome obstacles to justice in countries where torture is endemic by ensuring that international standards are applied at national level. REDRESS achieves this objective through partnerships with local organisations; developing joint strategies that involve capacity building for civil society as well as government actors at the national level; advocacy towards national policy makers and litigation to seek justice and reparation for survivors and establish useful precedent for later cases. REDRESS has formal partnerships with key organisations in Europe, Sub-Saharan Africa, Central and South America, Middle East and North Africa and Asia which provide cornerstones to REDRESS' work.

- In October 2013, REDRESS published a global report on reparation for torture, which was the culmination of global research and a series of five meetings bringing together lawyers and civil society groups in the regions of Sub-Saharan Africa, Middle East and North Africa, the Americas, Europe and Asia. The report considers the law and practice relating to reparation for torture throughout the world.
- During the year, REDRESS produced advocacy briefings, reports and submissions in relation to **Bahrain, Nepal, Peru, Libya, Sudan and the United States of America**. These reports considered a variety of issues concerning remedies for torture, including the particular contexts of torture committed in the context of counter-terrorism measures.
- REDRESS also carried out training and capacity building in an array of countries, on the legal documentation of torture cases, investigation techniques, casework strategies, and other obligations of local authorities to investigate and prosecute torture cases.

As a UK based organisation, REDRESS also has a dedicated advocacy focus to ensure that the UK Government meets its international obligations and stays true to the absolute prohibition of torture in all respects. This includes ensuring that strong policy level statements which reject torture are substantiated with good practice by all relevant agencies. This includes how the UK Government responds to torture allegations in its foreign relations as well as its response to allegations which concern UK officials, e.g., the UK Government's performance in investigating, prosecuting and affording reparation to victims of torture and other prohibited treatment allegedly carried out by or with the acquiescence, acknowledgement or

complicity of UK officials (whether they are border guards, security officials, persons in charge of places of detention, military, police or private actors with functions delegated by the State). It also includes monitoring the performance of the immigration, police and prosecution services as appropriate in detecting persons who are located in the United Kingdom and are alleged to have perpetrated torture or related crimes abroad and ensuring that those persons are duly investigated and prosecuted in accordance with national law and international obligations. REDRESS also monitors the performance of consular officials and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office more broadly in adequately responding to torture allegations made by British nationals and provides input on how this work may be improved.

For example, during the year:

- REDRESS advocated for the Government to carry out a full and effective investigation into the alleged role of UK officials in the unlawful detention, torture and rendition of terror suspects. The allegations were the subject of the Detainee Inquiry chaired by Sir Peter Gibson, and have now been tasked to the parliamentary Intelligence and Security Committee;
- REDRESS advocated the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to revise its policy on consular assistance and diplomatic protection for UK nationals tortured abroad. It also provided oral and written submission to the Foreign Affairs Committee which had been tasked to inquire into the matter;
- REDRESS provided a submission to the United Nations Committee Against Torture on its List of Issues for Consideration of the UK'S 5th State Party Report.
- REDRESS organised together with the All Party Parliamentary Human Rights Group, a public roundtable on '*Reducing vulnerability to torture: Challenges to UK's foreign policy*' at the House of Commons. The event offered an opportunity for REDRESS' partners to raise issues relating to the UK's foreign policy, in particular the Foreign and Commonwealth Office's anti-torture strategy.

4. Promoting International Standards

REDRESS works to ensure that survivors' rights are recognised and protected in international and regional treaties, declarations and related principles, and to make certain that the bodies interpreting such instruments positively affirm and practically advance such standards in their daily work. The recent adoption by the UN Committee Against Torture of General Comment 3, on the meaning of "redress" is a recent successful example. In this case, REDRESS provided substantive input to the Committee throughout the drafting process, and continues to work to ensure that the adopted General Comment is widely known and implemented by States.

REDRESS' international standard setting work consists in carrying out analytical research on the meaning of existing standards, clarifying standards which are vaguely articulated as well as carrying out advocacy to introduce new standards where the existing ones do not adequately address barriers to justice. REDRESS has been urged by a range of stakeholders and mandate holders to maintain its emphasis on giving support to regional and international institutions, and advocating that they continue to address institutional weaknesses so that they can address victims' needs and rights most adequately and effectively. Efforts are aimed at strengthening the international framework (encouraging a transition from soft law to hard law where appropriate); translating these international standards into regional practices; and on implementation in-country. It is particularly important to defend existing standards in the face of an increasingly hostile political environment regarding issues of non-refoulement and even the absolute prohibition on torture. The International Standards programme works in synergy with REDRESS' other programmes. It takes as inspiration the systemic barriers to justice that victims face, which become known through REDRESS' other programmes of work. It also ensures that new standards and related international jurisprudence are reflected in the ongoing work at the domestic level.

UN Human Rights Bodies

- REDRESS submitted numerous reports and commentary to the UN Human Rights Committee, Committee against Torture, Committee on the Elimination of Violence Against Women and the Working Group on Disappearances. It also engaged actively with UN mandate holders such as the Special Rapporteur on Torture and the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women. It contributed commentary on the meaning of particular treaty provisions and their application to particular contexts, including on issues as diverse as victim and witness protection, reparation and the enforcement by States of treaty obligations.

African Commission of Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR)

In addition to the numerous claims REDRESS has filed with the African Commission on behalf of victims of torture in Africa, REDRESS is seeking to work with the African Commission and other institutions in Africa to strengthen their approach to victims of torture and related international crimes. For example,

- In March 2014, REDRESS attended an expert meeting convened by the Committee for the Prevention of Torture in Africa. REDRESS, together with its partner, the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, were asked to participate in the meeting and address the Committee on the content and scope of a potential General Comment on Article 5 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. The invitation was preceded by previous engagement of the Committee by a range of organisations working and advocating for the strengthening of the rights of victims of torture and ill-treatment in Africa.
- REDRESS produced a report on reparation within the African human rights system. The purpose of the report was to describe and analyse the past practise of human rights institutions in Africa on assessing victims' claims for reparation, issuing awards and engaging in follow-up with Member States in order to ensure that awards and related recommendations are implemented and to provide recommendations to African institutions on areas for strengthening. The report also assisted to galvanise civil society engagement in the issue of reparations, through the Pan-African Reparation Initiative.

European Institutions

REDRESS has been working jointly with a number of civil society groups to strengthen European institutions for the protection of human rights and to counter impunity.

- With respect to the **European Court of Human Rights**, REDRESS has joined a number of NGOs in making a series of submissions highlighting key concerns over the draft of Protocols 15 and 16 to the European Convention on Human Rights, which have the potential to undermine the functioning of the European Court of Human Rights. These included amendments referring to "the margin of appreciation doctrine" developed by the Court in relation to the interpretation and application of the Convention by states, the reduction of the period for applying to the Court from 6 to 4 months and the legal effects of advisory opinions issued by the Court. In January 2014, REDRESS made further comments on the importance of the right of individual application before the Court, interim measures of relief and awards of just satisfaction.
- REDRESS has been working to collaborate with and support the **EU Genocide Network**, a network of state investigators and prosecutors working on international crimes cases within the EU. In the year, REDRESS and its partners provided commentary to the GENVAL Working Party of the EU Council on Strengthening efforts to combat impunity within the EU and its Member States for crimes under international law. REDRESS also commented on the implementing guidelines for the EU Directive on Minimum Standards for Victims of Crimes, explaining their relevance for international crimes victims in the EU or affected by investigations and prosecutions in EU Member States and hosted a meeting in Brussels where these issues were canvassed.

Communications

Communications serves a number of purposes for REDRESS:

- Improving the visibility of REDRESS and its work in order to showcase the work we are doing and build communities of support;
- Strengthening public awareness of the scale of the problem of torture in order to advance policy agendas, explain why there should be zero tolerance of torture, and provide for a more rehabilitative environment for survivors through greater awareness of victims' experiences, rights and needs;
- Making REDRESS' services known to potential clients, front-line agencies working with torture survivors and civil society groups globally in order to extend our reach.

In the past year, REDRESS' work has been covered in a variety of media outlets, including major international news outlets and local media in countries affected by REDRESS' work. In addition, REDRESS' social media presence continues to grow, through Facebook and Twitter pages and increased traffic on our website.

Public Benefit

The Trustees confirm that they have complied with the guidance of the Charities Act 2011 to have due regard to public benefit published by the Commission in determining the activities undertaken by the Charity. The Trustees are satisfied that the aims and objectives of the charity, and the activities reported on above to achieve those aims, meet these principles.

Our Plans for the Future

Evaluation of our work

During the year, REDRESS carried out an internal evaluation which assessed the extent to which REDRESS met the objectives set out in its prior three year strategic plan and to inform future strategies of the organisation. This consisted of a series of internal staff meetings and a trustee and staff Away-Day to consider past work achievements and to assess REDRESS' current positioning as a specialist international human rights organisation with a focused mandate and having regard to the evolving external landscape.

Also during the year, one of REDRESS' largest programme grants was evaluated by an independent expert. The independent expert was contracted to evaluate REDRESS' recently completed EU funded project on *Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Experience*. The project involved work in four core target countries (India, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan) and the evaluation included a review of the various outputs and reports as well as meetings with programme staff and stakeholders in London, Lima, Peru and Geneva. In his final report, the evaluator gave high scores to the project on all the evaluation criteria (relevance and quality of design, efficiency of implementation, effectiveness, impact and potential sustainability). In particular he noted that REDRESS' national partners value the technical assistance they receive from REDRESS in taking cases, particularly using international mechanisms. The overall strategy of combining human rights litigation with research, publications and networking opportunities developed during this project was extremely relevant and it is recommended that it should be continued in future ones. He indicated that the 'outputs of this project generally seem to have been excellent', and the 'implementation

strategy developed during this project was extremely effective and it is recommended that it should be continued in future ones'.

Looking Forward

REDRESS trustees issued a new Strategic Plan covering a three year period from 1 April 2014. This plan builds on REDRESS' prior successes, its unique positioning and the evolving human rights landscape in countries where REDRESS is active. In particular, the new plan

- underscores REDRESS' desire to strengthen its partnerships with local civil society groups in order to maximise impact;
- commits REDRESS to working in countries where torture is endemic and taking special measures to ensure that particularly marginalised groups who experience or are especially vulnerable to torture are able to benefit from REDRESS' interventions;
- commits REDRESS to work to end State complicity in torture and seek justice for the victims of such collusion, particularly in the context of the phenomenon of democratic States' collusion in torture during counter-terrorism or wider security operations;
- underlines REDRESS' goal of developing and strengthening the organisation' operational capacity and resources to support and sustain its programme work and operational running; in particular by increasing and diversifying its funding base, with a focus on core funding.

Our Supporters

Funders

REDRESS is indebted for funding this year to:

Bromley Trust

Trust for London

The Esmée Fairbairn Foundation

European Union – European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights

European Union - Criminal Justice Programme

Fidelity Charitable

Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP

Humanity United

John Armitage Charitable Trust

John D. and Catherine T. Macarthur Foundation

National Endowment for Democracy

Oak Foundation

Sigrid Rausing Trust

Sir Jeremiah Coleman Gift Trust

The Hague Institute for Global Justice

UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture

VCEP

Many of our funders, such as the Bromley Trust, the European Union, the MacArthur Foundation, the Oak Foundation and the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, have continued to support REDRESS for many years, and their commitment to the organisation and its aims has been very important to REDRESS' stability and success.

We are also very grateful to the many individuals who supported our work this year. In 2014, we have received £9,571 (2013 - £13,478) from individual donations, many from long-term supporters of the organisation, some from newer contacts and as a result of sporting and other events. REDRESS supporters

raised a record sum though marathons and other sporting events. In this regard, we would like to thank the runners who participated in the 2013 London Virgin Marathon and the 2013 British 10K London Run and raised money in support of REDRESS's work: Amir Arasta, Andrew Pears, Luke Whiting, Stephen Jones, Ben Freedman, Mauricio Zamorano, Amy Wordley, Jo-Anne Prud'homme, Orin Gordon, Alan Mitchell, Christiana Hayward-Kourabas. Sporting events helped draw wider attention to our cause and raised key resources for our work.

Volunteers, interns and other supporters

The Trustees would also like to record their appreciation of the many volunteers who willingly gave their time to the benefit of the charity. This year, REDRESS' volunteers provided invaluable support to all of our programme areas. REDRESS has been fortunate to host a range of interns and volunteers from many countries, who have contributed substantially to our work. We would also like to warmly thank the professors and students who collaborated with REDRESS through a number of clinical and related human rights programmes. We would also like to thank the law clinics that have provided substantial support this year, including Boston College of Law London programme; the School of Oriental and African Studies international human rights clinic; the Human Rights Implementation Centre at the University of Bristol and the University of Essex Human Rights Centre.

Special thanks are due to civil society partners throughout the world who continue to share our vision for a world without torture and for the need to achieve justice for victims.

Support from the legal community

We would also like to warmly thank the numerous law firms, barristers and solicitors that have supported our work over the year. In particular, special thanks to Simon Creighton and Mark Scott (Bhatt Murphy); Tamsin Allen (Bindmans LLP); Ronnie Graham (Birnberg Peirce); Tim Otty QC and Ravi Mehta (Blackstone Chambers); Sue Willman (Deighton Pierce Glynn); John R.W.D. Jones QC (Doughty Street Chambers); Catherine Drummond, Ben Juratowitch, Clarissa O'Callaghan, Samuel Sauphanor (Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer); Shivani Jegarajah (Mansfield Chambers); Richard Hermer QC (Matrix Chambers); Hannah Chambers (Migrants' Law Project, Islington Law Centre); Eric Metcalfe (Monckton Chambers); Gerry Hickey (solicitor).

Structure, governance and management

The Board of Trustees confirms that the annual report and financial statements of the charity comply with current statutory requirements, the requirements of the charity's governing document and the provisions of the Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) "Accounting and Reporting by Charities" issued in March 2005.

The charity may by Ordinary Resolution in General Meeting appoint any person who is willing to act to be a Trustee, either to fill a vacancy or as an additional Trustee. At every third Annual General Meeting thereafter all the Trustees shall retire from office. Retiring Trustees are eligible for re-election. Trustees are recruited personally by existing members for their legal knowledge, experience of and interest in the charity's work.

The Board of Trustees is responsible, inter alia, for setting and overseeing the overall direction, policies and finances of the charity. It has the power from time to time to adopt and make, alter or revoke, bye-laws for the regulation of the charity and otherwise for the purposes for which the charity is established, so long as such bye-laws are consistent with the Memorandum or Articles of Association. The Director is responsible for the day-to-day management of the charity and execution of policies and practices set by the Board of

Trustees. There have been no changes in the objectives since the last annual report. REDRESS plans to continue the activities as outlined above in the forthcoming years subject to satisfactory funding arrangements.

Induction and Training of Trustees

Trustees receive an induction programme which involves meetings with all of the charity's staff and consultants and is intended to inform them of the charity's work and objectives.

Financial Review

Financial performance

The charity had net outgoing resources on unrestricted funds of £29,759 for the year (2013 – £51,408) before transfers. After transfers, together with the accumulated surplus brought forward from previous years, the charity now has an accumulated surplus on unrestricted funds of £122,201 (2013 - £151,960). Restricted funds carried forward at 31 March 2014 amounted to £362,747 (2013 - £549,446), following net outgoing resources for the year of £186,699 (2013 – £170,098). The funds carried forward are sufficient for the activities for which the funds were provided.

The balance sheet shows that funds held at the end of the year were £216,458 less than at the start of the year, £187,699 (86%) of this reduction being in restricted funds. This reflects monies held that have been received in advance for future years' projects and it varies according to the projects plans and the timing of grant income to fund them.

The Trustees' efforts in developing and implementing the charity's fundraising strategy during the year resulted in growth in total income.

The Trustees have also carefully addressed the complementarities of the charity's work with other national and international organisations to assure donors that funding contributes the maximum impact to a co-ordinated approach to the charity's overall goals.

Reserves policy

REDRESS holds Reserves for a number of reasons:

- To enable activities to continue in the period between major projects supported by Restricted Grant Income;
- To enable REDRESS to initiate projects which can demonstrate to a funder a need for support;
- To invest in future income generation;
- To cover any unforeseen expenditure; and
- To provide cash flow support for Restricted Grant Income paid in arrears.

At the year-end REDRESS had free reserves of £106,573, calculated as the total value of Unrestricted Funds less the value of Fixed Assets which are not immediately realisable for use under the Policy. The Trustees calculate that REDRESS requires a range of free reserves of between £93,121 and £164,268. The current free reserves are within the target range. The Trustees consider this level to be appropriate because, over

the next year, a number of grants are due for renewal with the outcome of applications currently being uncertain.

The Trustees review the organisational Budget regularly during the Financial Year and will review the Reserves Policy annually as part of this process.

Risk management

The Trustees have identified that the main risks are (i) not meeting fundraising targets and (ii) ensuring that funders' accountability requirements continue to be met. A strategy is in place to achieve the renewal of expired grants and to identify potential new funders. As part of their risk management review, the Trustees have agreed a contingency plan with the Director and will closely monitor the progress on grant applications.

Statement of the Board of Trustees' Responsibilities

The Trustees (who are also directors of The Redress Trust for the purposes of company law), are responsible for preparing the Trustees' Report and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

Company law requires the trustees to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the charitable company and of the incoming resources and application of resources, including the income and expenditure, of the charitable company for that period. In preparing these financial statements, the trustees are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- Observe the methods and principles in the Charities SORP;
- Make judgments and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- State whether applicable UK Accounting standards have been followed, subject to any material departures disclosed and explained in the financial statements;
- Prepare the financial statements on the going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charitable company will continue in business

The trustees are responsible for keeping proper accounting records that disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time of the financial position of the charitable company and enable them to ensure that the financial statements comply with the Companies Act 2006. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charitable company and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

In so far as we are aware:

- There is no relevant audit information of which the charitable company's auditor is unaware; and
- The trustees have taken all steps that they ought to have taken to make themselves aware of any relevant audit information and to establish that the auditor is aware of that information.

Events since the end of the year

In the opinion of the Board of Trustees no event since the balance sheet date significantly affects the company's financial position.

Auditors

The auditors, haysmacintyre, are proposed for re-appointment in accordance with Section 485 of the Companies Act 2006.

In preparing this report, the Trustees have taken advantage of the small companies exemptions provided by section 415A of the Companies Act 2006

This report was approved by the Board of Trustees on and signed on its behalf by:

Sir Emry Jones Parry GCMG, PhD, FInstP
Chair of the Board of Trustees, 10th July 2014

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE REDRESS TRUST LIMITED

We have audited the financial statements of The Redress Trust Limited for the year ended 31 March 2014, which comprise of the Statement of Financial Activities, the Balance Sheet, and the related notes. The financial reporting framework that has been applied in their preparation is applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

This report is made solely to the charitable company's members, as a body, in accordance with Chapter 3 of Part 16 of the Companies Act 2006. Our audit work has been undertaken so that we might state to the charitable company's members those matters we are required to state to them in an Auditors' Report and for no other purpose. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the charitable company and its members, as a body, for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinion we have formed.

Respective responsibilities of trustees and auditor

As explained more fully in the Trustees' Responsibilities Statement, the trustees (who are also the directors of the charitable company for the purposes of company law) are responsible for the preparation of the financial statements and for being satisfied that they give a true and fair view

Our responsibility is to audit and express an opinion on the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland). Those standards require us to comply with the Auditing Practices Board's Ethical Standards for Auditors.

Scope of the audit of the financial statements

A description of the scope of an audit of financial statements is provided on the Financial Reporting Council's website at www.frc.org.uk/auditscopeukprivate.

Opinion on financial statements

In our opinion the financial statements:

- give a true and fair view of the state of the charitable company's affairs as at 31 March 2014 and of its incoming resources and application of resources, including its income and expenditure, for the year then ended;
- have been properly prepared in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice; and
- have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Companies Act 2006.

Opinion on other matter prescribed by the Companies Act 2006

In our opinion the information given in the Trustees' Annual Report for the financial year for which the financial statements are prepared is consistent with the financial statements.

Matters on which we are required to report by exception

We have nothing to report in respect of the following matters where the Companies Act 2006 requires us to report to you if, in our opinion:

- adequate accounting records have not been kept or returns adequate for our audit have not been received from branches not visited by us; or
- the financial statements are not in agreement with the accounting records and returns; or
- certain disclosures of trustees' remuneration specified by law are not made; or
- we have not received all the information and explanations we require for our audit; or

- the trustees were not entitled to take advantage of the small companies exemption in preparing the Trustees' Annual Report and Strategic Report.

*Murtaza Jessa (Senior statutory auditor)
for and on behalf of haysmacintyre, Statutory Auditor*

*26 Red Lion Square
London
WC1R 4AG*

Date:.....

Statement of Financial Activities for the year ended 31st March 2014 (incorporating the Income & Expenditure account)

	Note	Unrestricted Funds £	Restricted Funds £	Total 2014 £	Total 2013 £
Incoming resources					
<i>Incoming resources from generated funds</i>					
Voluntary income:					
Donations	2	373,371	-	373,371	154,678
Legacies		141	-	141	103
Investment Income		458	-	458	770
<i>Incoming resources from charitable activities</i>	3				
Grants receivable:					
Casework		-	108,246	108,246	386,691
Justice in the Context of Mass Victimisation		-	60,220	60,220	31,200
Promoting International Standards		-	190,018	190,018	252,366
Influencing National Laws and Institutions		-	263,631	263,631	146,665
Communication		-	-	-	2,758
Core Restricted		-	-	-	2,462
Training and other income		42,027	-	42,027	50,017
Total incoming resources		415,997	622,115	1,038,112	1,027,710
Resources expended					
<i>Costs of generating funds</i>					
Costs of generating voluntary income		54,620	-	54,620	51,685
<i>Charitable activities</i>	4				
Casework		174,594	379,558	554,152	413,868
Justice in the Context of Mass Victimisation		41,393	89,987	131,380	193,306
Promoting International Standards		83,436	181,384	264,820	309,405
Influencing National Laws and Institutions		72,626	157,885	230,511	59,721
Communication		-	-	-	79,137
Core Restricted		-	-	-	115,663
Training and other Expenditure		-	-	-	-
Governance	5	19,087	-	19,087	6,020
Total resources expended		445,756	808,814	1,254,570	1,228,805
Net (outgoing)/Incoming resources before transfers	6	(29,759)	(186,699)	(216,458)	(201,095)

Statement of Financial Activities for the year ended 31st March 2014 (incorporating the Income & Expenditure account)

	Note	Unrestricted Funds	Restricted Funds	Total 2014	Total 2013
		£	£	£	£
Net (outgoing)/Incoming resources before transfers	6	(29,759)	(186,699)	(216,458)	(201,095)
Net (expenditure)/income for the year after transfers		(29,759)	(186,699)	(216,458)	(201,095)
Fund balances brought forward at 1 st April 2013		151,960	549,446	701,406	902,501
Fund balances carried forward at 31st March 2014		122,201	362,747	484,948	701,406

There were no recognised gains and losses for 2014 or 2013 other than those included in the statement of financial activities. All the above results are derived from continuing activities. The notes on pages 27 to 36 form part of these financial statements.

Balance Sheet as at 31st March 2014 Company number: 02774071

	Note	£	2014 £	2013 £
FIXED ASSETS				
Tangible fixed assets	8		15,628	22,944
CURRENT ASSETS				
Debtors	9	70,960	102,022	
Cash at bank and in hand		493,745	671,374	
Total current assets		564,705	773,396	
CREDITORS: falling due within one year	10	(95,385)	(94,934)	
NET CURRENT ASSETS		469,320	678,462	
NET ASSETS		484,948	701,406	
REPRESENTED BY:	12			
Restricted funds		362,747	549,446	
Unrestricted funds:				
General funds		49,731	69,973	
Designated funds		72,470	81,987	
		484,948	701,406	

The financial statements were approved and authorised for issue by the Board of Trustees on 10th July 2014 and signed on its behalf by:

Sir Emry Jones Parry GCMG, PhD, FInstP

Chair

The notes on pages 27 -36 form part of these financial statements.

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

1. ACCOUNTING POLICIES

A summary of the principal accounting policies, all of which have been applied consistently throughout the year and with the preceding year, is set out below:

Basis of preparation of financial statements

The financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention, on the going concern basis and in accordance with the Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) "Accounting and Reporting by Charities" issued in March 2005 and with applicable accounting standards. The financial statements include the results of the charity's operations which are described in the Board of Trustees' Report and all of which are continuing.

The charity has taken advantage of the exemption in Financial Reporting Standard No. 1 from the requirement to produce a cash flow statement on the grounds that it is a small company.

Company status

The charity is a company limited by guarantee. The members of the company are the Board of Trustees named on Page 37. In the event of the charity being wound up, the liability in respect of the guarantee is limited to £10 per member of the charity.

Fund accounting

General funds are unrestricted funds which are available for use at the discretion of the Board of Trustees in furtherance of the general objectives of the charity and which have not been designated for other purposes.

Restricted funds are funds that are to be used in accordance with specific restrictions imposed by the donors, which have been raised by the charity for particular purposes. The aim and use of each restricted fund is set out in the notes to the financial statements.

Investment income, gains and losses are allocated to the appropriate fund.

Incoming resources

All incoming resources are included in the Statement of Financial Activities when the charity is legally entitled to the income and the amount can be quantified with reasonable accuracy.

Resources expended

All expenditure is accounted for on an accruals basis and has been included under expense categories that aggregate all costs for allocation to activities. Where costs cannot be directly attributed to particular activities they have been allocated using the ACEVO Full Cost Recovery Model.

Governance costs are those not attributable to direct expenditure and have been incurred in ensuring compliance with constitutional and statutory requirements.

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

Tangible fixed assets and depreciation

Assets acquired for the long-term use of the charity and having an initial cost or valuation of £250 or more are capitalised as tangible fixed assets. Tangible fixed assets are stated at cost or valuation less depreciation. Depreciation is provided at rates calculated to write off the cost or valuation of fixed assets, less their estimated residual value, over their expected useful lives on the following bases:

Office equipment	-	4 years Straight line
Fixtures & fittings	-	6 years Straight line

Foreign currencies

Assets and liabilities in foreign currencies are translated into sterling at the rates of exchange ruling at the balance sheet date. Transactions in foreign currencies are translated into sterling at the rate ruling on the date of the transaction. Exchange differences are taken into account in arriving at the operating surplus.

Pensions

The charity operates a defined contribution pension policy and the pension charge represents the amounts payable by the charity to funds established by individuals in respect of the year.

Taxation

The charity is exempt from income tax and corporation tax on its charitable activities. The charity is not registered for VAT and is unable to recover VAT on its purchases. All irrecoverable VAT is included within the appropriate headings.

2. VOLUNTARY INCOME

	Unrestricted Funds	Restricted Funds	Total Funds 2014	Total Funds 2013
	£	£	£	£
Oak Foundation	125,000	-	125,000	-
The Sigrid Rausing Trust	100,000	-	100,000	-
Fidelity	92,505	-	92,505	-
J Armitage Charitable Trust	36,000	-	36,000	36,000
Other	19,866	-	19,866	21,757
VCEP	-	-	-	96,921
	373,371	-	373,371	154,678

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

3. INCOMING RESOURCES FROM CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES

	Unrestricted Funds	Restricted Funds	Total Funds 2014	Total Funds 2013
	£	£	£	£
<i>Casework</i>				
European Union	-	74,625	74,625	281,487
Trust for London	-	18,750	18,750	38,750
UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture	-	14,871	14,871	22,896
Esmee Fairbairn Foundation	-	-	-	33,058
Humanade	-	-	-	8,000
Allen & Overy LLP	-	-	-	2,500
<i>Justice in the Context of Mass Victimation</i>				
European Union – Sudan	-	26,529	26,529	-
Bromley Trust	-	20,000	20,000	20,000
National Endowment for Democracy	-	13,691	13,691	8,360
John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	-	-	-	2,840
<i>Promoting International Standards</i>				
John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	-	89,826	89,826	94,193
Freshfields	-	64,733	64,733	-
Humanity United	-	35,459	35,459	38,390
The Sigrid Rausing Trust	-	-	-	80,000
Pro Victimis Foundation	-	-	-	36,783
Other	-	-	-	3,000
<i>Influencing National Laws and Institutions</i>				
European Union – Criminal Justice Programme	-	263,631	263,631	113,763
Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust	-	-	-	10,000
The Hague Institute for Global Justice	-	-	-	22,902
<i>Communications</i>				
John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	-	-	-	2,758
<i>Communications</i>				
John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	-	-	-	2,462
<i>Training & Consultancy</i>	42,027	-	42,027	50,017
	42,027	622,115	664,142	872,159

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

4. TOTAL RESOURCES EXPENDED

	Staff Costs £	Other Costs £	Apportioned Support Costs £	Total 2014 £	Total 2013 £
Costs of generating funds	33,961	3,450	17,209	54,620	51,685
Charitable activities					
Casework	147,161	232,397	174,594	554,152	413,868
Justice in the Context of Mass Victimisation	49,491	40,496	41,393	131,380	193,306
Promoting International Standards	121,187	60,198	83,435	264,820	309,405
Influencing National Laws and Institutions	84,198	73,687	72,626	230,511	59,721
Communications	-	-	-	-	79,137
Core Restricted	-	-	-	-	115,663
Governance	-	13,073	6,014	19,087	6,020
Total	435,998	423,301	395,271	1,254,570	1,228,805

Apportioned support costs include the following costs, allocated to activities using the ACEVO Full Cost Recovery model:

Cost pool	2014 £	2013 £
Staff costs	309,525	121,275
Casework costs	44,581	51,666
Communications costs	1,107	1,985
Office costs	37,709	20,805
Premises costs	2,349	13,358
Total	395,271	209,089

5. GOVERNANCE COSTS

Governance costs include:

	2014 £	2013 £
Audit and accountancy	11,246	3,320
Other	7,841	2,700
Total	19,087	6,020

Audit and accountancy costs are charged to Restricted Funds where allowed.

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

6. NET (OUTGOING)/INCOMING RESOURCES

Net (outgoing)/incoming resources are stated after charging:

	2014 £	2013 £
Depreciation of tangible fixed assets	8,055	8,454
Auditors remuneration		
Audit services (excluding VAT)	6,300	6,100
Other services	3,863	3,500
Operating leases	35,506	30,524
	<hr/> 55,757	<hr/> 50,498

Audit services costs totalling £950 (2013 - £7,320 including VAT) have been charged to Charitable Activities (see Note 3 above) where they are covered by Restricted grants.

7. STAFF COSTS

	2014 £	2013 £
Wages and salaries	568,261	493,952
Social security costs	55,339	48,511
Pension and other costs	54,470	46,146
Temporary, contract and non-UK staff costs	63,686	118,537
Other staff costs e.g. recruitment, training, volunteers	3,767	9,074
	<hr/> 745,523	<hr/> 716,220

No employee received remuneration exceeding £60,000 in the year (2013: none) and the employer's pension contribution in the year was nil (2013: nil)

The non-UK staff costs include staff employed by partner organisations working to implement projects and not directly by the charity.

The average monthly number of employees during the year was as follows:

	2014	2013
Project staff	13	13
Support staff	6	6
	<hr/> 19	<hr/> 19

No trustees (2013 nil) received any remuneration in respect of their role as trustees. Two trustees (2013: three) claimed reimbursement of £509 expenses (2013: £565) during the year.

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

8. TANGIBLE FIXED ASSETS

	Office Equipment £	Fixtures & Fittings £	Total £
Cost			
At 1 st April 2013	67,845	7,579	75,424
Additions	739	-	739
Disposals	(19,371)	-	(19,371)
At 31 st March 2014	<u>49,213</u>	<u>7,579</u>	<u>56,792</u>
Depreciation			
At 1 st April 2013	46,910	5,570	52,480
Charge for the year	7,732	323	8,055
Disposals	(19,371)	-	(19,371)
At 31 st March 2014	<u>35,271</u>	<u>5,893</u>	<u>41,164</u>
Net Book Value			
At 31 st March 2014	<u>13,942</u>	<u>1,686</u>	<u>15,628</u>
At 31 st March 2013	<u>20,935</u>	<u>2,009</u>	<u>22,944</u>

9. DEBTORS

	2014 £	2013 £
Due within one year		
Other debtors	11,089	15,623
Advances to partners under Grant agreements	6,723	37,384
Prepayments	17,911	42,052
Accrued income	35,237	6,963
	<u>70,960</u>	<u>102,022</u>

10. CREDITORS

	2014 £	2013 £
Amounts falling due within one year		
Trade creditors	26,393	51,456
Accruals	8,550	7,607
Social security and other taxes	12,037	15,519
Other creditors	48,405	20,352
	<u>95,385</u>	<u>94,934</u>

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

11. FUND MOVEMENTS

The funds of the charity include restricted funds comprising the unexpended balances of donations and grants, as set out below, held on trusts to be applied for the following purposes:

Casework

This programme supports the charity's direct work with survivors of torture based in the United Kingdom and abroad. It is the charity's main programme supported by the EC EIDHR, the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, Trust for London, Humanade and the Allen & Overy Foundation.

Justice in the Context of Mass Victimation

This programme supports the charity's work in conflict areas such as Rwanda, Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda. Bromley Trust, National Endowment for Democracy, John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, European Union - Sudan and the Oak Foundation have funded this work.

Promoting International Standards

This programme supports the charity's work to increase victims' participation and access to the International Criminal Court and other regional courts and tribunals where they may obtain reparation and redress. It also supports the organisation's work in international standard-setting before these and other international bodies. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Humanity United, The Sigrid Rausing Trust, Pro Victimis Foundation, and Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP have funded the work this year.

Influencing National Standards and Institutions

This programme supports the charity's work to ensure that national laws and institutions reflect international law standards and survivors' rights. It includes the organisation's policy, advocacy and capacity building work in the United Kingdom and in a range of countries worldwide. The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and European Union – Criminal Justice Programme & The Hague Institute for Global Justice have funded this work.

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

11. Funds Movement continued

	Balance 1 st April 2013	Incoming Resources	Resources Expended	Transfers Between Funds	Balance 31 st March 2014
	£	£	£	£	£
Restricted funds					
Casework	289,635	108,246	379,558	-	18,323
Justice in the Context of Mass Victimisation	35,806	60,220	89,987	-	6,039
Promoting International Standards	116,255	190,018	181,384	-	124,889
Influencing National Laws and Institutions	107,750	263,631	157,885	-	213,496
Total restricted funds	549,446	622,115	808,814	-	362,747
Unrestricted funds					
Designated fund –Development	59,043	192,505	194,706	-	56,842
Designated fund –Fixed Assets	22,944	-	8,055	739	15,628
General fund	69,973	223,492	242,995	(739)	49,731
Total unrestricted funds	151,960	415,997	445,756	-	122,201
Total funds	701,406	1,038,112	1,254,570	-	484,948

Restricted Funds

In line with the terms of the agreements, restricted funds were used to purchase fixed assets during the year. The value of these assets has been transferred from restricted funds to designated funds to cover the depreciation in future years.

Designated Funds

The Trustees have continued to designate the funding from VCEP as a fund to support development of the charity.

A designated fund representing the net book value of fixed assets has been established. These funds are tied up in fixed assets and are not readily realisable to support the work of the organisation.

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

12. ANALYSIS OF NET ASSETS BETWEEN FUNDS

	Unrestricted Funds	Restricted Funds	Total Funds 31 st March 2014	Total Funds 31 st March 2013
	£	£	£	£
Fund balances at 31 st March 2014 are represented by:				
Tangible fixed assets	15,628	-	15,628	22,944
Current assets	191,009	373,696	564,705	773,396
Current liabilities	(84,436)	(10,949)	(95,385)	(94,934)
	122,201	362,747	484,948	701,406

13. CAPITAL COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENT LIABILITIES

At the end of the period there were no capital commitments or other financial commitments for which full provision has not been made in these financial statements (2013: nil).

14. OPERATING LEASES

Operating lease rentals of £35,597 (2013: £30,524) were payable in respect of properties and equipment held under leases in the year. In the coming year, the charity is committed to paying the following amounts in respect of operating leases, expiring:

	Land and buildings		Other	
	2014	2013	2014	2013
	£	£	£	£
From one to five years	35,506	30,524	-	-

15. PENSION SCHEMES

The charity operates a defined contribution policy in respect of its employees. Individuals are encouraged to establish their own schemes to which the charity contributes. Pension contributions for nine members of staff have been accrued for the year pending establishment of schemes for those individuals. As at 31 March 2014, employer contributions outstanding amount to £27,184 (2013: £14,859).

Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March 2014

16. REDRESS TRUST (USA)

The Redress Trust Limited was incorporated as a Not-for-Profit Corporation in the State of New York on 27th June 1995, (Number 13-4028661). The Internal Revenue Service determined on 22nd October 1999 that The Redress Trust Limited (USA) is exempt from federal income tax under Section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as an organisation under Section 501 (c) (3).

The Board of Directors consists of:-

Professor Michael Bazyler (USA), Chair
Stephanie Deckrosh (USA)
Professor Naomi Roht-Arriaza (USA)
Professor David Weissbrodt (USA)

Who's who at REDRESS

Board of Trustees

Sir Emry Jones Parry GCMG (Chair)
Michael Birnbaum QC
Professor Bill Bowring
Sherman Carroll PhD, MBE (Hon.)
Simon Carruth (Treasurer)
Sir Robin Christopher KCMG
Patricia Hakong (Resigned September 2013)
Leah Levin OBE
Rev. Nicholas Mercer
Ian Martin (Appointed July 2013)
Dr Nimisha Patel (Appointed April 2014)

Staff

Carla Ferstman	Director and Company Secretary (sabbatical October 2012 to June 2013)
Dadimos Haile	Interim Director (September 2012 to June 2013) & Legal Advisor
Mariana Goetz	Deputy Director/Director of Programmes
Michelle Willis	Head of Finance
Lutz Oette	Counsel
Liliana Rodrigues	Fundraiser
Kevin Laue	Legal Advisor
Juergen Schurr	Legal Advisor
Gaelle Carayon	ICC Programme Officer
Theo Boutruche	Post Conflict Legal Advisor
Sarah Fulton	International Legal Officer
Tara O'Leary	UJ Project Coordinator
Najlaa Ahmed	Sudan Project Officer (until February 2014)
Jo-Anne Prud'homme	Legal Officer (cover July 2012 to July 2013)
Harpreet Paul	Caseworker
Catie Harvey	Administrator
Letizia Paoloni	Administrator
Makuta Kamara	Finance Assistant
Eva Sanchis	Communications Officer

Auditors

haysmacintyre
26 Red Lion Square
London, WC1R 4AG

Bankers

Unity Trust Bank	Royal Bank of Scotland	HSBC Bank
Nine Brindleyplace	High Holborn Branch	London Bridge Branch
Birmingham B1 2HB	London, WC1V 6PQ	London, SE1 1YB

Patrons

The Honourable Louise Arbour CC, GOQ (appointed in May 2013)

Professor Michael Bazyler

The Rt Hon the Lord Crickhowell

Dato' ParamCumaraswamy

Edward Datnow FRCS

Anthony Foulger

Dr Inge Genefke MD, D.M.Sc.h.c.

The Rt Hon the Earl of Haddington

Judge Roslyn Higgins DBE QC

The Rt Hon the Lord Judd

The Rt Hon the Lord Lester of Herne Hill QC

Ms Caroline Moorehead CBE

Professor Manfred Nowak (appointed in February 2013)

The Rt Rev Richard D Harries of Pentregarth

The Hon Lord Prosser

Professor Sir Nigel Rodley KBE (appointed in February 2013)

Professor Dinah Shelton

John Simpson CBE

Professor Theo van Boven

Professor David Weissbrodt

Dame Vivienne Westwood DBE, RDI (appointed in February 2013)

Founder and Honorary President

Keith Carmichael

Legal Advisory Council

Professor Michael Bazyler

Sir Geoffrey Bindman

Joanna Glynn QC

Professor David Harris CMG

Professor Geraldine Van Bueren

Lorna McGregor

Professor David Weissbrodt

Publications this year

- March 2014 ***Participation in Transitional Justice Processes by survivors of Sexual And Gender-Based Violence:*** Submission to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
- February 2014 ***Human Rights Concerns and Barriers to Justice in Sudan:*** National, Regional and International Perspectives: A compilation of Sudan Law Reform Advocacy Briefings
- February 2014 REDRESS' ***Comments on the OTP Draft Policy Paper on Sexual and Gender Based Crimes***
- February 2014 ***Submission to the Human Rights Committee ahead of its Examination of Nepal's Second Periodic Report*** under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
- February 2014 ***Submission to the Committee against Torture on Key Concerns in Relation to Peru for Inclusion in the List of Issues*** prior to Reporting at the Committee's 52nd Session
- February 2014 ***Rendered Silent: Denying defendants in military commission trials the right to complain of torture and enforced disappearance:*** Shadow report to the Human Rights Committee for its examination of United States of America at its 110th session
- February 2014 ***Submission to the UK Foreign Affairs Committee's Inquiry on Consular Assistance***
- January 2014 ***The Constitutional Protection of Human Rights in Sudan:*** Challenges and Future Perspectives
- January 2014 ***Submission on the Future of the European Convention and Court of Human Rights***
- December 2013 ***Submission to the European Commission on future EU justice policies*** - Ending impunity for crimes under international law
- December 2013 ***Right to Reparation for Victims of Torture and ill-treatment in Africa:*** Civil Society Letter to the Committee for the Prevention of Torture in Africa
- December 2013 ***Civil Society Letter to GENVAL Working Party of the EU Council on Strengthening efforts to combat impunity within the EU and its Member States*** for crimes under international law
- November 2013 Victims Rights Working Group's ***Submission to the ICC Assembly of States Parties***
- October 2013 REDRESS ***submission to UK Government on proposed legal aid changes***
- October 2013 ***Reaching for Justice: The Right to Reparation in the African Human Rights System***
- October 2013 ***Redress for Rape: Using international jurisprudence on rape as a form of torture or other ill-treatment***
- October 2013 ***Justice for Torture Worldwide: Law, Practice and Agendas for Change***

October 2013 ***Civil Society Letter to EU Genocide Network on Strengthening efforts to combat impunity within EU Member States for crimes under international law***

September 2013 ***Joint Submission from REDRESS and SAJ to the Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review (Second Cycle), Democratic Republic of Congo***, 19th session – April/May 2014

September 2013 ***REDRESS submission to Crown Prosecution Service in response to consultation on Victims Right to Review Guidance***

September 2013 VRWG ***comments on the Draft ASP resolution on victims and reparations***

August 2013 ***Torture in the Middle East and North Africa Region: The Law and Practice***

August 2013 ***Submission to Human Rights Committee regarding the pre-sessional meeting on Sudan***

August 2013 ***Filing a Communication before the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights: A complainant's manual***

July 2013 ***Independent Panel of experts report on victim participation at the International Criminal Court***

July 2013 ***Comments on the draft Explanatory Working Paper related to the implementation of Directive 2012/29/EU establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime***

July 2013 ***Submission to the Hague Working Group of the Assembly of States Parties***

July 2013 ***Torture in Asia: The Law and Practice***

June 2013 ***Access to justice for survivors of sexual violence in DRC: Shadow report to CEDAW***

June 2013 ***The International Criminal Court in Kenya: Victims' Rights to participate and seek reparation before the ICC. A guide for Victims of Post-Election Violence in Kenya***

June 2013 ***Torture in the Americas: The Law and Practice***

May 2013 ***Submission to the Foreign Affairs Committee for its Annual Inquiry into the Foreign and Commonwealth Office's Human Rights Work in 2012***

April 2013 ***Nepal: AF, REDRESS and APT Submission to UN Human Rights Committee for List of Issues***

April 2013 ***Submission to the Committee Against Torture on its List of Issues for Consideration of the UK'S 5th State Party Report***

April 2013 ***Bahrain: Fundamental reform or torture without end?***

April 2013 ***Draft Protocol 15 to the European Convention on Human Rights: a reference to the doctrine of the margin of appreciation in the Preamble to the Convention: open letter to member states of the Council of Europe***

April 2013 ***Access to Justice for Victims of Systematic Crimes in Africa: Challenges and Opportunities***