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The UK’s Magnitsky sanctions regime provides the Government with an important tool to challenge the most egregious cases of human rights violations and corruption committed around the world. However, the effective use of Magnitsky sanctions requires a coordinated, multilateral approach across multiple jurisdictions. Multilateralised sanctions generally have greater effect on the designated target as they are prevented from travelling to and using their financial assets in multiple jurisdictions. Coordinated sanctions also send a much stronger signal that such behaviour is not tolerated by the international community.

Recommendations

The UK Government should:

1. Improve its multilateral approach to Magnitsky sanctions by sanctioning more perpetrators already identified and sanctioned by partner jurisdictions where they meet the requirements for designation under UK regime, and where the UK has failed to sanction. The UK should also demonstrate global leadership by imposing Magnitsky sanctions, without fear or favour, at a greater rate and leading, rather than following, partner jurisdictions.

2. Coordinate with partners in sanctioning corrupt actors acting across multiple jurisdictions. In doing so, the UK should seek to target corrupt networks as a whole, not just individuals or entities sitting at the top of a scheme.

3. Increase its focus for Magnitsky sanctions on underrepresented regions, including South America and Central Asia.

4. Strengthen its intersectional and survivor-centred approach to Magnitsky sanctions to provide greater accountability for a more diverse group of survivors and victims, including women and girls, children, persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and persons identifying as LGBTQI+. 
Recent research carried out by REDRESS, Human Rights First, Open Society Foundations and the Raoul Wallenberg Centre for Human Rights has identified 774 unique Magnitsky sanctions designations across four major jurisdictions with Magnitsky sanctions regimes: the US, Canada, the UK and the EU. Of this global total, only 14% are currently listed under the UK’s Magnitsky Sanctions regime, whilst a further 17% are listed under the UK’s other sanctions regimes, such as the country-specific Russia sanctions regime or the Chemical Weapons sanctions regime. This means that, 69% of global Magnitsky designations currently in place have not yet been multilateralised by the UK under its Magnitsky or other sanctions regimes.

Of the 69% of global Magnitsky sanctions that have not yet been replicated by the UK under its Magnitsky or other sanctions regimes, 71% of these sanctions have been imposed by the US; 27% have been imposed by Canada, and 2% have been imposed by the EU. 16% of sanctions yet to be multilateralised by the UK relate to human rights violations and corruption in Venezuela; 13% relate to Bulgaria, and 10% relate to the Democratic Republic of Congo.

**Countries where the UK has not coordinated global Magnitsky sanctions**

---

1 This includes sanctions made pursuant to the US’ Global Magnitsky Act 2016 and the Global Magnitsky sanctions program, established by Executive Order 13818; Canada’s Justice for Victims of Corrupt Foreign Officials Act (Sergei Magnitsky Law) (JVCFOA) and the Special Economic Measures Act (SEMA), the UK’s Global Human Rights Sanctions Regulations and the Global Anti-Corruption Sanctions Regulations, and the EU’s Council Regulation (EU) 2020/1998.
WHERE THE UK HAS IMPOSED MAGNITSKY SANCTIONS

To date, the UK has made 108 designations under its Magnitsky regimes, accounting for 14% of global Magnitsky sanctions. This number rises to 31% when accounting for sanctions imposed by the UK under its other country or thematic sanctions regimes.

Out of the 14% of global Magnitsky sanctions that have been imposed by the UK, 72% have been multilateralised, whilst 28% have been imposed solely by the UK without multilateralisation by other jurisdictions. Taken as a whole, this is largely reflective of the UK’s cautious approach to imposing Magnitsky sanctions. Where the UK is willing to impose a limited number of sanctions, it generally does so where other jurisdictions are also willing to do so.

UK Magnitsky sanctions at a glance

- 52% of UK Magnitsky sanctions target the Europe/Eurasia region. By comparison, only 5% of UK sanctions target South America, whilst 2% target South and Central Asia.
- 85% of UK sanctions are made in response to killings, whilst 68% are made in response to torture and ill-treatment.
- 25% of UK Magnitsky sanctions are designated for serious corruption. Where corruption designations have been imposed, the UK is targeting relative smaller corrupt networks in comparison with the US.
- Only 2% of UK sanctions target perpetrators in States considered to be ‘allies’ of the UK, all of which relate to Pakistan.
- Not a single UK Magnitsky Sanction has been imposed that recognises or identifies one or more women and/or girls as victims. 60% of UK sanctions recognise men and/or boys as victims, whilst 40% of UK sanctions do not account for the gender of victims.
- UK sanctions have also failed to identify a single child victim.
- While the use of Magnitsky sanctions for abuses carried out against LGBTQI+ persons are extremely low across all four jurisdictions under review, the UK performs best here, where 5% of its sanctions recognise LGBTQI+ victims.
- No jurisdiction, including the UK, recognised persons with disabilities as victims in their sanctions designations.
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