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This review has been published to mark the first ten years of EHRAC’s work. The impetus for establishing EHRAC was the beginning of the possibility to use litigation at the European Court of Human Rights to challenge egregious human rights violations committed by the Russian security forces in Chechnya and the other republics of the North Caucasus. Cases of torture, disappearances and the disproportionate use of military force have remained a key element of our work.

Since we opened our doors in 2003 we have also taken on cases about the right to demonstrate, the right to a fair trial, the right to a healthy environment, the protection of journalists and human rights defenders, the rights of detainees and people being extradited, and the right to freedom of movement. We have brought litigation to challenge ethnic discrimination and the failure to investigate crimes of violence against women. We have expanded our remit beyond Russia, developing our work in Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia. Our litigation in the South Caucasus includes cases arising from the 2008 South Ossetian conflict and the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

The rationale for setting up EHRAC was always to strengthen the capacity of human rights organisations in the region to litigate effectively and strategically in Strasbourg, and to that end we have worked with Memorial in Russia, the Georgian Young Lawyers’ Association in Georgia and many other lawyers and NGOs from across the region.

In the ten year period we have taken on 310 European Court cases, leading to judgments in 98 cases (so far). At least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights was found in 96% of these decisions, and more than six and a half million Euros have been awarded to the applicants. For many applicants the Strasbourg process was critical in establishing what had happened, and who was responsible - especially for family members in Chechnya whose loved ones had been the subject of enforced disappearances or extra-judicial executions. Other litigants achieved particular measures of individual redress, such as a supreme court judge who was reinstated to his role, or the man whose extradition from Russia was prevented as he faced the risk of torture in his home country. As well as achieving a measure of justice and accountability, and drawing international attention to human rights abuses, a number of the cases have led directly to changes in national law and practice.

This review tells you just some of the stories behind these cases.

We want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the courage and indefatigability of the many human rights lawyers and NGOs in the region with whom EHRAC has worked over the decade. We also want to express our sincerest thanks to all those (past and present) who have supported EHRAC’s work in so many different ways: the staff, interns and volunteers, our partners, our funders, the external lawyers and steering committee members.

Here’s to the next ten years.

Professor Philip Leach
Director, EHRAC

Professor Bill Bowring
Chair, International Steering Committee
OUR VISION

Every person in the former Soviet Union has a voice, access to justice, and can hold their state to account over human rights violations.

OUR MISSION

EHRAC is an independent apolitical organisation that stands alongside victims of human rights abuse in order to secure justice. Working in support of civil society organisations, we bring strategic cases to the European Court to challenge impunity for human rights violations. We raise awareness of violations and means of redress for victims, and we build capacity of individuals and organisations through mentoring, training and advocacy. Each judgment we secure contributes to an objective account of human rights abuse that cannot be refuted.

About us

The European Human Rights Advocacy Centre (EHRAC) was founded in 2003 by a team of human rights lawyers and experts with a great wealth of experience of taking cases to the European Court. They were in a prime position to support human rights lawyers working in the former Soviet Union. EHRAC worked initially with lawyers at the leading Russian non-governmental organisation Memorial, who were attempting to take the first cases to the European Court on behalf of victims of gross human rights violations arising from the Chechen conflict. EHRAC’s support was key and led to the first judgments (in 2005) finding Russia to have violated the European Convention on Human Rights during the conflict in Chechnya.

Since then, EHRAC has expanded its reach, taking on challenging and groundbreaking litigation in partnership with local human rights lawyers across the region. A distinct mentoring and capacity-building mandate grew as EHRAC saw the benefit of training young lawyers ‘in-country’, enabling them to support more victims and challenge violations at the European Court.

Over the years we have also sought to raise awareness of human rights violations through traditional and new media channels and in publications, in order to give greater numbers of people access to accurate and up-to-date information.

We also turned our attention to implementation as a fundamental part of combatting injustice on a wider scale. The full and successful implementation of European Court judgments helps to bring about long-term and far-reaching changes to domestic law and policy, contributing to the end of impunity for human rights abuses.

Today, EHRAC works in Russia, Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia, as well as collaborating with individual lawyers and NGOs in Estonia and Ukraine. Our expertise and focus remain on the countries of the former Soviet Union.
EHRAC’s first successes

JUSTICE FOR CHECHENS

Years of conflict in Chechnya saw vast destruction and countless violations of human rights, including extra-judicial killings and enforced disappearances, indiscriminate bombings, and widespread incidence of torture. As the Russian courts have never effectively scrutinised the actions of the Russian security forces in the North Caucasus, the ability to seek justice through international mechanisms was incredibly significant for the people of the region.

Three cases submitted to the European Court by EHRAC and Memorial on behalf of victims’ relatives reached judgment in 2005. These cases represented the first time that an international court had found the Russian security forces had used grossly disproportionate force in Chechnya with utter disregard for the risk to civilian life.

In each case, the European Court found that Russia had violated the right to life and was ordered to pay significant damages to the applicants. These cases set a ground-breaking precedent for the way the European Court would handle cases from the North Caucasus region in the following years. Since 2005, over 200 judgments have been passed down in cases from the region.

**Khashiyev and Akayeva v Russia (2005)** concerned the torture and extra-judicial execution of five of the applicants’ relatives in Grozny (the Chechen capital) in January 2000. The bodies of the relatives of Magomed Khashiyev and Roza Akayeva were found with numerous gunshot wounds.

**Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazayeva v Russia (2005)** arose out of the indiscriminate bombing of civilians leaving Grozny by car (to avoid the fighting) in October 1999. Medka Isayeva was wounded and her two children and sister-in-law were killed, Zina Yusupova was wounded and Libkan Bazayeva’s cars were destroyed.

**Isayeva v Russia (2005)** concerned the indiscriminate bombing of the Chechen village of Katyr-Yurt in February 2000. Zara Isayeva’s son and her three nieces were killed.
Securing moral justice for enforced disappearances

In the North Caucasus, state authorities continue to employ unlawful methods to tackle the problem of armed groups, with little or no regard for the rule of law. This includes the ‘enforced disappearance’ of individuals by State agents. Numerous cases brought by EHRAC and partner NGOs have revealed a systemic pattern of behaviour in these cases. The victims are forcibly taken by people believed to be state agents. The authorities deny any state involvement, and the incident is not effectively investigated and those responsible are not prosecuted.

Despite denial from the State, evidence from applicants and witnesses has been sufficient for the European Court to issue judgments in their favour, securing moral justice for the relatives of the “disappeared” who, in many cases, never find out the fate of their relative. This practice continues today.

“... The European Court decision helped us on a moral level. An independent court officially recognised that our and my brother’s fundamental rights were violated – the right to life and the right to an effective investigation. This is a serious moral victory for us. Of course the Russian Government also paid us the financial compensation that we were granted, but this was not the most important thing. Maybe it is even the least important thing. It is important in principle, of course, but in essence what was important for me is that we won and that independent judges told us that we were right.

“We keep on hoping. We continue to ask the local courts here to carry out an effective investigation and to find the people who are responsible. I don’t still hope he is alive, but I do still hope that one day they will show us where they buried him.”

Magomed Mutalgov, brother of Baor Muatlov, who disappeared from near his home in Karabulak, Ingushetia on 18 December 2002 (Mutaliov v Russia (2010)).

UMAROV V RUSSIA (2012)

In 2007, Ramazan Umarov was taken away following a search of his flat in Makhachkala, Dagestan, and was never seen again. The Russian Government claimed that he was a member of a radical religious movement, and that they were unaware of his arrest, suggesting he could be hiding. An investigation into his disappearance, which began nine days after his relatives reported him missing, was suspended on six occasions. In its judgment, the European Court held that there had been a violation of the right to life, finding that the evidence established ‘beyond reasonable doubt’ that Mr Umarov should be presumed dead following his unacknowledged detention by State agents.

As the Russian Government failed to justify his detention, his death was presumed dead following his unacknowledged detention by State agents. The European Court found that there had been a violation of the right to life, finding that independent judges told us that we were right.

SHAFIYEV V RUSSIA (2012)

In 2009, Sirazhudin Shafiyev disappeared after taking his children to nursery school in Derbent, Dagestan. His car was blocked by two vehicles without official registration numbers, from which a group of masked men forcibly took him away in his own car. The abduction was witnessed by several local residents, one of whom managed to photograph the incident. Mr Shafiyev’s whereabouts are unknown to this day. The Russian Government argued that their involvement had not been proved, and that the disappearance had most likely been staged. The European Court found a violation of the right to life due to the failure to carry out an effective criminal investigation into the circumstances of his disappearance.

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS

Eye witness accounts describe how the attack was carried out while people were running away.

Challenging indiscriminate bombing in Chechnya

ESMUKHAMBETOV & OTHERS V RUSSIA (2011)

On 12 September 1999, two Russian military planes bombed the village of Kogi in the Shelkovsky district of Chechnya, destroying the village and killing several of the villagers.

The low-flying planes circled and then bombed the village, starting at one end and then returning to bomb the other. Three bombs hit the garden of the home of the Esmukhambetov family, killing the two children, Elmurat and Eldar and their mother, Borambike Dormalayevna. Machine gun bullets, fired indiscriminately, killed the mother of Mautli Kartaykoev, while she tried to escape to the nearby village of Kumli with her son in her arms. The mother of Bashir Mutsolgov, Magomed Mutsolgov, brother of Bashir Mutsolgov, who disappeared from near his home in Karabulak, Ingushetia on 18 December 2002 (Mutaliov v Russia (2010)).

In its judgment, the European Court found the Russian Government’s arguments in response to the cases ‘inadequate’ and ‘unconvincing’, and concluded that the indiscriminate nature of the bombing was ‘manifestly disproportionate’ given the ‘absence of any reliable evidence that any unlawful violence was threatened or likely’. The European Court found violations of the right to life, right to property, and right to respect for family life, and awarded the Kogi villagers damages amounting to almost one and a half million Euros.

DAMAYEV V RUSSIA (2012)

Imarali Damayev was away from his home on the day in 2004 when the Russian federal armed forces carried out an aerial bombardment of his family home in Rigakhoy, Chechnya. The bombs killed his wife and five of his children. Their bodies were buried later that day. Only his eldest son survived as he was also out of the house at the time.

Despite Mr Damayev’s appeals, servicemen claimed it was unnecessary to investigate the deaths as they claimed the house had exploded due to a gas cylinder or landmine. However, on searching the ruins of the house a few days later, residents of the village, who were by then living in temporary accommodation in nearby villages in Dagestan, found bomb fragments.

In its judgment, the European Court found that the Russian Government’s arguments in response to the cases ‘inadequate’ and ‘unconvincing’, and concluded that the indiscriminate nature of the bombing was ‘manifestly disproportionate’ given the ‘absence of any reliable evidence that any unlawful violence was threatened or likely’. The European Court found violations of the right to life, right to property, and right to respect for family life, and awarded the Kogi villagers damages amounting to almost one and a half million Euros.

“... It appears improbable that any reasonable person would try to extract highly explosive material from an artillery shell at home in the vicinity of five minor children. Such a course of events appears even less probable considering that an artillery attack was taking place in the area on the day of the explosion.”
Highlighting the prevalence of torture

The practice of torture of detainees is widespread across the North Caucasus region. Following a visit to the region in 2011, the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment found that cases of ill-treatment in detention facilities were frequently of such severity as to amount to torture, citing the use of electric shock treatment, physical beatings and threats of rape. They also found that investigators and judges fail to take the necessary action when made aware of such cases.

EHRAC and our partner lawyers have used the European Court mechanism to challenge the practice of torture, both to secure justice for the victims and to raise awareness of the issue.

ISAYEV & OTHERS v RUSSIA (2011)

On the evening of 9 May 2004, Zelimkhan Isayev was at home in his village of Goi-Chu, Chechnya with his sister-in-law Lipa Dudusheva. At around 8.30pm a group of armed, masked men burst into their courtyard and seized and handcuffed Zelimkhan. He offered no resistance. The men searched the house looking for weapons, but found nothing. Zelimkhan was taken away in a vehicle, which his relatives tried in vain to follow.

The next day, Zelimkhan’s relatives were told that he was being held in the Urus-Martan District department of the interior. An officer from the Federal Security Service (FSB) told them that Zelimkhan was unwell and had been injured during his detention as he had resisted arrest.

Two days later, Zelimkhan was transferred to hospital where his brothers managed to photograph his injuries. Zelimkhan told them that following his detention, FSB officers had tortured him all night by applying an electric current to his genitals, burning him with cigarettes, and beating him with truncheons to make him tell them “everything he knew”. He consequently agreed to sign documents without reading them before being transferred to the Urus-Martan District Department of the Interior. Shortly after his brothers visited, Zelimkhan’s health seriously deteriorated and he died from acute renal failure and other serious injuries caused to his kidneys and lungs.

EHRAC and Memorial brought this case to the European Court in 2004, and it reached judgment in 2011. The European Court found Russia in violation of the right to life and stated that the ill-treatment inflicted upon Zelimkhan was “particularly cruel and severe” and amounted to torture in violation of Article 3 of the European Convention. A further violation was found on account of the ineffective investigation into his death, which was opened more than three years after he died.

Russia and Central Asia

APPLYING THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-REFOULEMENT

Despite being signatories to international human rights agreements, Russia has in recent years cooperated in returning people to Central Asia in the name of national security, even where there is a real risk of their being tortured or otherwise ill-treated on their return.

EHRAC and our partners have taken on several urgent cases in which we have sought ‘interim measures’ from the European Court to prevent the imminent expulsion of applicants from Russia to Central Asian countries, predominantly to Uzbekistan. In 2011 the European Court found in the case of Yakubov v Russia that the “ill-treatment of detainees and prisoners continued unabated” in Uzbekistan. Human Rights Watch has reported that in Uzbekistan, methods used by law enforcement officials include “…hanging by wrists and ankles, rape and sexual humiliation, asphyxiation with plastic bags and gas masks, threats of physical harm to relatives…” (Human Rights Watch, ‘No One Left to Witness’, 2011).

YAKUBOV v RUSSIA (2011)

Umid Yakubov, an Uzbek national, moved to Russia in May 2009. In October 2009, the Uzbek authorities charged him with participation in the “banned religious extremist, separatist and fundamentalist organisation” Hizb ut-Tahrir and with leaving Uzbekistan unlawfully, and issued an arrest warrant calling for his extradition. He was detained by the Russian authorities, acting on behalf of the Uzbek authorities, on 4 January 2010 but was released after ten days. Later in January he was detained for disobedience to police officers and sentenced to seven days’ detention. On 1 February 2010 at the Sovetskiy district court of Ryazan, he was charged with giving false information during migration registration and his expulsion from Russia was ordered.

Throughout the proceedings, Mr Yakubov stated that he had been repeatedly ill-treated while in detention in Uzbekistan between 1999 and 2008, resulting in chronic injuries from which he still suffered, and that his extradition would lead to a serious risk of further ill-treatment.

Following the initial request for interim measures, on 5 February 2010 the President of the European Court ordered that Mr Yakubov should not be extradited to Uzbekistan until further notice. In the final judgment, the European Court ruled that, should Russia carry out the expulsion of Mr Yakubov to Uzbekistan, it would violate the European Convention as he would face “a real risk of treatment proscribed by Article 3".

EHRAC and our partner lawyers have used the European Court mechanism to challenge the practice of torture, both to secure justice for the victims and to raise awareness of the issue.
Environmental pollution

In 2005 EHRAC won an innovative European Court case concerning environmental pollution - Fadeyeva v Russia.

Nadezhda Fadeyeva lived with her family in Cherepovets, a major steel-producing centre in Russia. Her council flat was within an area known as the 'sanitary security zone' (SSZ) around a steel factory. Under Russian law no one may live within an SSZ because of hazardous substances in the air. Mrs Fadeyeva believed that living in the SSZ was a danger to her life and health and appealed to the local authorities to be re-housed. As a result she was simply put on a general waiting list for re-housing. She then applied to the European Court, represented by EHRAC and Memorial. On her behalf we submitted expert evidence (from the Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide) about the human health effects of the levels of pollutants in the air.

On 9 June 2005, the European Court ruled that Russia had violated Mrs Fadeyeva’s right to respect for her home and private life by the unregulated presence of a polluting enterprise.

Accountability for attacks on journalists and human rights defenders

Following Vladimir Putin’s return to the Presidency in 2012, Russia’s rating in the Press Freedom Index dropped from 142 (out of 179 countries) in 2012 to 148 in 2013. The unprecedented wave of opposition protests saw a hike in repressions of the press, with murders and attacks against journalists continuing with impunity.

The past decade alone has witnessed 16 murders of journalists, each case still unsolved, putting Russia in the ninth-worst position in the world for combating deadly anti-press crime. Journalists in the North Caucasus have been exceptionally vulnerable, with one recent victim being Kazbek Gekkiyev, a state television anchor working in the region, who was shot dead in December 2012 on his way home from work.

Russia’s historically poor record in prosecuting journalist killers prompted the mother of Maksim Maksimov, a journalist missing and presumed dead, to approach EHRAC and Memorial for help in applying to the European Court of Human Rights, arguing that Russia fosters a state pattern of impunity in murders of journalists.

“When Rimma Maksimova last spoke with her son, investigative journalist Maksim Maksimov, in a phone call on June 26, 2004, they talked about the comings and goings of family life; his approaching birthday, her plans to visit him the next month in St. Petersburg. Mother and son swapped calls in the next couple of days but missed each other. She rang him up one last time on July 3, leaving a message that wished him a happy 41st birthday.

By that time, Maksim Maksimov was gone. His mother would spend her trip to St. Petersburg, and the next eight years, trying to find out what had happened to Maksimov, who was last seen on June 29, 2004, in downtown St. Petersburg. He was never found.”

Elisabeth Witchel, ‘Seeking Justice in Russia, a Mother Turns to Europe’, Committee to Protect Journalists, 2012

JUSTICE FOR NATALIA ESTEMIROVA

A Memorial employee and one of the leading human rights defenders in the North Caucasus was abducted and murdered in 2009. Her murder forced Memorial to suspend its operations in the region for six months. The Russian authorities have failed to identify and prosecute the perpetrators. On the grounds of her murder and the lack of an effective investigation, EHRAC and Memorial launched an application at the European Court in 2011, with her sister as the principal applicant in the case.

In 2012 EHRAC became a participating partner in the Committee to Protect Journalist’s campaign ‘Speak Justice: Voices against Impunity’ - a digital media campaign against impunity in the murders of journalists.
EHRAC started working in Georgia in 2006, partnering with the Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA) on their strategic litigation programme. EHRAC and GYLA were therefore in the perfect position to challenge human rights violations arising from the 2008 South Ossetia conflict. After extensive work in obtaining witness statements from those affected by the conflict, 32 cases were lodged against Russia at the European Court in February 2009, representing 135 Georgian applicants.

The applicants in these cases endured shelling and air attacks on their villages, allegedly by Russian armed forces, resulting in their properties being destroyed, relatives being killed or injured, and houses being deliberately burned or looted by Russian soldiers or the Ossetian militia. Others described how their village was shelled from surrounding Ossetian villages, and then attacked by air by Russian helicopters and planes. They also claimed that a group of people wearing military uniforms looted and burned their houses.

One applicant alleges that her mother was killed by shrapnel during the shelling of the village. Others claim they were illegally detained by Russian soldiers; one applicant states he was detained near his home village, that he was taken to Tskhinvali in a small tank, and detained there for 22 days in the basement of a building. During this time he was denied food and water, and was drugged and beaten every day.

These cases were communicated to the Russian government in 2011 – judgments are awaited.

South Ossetia is a breakaway region in the Caucasus which has claimed de facto independence from Georgia since 1992. In 2008 tensions escalated in the region, with armed clashes between Georgian, Russian and South Ossetian forces.

7 August: the formal negotiations aimed at resolving the conflict broke down. Georgian forces attacked Tskhinvali, the South Ossetian capital. Georgia claimed this was in response to the movement of Russian forces into its territory, which Russia claims it only did after the Georgian offensive in order to protect South Ossetia.

7-12 August: five-days of conflict ensued. Russian forces took control of South Ossetia and there were hostilities in other areas.

12 August: a truce was agreed

15-16 August: the two countries signed a ceasefire

26 August: Russia recognised the independence of South Ossetia. Russian forces created ‘buffer zones’ in Georgian territory near South Ossetia but withdrew by October.
Standing up for victims of Soviet repression

Over the course of the Soviet Union’s existence, those considered to be against the Soviet regime and ideology suffered from waves of terror and repression which saw millions sent to Gulag (correctional labour camps), executed, tortured or imprisoned, and entire families and communities were forcibly relocated, often to the most remote and harsh regions.

**KILADZE V GEORGIA (2010)**

After the fall of the Soviet Union, a law was introduced in Georgia that entitled those who had suffered from Soviet repression to claim compensation. However, a significant gap in the legislation prevented victims from actually receiving it. Klaus and Yuri Kiladze’s father was executed in 1937 and their mother was sent to a Gulag in 1938 for alleged crimes against the Soviet regime. Their parents’ flat in Tbilisi and all their belongings were confiscated. The applicants were sent to an orphanage in Russia where they lived in cramped conditions for two years before returning to Georgia to live with their grandmother. The brothers were recognised as victims of political repression in 1998, and in 2005 they applied to the Georgian courts seeking compensation. However, the domestic courts rejected their claims as a further law, which was necessary to decide the amount of moral damages due to them, had not yet been adopted. In 2006 they applied to the European Court, represented by EHRAC and GYLA.

In this landmark judgment in 2010, the European Court ordered the Georgian Government to make changes to the domestic law to enable the applicants, and many other people in similar situations, to benefit from their legal rights. As a result, amendments to the legislation came into force in May 2011, allowing thousands of victims to apply for damages to the Tbilisi City Court.

Upholding the right to freedom of assembly in Georgia

**KAKABADZE & OTHERS V GEORGIA (2012)**

In June 2006, members of the Georgian organisation ‘Equality Institute’ held a demonstration outside the Tbilisi Court of Appeal to show their support for the owners of a television channel who were on trial at the time. Court bailiffs restrained the demonstrators and arrested them for ‘breaching public order’ and for ‘contempt of court, insults, and disregarding the bailiffs’ lawful orders to stop the wrongdoing’. They were each sentenced to 30 days’ detention, which was decided solely on the grounds of the bailiffs’ statements, and without the opportunity for an oral hearing.

EHRAC and GYLA assisted the demonstrators in bringing their case before the European Court. In October 2012, Georgia was found to have violated their rights to liberty, fair trial and freedom of assembly.

Azerbaijan

The human rights situation in Azerbaijan remains dire. Serious violations of the European Convention on Human Rights are widespread, and state interference with freedom of expression, assembly and association are common. Media freedom is a particular concern; Azerbaijan is ranked 156 out of 179 countries on the Press Freedom Index. Almost 600,000 people are believed to be internally displaced as a result of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, having a direct impact on the effective implementation of social, economic and cultural rights. Abuse in the military also remains a significant issue with 97 deaths recorded in 2012, and impunity for abuses continuing today.

EHRAC began working with Azerbaijani human rights NGOs in 2010, following a visit to Baku. Lawyers from these organisations have attended training seminars arranged by EHRAC, in the UK, in Azerbaijan and in Georgia.

**SARGSYAN V AZERBAIJAN**

Minas Sargsyan and his family are ethnic Armenians, who lived in a house in the village of Gulistan in a region of Azerbaijan bordering Nagorno-Karabakh that was later claimed by the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic. During the conflict, Gulistan was attacked by Azerbaijani forces in June 1992 and the entire village fled fearing for their lives.

With the assistance of the NGO Legal Guide (based in Yerevan), in August 2006 Minas complained to the European Court about his forced displacement from Gulistan and the Azerbaijani Government’s continuing refusal to allow him access to his home and belongings. He also complained that no effective remedy was available to him in Azerbaijan due to the unresolved nature of the conflict. Minas died in 2009 without seeing justice; however his wife and children are now pursuing his application.

Their case is currently pending before the Grand Chamber of the European Court and will set a precedent as regards cases relating to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

“On behalf of Legal Guide I would like to thank you for your involvement in the case of Sargsyan and your committed work. Through this cooperation we have all seen many things in our work changed for the better, which is an inspiration to us. We truly enjoyed working with EHRAC, which proved to be more than just an organisation: it is a great team involving highly dedicated people. Thank you again for your support and we hope that there will be other opportunities to collaborate.”

Narine Gasparyan, President, Legal Guide

**NAGORNO-KARABakh**

When Armenia and Azerbaijan gained independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, conflict over the contested region of Nagorno-Karabakh intensified. A ceasefire was reached in 1994 but the conflict continued with fatalities on both sides. International attempts to broker a peaceful settlement in 2008 and again in 2009 had limited success. Today, thousands of people are living in temporary accommodation after being displaced. They have lost property, livelihoods, and in some cases, their lives.
Armenia

Numerous issues exist within Armenia which continue to prevent the effective protection of basic civil and political rights. The use of violence by the state remains a problem, particularly the use of torture and the prevalence of inhumane or degrading treatment. The media is heavily regulated by the state, leading to a high degree of self-censorship and a lack of pluralism in reporting. The situation is exacerbated by continuing attacks on journalists.

Violence in the military and the death of soldiers outside combat situations, as well as deaths of people held in custody, are frequently highlighted by human rights groups.

In 2012, EHRAC conducted a first visit to Armenia to 'launch' our work there, holding a roundtable for local lawyers and human rights organisations, supported by the Open Society Foundations. Following this trip we began to collaborate with several NGOs including the Helsinki Citizens' Assembly Vanadzor, with whom a case was launched in December 2012. Armenian lawyers have attended training seminars hosted by EHRAC. We have also taken on several right to life cases arising from the mass protests which took place in Yerevan in March 2008 following the Presidential elections.

GASPARYAN V ARMENIA
In 2010, ten year old Derenik Gasparyan died while at school, following a fight with another pupil. It was 46 days after his death that a criminal case was eventually opened, and no prosecution has ever taken place. Derenik’s grandfather has applied to the European Court, represented by EHRAC and the Helsinki Citizens' Assembly Vanadzor, to secure justice over the death of his grandson. He argues that the State is responsible as the child died while at school - a state institution - under the supervision of a teacher. He also believes that the criminal investigation into the incident was inadequate.

VOLKOV V UKRAINE
Oleksandr Volkov was appointed as a Supreme Court judge in Ukraine in 2003. In 2008, proceedings were brought against him before the High Council of Justice for alleged professional misconduct, and in 2010 he was dismissed from his post for an alleged breach of oath. He appealed to the Higher Administrative Court against his dismissal, but his appeal was rejected.

When Mr Volkov approached EHRAC in 2012 to take on his case, we could see the real potential to address significant shortcomings in the Ukrainian legal system.

In a landmark judgment in January 2013, Ukraine was found to have violated Mr Volkov’s rights to a fair trial and to respect for his private life. The European Court, for the first time ever, ordered Ukraine to reinstate him as a Supreme Court judge ‘at the earliest possible date’.

The European Court also found “serious systemic problems as regards the functioning of the Ukrainian judiciary” and stressed the need for legislative reform involving the restructuring of the institutional basis of the system of judicial discipline.

Challenging injustice in the Ukrainian Legal System

“Mr Volkov was the victim of endemic political corruption, which this judgment confirms is prevalent in Ukraine. It is significant that the European Court has, for the first time, ordered the reinstatement of someone who was unfairly dismissed. This judgment confirms that the Ukrainian legal system is in urgent need of fundamental reform.”

Professor Philip Leach, Director, EHRAC
The implementation of judgments

EHRAC seeks to generate lasting changes beyond individual cases by advocating for systemic change to domestic law, policy and practice, bringing them into line with European Convention standards. The implementation of judgments should encourage the domestic authorities to adhere to domestic and European human rights standards, thereby reducing the numbers of human rights violations in the long-term.

EHRAC advocates for international pressure to be put on states by making submissions to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, the body responsible for monitoring the implementation of judgments.

We also support partner NGOs in using and applying international human rights law at the domestic level. This includes following up judgments issued by the European Court to press for effective investigations, and for compensation to be awarded.

Our litigation and advocacy produces tangible changes, such as:

**LOPATA v RUSSIA (2010) – ILL-TREATMENT IN POLICE CUSTODY**

In response to this judgment, the Russian authorities indicated that a new Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP) had entered into force, reinforcing safeguards in police custody. The CCP stipulates in particular that a suspect may have access to their lawyer from the moment of apprehension. It also provides that confessions without a lawyer present and not confirmed by the lawyer from the moment of apprehension are inadmissible.

**ELMURATOv v RUSSIA (2011) – UNAUTHORISED DETENTION PENDING EXTRADITION**

This judgment highlighted the lack of any clear provisions in Russian legislation regulating the placement of people in detention pending their extradition. In response to the judgment, the Russian government confirmed that there would be legislative reform, and in the mean time, the Supreme Court provided lower courts with guidelines on how to apply domestic legislation in line with European Convention standards. In particular, the Supreme Court set out how courts should assess whether there is a risk of ill-treatment in the country requesting the extradition. The Committee of Ministers has described these recommendations as being “particularly valuable since the lack of assessment of such risk by Russian courts often resulted in the Court finding violations of the Convention”.

**INFRINGEMENT PROCEEDINGS**

EHRAC also seeks to utilise new mechanisms to challenge the systemic non-implementation of judgments. In 2010, the ‘infringement proceedings’ mechanism was introduced, allowing the Committee of Ministers to refer a case back to the European Court of Human Rights where the State has failed to comply with a judgment.

In 2012 EHRAC saw the opportunity to use this mechanism in relation to two judgments - Isayeva v Russia (2005) and Abuyeva and Others v Russia (2010), both of which found Russia directly responsible for the bombing of the Chechen village of Katyr-Yurt, resulting in the deaths of villagers. In Abuyeva, violations of the right to life, the failure to investigate and the lack of domestic remedies, mirrored those found in Isayeva, five years earlier. This led the European Court to take the unprecedented step of finding that Russia had “manifestly disregarded the specific findings of a binding judgment.”

There have been more than 200 judgments against Russia concerning human rights violations in the North Caucasus region, the vast majority of which have involved multiple violations of the European Convention. The inadequacy of official investigations has featured in many of these cases on a scale which indicates an ongoing, systemic problem.

Given the high number of cases, the grave nature of the violations, the lack of accountability and investigation, and the potential time constraints (domestic limitation periods may prevent prosecutions), EHRAC considered the initiation of infringement proceedings to be the next step in bringing those responsible to account and ensuring that the Russian Federation carries out full and effective investigations into gross violations of human rights. In August 2012, EHRAC and Memorial HRC submitted a formal application for infringement proceedings to the Committee of Ministers. The application acted as an important catalyst, prompting the Committee of Ministers to:

“Call upon the Russian authorities to ensure that this additional investigation eventually addresses all the shortcomings repetitively identified by the Court and invite them to provide detailed information in this respect so as to enable the Committee to ascertain that this investigation has effectively paid due regard to all the Court’s conclusions.”

**INTERNATIONAL ADVOCACY**

EHRAC plays an active advocacy role; commenting on the ongoing reforms of the European Court and other issues relating to its effectiveness, and collaborating on numerous submissions to the Council of Europe with other leading human rights NGOs such as Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the AIREF Centre, Justice, International Commission of Jurists, Liberty and Redress. Most recently, in 2012, this group of NGOs came together to respond to ongoing discussions on the reform of the European Court following the Interlaken, Izmir and Brighton conferences and declarations. The group commented on issues such as the elaboration of Protocols 15 and 16, proposals to charge applicants a fee to apply to the Court, and the reduction of the time period during which an application can be submitted.

EHRAC also liaises with and provides information to bodies such as the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights), the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights and the UN Special Procedures.
Training seminars

Over the past ten years, lawyers from countries across the former Soviet Union have benefited from training seminars, legal consultations, and roundtables organised by EHRAC and partner organisations. EHRAC has held a total of 37 events since 2003, reaching over 850 participants in Moscow, St Petersburg, Novorossiysk, Daghestan, Ingushetia, South Ossetia, and Tbilisi, as well as in Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia. Bringing together experts from the UK and lawyers from across the former Soviet Union has encouraged dialogue, offering lawyers the chance to exchange experience, develop strategies for collaboration and tackle themes common to their countries. Participants at training seminars are encouraged to stay in touch with EHRAC and each other for advice or assistance in taking cases to the European Court. In addition, legal consultations between EHRAC and partner lawyers have provided more intense mentoring and guidance on specific cases, enabling face-to-face discussions and a greater exchange of knowledge to benefit the case.

Each year, EHRAC has also run a Legal Skills Development Programme, in which lawyers from the region attend an intensive training programme in London (and/or Strasbourg), focused on human rights litigation and themes common to their countries. Attendees also meet with donors, international agencies and government departments, such as the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, to deepen their knowledge of effective fundraising and advocacy strategies.

Over the years, EHRAC has carried out other training programmes for NGO staff members on topics such as fundraising, office management and financial management. These have helped our partner NGOs to develop and become more effective in the day-to-day running of the organisation.

Mentoring success

Over the past ten years, our practice of closely mentoring lawyers on the ground has not only benefited applicants in our cases but has significantly contributed to the professional development of the lawyers themselves.

Musa Khasanov worked with EHRAC and Memorial for four years before going on to work as a Registry lawyer in the European Court of Human Rights. He is the first Chechen lawyer to be appointed at the Court.

“My experience with EHRAC/Memorial has clearly changed my life by significant influence on my professional growth. I want to thank the highly professional and prominent lawyers of EHRAC legal team as well as project manager in London.”

Sophio Japaridze was a lawyer and project coordinator of the EHRAC-GYLA project from 2006-2009. In 2012 she became the Deputy Minister of the Ministry of Corrections and Legal Assistance of Georgia, which ensures the execution of sentences and management of penitentiary establishments, as well as the provision of a free legal aid service.

“Working with EHRAC immensely contributed to my professional growth and helped me to develop lawyering skills needed for the successful litigation of complex cases before the European Court of Human Rights.

In 2006 when I was employed by the Georgian Young Lawyers’ Association (GYLA) I had a strong theoretical knowledge of the European system, but little experience of actually litigating cases before the Court. Comprehensive feedback provided by EHRAC lawyers on draft submissions prepared by me was extremely helpful. It enabled me to identify the mistakes made and significantly improve the drafts. I believe EHRAC’s legal expertise on the cases considerably increased their chances for the success. I can say with full confidence that through the cooperation with EHRAC I have improved my drafting skills. I have learnt how to organise arguments effectively and structure submissions in an efficient way.

Cooperation on the cases related to the Russian-Georgian armed conflict was extremely productive for me. I was in contact with EHRAC lawyers on a daily basis asking them various questions on the case selection criteria, interviewing techniques, managing complicated narrative and various other questions related to dealing with a complex group of applications.

Collaboration with EHRAC resulted in the best possible outcome for me as a lawyer. From a lawyer with a strong theoretical background in law I was transformed into an ECHR lawyer experienced in strategic litigation developing excellent skills in the management of complex cases working with labour intensive documents. I have gained extensive experience not only through the team work on GYLA/EHRAC cases, but also through other activities I was involved in. The Legal Skills Development Programme (LSDP), annual trainings and case meetings are definitely among the activities that improved my lawyering skills.

Collaboration with EHRAC and the experience I have gained from it was very helpful for my career development.”

“I really enjoyed the programme. It was beneficial to hear about the experiences of successful English barristers. It was also useful to learn how different organisations dealing with human rights issues find and select cases strategically. Participating in the programme has definitely improved my spoken English.”

Participants at EHRAC’s seminar ‘Strategic litigation - a regional perspective’ held in Tbilisi in 2011.
EHRAC’s work in the public eye
10 YEARS, 10 HEADLINES

Over the past decade, EHRAC has enjoyed significant coverage of its work across a range of media, notably in the printed and online press.

By drawing international attention to violations and judgments we make vulnerable and marginalised people more aware of the legal mechanisms available to them to challenge abuse and achieve redress.

We use a range of communication channels to disseminate information to supporters, members of the public and lawyers in the region. Wherever possible, information is shared in English and in Russian to maximise our reach. EHRAC staff also attend high-level human rights events, speaking at conferences, debates and roundtables hosted by organisations such as the Council of Europe, the Law Society, the Bar Human Rights Committee, NGOs and universities in Europe.

Press releases are circulated following every judgment, and we have secured an impressive array of press and online coverage in the Guardian, the BBC, the Times, the Telegraph, the International Herald Tribune, the Independent, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, Le Monde and, more recently, a great deal of coverage in the Russian media.

In recent years, social media has also increased our reach, enabling us to share news from Russia, the South Caucasus and the European Court with thousands of people worldwide. 
Providing training resources

Over the last 10 years, thousands of lawyers and European Court practitioners have benefited from publications and materials produced by EHRAC experts on many issues relating to European Court litigation. These have been translated into Russian, printed, and shared widely online, as well as being made available at universities and public libraries.

The EHRAC Bulletin is a free resource and contains updates on key developments in Strasbourg which litigating lawyers can refer to in domestic pleadings or before the European Court. It reports on significant changes in the human rights field of relevance to the former Soviet Union. The Russian-language Bulletin has been extremely popular, and each edition is distributed to over 3,000 contacts.

How to take a case to the European Court, a practical reference work on European Court litigation with a particular focus on Russian issues, was produced in 2005 and continues to be used today. It includes the Russian translation of four chapters from Professor Philip Leach’s book ‘Taking a Case to the European Court of Human Rights’ (then in its second edition, published by Oxford University Press) and new chapters by other specialists on Russia on domestic litigation practice, admissibility issues in Russian cases, and judgments on the merits in Russian cases.

The Witness Guide (published in English, Russian, and Georgian) is a practical guide to preparing detailed witness statements.

Translation of the first six Chechen judgments. When the first Chechen judgments were produced by the Court in 2005, we considered it essential to publish and disseminate Russian translations - particularly in the North Caucasus region. They were published as a joint initiative between EHRAC, Memorial, the Stichting Russian Justice Initiative and the European Council on Refugees and Exiles.
Challenging the Foreign Agent Law

ECODEFENCE AND OTHERS V RUSSIA

The situation for human rights NGOs in Russia reached an all-time low in late 2012 when a law was introduced that established a new classification of NGOs in Russia: the ‘Foreign Agent’. Under this law, if an NGO receives foreign funding and is engaged in ‘political activity’, it must register as a ‘Foreign Agent’ and is then subject to significant reporting restrictions and regulations. Any materials or resources produced by the NGO must be labelled as having been produced by a ‘Foreign Agent’.

In February 2013, EHRAC and Memorial lodged an application with the European Court on behalf of 11 leading Russian human rights NGOs to contest the law, alleging that it violates their rights to freedom of association and expression.

Following a series of raids on NGOs by the authorities, at the end of April 2013 Memorial was officially named a ‘Foreign Agent’ for “being funded from abroad and engaging in political activity”, which is said to be in direct violation of the Russian law. They were given one month to “correct the violations” and to register as a Foreign Agent. Under the law, refusing to register could lead to a series of sanctions, the first being a fine of up to 500,000 roubles (around £10,000) and the last being suspension of activity, criminal prosecution and liquidation of the organisation.

Law banning ‘gay propaganda’

ALEKSANDROV V RUSSIA

In August 2012 Sergey Aleksandrov applied for permission to hold a demonstration in Arkhangelsk to raise awareness about the problems faced by LGBT teenagers. His application was refused, with the authorities citing the ‘Protection of Children’s Health and Morals Act of Arkhangelsk Region’ legislation, which prohibits the ‘Propaganda of homosexuality’ among minors.

Mr Aleksandrov applied for judicial review, but two further courts ruled that the original decision to refuse his application was justified on the grounds of the ban.

EHRAC and Memorial have applied to the European Court on behalf of Mr Aleksandrov arguing that the City Hall’s decision breached the Protection of Morals Acts which, according to the Russian Supreme Court, cannot justify bans on public events.

Mr Aleksandrov also claims that the interference could not be considered ‘necessary in a democratic society’. As well as arguing that his right to freedom of assembly was violated, he also complains under the prohibition of discrimination, as, he claims, those seeking approval for public assemblies are treated differently on the basis of their sexual orientation.

Acting as interveners - the right to truth

JANOWIEC AND OTHERS V RUSSIA

This ground-breaking case concerns the historic ‘Katyn Massacre’, in which over 21,000 Polish prisoners were executed without trial by Soviet forces in 1940 and buried in mass graves in the Katyn forest. The applicants are relatives of some of the victims of the massacre. They complain that the Russian authorities failed to carry out an effective investigation into the deaths of their relatives, in violation of the right to life and the prohibition on inhuman and degrading treatment. The case is likely to establish the extent to which there is an obligation to investigate particularly atrocious crimes which took place prior to the existence of the European Convention on Human Rights itself.

A third party intervention submitted by EHRAC, Memorial and the Essex Transitional Justice Network in January 2013 focused on the on-going obligation to investigate gross human rights violations and the right of family members to know the truth about the circumstances in which their relatives died or disappeared. The intervention drew on international human rights law, international humanitarian law, customary international law and the case law of regional human rights systems.
Our ambition is to strengthen our position as a leading human rights organisation, specialising in the European Convention on Human Rights, recognised and respected by peers and partners for our expertise, experience and integrity. Our specific objectives are:

BUILDING CAPACITY

We will focus on our capacity-building work at three levels: individual lawyers, organisations (NGOs), and civil society.

For individuals, we will work with legal practitioners to build their capacity through joint litigation and mentoring, and dedicated training programmes. Ownership of cases will lie with the partner lawyer and mentoring and training will be adapted to their specific needs.

For organisations, we intend to facilitate conditions that allow individuals to build and enhance their knowledge and skills. We will invest in NGO management so that organisations are able to support their legal teams effectively, and are able to provide effective checks and balances to government actions.

For civil society, we will increase knowledge among vulnerable or marginalised people of legal mechanisms, so that in the event of a human rights violation the victim(s) are equipped to access support and mechanisms for redress. We will also continue to raise awareness of European Court judgments and the state’s obligations to implement them, so that activists are able to hold their state to account.

GEOGRAPHY

Our strategic priorities for the next decade are to:

• Develop our work in Russia, Georgia, Armenia, and ensure our reach continues to extend beyond the capital cities into more remote and volatile regions
• Actively develop stronger relationships with partners across Azerbaijan
• Build on our connections in Ukraine and assess the potential for partnerships there
• Assess the needs and opportunities for EHRAC within the former Soviet Union as a whole

We will also respond to incidents where there is sudden, urgent need and where our expertise offers clear benefits.

LITIGATION FOCUS

Across the region, our primary objectives in the coming 10 years will be to:

• Continue our focus on the right to life, especially cases arising from conflict situations and gross violations of human rights.
• This includes the right to truth
• Build on and expand our work around the rights to freedom of association and assembly
• Consider developing expertise on minority rights, gender-based violence and environmental issues

ADVOCACY AND IMPLEMENTATION

We will conduct regular advocacy trips to Strasbourg with partner lawyers, in order to develop meaningful contacts with delegates at the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary assembly, and government representatives; to update and share information on our cases and priorities; and to lobby on implementation and other issues. In the UK we will focus on developing contacts at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to complement the advocacy work in Strasbourg. We will incorporate training on the implementation and execution of judgments from a Council of Europe perspective into our existing programmes.

DEVELOPING PARTNER RELATIONSHIPS

We will focus on our ‘partner offer’: the support and resources we are able to offer partner lawyers and organisations, based on the skills that EHRAC itself holds at a high standard. Each partner will be consulted to identify the elements of our offer that are beneficial to them in order to form a partnership agreement.

Partners will be selected according to their alignment with EHRAC’s strategic priorities, and when at least one element of our offer meets their needs.
EHRAC has run a successful internship programme since launching in 2003. These interns have made a huge contribution to our work and enabled us to achieve more than our resources would otherwise have allowed, offering skills in legal research, translation, marketing, finance, design and much more.

We endeavour to ensure that interns develop their skills and abilities during their time with us by involving them in all aspects of our work, so that they become integrated into the team and learn about the day to day running of an NGO. In this way they gain practical work experience, and many of our intern ‘alumni’ have gone on successfully to find employment within the human rights sector.

A large number of volunteers have given their time, translating documents from and into Russian, Georgian, Azeri and Armenian. This has been of great benefit to our work over the years and enabled us to take on more cases than would have been possible without this contribution.

Over the past decade over 300 interns and volunteers have contributed to our work, and we are extremely thankful to these individuals. A full list can be found on our website at www.mdx.ac.uk/ehrac/intern.

“My internship at EHRAC was a wonderful experience; it was in fact more than I could have expected! Over the period of 9 months I was able to spend many hours working on very interesting and challenging tasks. This included a number of research tasks as well as administrative ones. I am very grateful to the entire team for sharing their expertise and knowledge and for helping me to learn and grow in developing my skills. Moreover, the staff always made me feel like a full-time member of the group.”

Irina Shakhnanova, October 2012 - June 2013
A thank you to our supporters

EHRAC was set up in 2003 with the support of a three year grant from the then European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights. Since then, the major contributors to our core work have been:

We have also been fortunate to receive additional support and funding from:

- ACAT Suisse
- Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust
- Committee to Protect Journalists
- Council of Europe
- Foreign and Commonwealth Office
- Friedrich Ebert Stiftung
- Law Society of England & Wales
- London Metropolitan University
- Middlesex University
- Netherlands Helsinki Committee
- Persila Foundation

We would like to express our sincere thanks to all the foundations and individuals (past and present) who have given us vital financial assistance over the years, without whom we would have been unable to carry out our work in support of human rights protection in the former Soviet Union.
Statement of Financial Activities
European Human Rights Advocacy Centre
1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2012

Until 31 December 2012, EHRAC was a centre within London Metropolitan University. The University-wide annual audit of accounts was carried out by independent external registered auditors and chartered accountants, reporting to the Board of Governors of London Metropolitan University.

This summary of financial information represents the period January to December 2012. The information is derived from a schedule of EHRAC income and expenditure, subjected to an agreed upon procedures review by the University’s external auditors for the period January to October 2012, with income and expenditure for the rest of the year derived from internal records. The Fund balances have been computed based on the total funds taken over from London Metropolitan University to Middlesex University, by agreement, as at 31 December 2012 and the unexpended amount of restricted grants as at the same date.

The statutory accounts for the year ending 31 July 2012 at London Metropolitan University can be found at http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/company-information/statutory-accounts

* Grants receivable are included in this statement of financial activities for 2012 only, to reflect the grants owed to EHRAC that were postponed due to our move to Middlesex.

+ This includes funds held on behalf of partner organisations in Russia and the South Caucasus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Total Jan-Dec ’12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and donations received</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>261,409</td>
<td>261,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants receivable*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48,793</td>
<td>48,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>13,674</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Incoming Resources</strong></td>
<td>13,964</td>
<td>310,202</td>
<td>324,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources Expended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising and Publicity Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,176</td>
<td>21,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charitable Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional programme: Russia/ Georgia/ Azerbaijan/ Armenia</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>130,941</td>
<td>135,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights litigation and advocacy</td>
<td>10,530</td>
<td>97,990</td>
<td>108,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights training</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>23,310</td>
<td>25,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness and disseminating information</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>30,584</td>
<td>35,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support costs</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Administration</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>7,923</td>
<td>8,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total resources expended</strong></td>
<td>24,234</td>
<td>318,824</td>
<td>343,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Outgoing Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 10,270</td>
<td>-8,622</td>
<td></td>
<td>-18,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balances at 1 Jan 2012+</strong></td>
<td>234,306</td>
<td>32,658</td>
<td>266,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balances at 31 Dec 2012+</strong></td>
<td>224,036</td>
<td>24,036</td>
<td>248,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>