The Redress Trust

87 Vauxhall Walk
London, SE11 5HJ
United Kingdom

TEL: +44 (0)20 7793 1777    FAX: +44 (0)20 7793 1719
WEB: WWW.REDRESS.ORG

Registered Charity Number 1015787
A Limited Company in England Number 2274071
Registered with 501(c)(3) status in the USA
In Special consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Messages from the Chair and Interim Director</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About REDRESS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies, Programme Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme areas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Casework</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Highlights of successful outcomes in 2012-3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Key hearings and submissions filed in 2012-3:</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working in Post Conflict Contexts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Strengthening victims’ access to international justice</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Engaging local justice mechanisms</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Combating Sexual Violence in Conflict</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Influencing national standards and practice</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Global Sharing of Expertise</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Country-specific advocacy work</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Thematic focus: National security laws</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Universal Jurisdiction: promoting best national practice</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Promoting International Standards</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 UN Human Rights bodies</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 The International Criminal Court</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 African Commission of Human and Peoples’ Rights (ACHPR)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 European Court of Human Rights</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Plans for the Future</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Evaluation of our work</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Looking Forward</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Supporters</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Review</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Financial performance</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Reserves policy</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Risk management</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Statement of the Board of Trustees’ Responsibilities</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Audit Report</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Financial Activities for the year ended 31st March 2013</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incorporating the Income &amp; Expenditure account)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes to the Financial Statements</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who’s who at REDRESS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications this year</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking back, this has been a particularly eventful year for REDRESS. We marked our 20th anniversary. From modest beginnings I’m proud to report that the organisation has established itself as a champion of torture survivors, recognised for the quality of its work, and active across continents and legal institutions. We are indebted to our staff in particular, for their ability, diligence, and unflagging efforts. Funding REDRESS in the present economic situation is not easy. So a special 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. We held a number of events throughout the year to commemorate our birthday. They highlighted the journey which REDRESS has undertaken over these years, the continued nature of the challenge of combating torture, and the crucial importance of law and its consistent application.

It remains a rebuke to all that the need for REDRESS is as great today as it was in 1992. The scourge of torture remains with us despite its illegality and all the many arguments against it. All governments need to do better to ensure that they do not practice torture or are complicit in it. There are no grounds for complacency. Legal provisions should deny impunity to the torturer and provide justice and reparation to the survivor. REDRESS' painstaking legal work on many individual cases and its advocacy role are I think a valuable contribution to the overall effort required.

Working with partners also enhances our effectiveness. REDRESS has traditionally kept a low profile and tended to hide our light under a bushel. We are now putting more effort into communications. This has already produced positive results, important for our campaigning and for attracting more revenue.

I commend to you the contents of this Annual Report which describes our activities and sets out our financial performance. My personal thanks go to my fellow trustees, to our interim director Dadimos Haile, and to our dedicated staff.

Sir Emyr Jones Parry GCMG, PhD, FinstP
This year REDRESS continued its active engagement on behalf of torture survivors as it marked the 20th anniversary of its founding through a series of activities and well-attended events. We have been able to celebrate REDRESS’ achievements over the past 20 years with our supporters and friends, reflect on the new and persistent challenges and reaffirm our commitments.

Over the years, REDRESS has provided legal assistance to torture survivors in the UK and around the world, directly and through its partners. It has contributed to developments in the jurisprudence of regional and international mechanisms through case submissions and amicus briefs. REDRESS has challenged national authorities and spearheaded high-level policy debates at domestic and international levels on victims’ rights and the prohibition of torture through its research publications, advocacy briefs and newsletters. It has provided expertise to UN bodies and the International Criminal Court on a range of victims’ issues and is proud to have contributed to the development of key international standards and principles, including the UN Basic Principles on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims.

Today, REDRESS has become a frontline organisation on the prohibition of torture and promotion of victims’ rights whose expertise is frequently solicited by governmental and non-governmental organisations. We are grateful to REDRESS’ founder Keith Carmichael - to whom the organisation owes its existence and who guided it through its early development - to REDRESS’ patrons, trustees’ and dedicated staff, past and present, and its Director, Carla Ferstman, who has led the organisation through its transformation into what it has become. In 2012 Carla took up the prestigious Jennings Randolph Senior Fellowship with a nine month sabbatical at the United States Institute of Peace, which is a recognition of her leadership and accomplishments at REDRESS, among others.

As Interim Director, I feel privileged to report that together, all of us at REDRESS have worked hard to build on the accomplishments of the previous years and meet the challenges and opportunities that we have faced. Among the most encouraging highlights of the year is the adoption of General Comment 3 by the UN Committee Against Torture in December 2012, elaborating the nature and scope of States’ obligation to provide effective redress under Article 14 of the UN Convention Against Torture, and resolution in March 2013 by the UN Human Rights Council affirming the same. REDRESS had provided inputs in both instances. As you will see from this Annual Report, there have also been a number of rulings by national, regional and international bodies in favour of the survivors we have represented or supported. After what has been a prolonged delay, REDRESS was able to secure a hearing before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights for one of its longstanding clients, a Chilean torture survivor, who has had the rare opportunity to testify in person and tell his story.

REDRESS continued to expand its network of country experts and counterparts in Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe and the Middle East and North Africa through a series of regional meetings and ongoing collaboration. This has also been a very productive year in terms of research outputs and advocacy works, with more than 30 reports and statements having been produced with different thematic, regional or country focus.

In 2011 REDRESS had developed a communications strategy and created a dedicated communications post, thanks mainly to the core funding made available through the MacArthur Award for Creative and Effective Institutions, which REDRESS was honoured to receive in 2010. A year later, those measures have already borne fruit as REDRESS experienced a significant growth in its communication and outreach capacity as well as media coverage.

Also, we have been very fortunate this year to have four eminent personalities and staunch advocates of human rights join us as Patrons of REDRESS. The addition of Justice Louise Arbour, Professor Manfred Nowak, Sir Nigel Rodley and Dame Vivienne Westwood to our list of Patrons is tremendously encouraging for us and will further enhance the growing profile of our work.

All of these developments were made possible thanks to the support of REDRESS’ Chair and Trustees, staff, institutional and individual donors, partner organisations, pro bono lawyers, the many volunteers and interns, and the survivors who have placed their confidence in our work.

As we celebrate our achievements and the developments in international human rights, we are acutely reminded that we have registered significant gains but the fight for a world free from torture has yet to be won.

I hope you will find this Annual Report informative and that you will continue to join us in the struggle. We invite you to follow our work on our website and social media and by signing up to our newsletters. I thank you on behalf of the entire REDRESS Team!

Dadimos Haile

1 April 2012—31 March 2013
REDRESS seeks justice and reparation for survivors of torture and related international crimes and works to ensure perpetrators of torture are held accountable. REDRESS was founded in 1992 by Keith Carmichael, a British citizen who was arbitrarily detained and tortured in Saudi Arabia. While based in London, REDRESS works globally in partnership with a range of international organisations and local counterparts.
Our Strategies

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.

Programme areas

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

- **Casework**: seeking remedies and reparation for individuals and communities directly

- **Working in post conflict contexts**: seeking justice and reparation for survivors in post-conflict contexts

- **Influencing national standards and practice**: to promote national laws and institutions that guarantee torture survivors rights in practice

- **Promoting International Standards**: to promote and strengthen international standards and institutions that reflect survivors’ rights to justice and reparation

Who are victims of torture?

The fruits of REDRESS’ 2010-13 *Global Sharing of Expertise* project have sketched a disturbing picture of the global incidence of torture. Through the regional conferences, patterns of torture have emerged with surprising similarity. Torture is still widely used around the world to “solve” ordinary crimes, disproportionately affecting individuals from socially and economically disadvantaged communities. While victims of torture, our clients, come from all sectors of society, common target groups include:

- Individuals suspected or accused of crimes tortured to “confess” to help “solve” crimes
- Political activists, for instance from Cameroon, Zimbabwe, Bahrain;
- Human rights defenders, trying to denounce government abuses;
- Civilians targeted in armed conflict, including women and children;
- Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender individuals persecuted for their sexual orientation.
Communications

REDRESS has seen a momentous increase in media presence in 2012-13. The introduction of Facebook and twitter as well as improvements to the website and the establishment of regular e-newsletters and e-campaigns has significantly increased our media coverage, with major media outlets such as the BBC, guardian and others soliciting interviews on a weekly basis. REDRESS issued 35% more press releases in 2012-13 than the previous year.

We currently reach 2,000 people through our weekly posts. Our Facebook page, launched in November 2011, had just 42 followers in January 2012, and increased 100 fold to 438 at end of March 2013.

Our Twitter presence, launched on 2 November 2012, has also been significant, with 950 followers joining in less than 6 months. We currently have a growth of about 5-10 followers weekly. Followers include over 50 NGOs, a growing number of activists and human rights defenders from the Middle East, Africa, Europe, Latin America and Asia, and a very significant number of scholars and experts on human rights law and humanitarian law following us as well as leading journalists, including Ian Cobain (senior reporter at the Guardian).

SW Radio Africa (London)

Zimbabwe: Zim Govt Found Responsible for Torture in Landmark Ruling

BY ALEX BELL, 25 MARCH 2013

The leading human rights court in Africa has ruled that the Zimbabwe government was responsible for the torture of human rights lawyer Gabriel Shumba, in a landmark ruling that sets a new precedent against impunity in Africa.

The African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights has now given Zimbabwe 90 days to act on the decision, including launching an investigation into the torture that Shumba was subjected to in 2003. The Commission’s decision was made in May 2012, but it was only approved by the Executive Council of the African Union in January 2013, and the African Commission informed Shumba of its decision last week.

Shumba was arrested by the police and CIO officials in Zimbabwe in 2003, while attending to a client. During his detention he was kicked, beaten and severely tortured and ill-treated for several hours. He was threatened with death, electrocuted, burned with chemicals and suffered other serious abuses.

Following this torture he was then forced to flee to South Africa, where he is currently living and working as an advocate in the High Court. He filed the complaint against Zimbabwe with the African Commission in 2004.

In its decision, the African Commission said that Shumba had submitted “more than adequate evidence” to support his allegation of torture and ill-treatment, including being subjected to prolonged electric shocks in the mouth, genitals, fingers, toes and other parts of the body. The Commission said Zimbabwe failed to open an official investigation, ordering it to do so within 90 days and bring those responsible to justice.

Jeügen Schurr, the legal representative for the international group REDRESS, which supported Shumba’s action before the Commission, said the case is “landmark.” He told SW Radio Africa that the case is “tremendously important,” because of the precedent it sets for the fight against impunity.

“It shows the Commission is a crucial forum for redress for citizens who cannot obtain justice in their own countries,” Schurr said. …

Torture survivor leads Chileans’ battle for justice over Pinochet abuses

Inter-American court for human rights to give judgment on landmark compensation claim by 79-year-old Allende ally

Owen Bwocott, legal affairs correspondent; theguardian.com, Monday 6 May 2013 18.24 BST

Leopoldo García Lucero carries a disfiguring zigzag scar above his left eye where a police officer lacerated his face with the stock of a machine gun. The injury was inflicted nearly 40 years ago in the blood-stained basement of a Santiago police station during the military coup in Chile that toppled President Salvador Allende. Next month, the 79-year-old torture survivor, most of whose teeth are missing from repeated beatings and interrogations, will discover whether his quest for justice, pursued for half his lifetime, has been rewarded. García’s claim has become the lead case for those seeking compensation from Chile and a full investigation of past crimes. It could set international standards about what constitutes just reparation for those tortured and exiled from their homeland. …

“In the comisaría [police station] there were bags of concrete covered in blood,” García recalled.
By Alex Bell, 25 March

The leading human rights court in Africa has ruled that the Zimbabwe government was responsible for the torture of human rights activist Peter Shumba, setting a new precedent against impunity in Africa. The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights has now given Zimbabwe 90 days to act on the decision, including launching an investigation into Shumba's torture.

Shumba was subjected to in 2003. The Commission's decision was made in May 2012, but it was only approved by the Executive Council in January 2013, and the African Commission informed Shumba of its decision last week.

Shumba was arrested by the police and CIO officials in Zimbabwe in 2003, while attending to a client. During his detention he was subjected to ill treatment, including rape, castration and severe beatings. Following this torture he was then forced to flee to South Africa, where he is currently living and working as an advocate in Zimbabwe with the African Commission in 2004.

In its decision, the African Commission said that Shumba had submitted "more than adequate evidence" to support his allegations of torture.

Jeurgen Schurr, the legal representative for the international group REDRESS, which supported Shumba's action before the Commission, said that the case is "tremendously important," because of the precedent it sets for the fight against impunity. "It shows the Commission is a crucial forum for redress for citizens who cannot obtain justice in their own countries," Schurr said.

Al Jazeera

Providing reparation for colonial abuses in Kenya is an important first step, and the UK must do the same elsewhere

Lutz Oette, REDRESS, 14 June 2013

The settlement of the claims brought by a group of elderly Kenyans, imprisoned and tortured during the Mau Mau insurgency that preceded the country's independence, marks an important victory of justice for colonial crimes. The survivors of the torture meted out by the colonial administration were determined to break the silence surrounding their suffering, including rape, castration and severe beatings. They succeeded in overcoming major hurdles with the support of Kenyan organisations, human rights groups, lawyers, academics and others.

The "Mau Mau" settlement is groundbreaking because - contrary to the government's portrayal - it does indeed set a major precedent in which decades of denial and silencing of the victims is replaced with the truth as to what happened, the responsibility of the UK, and the right of victims to obtain reparation.

Even though the UK government stopped short of apologising, it is clear that the settlement goes a long way in restoring the dignity of the victims. The settlement has potentially wide ramifications for victims of violations from Aden to Cyprus and Malaysia that have been swept under the colonial carpet. More claims can be expected. The foreign office has already been informed that it will be receiving a claim from lawyers representing a number of Cypriots who allege that they were also mistreated during the island's decolonisation conflict in the 1950s.

"They wanted me to tell them where the [Allende supporting] senators were hiding. They said they would kill me but first they would bring my six applications to the court. His three daughters have married and live in Britain. Clara Sandoval, a barrister, law lecturer at Essex University and consultant with Redress, appeared before the inter-American court to represent Garcia in March. She told the BBC, "Up until 2011, "Chile did not initiate investigations into torture. So this is a fundamental case to test how a state has to respect victims of torture who have been exiled. "Under the treaties Chile has signed, it has an obligation to investigate and punish torture. There have been no reparations for being sent into exile. Chile pays him a pension of £150 a month and has given him £8,000 £5,000, as a special bonus." (Garcia's lawyers have submitted a claim of £110,000 for "moral damages". Sandoval said: "We have asked the state to investigate his torture. This case is not about money but about treating a victim fairly who has a right to reparations."

"Thanks so much for all your time ... regarding war crimes suspects... lots of positive feedback on our revelations yesterday and having your expertise was invaluable.”

BBC Reporter, Radio 4

Providing reparation for colonial abuses in Kenya is an important first step, and the UK must do the same elsewhere

Lutz Oette, REDRESS, 14 June 2013

The settlement of the claims brought by a group of elderly Kenyans, imprisoned and tortured during the Mau Mau insurgency that preceded the country's independence, marks an important victory of justice for colonial crimes. The survivors of the torture meted out by the colonial administration were determined to break the silence surrounding their suffering, including rape, castration and severe beatings. They succeeded in overcoming major hurdles with the support of Kenyan organisations, human rights groups, lawyers, academics and others.

The "Mau Mau" settlement is groundbreaking because - contrary to the government's portrayal - it does indeed set a major precedent in which decades of denial and silencing of the victims is replaced with the truth as to what happened, the responsibility of the UK, and the right of victims to obtain reparation.

Even though the UK government stopped short of apologising, it is clear that the settlement goes a long way in restoring the dignity of the victims. The settlement has potentially wide ramifications for victims of violations from Aden to Cyprus and Malaysia that have been swept under the colonial carpet. More claims can be expected. The foreign office has already been informed that it will be receiving a claim from lawyers representing a number of Cypriots who allege that they were also mistreated during the island's decolonisation conflict in the 1950s.

"They wanted me to tell them where the [Allende supporting] senators were hiding. They said they would kill me but first they would bring my six-year-old daughter, stand her in front of the concrete bags, and shoot her. ...
Making a difference to individuals and communities directly

Casework is at the core of REDRESS’ mandate to assist torture survivors obtain justice and reparation. We provide legal advice and support to survivors in the United Kingdom and overseas, to enable them to bring their case to the relevant national, regional and international jurisdiction. REDRESS also intervenes as ‘third-party’ or ‘amicus’ in cases involving torture survivors’ rights to remedies and reparation. Our casework strategy has two main components aimed at facilitating access to justice and advancing strategic cases, which are often pursued simultaneously.

Facilitating access to justice for survivors

REDRESS provides high quality assistance, legal advice and representation to torture survivors who would otherwise have little or no access to justice; supporting lawyers and civil society organisations working with survivors in all regions of the world working collaboratively on national and international litigation.

We support criminal prosecutions of alleged perpetrators, civil actions for reparation, and other possibilities such as apologies and formal acknowledgement and rehabilitative measures. These cases are important to the individuals and communities directly concerned, however they also serve an additional purpose of advancing the rule of law and the fight against torture worldwide.

Approximately 17% of our cases involve survivors living in the UK; either as British nationals tortured whilst working or travelling abroad or refugees and asylum seekers who fled torture in their home countries and currently live in the UK. We have formed a special relationship with the Traumatic Stress Clinic in London for the cross-referral of cases and also collaborate with Freedom from Torture as well as other

“...made me feel terrible, psychologically and emotionally. Now I feel much stronger because my case is progressing and because my true story is being told”.

Necati Zontul, © Fiona Lloyd –Davies
trauma care groups, refugee and asylum-seeker community groups and specialised agencies.

Strategic Litigation

REDRESS also takes up cases that have a broader societal significance and potential to set precedents and affect change domestically. These include litigation strategies aimed at addressing specific gaps or entrenched practices (eg. sexual violence amounting to torture; LGBT discrimination and torture) and cases that demonstrate patterns of violence or the lack of domestic remedies in a specific country.

Currently REDRESS’ caseload (excluding assistance cases, which are all mostly UK-based and non-litigious) is broken down as follows:

- UN Human Rights Committee: 13
- UN Committee Against Torture: 0
- International Criminal Court: 3
- European Court of Human Rights: 6
- Inter-American Commission of Human Rights: 4
- Inter-American Court of Human Rights: 1
- African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights: 8
- UN Special Procedures (eg. Special Rapporteurs): 11
- Domestic Courts: 77

REDRESS in numbers

- REDRESS is working on 123 cases relating to 810 survivors in 23 countries.
- 71 of these survivors were tortured in Africa.
- 33 were tortured in Eastern Europe and former Soviet states.
- 277 were tortured in Asia-Pacific states.
- 42 were tortured in Latin America.
- 6 were tortured in Western Europe and other states, including.
- 2 currently in Guantanamo Bay.

“I have never been more conscious that every second counts. Self pity and blame is a waste of precious time. I am lucky to have the resources and skill to adapt to any situation. I am more lucky than those in XXX, to be in England and have the opportunity to meet with good people like you.”

REDRESS client
Human rights defender wins torture case against Zimbabwe at African Commission

Gabriel Shumba, a well-known Zimbabwean human rights defender, was arrested with others during a meeting with clients in January 2003. He was beaten, taken into custody, held in unsanitary conditions, hooded and tortured by interrogators who electrocuted him and applied a chemical substance to his body. Photographs were taken of him while naked and he was forced to sign a confession. He was charged with conspiring to overthrow the government through unconstitutional means. Mr Shumba subsequently fled Zimbabwe for fear of his life, and filed a complaint against Zimbabwe with the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights in May 2004.

REDRESS substantiated his claim and responded to the Government’s comments on the merits. The African Commission ruled in favour of Mr Shumba in May 2012, publishing its decision in March 2013. Zimbabwe was found guilty of violating Article 5 (prohibition of torture and ill-treatment) of the African Charter and was ordered to pay compensation and to bring those responsible to account. REDRESS is now working on enforcing this ruling.

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

"As far as I know [the man who attacked me] is in prison. The only way that I know this is thanks to REDRESS, who have been so amazing in supporting me. … I’m fine [now], but I wouldn’t have been fine if I hadn’t been supported by REDRESS through this."

Tanya (her name has been changed), a UK humanitarian worker, was raped by a military officer at an Egyptian checkpoint REDRESS located her case within the Egyptian military court system, and liaised with Egyptian organisations to ensure that - a first for such a case - submissions could be made to the court on her behalf. Following a complaint to the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), which subsequently admitted that aspects of her complaint were substantiated, the FCO committed to improving training on handling rape and sexual assault complaints by consular offices, updating the global guidelines issued to staff on mistreatment and torture, after belatedly recognising that the complainant was a victim of torture. REDRESS also brought a complaint to the UK Parliamentary & Health Services Ombudsman who has taken up the case and met with our client.

Nepal found responsible for disappearance and torture of teacher: to enact new law

The UN Human Rights Committee has again found Nepal responsible for the disappearance and torture of one of its citizens. In a landmark first, as part of the remedy awarded, Nepal has been told to enact a law defining and criminalising torture, and to repeal laws granting immunity to alleged perpetrators of torture and enforced disappearance. The Committee found that teacher Dev Bahadur Maharjan had been the victim of arbitrary detention, torture and ill-treatment by members of the Royal Nepal Army during 13 months in 2003-4. He was represented by Advocacy Forum Nepal, and supported by REDRESS, which took his case to the Committee after failing to achieve justice in Nepal.
European Court upholds prohibition on use of “torture evidence”

On 25 September 2012, the European Court of Human Rights upheld the prohibition on the use of evidence obtained through torture in the El Haski v Belgium case. REDRESS and the European Centre for Constitutional and Human Rights had intervened on 16 June 2009, in the case of El-Haski, a Moroccan national who had been convicted of terrorism in Belgium, based on evidence obtained in Morocco. The European Court held that there was a “real risk” that the evidence had been obtained through torture and that therefore there had been a violation of his fair trial rights (Article 6 ECHR).

Mistaken Al-Qaeda suspect wins torture case at European Court of Human Rights

Khaled El-Masri, a German national of Lebanese origin, was abducted, accused of being a member of Al-Qaeda and extraordinarily rendered from Macedonia to Kabul after a CIA rendition team beat, stripped, sodomised and drugged him. Mr El-Masri was detained in Afghanistan in inhuman and degrading conditions for months before being released. When he arrived back in Germany, he brought a case against the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the European Court of Human Rights for its role in his extraordinary rendition and torture. In 2011 REDRESS filed an amicus curiae brief with the Court focusing on his rights to an adequate investigation, remedy and reparation. REDRESS instructed Timothy Otty QC and Simon Pritchard to assist drafting its submissions. In 2012 the case was sent to the Grand Chamber of the European Court. REDRESS filed updated submissions in April 2012, and the case was heard on 16 May 2012. Judgment was delivered on 13 December 2012, finding Macedonia responsible for torture, secret rendition and detention of Mr El Masri, and a failure to investigate his allegations and provide a remedy (violations of Arts. 3, 5, 8 and 13). It ordered Macedonia to pay Mr El Masri 60,000 Euros in compensation.

Historic legal victory for Kenyan victims of Colonial Torture

On 5 October 2012, three elderly Kenyans who were tortured during the Mau Mau struggle for independence in the 1950s won a historic legal battle against the British Government, after the High Court rejected the government’s argument that their claims were time barred under English law. REDRESS made both written and oral submissions to the High Court in support of the victims’ claims. The Government appealed the case, and REDRESS sought to intervene in the Appeal in February 2013. The British Government has subsequently entered into discussions with a view to settling the case.

Victim of homophobic torture receives €50,000 in compensation from Greece

Greece has paid €50,000 in compensation to Necati Zontul, a client of REDRESS who was raped at the hands of Greek coastguards a decade ago. The payment complies with a European Court of Human Rights decision that ordered Greece to compensate Mr Zontul. The payment was received by REDRESS and forwarded to Mr Zontul in August 2012.
**Key hearings and case submissions in 2012-13**

**Purna Maya v Nepal - UN HRC**

Purna Maya (her name has been changed), a Nepalese woman who ran a tea shop, was dragged to a nearby barracks in November 2004 where she was interrogated about her husband’s activities, punched and kicked, told to drink urine, bitten, and raped repeatedly by at least four different soldiers. Despite reporting the crimes to the authorities, her case has not been investigated or prosecuted. Advocacy Forum and REDRESS are representing Purna Maya before the UN Human Rights Committee. Our submission, filed in December 2012 examines the nature of rape as a form of torture, and the positive obligations states have to respond to it, and challenges the 35 day limitation period imposed under Nepalese law to file rape complaints, as unacceptable and contrary to Nepal’s obligations under the ICCPR.

**Mujkanovic v Bosnia and Herzegovina - ECHR**

After having been granted leave in late 2012, REDRESS and OMCT intervened in the European Court of Human Rights case of Mujkanovic v Bosnia and Herzegovina & 10 other applicants, in January 2013. The case concerns the disappearance of individuals during the 1992-1995 war, where Bosnia and Herzegovina has failed to fulfil its obligation to investigate their disappearance and death. REDRESS and OMCT’s submission highlighted (i) the link between enforced disappearance and torture under Article 3 of the ECHR, and (ii) the relationship between the continuing nature of enforced disappearance and the content of an effective remedy and reparation for those who have disappeared.

**Amarasinghe v Sri Lanka – UN HRC**

REDRESS and Asian Legal Resource Centre submitted a communication to the UN Human Rights Committee on behalf of the brother of Mr Amarasinghe, who was arrested, tortured and killed by police officers in Sri Lanka. An investigation had been commenced, and the magistrate found that there was enough evidence to charge the arresting police officers with murder. However, the Attorney General intervened and blocked the investigation. The case is significant in that it highlights, among others, systemic problems linked to the lack of judicial independence that impedes accountability and reparation for torture.
Leopoldo García Lucero v Chile

Don Leopoldo Lucero Garcia was a political activist in President Allende’s circle. Shortly after the military coup in Chile in 1973, Don Leopoldo was arbitrary detained, held incommunicado and subjected to torture, initially 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 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 failing to obtain adequate remedies or reparation in Chile, REDRESS pursued Mr García’s case before the Inter-American Commission, found to be admissible in 2005 as an Article 8 access to justice case given that the torture took place before Chile’s ratification of the American Convention. No friendly settlement was reached and the Inter-American Commission transferred the case to the Inter-American Court. The case was heard before the Court, sitting in Medellin on 20-21 March 2013. Leopoldo won his case later in the year.

“No amount of money will ever be able to compensate the suffering that my family and I have endured, but I am glad that the judgment recognizes that Chile could have done more for victims like us.

I also hope the judgment will help prevent similar events from happening in the future, and that Chile finds and punishes those responsible for my torture and exile before I die, so I can live to see justice done.”

Mutabar Tadjibayeva v Uzbekistan - UN HRC

Mutabar Tadjibayeva, one of Uzbekistan’s leading human rights defenders was arrested and charged with criminal activity following her denouncement of a government massacre in 2005. During several years in detention she was tortured, including being beaten, hung from a hook, forced to stand naked in the cold until she fell unconscious, and encouraged by prison guards to commit suicide. She was also forced to undergo an operation to remove her uterus. Up to this day, she has not been able to see her full medical records or knows the reason for her operation. REDRESS and FIDH filed a complaint on her behalf before the UN Human Rights Committee in December 2012.
Strengthening victims’ access to international justice

In 2012-3 REDRESS continued to coordinate the Victims’ Rights Working Group in relation to the International Criminal Court, including a dedicated website (www.vrwg.org), quasi monthly legal update on victim-related jurisprudence at the ICC and the ACCESS newsletter, reaching hundreds of individuals and organisations seeking to ensure victims’ rights in the post conflict context and the role of the International Criminal Court. Listed below are some the other activities undertake by REDRESS:

**Congo: Reparations for victims in Ituri?**

REDRESS organised several outreach sessions on the ICC and reparations in Ituri, Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo in August 2012 and January 2013. Participants were brought up to date on ICC developments, particularly decisions relating to conviction, sentencing and reparation in the Thomas Lubanga case.

**Kenya: justice for victims of Post-Election Violence**

REDRESS co-organised a range of outreach sessions with partner organization Kituo Cha Sheria in the course of 2012-3, focusing on victims’ access to ICC prosecutions of post-election violence.

**Ivory Coast: Victim Participation in ICC Gbagbo case**

REDRESS and the Ivoirian Coalition for the ICC co-organised a training workshop for intermediaries. REDRESS also presented on various panels in their International Symposium on the ICC in Abidjan on 14-15 July 2012.

**A Pan-African Victims’ Rights network?**

REDRESS co-organised a Pan-African regional Conference in The Gambia, 13-14 April 2012 on addressing systemic crimes in Africa. Participants raised the need for a Pan African civil society network on victims’ rights as a platform to share information and undertake joint advocacy at the African regional level.
Engaging local justice mechanisms

We are working to build capacity and encourage the development of law and policy on transitional justice and reparations in numerous conflict affected countries.

Uganda: Capacity building on transitional justice

REDRESS provided training to the Uganda Victims’ Foundation (UVF) on amnesty laws (July 2012) and gender and reparations (January 2013). It facilitated discussions leading to two UVF statements on Amnesty and Gender and Reparations respectively, used as advocacy tools in the ongoing transitional justice discussions in Uganda.

Rwanda: research, analysis and advocacy

In July 2012, REDRESS and Survivor’s Fund (SURF) published a joint report *Rwanda: No Justice without Reparations* analysing the impact of the closure of the gacaca courts on survivors. Recommendations included that Rwanda establish a reparations Task Force.

In October 2012, REDRESS published the report *Testifying to Genocide: Victims and Witnesses Protection in Rwanda*, exploring the challenges that witnesses of the Rwandan genocide face in testifying and assessing various protection mechanisms.

In October 2012, REDRESS and IBUKA, a coalition of Rwandan organisations supporting survivors of the genocide, and SURF submitted a discussion paper on the *Right to Reparation for Survivors of the 1994 Genocide* to help progress national debates.

Sudan: ending atrocities in South Kordofan

Hostilities in South Kordofan are marked by large scale violations allegedly committed primarily by the Sudan Armed Forces with the support of the Popular Defence Forces and National security forces. These include widespread killings, arbitrary arrests, torture, sexual violence, enforced disappearances and extrajudicial killings, particularly of civilians apparently targeted because of their ethnicity. On 15 August 2012, REDRESS and other NGOs filed a submission with the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the admissibility of an earlier communication. The initial communication requested that the Commission adopt provisional measures forcing the Government of Sudan to put an end to abuses in South Kordofan, noting that human rights violations continued to be committed “with complete impunity”.

1 April 2012—31 March 2013
Sexual violence is the most pervasive form of violence in conflict-ridden countries. The first phase of REDRESS’ Sexual Violence Litigation Strategies initiative has focused on capacity building, with increased casework with partners to follow next year.

Sexual Violence Litigation Strategies

Africa Sexual Violence in Conflict workshop.

Lawyers working with women and girls who are victims of sexual violence amounting to torture in Africa shared challenges and best practice in a 3-day workshop in Kampala with FIDA Uganda, 25-27 April 2012.

Nepal Gender based violence seminar. REDRESS and Advocacy Forum held a workshop on sexual and gender based violence and its intersection with torture, covering difficulties litigating such cases in Nepal and strategies to pursue cases at domestic and international levels. The seminar took place in Kathmandu on 18-19 June 2012.

Sharing expertise with the FCO’s Preventing Sexual Violence Initiative (PSVI)

REDRESS participated in meetings and provided a briefing note on reparation and gender ahead of the G8 summit in the UK in June 2013. The PSVI initiative aims to strengthen international efforts to prevent and respond to sexual violence in conflict. REDRESS provided the note: What is reparation? Challenges and avenues to reparation for survivors of sexual violence, and has been invited to join a drafting committee on a Protocol on Documenting Sexual Violence.
REDRESS has provided input to the newly appointed UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence. In addition to sharing our experience and expertise during individual meetings and exchanges with the Special Rapporteur’s staff, we have made an oral submission during the Interactive Dialogue on the Report of the Special Rapporteur at the 21st Regular Session of the United Nations Human Rights Council in September 2012. Our submission highlighted, among others, the central importance of the meaningful participation of victims in all their differences, in the design and implementation of measures aimed at remedying past violations and the need to ensure the protection of victims and witnesses.

Some of our Post Conflict Programme Publications

Manual on Litigation Strategies for Sexual Violence in Africa

Vahida Nainar, renowned expert on international law, mass crimes and gender, examines with REDRESS in this acclaimed manual the different legal options available to survivors of sexual violence or rights groups on their behalf in seeking justice and reparation.

The manual has been widely disseminated and is being used as part of course materials at The Hague University of Applied Sciences in The Netherlands.

ACCESS Bulletin:

cross-fertilizing perspectives on victims’ rights and the ICC

REDRESS has continued to publish and disseminate the ACCESS bulletin, available in English, French, Spanish and Arabic. ACCESS shares information between the grassroots and the International Criminal Court, providing a victims’ perspective.
Influencing national standards

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.

“What renders the ... approach unique is the combination of support to torture victims with the preparation of legal reform documents for the introduction of systemic changes in the jurisprudence of the target countries.” REDRESS has obviously given considerable thought to developing this in a holistic manner, so that the different type of activities complement one another, which has ensured that the [work] remains highly relevant even as it has evolved in the light of changing circumstances.”

REDRESS independent evaluation, 2013

Global Sharing of Expertise

REDRESS has undertaken a number of activities within the frame work of the three year project Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Expertise funded by the EU, which is aimed at: increasing opportunities for survivors to seek & obtain justice and reparation in 4 target countries (India, Peru, Sri Lanka and Sudan) and other countries where torture is endemic; building capacity of national actors and increasing networking between lawyers/experts working on reparation cases and increasing compliance with international standards.

In the course of 2012-2013, REDRESS supported its partners in the four target countries in preparing and submitting cases on behalf of survivors, conducting capacity building workshops for national actors, and engaging in debates on legislative and institutional reforms. A major component of the project involved five regional expert meetings, bringing together practitioners litigating or advocating against torture and supporting survivors at the domestic level. The meetings were aimed at increasing regional connections between lawyers and civil society groups and enhanced access to comparative best practice.

Each expert meeting led to a meeting report summarising developments and challenges across each region and providing recommendations. The reports are translated into several languages (English plus one other language depending on the region) and widely disseminated. Regional experts meetings

Asia:

The first of the meetings, the Asia regional experts meeting, took place in Hong Kong in September 2011. A special edition of Article 2, the Human Rights Journal of the Asian Human Rights Commission, will present country studies on the torture and its legal and practical responses.

Europe:

Following an expert meeting on torture litigation in Europe, co-organised by REDRESS and the European Centre for Constitutional and Human rights, which took place in Berlin in September 2011, the partners co-published Torture in
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**Europe: The Law and Practice**

In October 2012, The report examines the practice and patterns of torture in 15 European countries and addresses available safeguards against torture as well as, accountability and reparation mechanisms for survivors.

**Africa:**

REDRESS, together with the Independent Medico Legal Unit (IMLU, Kenya) organised the Africa regional meeting in May 2012, which was held in Naivasha, Kenya. In October 2012, REDRESS co-published *Torture in Africa: The Law and Practice* examining the practice and patterns of torture in the region as well as the presence and effectiveness of safeguards against torture in a selection of African countries.

**Americas:**

In October 2012, REDRESS co-organised with the Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos (CNDDHH)-Peru, a fourth regional meeting, bringing together experts from 18 countries in the Americas. Participants presented country reports considering issues of marginalisation, gender-based discrimination, impunity, access to justice, reparation and rehabilitation, challenges to proving torture, victim and witness protection, and regional litigation and advocacy strategies. A regional report will be published shortly.

**MENA region:**

In the midst of crucial changes and entrenched repression in the Middle East-North Africa region, REDRESS and Mizan Law Group for Human Rights, a Jordan-based NGO, brought together 20 lawyers and human rights defenders from 12 different countries, with first-hand experience of litigating torture cases and/or advocating against torture in Amman, Jordan on 14-16 January 2013. A detailed analysis of the outcomes will be published in the next issue of the *Association for the Prevention of Torture MENA e-bulletin*, and a regional report will also be published shortly.
Bahrain: responding to ill-treatment of “Arab Spring” protesters

REDRESS sent a delegation to Bahrain to meet with government officials, civil society and victims. The purpose of the visit was to assess government follow-up of recommendations made by the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry, established by the King to inquire into alleged abuses against Bahraini "Arab Spring" protesters. REDRESS also wrote to Bahrain's Minister of Human Rights on 27 May 2012 concerning reports of intimidation of Bahraini human rights defenders who presented information to the UN Universal Periodic Review, which was considering Bahrain's human rights record. REDRESS launched a report on Bahrain in May 2013 highlighting the need for fundamental reform to combat torture. REDRESS' work on Bahrain has resulted in an increase in Bahraini nationals seeking our legal support on individual cases.

Maldives: UN Human Rights Committee highlights REDRESS' report on torture

On 12 July 2012 the UN Human Rights Committee highlighted our report on torture in the Maldives. Together with Torture Victims Association of the Maldives, REDRESS compiled a 56-page report addressing the legacy of torture and ill-treatment in the Maldives. The report gives an overview of the patterns of torture during the period 1978-2008, and is based on detailed testimonies from 24 torture survivors.

Nepal: Committee Against Torture investigates Nepal in Confidential Inquiry:

REDRESS and Advocacy Forum had repeatedly urged the UN Committee Against Torture to open an inquiry into torture in Nepal, and had provided key evidence of the systematic practice of torture and systematic breaches of Nepal’s obligation to investigate, prosecute and provide reparations. In 2012, the Committee against Torture made public a report on a confidential inquiry into Nepal it had undertaken during 2011.

Draft Bill criminalising torture tabled:

REDRESS and Advocacy Forum-Nepal submitted a letter to the Prime Minister of Nepal on 17 April 2012 urging him to consider recommendations for a new law criminalising torture. Following sustained pressure, a Bill was prepared, and tabled in parliament in May 2012. While parliament was subsequently dissolved, REDRESS will continue to work to ensure that the Bill features high up on the agenda when parliament is reinstated.
Peru: CAT notes REDRESS report and recommends measures to protect LGBT individuals:

REDRESS submitted its report *Torture and Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Persons in Peru* before the UN Committee Against Torture and Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. The report describes how LGBT persons in Peru face constant discrimination, murder, rape, arbitrary detention and torture. The report demonstrates how Peru’s legal system fails to provide adequate protection against torture for members of the LGBT community. The Committee, in its concluding observations, noted REDRESS’ findings and recommended that Peru take effective measures to end the abuse and torture that LGBT persons suffer.

Philippines: REDRESS submits shadow report on failure to implement views

REDRESS submitted a shadow report to the UN Human Rights Committee on the Philippines’ failure to implement in good faith recommendations made by the Committee in a number of cases involving serious human rights violations.

Sudan: REDRESS calls for reform of laws and practices

REDRESS submitted two reports to the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the laws in Sudan: The first report was submitted with Sudan Democracy First Group and the African Centre for Justice and Peace Studies, and highlighted the continued and widespread use of torture and other ill-treatment or punishment by Sudanese authorities during 2008-2012. The second report was submitted with the Sudanese Human Rights Monitor and it analyses law reform in Sudan.

In August 2012, REDRESS published *Arrested development: Sudan’s Constitutional Court*, assessing the record of the Constitutional Court as a guardian of human rights. The report identifies the changes needed to make the Court effective in fulfilling its role.
Tortured Abroad: The UK’s Obligations to British Nationals and Residents

Every year, British nationals and residents are arrested, detained and imprisoned while abroad, and some of these individuals are ill-treated whilst in detention, either to extract a confession, as a punishment, or through neglect. REDRESS published *Tortured Abroad*, a report examining the law, policy and practice of British diplomatic protection and consular assistance.

REDRESS condemns Justice and Security Bill: secret courts must be stopped

In March 2012, REDRESS renewed condemnation of Government plans to extend secret proceedings into the civil courts in England and Wales (set out in the Justice and Security Bill). The bill was drafted in response to legal cases involving allegations of UK complicity in secret rendition, torture and ill-treatment. The Government claims the reform will enable judges to hear a greater range of national security cases. However, REDRESS considers that the plans are an attack on open and accessible justice, and a threat to the right to a fair trial and the rule of law.

On 4 May 2012 REDRESS and others were vindicated by the Joint Committee on Human Rights, which rejected the idea of “closed material procedures” (CMPs) and the use of “special advocates” in cases where civil claims are made against the security services, so any information held by the security and intelligence agencies is heard only in secret. The JCHR argued that CMPs (already used in deportation proceedings) are inherently unfair.

Submission to Foreign Affairs Committee on Bahrain and Saudi Arabia

REDRESS made a submission to the Foreign Affairs Committee in November 2012, in response to an inquiry into the UK’s relations with both Bahrain and Saudi Arabia. The submission highlighted, among other issues, the deteriorating human rights situation and continued use of torture in both States, as well as some weaknesses in the UK’s policy towards them.
National security laws

The period following the 9/11 terrorist attacks has been characterised by the proliferation of security legislation. Our report *Extraordinary measures, predictable consequences: security legislation on the prohibition of torture* forms part of a worldwide initiative in which REDRESS and its partners have been working with lawyers and human rights defenders to share experiences on the law and practice in respect of torture. Besides the ongoing challenges faced in combating torture in the law enforcement context, the initiative has highlighted the detrimental impact of security legislation.

“No, London NGO Redress and the Human Rights Monitoring Institute in Vilnius have filed a complaint with the Lithuanian Prosecutor General over information that another CIA prisoner was held in Lithuania between 2004 and 2006. These are only the latest in a string of events which cast doubt on Lithuania’s commitment to support of human rights and accountability for their abuse, even as it holds the presidency of the Council of the European Union.”

Huffington Post, 13 September 2013

Universal Jurisdiction: promoting best national practice

**Launch of new UJ project:** On 14 February 2013, REDRESS hosted more than a dozen experts and practitioners working in the field of universal jurisdiction to launch a new project on universal jurisdiction in the European Union.

**Universal Jurisdiction News:** In March 2013, REDRESS launched a monthly newsletter reporting on latest case updates, legal development and news relating to universal jurisdiction.

**UK prosecution of Kumar Lama:** REDRESS is closely monitoring the prosecution of a Nepali colonel suspected of torturing two men in 2005 during the civil war in Nepal. On 4 January 2013, REDRESS wrote to the Attorney General to stress that a prosecution for torture is in the public interest as is required under UK’s Code for Crown Prosecutors.
A significant component of our work is aimed at ensuring that survivors’ rights are recognised and protected in international treaties and related standard-setting texts, and that the jurisprudence and commentaries of bodies interpreting such instruments uphold and elaborate survivors’ rights in context. Our engagement with local NGOs and lawyers around the world as well as our specialist knowledge on issues relating to torture litigation has been helpful to support the work of United Nations bodies and regional human rights commissions and courts. For instance, our experience and expertise on reparation as well as victim and witness protection concerns were fed into debates at UN and regional fora with a view to strengthening international standards. REDRESS has successfully coordinated a victims’ rights coalition and contributed to the evolution of the policies of, and the standards applied by, the International Criminal Court on victims’ issues.

UN Human Rights bodies

Committee against Torture: historic General Comment on “redress” adopted

On 19 November 2012, the Committee against Torture, the UN body tasked with interpretation of the Convention against Torture, issued a key document clarifying the steps that states are obliged to take to ensure that victims of torture and ill-treatment obtain redress for the harm they have suffered. It is only the third General Comment issued by the Committee since 1988. REDRESS welcomes the news as it is a significant development for victims of torture in their fight for justice and redress. REDRESS had submitted detailed commentary to the Committee in the lead up to the drafting and eventual adoption of the General Comment.

“All of [REDRESS’] reports are based on its growing body of legal case-work and interventions. REDRESS can credibly claim to be helping to write the international jurisprudence in this area as well as simply documenting it.”

... “one [Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Torture] member described [a shadow report] as ‘extremely impressive, one of the best I have ever seen.’ Another interviewee commented that REDRESS have a global reputation as ‘very professional in their approach, the quality of their reports and their outreach/ communications is widely considered to be very high.’”

REDRESS external evaluation 2013
CEDAW: Justice remains out of reach for many women

Women and girl victims of human rights violations continue to face numerous challenges in accessing justice. REDRESS and the Strategic Initiative for Women in the Horn for Africa made a submission to the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) to draw attention to the many barriers faced by women, including the impact of customary systems of law. The expert body is drafting a General Recommendation on the topic, and our submission will be considered as part of that process. On 18 February 2013 REDRESS also attended the Half Day of General Discussion on Access to Justice held by the CEDAW Committee in Geneva, to further discuss the submission.

Migrants vulnerable to torture

Torture often targets the vulnerable in society, and in many circumstances migrants fall under that category. REDRESS and the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (IRCT) made a submission to the UN Committee on Migrant Workers on the rights of migrant workers and their families in irregular situations, in January 2013. The submission highlights the particular vulnerability of migrant workers to torture and ill-treatment, both at the hands of their employers and the State, and brings attention to States’ obligations to provide redress to victims of torture and ill-treatment.
REDRESS has advocated for a victim-friendly International Criminal Court prior to the adoption of the Rome Statute, and ever since, has sought to ensure that the Court’s procedures and practices provide an effective avenue for victims to engage with the justice process and to see justice done. Now that the Court is fully functional, REDRESS is engaging with the organs of the Court that most closely interact with victims and works with victims groups and civil society in countries with on-going ICC investigations and cases.

The highlights of our activity in the last year include:

**REDRESS explains the impact of the ICC's First reparations decision.** On 7 August 2012, the ICC handed down its first decision on reparations. REDRESS has been focusing on the issue of reparations at the ICC for many years, publishing numerous papers, a major report in 2011, as well as hosting several conferences and events. When the first decision was issued in the Thomas Lubanga Case in August 2012, REDRESS sought to explain the impact for victims. REDRESS’ actions included:

- Q & A explaining the decision and its implication for victims

- REDRESS director, Carla Ferstman, spoke at the two-day conference on *The First Reparations Decision before the ICC: Issues and Challenges for the Future*, organised by the Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies

- Outreach mission to Ituri, to meet with affected communities took place in August 2012.

**REDRESS advocates for meaningful victim participation in ICC Proceedings**

In October 2012, REDRESS released a key report, *Victim Participation in ICC Proceedings: A Review of the Practice and Consideration of Options for the Future*. The report was released in order to contribute to the current debate on the system of victim participation at the Court, and ahead of the ICC Assembly of States Parties meeting in November 2013, where the ICC’s progressive victim participation regime will be under review. REDRESS co-hosted a side event at the ASP on the topic and has issued numerous position papers with the Victims’ Rights working group on related issues, such as the role of intermediaries and lawyers in assisting victims to participate in ICC proceedings.
African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights (ACHPR)

In April and October 2012, REDRESS attended the ordinary sessions of the African Commission, where it met with representatives from the Commission, presented in various side events and distributed its materials. Specific initiatives include:

- REDRESS hosted a side event on Systemic Crimes in Africa, April 2012;
- a one day meeting on challenges faced in litigating at the ACHPR, October 2012;

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.
Public Benefit

The Trustees confirm that they have complied with the duty in section 17 of the Charities Act 2011 to have due regard to public benefit guidance 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

We have had several external evaluations of major programmes of work in recent years. In the context of our ongoing EU funded project on Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Experience, our work, which involves four core target countries (India, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan) was evaluated in 2012, by a team of monitors contracted by the EU. The evaluation included a review of the various outputs and reports as well meetings with programme staff and stakeholders in London, Hong Kong and Lima, Peru. In their final report, the evaluators gave high scores to the project on all the evaluation criteria (relevance and quality of design, efficiency of implementation, effectiveness, impact and potential sustainability) and noted “what renders the project approach unique is the combination of support to torture victims with the preparation of legal reform documents for the introduction of systemic changes in the jurisprudence of the target countries.”

Looking Forward

Our plans for 2013-4 build on the successes of last year and 20 years of expertise, developing and refining our strategies to maximise impact. The thematic research and analysis underpinning our three mutually reinforcing strategies has, amongst others, revealed particular needs to reinforce torture survivors’ access to justice from particular marginalised groups. These include:

- Victims of sexual violence amounting to torture in conflict;
- Victims of torture in the context of counter-terrorism and national security laws;
- Victims persecuted due to their sexual orientation (LGBT individuals).

In terms of our communications and outreach, we will to continue to:

- Increase and diversify our media presence;
- Reach out to organisations and front line agencies working with survivors in the UK – moving beyond London to other cities;
- Reinforce our outreach and capacity building with local partners;
- Maintain our firm stance on the absolute prohibition of torture and the corresponding rights of victims to justice and reparation.
Funders

REDRESS is indebted for funding this year to:

Allen & Overy LLP
Bromley Trust
Trust for London
The Esmée Fairbairn Foundation
European Union
European Union - Criminal Justice Programme
Foundation Pro Victimis, Geneva
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP
Humanade
Humanity United
John Armitage Charitable Trust
John D. and Catherine T. Macarthur Foundation
Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (Power and Responsibility Programme)
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 Commission, 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. This year, we have received £13,478 (2012 - £11,505) 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 2012 London Virgin Marathon and the 2012 British 10K London Run and raised money in support of REDRESS’s work: Charles Barclay, Arild Dregelid, Francis Fitzgibbon, Roger Foulger, Ben Freedman, Don Guttenplan, Alice Haslem, Nick Damski, Stephanie Damski, Mari Oye, Sarah Robertson, Rob Mills and Carla Ferstman, REDRESS’ Director. Sporting events helped draw wider attention to our cause and raised key resources for our work.
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.

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 make special mention of the numerous law firms, barristers and solicitors that have supported our work over the year. In particular, we are very grateful to Allen & Overy LLP, Sue Willmen (Deighton Pierce Glynn); Clarissa O’Callaghan and Nathalie Sheehan (Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer); Rosa Curling, Dan Leader and Richard Stein (Leigh Day & Co); Azim Hussain and Rahool Agarwal (Norton Rose LLP) Tamsin Allen and Athalie Matthews (Bindmans LLP); Timothy Otty QC and Simon Pritchard (Blackstone Chambers); Elizabeth Gumbel QC (1 Crown Row Chambers) and Guy Vassall-Adams (Doughty St Chambers); Richard Hermer QC, Mark Summers and Philippe Sands QC (Matrix Chambers), that have lent their support to REDRESS.
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 performance

The charity had net outgoing resources on unrestricted funds of £51,408 for the year (2012 – incoming £13,272) 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 £151,960 (2012 - £182,957). Restricted funds carried forward at 31 March 2013 amounted to £549,446 (2012 - £719,544), following net outgoing resources for the year of £170,098 (2012 – £173,656). The funds carried forward are sufficient for the activities for which the funds were provided.

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 £129,016, 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 £88k and £133k. 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.

---

Patson Muzuwa, Zimbabwian activist and torture survivor, © Fiona Lloyd-Davies
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. The Trustees are conscious that the organisation there are a number of grants expiring in 2013/14 and that this brings associated risk to the organisation; however, they recognise that management systems are in place to deal with the operational and decision-making risk. 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.

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, haymacintyre, are proposed for re-appointment in accordance with Section 485 of the Companies Act 2006. The report of the Trustee has been prepared in accordance with the special provisions relating to companies subject to the small companies regime within Part 15 of the Companies Act 2006.

In preparing this report, the directors 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 Emyr Jones Parry GCMG, PhD, FInstP
Chair of the Board of Trustees, 17th July 2013
We have audited the financial statements of The Redress Trust for the year ended 31 March 2013 which comprise 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 the Financial Reporting Standard for Smaller Entities (effective April 2008) (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice applicable to Smaller Entities).

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 auditors
As explained more fully in the Statement of Trustees’ Responsibilities, 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
An audit involves obtaining evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements sufficient to give reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error. This includes an assessment of: whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the company’s circumstances and have been consistently applied and adequately disclosed; the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by the Trustees; and the overall presentation of the financial statements.

In addition, we read all the financial and non-financial information in the Trustees’ Annual Report to identify material inconsistencies with the audited financial statements. If we become aware of any apparent material misstatements or inconsistencies we consider the implications for our report.
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 2013 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 applicable to Smaller Entities; and
- have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Companies Act 2006.

Independent auditor’s report to the members of The Re-dress Trust (continued)

Opinion on other matter prescribed by the Companies Act 2006

In our opinion the information given in the Trustees’ 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 prepare the financial statements in accordance with the small companies regime and take advantage of the small companies’ exemption in preparing the Trustees’ Report.

Murtaza Jessa (Senior Statutory Auditor)
Fairfax House
for and on behalf of haysmacintyre, Statutory Auditors
15 Fulwood Place, London, WC1V 6AY
17 July 2013
Statement of Financial Activities for the year ended 31st March 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Total 2013</th>
<th>Total 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Incoming resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming resources from generated funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154,678</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legacies</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Incoming resources from charitable activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grants receivable:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>386,691</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working in Post-Conflict Contexts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting International Standards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>252,366</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influencing National Standards and Practice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>146,665</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Restricted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and other income</td>
<td>50,017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total incoming resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205,568</td>
<td>822,142</td>
<td>1,027,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resources expended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs of generating voluntary income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51,685</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Charitable activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>70,422</td>
<td>343,446</td>
<td>413,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working in Post-Conflict Contexts</td>
<td>32,893</td>
<td>160,413</td>
<td>193,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting International Standards</td>
<td>52,647</td>
<td>256,758</td>
<td>309,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influencing National Standards and Practice</td>
<td>10,162</td>
<td>49,559</td>
<td>59,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>13,466</td>
<td>65,671</td>
<td>79,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Restricted</td>
<td>19,681</td>
<td>95,982</td>
<td>115,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and other Expenditure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total resources expended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256,976</td>
<td>971,829</td>
<td>1,228,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Net (outgoing)/incoming resources before transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(51,408)</td>
<td>(149,687)</td>
<td>(201,095)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no recognised gains and losses for 2013 or 2012 other than those included in the statement of financial activities. All the above results are derived from continuing activities. The notes on pages 39 to 49 form part of these financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds £</th>
<th>Restricted Funds £</th>
<th>Total 2013 £</th>
<th>Total 2012 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net (outgoing)/Incoming resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(51,408)</td>
<td>(149,687)</td>
<td>(201,095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers between funds</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20,411</td>
<td>(20,411)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net (expenditure)/Income for the year</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30,997)</td>
<td>(170,098)</td>
<td>(201,095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances brought forward at 1st April 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>182,957</td>
<td>719,544</td>
<td>902,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances carried forward at 31st March 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>151,960</td>
<td>549,446</td>
<td>701,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The financial statements have been prepared in accordance with the special provisions relating to companies subject to the small companies regime within Part 15 of the Companies Act 2006 and in accordance with the Financial Reporting Standard for Smaller Entities (effective April 2008).

The financial statements were approved and authorised for issue by the Board of Trustees on 17th July 2013 and signed on its behalf by:

Sir Emry Jones Parry GCMG, PhD, FInstP
Chair

The notes on pages 39-49 form part of these financial statements.
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 41. 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCEP</td>
<td>96,921</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96,921</td>
<td>94,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Armitage Charitable Trust</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21,757</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,757</td>
<td>15,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>154,678</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>154,678</strong></td>
<td><strong>146,082</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. INCOMING RESOURCES FROM CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds 2013</th>
<th>Total Funds 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casework</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>281,487</td>
<td>281,487</td>
<td>283,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,896</td>
<td>22,896</td>
<td>23,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust for London</td>
<td>38,750</td>
<td>38,750</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esme Fairbairn Foundation</td>
<td>33,058</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>33,058</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanade</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working in Post-Conflict Contexts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,360</td>
<td>8,360</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept for International Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union – Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting International Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,193</td>
<td>94,193</td>
<td>31,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanity United</td>
<td>38,390</td>
<td>38,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sigrid Rausing Trust</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Victimis Foundation</td>
<td>36,783</td>
<td>36,783</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Finland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influencing National Standards and Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union – Criminal Justice Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>113,763</td>
<td>113,763</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hague Institute for Global Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,902</td>
<td>22,902</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training &amp; Consultancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50,017</td>
<td>822,142</td>
<td>872,159</td>
<td>781,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 April 2012—31 March 2013
4. **TOTAL RESOURCES EXPENDED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost pool</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>121,275</td>
<td>89,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework costs</td>
<td>51,666</td>
<td>7,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications costs</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office costs</td>
<td>20,805</td>
<td>9,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises costs</td>
<td>13,358</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209,089</td>
<td>107,614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Costs</th>
<th>Other Costs</th>
<th>Apportioned Support Costs</th>
<th>Total 2013</th>
<th>Total 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of generating funds</td>
<td>40,568</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>8,794</td>
<td>51,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>152,881</td>
<td>190,565</td>
<td>70,422</td>
<td>413,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in Post-Conflict Contexts</td>
<td>91,661</td>
<td>68,752</td>
<td>32,893</td>
<td>193,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting International Standards</td>
<td>156,322</td>
<td>100,436</td>
<td>52,647</td>
<td>309,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing National Standards and Practice</td>
<td>40,111</td>
<td>9,448</td>
<td>10,162</td>
<td>59,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>35,049</td>
<td>30,622</td>
<td>13,466</td>
<td>79,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Restricted</td>
<td>78,353</td>
<td>17,629</td>
<td>19,681</td>
<td>115,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and other Expenditure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>6,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>594,945</td>
<td>424,771</td>
<td>209,089</td>
<td>1,228,805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. GOVERNANCE COSTS

Governance costs include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit and accountancy</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>4,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>7,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

6. NET (OUTGOING)/INCOMING RESOURCES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation of tangible fixed assets</td>
<td>8,454</td>
<td>8,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors remuneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit services</td>
<td>7,320</td>
<td>7,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating leases</td>
<td>30,524</td>
<td>25,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,498</td>
<td>44,894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audit services costs totalling £7,320 (2012 - £6,591) have been charged to Charitable Activities (see Note 3 above) where they are covered by Restricted grants.
### 7. STAFF COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and salaries</td>
<td>£493,952</td>
<td>£444,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security costs</td>
<td>£48,511</td>
<td>£48,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension and other costs</td>
<td>£46,146</td>
<td>£38,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary, contract and non-UK staff costs</td>
<td>£118,537</td>
<td>£171,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff costs e.g. recruitment, training, volunteers</td>
<td>£9,074</td>
<td>£5,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>716,220</strong></td>
<td><strong>709,934</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No employee received remuneration exceeding £60,000 in the year (2012: one) and the employer’s pension contribution in the year was nil (2012: £7,185)

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No trustees (2012 nil) received any remuneration in respect of their role as trustees. Three trustees (2012: one) claimed reimbursement of £565 expenses (2012: £84) during the year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due within one year</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other debtors</td>
<td>15,823</td>
<td>15,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances to partners</td>
<td>37,384</td>
<td>46,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under Grant agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepayments</td>
<td>42,052</td>
<td>27,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued income</td>
<td>6,963</td>
<td>62,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102,022</td>
<td>152,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. CREDITORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amounts falling due within one year</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade creditors</td>
<td>51,456</td>
<td>52,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accruals</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>7,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security and other taxes</td>
<td>15,519</td>
<td>11,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other creditors</td>
<td>20,352</td>
<td>24,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94,934</td>
<td>94,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

**Working in Post-Conflict Contexts**
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 of justice that reflect the rights of survivors to effective participation and redress**
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 practices that reflect torture survivors’ rights in practice**
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. It also includes the organisation’s specialised work with European Union Member States in which the organisation is working within the regional institutional framework to affect change in the policies and practices of Member States. The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and European Union – Criminal Justice Programme & The Hague Institute for Global Justice have funded this work.

**Communication Fund**
REDRESS has set aside funds to enhance its communications and media work to draw attention to the scourge of torture and the plight of victims, and to increase opportunities for engagement with stakeholders worldwide. The John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation has funded this work.

**Core Fund - Restricted**
The John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation awarded REDRESS funds to support the development of the organisation.
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.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance 1st April 2012</th>
<th>Incoming Resources</th>
<th>Resources Expended</th>
<th>Transfers Between Funds</th>
<th>Balance 31st March 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restricted funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>246,390</td>
<td>386,691</td>
<td>343,446</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>289,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in Post-Conflict Contexts</td>
<td>165,019</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>160,413</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting International Standards</td>
<td>120,647</td>
<td>252,366</td>
<td>256,758</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing National Standards and Practice</td>
<td>10,644</td>
<td>146,665</td>
<td>49,559</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>72,304</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>65,671</td>
<td>(9,391)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core – restricted</td>
<td>104,540</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>95,982</td>
<td>(11,020)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total restricted funds</strong></td>
<td>719,544</td>
<td>822,142</td>
<td>971,829</td>
<td>(20,411)</td>
<td>549,446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Unrestricted funds** |                        |                    |                    |                         |                        |
| Designated fund – Development | 65,558                | 96,921             | 103,436            | -                       | 59,043                 |
| Designated fund – Fixed Assets | 11,531                | -                  | 8,454              | 19,867                  | 22,944                 |
| General fund           | 105,868                | 108,647            | 145,086            | 544                     | 69,973                 |
| **Total unrestricted funds** | 182,957               | 205,568            | 256,976            | 20,411                  | 151,960                |
| **Total funds**        | 902,501                | 1,027,710          | 1,228,805          | -                       | 701,406                |

**Notes to the Financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2013**

1 April 2012—31 March 2013
### 12. ANALYSIS OF NET ASSETS BETWEEN FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted funds</th>
<th>Restricted funds</th>
<th>Total Funds 31 March 2013</th>
<th>Total Funds 31 March 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances at 31st March 2012</td>
<td>22,944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,944</td>
<td>11,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible fixed assets</td>
<td>218,766</td>
<td>554,630</td>
<td>773,396</td>
<td>985,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Assets</td>
<td>(89,750)</td>
<td>(5,184)</td>
<td>(94,934)</td>
<td>(94,520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>151,960</td>
<td>549,446</td>
<td>701,406</td>
<td>902,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 (2011 nil).

14. OPERATING LEASES

Operating lease rentals of £30,524 (2012: £25,189) 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land and buildings</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From one to five years</td>
<td>30,524</td>
<td>25,189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2013, employer contributions outstanding amount to £14,859 (2012: £7,507).

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)
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# Publications this Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>Preliminary comments on the Draft Law Criminalising Torture, Enforced Disappearances and Discrimination in Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>Comments to the Trust Fund for Victims in light of the Court’s first reparations decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>VRWG submission ahead of the discussions on intermediaries to take place in The Hague Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>What is reparation? Challenges and avenues to reparation for survivors of sexual violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>SIHA and REDRESS Submission to CEDAW on Access to Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>REDRESS and IRCT submission to Committee on Migrant Workers on Draft General Comment No. 2 concerning migrant workers in an irregular situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2012</td>
<td>REDRESS Timeline 1992-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2012</td>
<td>Submission to Foreign Affairs Committee Inquiry into UK’s Relations with Saudi Arabia and Bahrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2012</td>
<td>State Cooperation on safeguarding assets for reparations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>Right to Reparation for Survivors: Recommendations for Reparation for Survivors of the 1994 Genocide Against Tutsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>The Participation of Victims in International Criminal Court Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>Testifying to Genocide: Victim and Witness Protection in Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>Torture and the Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Persons in Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>Statement to the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>Implementation of Human Rights Committee Views in the Philippines: Shadow Report to the UN Human Rights Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>Torture in Europe: The Law and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>Torture in Africa: The Law and Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 2012  Extraordinary Measures, Predictable Consequences: Security legislation and the prohibition of torture

September 2012  Litigation Strategies for Sexual Violence in Africa

September 2012  Tortured Abroad: The UK’s obligations to British Nationals and Residents

August 2012  Arrested Development: Sudan’s Constitutional Court, Access to Justice and the Effective Protection of Human Rights

June 2012  REDRESS’ comments and proposals on the ICC Legal Aid Consultation, June 2012

June 2012  The International Journal of Human Rights: Torture and the Quest for Justice

June 2012  This is what I wanted to tell you: Addressing the Legacy of Torture and Ill-Treatment in the Maldives

June 2012  Letter to the Minister of Interior of Peru regarding alleged torture of protesters at the Xstrata Tintaya mine, Espinar Province, Cusco, Peru

May 2012  Submission to the Foreign Affairs Committee’s Annual Inquiry into the FCO’s Human Rights Work in 2011

April 2012  Letter to the Nepal Prime Minister on Proposed Torture Bill

April 2012  Comments to Sudan’s 4th and 5th Periodic Report to the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights: Article 5 of the African Charter: Prohibition of torture, cruel, degrading or inhuman punishment and treatment

April 2012  Comments to Sudan’s 4th and 5th Periodic Report to the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights: The need for substantial legislative reforms to give effect to the rights, duties and freedoms enshrined in the Charter
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