

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

This report should be a composite of all previous interim reports, plus the information & analysis of the last phase.

1. Name of beneficiary of grant agreement and of legal representative:

London Metropolitan University; Chris Topley

2. Name and title of the person responsible for the project:

**Philip Leach, Director, European Human Rights Advocacy Centre (EHRAC);
Senior Lecturer in Law**

**Bill Bowring, Academic Co-ordinator of EHRAC; Professor of Human Rights
and International Law**

3. Title of the project:

**Strengthening Capacity for Support for Women and Men making Complaints
against the Russian Federation to the European Court of Human Rights**

4. Reference number of the project: **B7-701/2002/1176**

5. Start date of the agreement: **5 December 2002**

6. End date of the project: **31 March 2006 (extended from 6 December 2005 on 14
September 2005 – Addendum 2)**

7. Target country(ies) or region: **Russian Federation**

8. Target beneficiaries &/or target groups¹ (if different) (including numbers of
women and men):

The beneficiaries of this project have comprised: (a) women and men in Russia (notably Chechnya) who seek redress from the European Court of Human Rights for human rights violations committed against them or members of their family; (b)

¹ The target groups are the people who will ultimately benefit from the project activities. The beneficiaries are the people who will participate directly in the project. Many times these will be the same people, but not always. For example, in a programme to raise the awareness of judges and politicians about the rights of indigenous peoples, the beneficiaries of the activities will be the judges and politicians, but the target groups will be the indigenous peoples about whose rights the beneficiaries are being made more aware.

human rights organisations and human rights lawyers in Russia who provide advice and assistance to the victims of human rights abuses.

As of 31 March 2006, the project was working on 85 European Court cases. The target beneficiaries numbered 539 individuals, 222 of whom were applicants themselves (117 women and 105 men), as well as 317 of their immediate family members (182 men, 114 women and 21 unknown) who have also been directly affected by the violations.

The primary target group has been the large number of persons who complain of egregious human rights violations committed by Russian Federal forces in Chechnya. Human rights violations in the region disproportionately affect men, especially 'disappearances' and extrajudicial killings (97 victims in EHRAC's current Chechen cases are men and 55 are women). However, just over half the applicants in the Chechen cases are women, who in many cases have lost their husbands, sons or other family members or had their homes destroyed as a result of actions taken by Russian armed forces against civilians.

A secondary target group has comprised individuals and organisations throughout the Russian Federation who claim to have suffered human rights abuses. These are well-documented by Memorial, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and others respected human rights monitoring bodies. They include victims of discrimination (particularly on grounds of ethnic identity); those who suffer from environmental pollution; people who are the subject of unfairness within the criminal and civil justice systems; those who have been subject to appalling conditions in prison; conscripts complaining of bullying within the armed forces; and those who were victims of deportation and other abuses during the former Soviet era.

Russian human rights NGOs, notably *Memorial*, have been a further target group. *Memorial* is well known in Russia for its highly-principled activity, and is ideally placed to deal with applications from all over the country, as its Human Rights Centre has 58 regional offices throughout Russia, including several offices in Chechnya and Ingushetia. Other human rights NGOs working in Russia have also been able to benefit from this resource, by (i) obtaining expert advice and assistance from project staff; (ii) attending project training sessions in Russia (September 2003, September 2004, December 2004, June 2005 and September 2005); and (iii) receiving the bi-annual Bulletin, the training manual and by consulting the project's websites. In these ways it has been possible to provide a unique service to Russian human rights lawyers.

9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place: The Russian Federation and the United Kingdom
--

A. Compliance with the Grant Agreement

1. Has the project been carried out as foreseen in the terms of reference of the agreement? If not, please explain how and why the original proposal was modified, including the dates that any addenda were requested and received.

The project has been carried out in accordance with the grant application.

However, over the course of the project, there were some (relatively minor) delays in the implementation of various activities. These are described below.

In the first year, the Steering Committee meetings were scheduled for month two (February 2003) and month six (June 2003). However, as the project developed in the first few months, it was felt that it would be more useful for the project if the Steering Committee meetings were to be held slightly later in the year. Accordingly, Steering Committee meetings were held in June and September 2003 (months six and nine). Due to the changes to the schedule of Steering Committee meetings in year one, the third Steering Committee meeting (originally scheduled for December 2003) took place in April 2004.

The first training seminar was originally scheduled for month seven, which fell in July 2003. However, in order to avoid the summer break, when many staff were taking annual leave, this was held over until September 2003. Similarly the UK internship was due to commence in August 2003, but was held over until September 2003. This had a knock-on effect on the Russian interns travelling to London, which took place in December rather than September 2003.

Each of these activities therefore took place within the first 12 months, as originally envisaged.

During the second year of the project, the mini-internship for Russian lawyers in the EHRAC London office (to include attendance at a European Court hearing in Strasbourg) which was due to take place in November 2004, had to be postponed to February 2005 because the ECtHR did not schedule any hearings in November 2004. However, it was considered to be more productive, and cost effective, to bring forward the mini-internship for Year 3, which therefore also took place in February 2005, ahead of the scheduled timing, in order to combine the mini-internship for both years 2 and 3. Permission was sought and obtained for these changes from, Ms. Tatiana Bokareva, the EC's Project Officer in Moscow (by email of 28 January 2005).

In the second year, the first and second editions of the EHRAC Bulletin were published in June and December 2004, rather than in May and July 2004, as originally envisaged. The slips in the timescale were caused by delays at various stages, including the commissioning of articles, the translation and editing stage and the publication stage. Nevertheless, two editions of the Bulletin were published in the second year, as originally planned.

The development of the Russian website took longer than had been anticipated. Preparations of materials for the site continued throughout the first half of 2004 and because of technical capacity issues, it was decided to commission external IT support. Accordingly, an external website designer was appointed early in 2004 to

develop and advise on the Moscow-based website. Following his departure, a second, replacement adviser was appointed in the Autumn of 2004. At that time the Memorial web operators were in the process of re-designing the entire Memorial site and were not able to meet and consult with the newly appointed web designer to discuss the incorporation of the project web pages. November saw the finalisation of the web pages and approval by the Memorial directors and the site was launched in early December 2004.

During the third year of the project the receipt of several judgments, including those in the first six Chechen cases in February 2005, entailing intensive presswork and fundraising activities, particularly during the summer of 2005, and considerable further legal work, meant that certain project activities fell behind schedule.

The third and fourth bulletins were published in June and December 2005 instead of May and October 2005. The training manual was scheduled to be printed and circulated in August 2005. However, the manual was actually printed in January 2006 and circulation took place during January-March 2006. In addition to the abovementioned staff time constraints, this publication is considerably larger (528 pages) than was originally anticipated (which is undoubtedly a benefit for the recipients of the manual). The increased text volume meant that translation, editing, checking, proofreading and typesetting all took longer than was initially planned and it was felt that quality should not be compromised by unduly rushing the process.

The period spent by the legal consultant in Moscow had to be altered as it proved impossible to recruit a suitably experienced candidate who was also available for a continuous three month period. The legal consultant was accordingly recruited for two periods of one month (September and November 2005).

The second internal evaluation report was completed in August 2005 rather than June 2005 as was originally anticipated. This was due to the illness and other work commitments of Dr. Robert Dunbar, who was commissioned to complete the report.

A request was made for an extension to the project of approximately four months on 31 August 2005. An extension to 31 March 2006 was confirmed by email by Tatiana Bokareva on 6 September 2005. The grant contract was amended accordingly by Addendum 2 and signed on 14 September 2005.

2. Was the provisional budget of the project respected? If not, please explain any changes that occurred.

In 2003 several changes to the budget were required:

- a) One of the three posts for lawyers in the Moscow office was split into two 0.5 posts initially to allow for a senior Memorial Director to oversee the management of the Moscow office and the Russia side of the project activities on a part-time basis. Due to the difficulties recruiting for the remaining 0.5 post, the post was offered as full-time for a fixed 1 year period, using funds unspent for the 0.5 post over the first project year.
- b) We were unable to recruit for the Administrator post in the Moscow office until the salary offered was increased from €292 per month to €435.
- c) The salary levels of human rights activists from Memorial (working 0.5) had to be decreased from €375.66 to €300 to reflect actual salaries paid.
- d) The unit rate of the Academic Co-ordinator was increased by €65 via transfer from finance staff costs to reflect actual salaries paid.
- e) The fee paid to the Legal Consultant commissioned to train lawyers in the Moscow office for 3 months was reduced to the level commensurate with the experience of the lawyer.
- f) Per diems for UK staff in Russia were decreased from 28 units to 25 and transferred to 'Visits by Moscow staff to regions' to better reflect the needs of the project.
- g) The per diem level of €249 was reduced to €195 as it was sufficient to cover the living costs of the Legal Consultant. Some of the unspent funds were transferred to 'Moscow staff to UK for training' to allow for a longer training period and a third Russian lawyer to participate in the internship.
- h) The level of per diems of the regional staff to go to Moscow for training was reduced from €249 to €210 as it was sufficient for subsistence costs.
- i) International travel between UK and Moscow was amended to include Strasbourg to reflect the aims and activities of the project as indicated in the narrative of the grant application. The budget here was also increased by a transfer of €1,000 from 'Regional staff to Moscow for training' and €1,000 from 'Office furniture in London', the costs of which were lower than originally anticipated.
- j) The cost of consumables had been underestimated and a transfer of €500 from 4.3 (Other services including tel/fax) was required.
- k) Expert witness costs were reduced by €3,000 in the first year as the few expert witnesses required in the first year worked on a voluntary basis, €1,000 was transferred to 'Translation' as costs were inadvertently left out of the budget in this category which is crucial to the casework, and €1,000 was transferred to 'Costs of conferences and seminars' which was underestimated in the original budget, and a further €1,000 was transferred to 'Training materials'.
- l) Evaluation costs were overestimated and accordingly reduced by €1,000 with €500 transferred to 'Financial Services' to cover bank transfer costs which had been inadvertently left out of the original budget and €500 to 'Translations'.

Approval for each of these amendments (a-l) was received from the European Commission by e-mail dated 4.12.03.

In 2004, a formal budget amendment was requested, as well as the release of €30,000 of the contingency reserve. The operation of the project revealed limitations in the original budget, and a budget amendment became necessary to better facilitate the conduct of the project. For example, per diem rates of €249 were reduced to €210 and the excess salary costs for UK staff was moved to budget areas that were underestimated, such as international travel costs to accommodate the flight expenses of Russian lawyers attending the mini-internship in London and Strasbourg, and for UK and Russian lawyers to attend case hearings.

It is also transpired that the original budget had omitted certain necessary costs altogether. For example, the cost of training/conference centre facilities, bank transfer fees and translation costs, amongst others, all of which are essential to the project, were omitted. The UK network of lawyers, assisting voluntarily on the cases do not have knowledge of Russian and the translation of Russian case documents were crucial to enable them to work on the cases. The project was reliant on the help of volunteer translators, which was adequate, but not wholly satisfactory, as the work was slow and not always of the requisite quality. A professional standard of translation was required for the 2nd and 3rd year of the project. For these reasons, the release of the contingency reserve was necessary.

Approval for the budget amendment and the release of the contingency reserve was obtained from the EC on 18 June 2004.

A second budget amendment was approved by the EC on 24 October 2005. The amendments made were a logical result of the extension to the grant period (approved in September 2005) and also addressed the underestimation (primarily translation) and overestimation (including office running costs, support costs and website hosting) of costs in the initial budget. The following changes were approved by the EC and reflected in the grant contract in Addendum 3:

- a) Salary costs were increased by a total of €52,799 to accommodate salary costs up to the end of the extended project period.
- b) The cost of specialist casework lawyers was reduced by €2,000 as a considerable amount of the litigation work is carried out by the EHRAC lawyers in-house.
- c) The cost of the litigation consultant was reduced by €7,100 as the final year consultancy was reduced from a period of 3 months to 2 months and the commission fee had remained low over the 3 years.
- d) €12,400 was reallocated from per diems for the litigation consultant in Moscow. This surplus was due to the reduced consultancy period in the third year and the reduced rate of per diems.
- e) An extra €950 was allocated to international travel to allow further project/case meetings during the extended period.
- f) The cost of travel to the regions was overestimated, therefore €2,000 was redistributed from this category.

- g) Office rent in Moscow was overestimated by €2,149 based on current rent costs. Therefore the remainder was available for reallocation.
- h) The cost of office supplies was overestimated by €2,500. Therefore the remainder was available for reallocation.
- i) The cost of office support costs was overestimated by €8,000. Therefore the remainder was available for reallocation.
- j) The cost of website design and maintenance were originally overestimated. The Russian web pages have been hosted on Memorial's main site and consequently did not incur the anticipated start-up costs of designing and launching a new website. A total of €18,000 is available for reallocation from this category.
- k) Expert witness costs were overestimated, as some experts offered their services on a voluntary basis due to the nature of the casework. Consequently €4,800 is unspent on this budget item.
- l) €1,800 is reallocated from insurance for legal work as this cost was initially overestimated.
- m) On the basis of the previous audit fee, €4,000 will be unspent in the auditing costs category, and therefore can be reallocated.
- n) Evaluation costs were originally overestimated, accordingly €4,500 will be left remaining for redistribution.
- o) An additional €15,000 was transferred to translation costs. The volume of translation required for case documents is fairly high. Translation is also required for bulletin materials, project management related documents, training materials, etc. Between February and August 2005, over €26,000 was spent on translations. Accordingly extra monies were required in this category to cover the extended project period.
- p) €1,000 was reallocated from financial services to reflect the current usage level.
- q) An additional €1,500 was allocated to training materials to cover the costs of legal texts and resource materials for the use of Russian lawyers. A number of the most useful legal texts are in English and, unfortunately, very expensive, but they form a crucial resource for litigating lawyers.

B. Project Objectives

- | |
|--|
| 1. Please list all project objectives, and indicate if they were modified. |
|--|

The overall objective of the project has been to strengthen the capacity of the Russian human rights NGO, Memorial, to provide assistance for women and men in the Russian Federation who complain of violations of their human rights as guaranteed by the European Convention on Human Rights, which Russia ratified in 1998. The project also seeks to build a sustainable resource for individuals, lawyers and NGOs who wish to make use of international human rights protection mechanisms.

The specific objectives have been as follows

- To strengthen the capacity of the “Memorial” Human Rights Centre in Moscow, by the provision of premises, administrative staff and additional legally trained advisers;
- To strengthen the capacity of a number of its 40 (now 58) branches, especially in Chechnya and Ingushetia, where most of the IDPs from Chechnya are to be found;
- To establish an administrative and advice structure in London, based at and organised from London Metropolitan University, with the support of the Bar Human Rights Committee of England and Wales;
- To create a system for drawing on the experience of the barristers of the Bar Human Rights Committee, many of whom have Strasbourg experience, as well as experienced solicitors, and NGOs such as Amnesty International, Interights, and others;
- To facilitate the giving of assistance by experienced human rights lawyers and NGOs in advising complainants, drafting pleadings, and providing representation at Strasbourg and at in-country fact-finding hearings of the European Court of Human Rights in Russia;
- To provide intensive and on-going training to advisers from Moscow and the Russian regions in the practice and procedure of the European Court of Human Rights; this training will focus on “training the trainers” and on cascading (passing on the knowledge) - throughout the Federation;
- In particular, to give practical training in English legal drafting, English being one of the two official languages of the European Court;
- To provide UK interns (young qualified lawyers with some Strasbourg experience) for periods of three months in Russia;
- To bring Russian lawyers to the UK to acquaint themselves with the experience and present practice of leading UK lawyers and NGOs in human rights litigation at the European Court of Human Rights at Strasbourg, UN Human Rights Committee, and other international mechanisms;
- If possible, to enable one or more Russian lawyers to witness appropriate case hearings in Strasbourg;
- To create resource “centres of excellence” in Moscow and the Russian regions on which all concerned with complaints under the ECHR and other international instruments, for example complaints under the First Optional Protocol to the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Russia is a party, may draw;
- To create and disseminate quality training materials based on the activities referred to above;
- To create, as part of the existing "Memorial" website (www.memo.ru), a set of pages for the widest public use;
- To provide the basis for support for human rights complaints to all international mechanisms by persons from the whole FSEE (Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe) area;

These objectives, as originally set out in the grant application, were not modified and remained valid throughout.

In the following ways, these objectives have in fact been enhanced or developed over the course of the project:

- (i) The project has been able to recruit a lawyer to be placed with the Moscow office (for three months in the first two years and two months in the final year) who has significantly more experience and expertise than originally envisaged. Therefore, the position was re-named “Litigation Consultant”, rather than “UK intern”;
- (ii) English-language versions of the bi-annual Bulletin have also been produced (in addition to the Russian-language version). The first three of which were produced only in electronic version, the fourth in both print and electronic format;
- (iii) An English-language website has been established (as part of the London Metropolitan University website) which details the progress and achievements of the project, in order to raise awareness amongst the international community, potential funders, volunteers, interns and the general public.

Accordingly, the project has sought to achieve each of these additional objectives.

C. Project Activities

1. Please list all the activities since the beginning of the project.

Eg: Activity 1:

Conference at town W with X participants for Y days on Z dates

Title of the activity:

Topics covered:

Reason for modification for the planned activity (if applicable):

Your assessment of the results of this activity:

(1) Steering Committee

An international Steering Committee was established comprising representatives from Memorial, London Metropolitan University and the Bar Human Rights Committee of England & Wales.

Its membership is as follows (as at 31 March 2006):

Professor Bill Bowring (London Metropolitan University)
Peter Carter QC (Bar Human Rights Committee)
Aleksandr Cherkasov (Memorial)
Rupert D’Cruz (Bar Human Rights Committee)
Svetlana Gannushkina (Memorial)
Tatyana Kasatkina (Memorial)
Philip Leach (London Metropolitan University)
Tanya Lokshina (Demos)
Oleg Orlov (Memorial)
Aidan Rose (London Metropolitan University)

Steering Committee meetings were held as follows:

- (1) in June 2003 (Moscow);
- (2) in September 2003 (Moscow);
- (3) in April 2004 (London);
- (4) in September 2004 (Moscow);
- (5) in September 2005 (Moscow).

The Steering Committee Agendas can be found at Annex A. At each meeting, the Steering Committee was presented, inter alia, with narrative and financial reports relating to the project. The Steering Committee approved its own terms of reference (Annex B) and a Partnership Agreement (Annex C).

The Steering Committee has discussed matters relating to all aspects of the project's activities, including staffing and recruitment, premises, litigation strategy, media relations, publications and financial matters (see the meeting minutes at Annex D).

(2) Staffing

In **Moscow**, Tatyana Kasatkina, the Executive Director of the Memorial Human Rights Centre, has been over-seeing the project in Russia since its inception. This project funds half of her time.

Kirill Koroteev and Dina Vedernikova were appointed as full-time lawyers under the auspices of this project on 1 May 2003. On 1 January 2004 Ruslan Yandarov (who is Chechen, a former judge, and a practising advocate) was appointed as the third lawyer in the Moscow office. Mr Yandarov left the project in April 2004 on seeking asylum in the United States. Natalia Kravchuk was appointed as the third lawyer in the Moscow office as from January 2005.

Kirill Koroteev left the position of full-time lawyer on 30 September 2005 to study for an LLM at the Sorbonne, Paris. As of 1 October 2005 he took on the position of Case Consultant and continued to work on his existing cases for EHRAC. He has been in regular contact with both the Moscow and London offices from Paris by email and telephone.

After steps were taken to recruit a suitable replacement for the position of Moscow Lawyer, previously held by Kirill Koroteev, Eleonora Davidyan was appointed to start on 1 November 2005, working 4 days a week.

In August 2003 Ekaterina Kokorina was appointed as Administrator in Moscow. She was replaced on 1 November 2003 by Ekaterina Newman, who was replaced by Elena Ryzhova in November 2004.

Five field workers in the regions of Russia were originally appointed, as follows:

<i>Region</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date appointed</i>
Perm	Roman Maranov	15 May 2003
Ryazan	Irina Ananyeva	15 May 2003
Pyatigorsk	Elena Samburova	15 May 2003
Krasnodar	Vladimir Gaydash	15 May 2003
Nazran	Medna Abdulkadyrova	15 May 2003

Medna Abdulkadyrova subsequently resigned due to the pressures of working in the Chechen region, and her successor, Isa Gandarov, was appointed on 1 September 2003. Roman Maranov resigned on 30 September 2003. The position held by Elena Samburova was terminated as from 31 December 2003.

In 2004, two additional fieldworkers were actively sought, leading to the following new appointments:

<i>Region</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date appointed</i>
Urus Martan	Dokka Itslaev	1 June 2004
St. Petersburg	Olga Tseytlina	1 November 2004

In view of the extensive casework emanating from Chechnya, it was agreed in 2004 that other Memorial employees based in Chechnya (including Grozny and Urus-Martani) would assist with the Chechen-related casework on an ad hoc basis, in support of the work carried out by Isa Gandarov from Nazran and Dokka Itslaev from Urus Martan.

Vladimir Gaydash left the project on 31 July 2005 and was replaced by Marina Dubrovina (also working in the Krasnodar region, but from Novorossiysk, rather than Krasnodar) on 1 September 2005.

Five working meetings were held in May and June 2003 involving the Memorial Moscow office and the regional field workers, in order to discuss the project in general, the field workers' job descriptions and their terms of contract. Additional extensive project meetings were held in July and September 2004, September 2005 and March 2006.

A number of interns have been working in the Moscow office, carrying out various tasks such as research, including Chris Pool, Tatiana Kurnosova, France Vauchon, Armel Rolland, Oksana Vasilieva and Tanya Rik.

In **London** both Bill Bowring (Academic Co-ordinator) and Philip Leach (Director) have been over-seeing the UK part of the project since its inception.

The Project Manager and Project Administrator posts were advertised in the Guardian newspaper and on the London Metropolitan University website in December 2002. Shortlisted candidates were interviewed in January 2003 with the assistance of Dr. Svetlana Stephenson, senior lecturer in social policy at London Metropolitan

University. As a result of this process, Tina Devadasan was appointed as Project Manager (full-time) in March 2003, and Elena Volkova was appointed as Project Administrator (half-time) in April 2003.

EHRAC has been able to utilise the services of various interns in the London office, including Tom Arrowsmith (an undergraduate law student at the University), Georgina Shelley (a barrister) and various Human Rights LLM students from London Universities. An intern arrangement was also established with Masters students at the University of Surrey, and several postgraduate students from the Institute of Commonwealth Studies have interned in the London office (see the full list at Annex E). Interest in undertaking an internship at EHRAC has grown over the course of the project. EHRAC now receives around 10 applications a week not only from the UK and Russia, but also from Europe, the US and Canada and is therefore able to select interns with skills that closely match the needs of the organisation, particularly a legal background, Russian language and specific IT skills.

Furthermore, from October 2005 to January 2006, EHRAC benefited from the work of three post-graduate law students from the Department of Law, Governance and International Relations at London Metropolitan University (where EHRAC is based). As part of the Human Rights LLM, these students undertook a new clinical legal module within EHRAC entitled 'Litigation at the European Court of Human Rights'. EHRAC's Director, Philip Leach is the convenor of this module. During the course of this module students carried out various tasks related to EHRAC's ECtHR cases, including research, drafting letters and submissions to the Court and other case-related written work.

See Project Structure (Annex F).

(3) Premises

In Moscow, new premises separate from the main Memorial office were identified, and a lease was signed in May 2003. Office equipment was obtained for the new premises, which were in use as from 1 August 2003.

At the end of July 2004, the landlord/administrators of the Moscow office building gave four weeks' notice to vacate, as the building required renovation. New premises were found and the Moscow office was relocated at the end of August 2004.

In London, an office was obtained within London Metropolitan University (the Ladbroke House building in Highbury, north London), which houses both the Project Manager and Administrator, and also desks for translators and interns. The office has its own fax machine. Both Bill Bowring and Philip Leach have offices in the same building.

Tina Devadasan, assisted by Elena Volkova, carried out extensive work in establishing the EHRAC office within the University (liaising with the finance department, human resources, information technology advisers etc).

The EHRAC London office now has workplaces for six people (staff and interns) equipped with PCs connected to the University's network and the Internet and telephone lines.

(4) Formal Launch of EHRAC

The EHRAC office in London was formally launched with a lecture by Lord Frank Judd, on 13 May 2003 at the University. Lord Judd, the former Council of Europe Rapporteur for Chechnya, spoke to an audience of representatives from government, the media, human rights organisations, the Law Society and the Bar Human Rights Committee of the continuing cycle of human rights violations being committed during the current conflict in Chechnya. The event was co-sponsored by Amnesty International and Bindman & Partners, a leading firm of solicitors in London dealing with human rights and civil liberties cases.

University Deputy Vice-Chancellor for Research, Chris Topley, introduced the event, linking the work of the new unit with the social justice aspects of the University's mission statement. The other speakers at the launch were Bill Bowring, Philip Leach and Becky Hess of Amnesty International, which ran a campaign in 2003 focusing on human rights in Russia.

(5) ECHR Casework

(a) Administrative arrangements

EHRAC has worked on a total of 95 cases over the duration of the project, and 85 are currently in progress. This has required extensive administrative preparations and support, in order for the offices in Moscow, London and the regional offices to work efficiently together. A database of all cases has been established in the Moscow office, which records key details on each case, including the current status (see Annex G). This database is being used by the Moscow and London offices to maintain an accurate and up to date record of the cases. Duplicate copies of all files are now held in the London office (and the relevant regional office) and the copying of case documents in new cases is on-going. Furthermore, extensive case documentation in London has to be translated from Russian into English, prior to its being reviewed by the lawyers.

(b) Working methods

The way in which the project staff work together on these cases is as follows. Claimants usually initially make contact with our regional fieldworkers who take detailed statements and obtain relevant documentation. They will also try to locate and contact additional witnesses, if relevant. These materials are then passed to the Moscow office, where the project lawyers provide advice and start to draft the pleadings (in English) for submission to the European Court. In some instances, regional fieldworkers are also drafting pleadings. Lawyers in the London office, and members of the Bar Human Rights Committee, have been providing ongoing advice on general questions of strategy and prioritisation. They also provide specific advice and guidance on individual cases, by giving detailed and comprehensive comments on draft letters and pleadings, and by advising on matters of evidence, procedure and substantive law. This is being done by email, telephone and by fax.

A number of cases have been referred to EHRAC by the European Court itself, and others have been referred directly to the office in Moscow.

Meetings between the Moscow office and/or the London and regional offices are regularly held, in order to discuss both general questions of strategic direction and the progress of individual cases. In May and June 2003 casework meetings were held involving the Memorial Moscow office and the regional field workers. In May 2003, Roman Maranov (Perm) and Oleg Mironov (the Moscow lawyer) met with Memorial Moscow to discuss cases concerning alternative service. In June 2003 Memorial Moscow met with Vladimir Gaydash (Krasnodar) and Irina Ananyeva (Ryazan) to discuss potential ECHR cases. Casework meetings (to discuss the range of cases) involving representatives from the Moscow and London offices were held in September (Moscow) and December (London) 2003.

In July 2004, case meetings between Bill Bowring, Philip Leach and the lawyers in the Moscow office, Dina Vedernikova and Kirill Koroteev were held in the Moscow office. Meetings were also scheduled with Isa Gandarov and Dokka Itslaev in Nazran but, unfortunately, had to be re-located to Moscow due to unrest in the region. Bill Bowring, Philip Leach and Kirill Koroteev travelled to Ryazan to meet with Irina Ananyeva about her cases, whilst Dina Vedernikova travelled to Krasnodar with Bill Bowring and Philip Leach to meet with Vladimir Gaidash with regards to his cases. In October 2004, Irina Ananyeva met with Litigation Consultant Maxim Ferschtman to discuss a litigation strategy in respect of military conscripts.

Further case meetings involving all the Russian and UK staff were held in Moscow in September 2004.

In June 2005 Philip Leach met Olga Tseytlina in Saint Petersburg to discuss casework. Case meetings were held in Moscow in June and September 2005 involving all members of the UK, Moscow and regional legal teams and the legal consultant, Drew Holiner. In November 2005, Drew Holiner travelled to both Ryazan and Saint Petersburg to meet with regional lawyers, Irina Ananyeva and Olga Tseytlina respectively to discuss their cases. During November 2005, Drew Holiner also held case meetings with Isa Gandarov (Ingushetia regional lawyer) and Dokka Itslayev (Chechnya regional lawyer) in the EHRAC Moscow office. In December 2005, Saint Petersburg regional lawyer, Olga Tseytlina, met with Bill Bowring in London to discuss her current cases. In March 2006 Philip Leach held a case meeting in Moscow with all the Moscow lawyers and he travelled together with Moscow lawyer, Eleonora Davidyán, to Novorossiysk to meet with regional lawyer Marina Dubrovina concerning ethnic discrimination cases. There they also held a meeting with members of the Yezidi community, to discuss potential ECHR cases.

(c) Subject matter of the cases

As to the nature of the cases, just over half (53%) concern alleged gross human rights violations in Chechnya: torture, extra-judicial killings, attacks on villages by Federal troops, destruction of property and 'disappearances'.

The remainder of the cases concern a wide variety of issues arising across the Russian Federation, including ethnic discrimination (the Meskhetian Turks and Yezidi in Krasnodar Krai), environmental pollution, unfairness within the criminal and civil justice systems and poor prison conditions.

(d) Hearings

In 2004 the European Court decided to hold hearings in Strasbourg on the merits in seven of EHRAC's cases. This in itself is an indication of the significance of these cases, because hearings have become increasingly uncommon, as the European Court of Human Rights strives to tackle the continuing backlog of cases (as of 1 April 2006, a total of 82,600 cases were pending before the Court). The Court's practice now is only rarely to hold admissibility or merits hearings – most cases are decided 'on paper' without a hearing ever having been held.

The European Court has not yet invoked its fact-finding hearing procedure (which involves sending a delegation of judges to the region to hear witnesses) in respect of the Chechen cases, although EHRAC and Memorial have submitted, and continue to submit, that such hearings are necessary in some of the cases from Chechnya.

(e) Chechen cases

A primary focus of the project has been the work carried out in relation to the first six cases concerning Chechnya to be declared admissible by the European Court of Human Rights (in December 2002) ("the first six cases"). The Moscow and London offices have been liaising as to questions of strategy, procedure and substantive law in relation to the first six cases since the inception of the project - a meeting was held in Moscow in January 2003 to discuss the first six cases. Professor Christopher Milroy, a Home Office forensic pathologist, based at Sheffield University, prepared a report for the first six cases, on instructions from EHRAC. Expert ballistics advice has been sought in another case concerning the bombing of a village in Chechnya.

Final written pleadings in the first six cases were drafted by Kirill Koroteev in Memorial's Moscow office, assisted from London by Bill Bowring and Philip Leach, and were submitted to the European Court in April 2003. On 8 September 2003, further observations were submitted to the court on behalf of the applicants, in response to extensive disclosure of documentation by the Russian government. These were drafted by Kirill Koroteev, again with the assistance of Bill Bowring and Philip Leach. In October 2004 the European Court held an oral hearing on the merits of the first six cases, at which the applicants were represented by Kirill Koroteev, Dokka Itslaev, Bill Bowring and Philip Leach.

On 24 February 2005 the Court handed down three judgments in regard to these six cases. In each case, the Court found Russia responsible for killing the applicants' relatives, in violation of Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), and that the authorities failed to carry out an adequate investigation into the deaths (also violating Article 2). The Court found that Article 13 had been violated because of the failure to provide any effective remedy before the Russian courts.

The Russian Government requested the referral of the three judgments to the Grand Chamber of the Court. However, on 14 July 2005, the European Court rejected the Government's request to refer the judgments to the Grand Chamber of the Court. As a result of this decision the judgments became final on 6 July 2005 and the Russian Government was formally obliged to implement them by 6 October 2005.

EHRAC's lawyers drafted and submitted (on 6 October 2005) a detailed request to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on behalf of the applicants in the first six Chechen cases (Annex H). The communication urged the Committee of Ministers to adopt a rigorous and comprehensive approach when considering the implementation of the judgments at a meeting scheduled to be held on 11-12 October to review government compliance. The request also detailed a number of measures in addition to the payment of compensation, including ensuring that thorough investigations be carried out into the killings of the applicants' relatives, the prosecution of named senior military officials who were found to be responsible for "massive use of indiscriminate weapons" and a review of the military field manuals. Copies of these submissions were also lodged with the European Court of Human Rights, the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe and the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE). Furthermore, on 9 December 2005 EHRAC hosted an NGO meeting to discuss the supervision of the enforcement of European Court of Human Rights judgments in cases arising from the Chechen conflict. The participants (from EHRAC, the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, Demos, Russia Justice Initiative and Amnesty International), reviewed the existing mechanisms for implementing ECHR rulings, the strategy taken by the applicants in the first six cases and considered how best to influence the Russian authorities, other Council of Europe states, and the Committee of Ministers (and other Council of Europe organs) to ensure that the broadest range of measures are taken when implementing the judgments and how to monitor such measures.

The monitoring work on the enforcement of these first judgments is still ongoing.

In the summer of 2004, the European Court began to 'communicate' a number of the project's other Chechen cases (that is, to refer them to the Russian Government for reply) and it was decided that the cases would be given priority, under Rule 41 of the Rules of Court.

In 2005, a further eight of EHRAC's cases arising from the conflict in Chechnya were declared admissible (see below for more details). Many more are being progressed at various stages including a case concerning alleged killings and the destruction of a Nogai village in Chechnya in 1999.

(f) Other cases

Other substantive issues raised by EHRAC's cases include environmental pollution (see the *Fadeyeva* judgment and admissibility decisions in *Dobrokhotova*, *Romashina*, *Ledyeva* and *Zolotaryeva* below), ethnic discrimination (notably of Meskhetian Turks and Yezidi in Krasnodar Krai), civil procedure and criminal justice.

(g) Case status

Judgments

A total of eight judgments have been handed down in relation to eleven of EHRAC's cases.

Khashiyev v Russia (57942/00) and ***Akayeva v Russia*** (57945/00) (24 February 2005): concern the alleged torture and murder of the applicants' relatives by members of the Russian army in Grozny in December 2000. A criminal investigation was opened, suspended and reopened several times but the culprits were never identified. The Court found that there had been violations of Article 2 in relation to the applicants' right to life, the procedural requirements of Article 3 in relation to the prohibition on torture and Article 13 in relation to their right to an effective remedy. The applicants were awarded a total of €35,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and €10,927 in respect of cost and expenses.

Isayeva v Russia (57947/00), ***Yusupova v Russia*** (57948/00), ***Bazayeva v Russia*** (57949/00) (24 February 2005): concern the right to life and protection from inhuman and degrading treatment arising from the bombing in October 1999 by Russian military planes of civilians leaving Grozny, resulting in the wounding of one applicant, the death of the applicants' relatives and the destruction of property. The Court doubted that the government had established any legitimate basis for the attack and found that in any event the attack had not been carried out with the requisite care given the risk to civilian life. The Court found that there had been violations of Article 2 in relation to the applicant's right to life and violations of Article 1 of the Protocol 1 in relation to the destruction of the applicants' property. The applicants were between them awarded a total of €12,000 in respect of pecuniary losses, €45,000 in respect of non-pecuniary losses and €10,926 in respect of costs and expenses.

Isayeva v Russia (57950/00) (24 February 2005): concerns the killing of the applicant's son and three nieces as a result of the indiscriminate bombing by the Russian military of the village of Katyr-Yurt in February 2000. A criminal investigation was opened in September 2000, but later closed. The Court found that although the operation in Katyr-Yurt may have been in pursuance of a legitimate aim, it was not planned and executed with the appropriate care for civilian lives. The Court found the Russian government to have violated the applicant's right to life under Article 2 and, in failing to carry out any adequate investigation, her right to an effective remedy under Article 13. The applicant was awarded €25,000 in respect of non-pecuniary losses, €18,710 in respect of pecuniary losses and €10,926 in respect of costs and expenses.

Klyakhin v Russia (46082/99) (30 November 2004): concerns the arrest of the applicant on suspicion of robbery. After a sustained period of detention on remand, he was convicted, but subsequently the conviction was quashed. In spite of this, the applicant was further detained until he was released as a result of an amnesty. The Court found that there had been violations of Article 5(3), 5(4) and 6(1) of the convention in relation to his right to an effective remedy. The applicant was awarded €5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and €500 in respect of costs and expenses.

Volkova v Russia (48758/99) (5 April 2005): concerns the applicants right to be rehoused in "comfortable" accommodation pursuant to a final judgment of the

Sovetskiy District Court on 22 June 1999. The judgment was quashed by subsequent supervisory review proceedings at the instigation of the local administration. The court considered that the right to a fair hearing before a tribunal as guaranteed by Article 6(1) required that where the courts have finally determined an issue their ruling should not be called into question and consequently had been violated in this case. The applicant was awarded damages of €3,000 in respect of non-pecuniary losses and costs of €1,300.

Zdanoka v Latvia (58278/00) (17 June 2004 and 16 March 2006) concerns the right to free elections guaranteed by Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 and the right to freedom of assembly and association guaranteed by Article 11 of the convention. Zdanoka had been ruled ineligible to be a member of Riga's City Council or to stand as a candidate for the 2002 parliamentary elections based on her former membership of the Communist Party of Latvia. The court found that the lack of a set duration for the applicant's ineligibility was not appropriate for the temporary nature of punitive measures. The Latvian government appealed this case and it was referred to the Grand Chamber. On 16 March 2006 the Grand Chamber found that there had been no violation of Article 3 of Protocol No.1. It felt that there was sufficient flexibility for the courts to reassess the situation as time passes, and also placed significance upon the fact that, as a leading member of the Communist Party of Latvia at the material time, although the applicant did not appear to engage in criminal or undemocratic activities, she did not speak out to distance herself from such activities. The Grand Chamber also found that there was no justification for a separate examination of either Article 10 or Article 11. Therefore, despite several dissenting judgements, none of the applicant's complaints were upheld.

Novoselov v Russia (66460/01) (2 June 2005) concerns Article 3 of the Convention in respect of the conditions in which the applicant was imprisoned in facility no. 18/3 of Novorossiysk for six months during 1998 and 1999. The court found that there had been a violation of Article 3 and awarded the applicant €3,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage plus any tax chargeable on that amount. The court also awarded the sum of RUR12,000 in respect of costs.

Fadeyeva v Russia (55723/00) (9 June 2005) concerns the location of the applicant's home which is situated within the 'sanitary security zone' around the Severstal steel-plant in the city of Cherepovets. The applicant complained under Article 8 of the Convention about the failure to re-settle her and that the operation of the Severstal steel-plant endangers her health. The Court found that there had been a violation of Article 8 and awarded Mrs. Fadeyeva €6,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and €6,500 and £5,540 in respect of costs and expenses.

Admissibility Decisions

A further sixteen cases have been declared admissible (please note – although admissibility decisions in the first three of these cases listed below were received after the grant period they relate to work carried out under the grant):

Goncharuk v Russia (58643/00) (18 May 2006) concerns a shell attack on Grozny by Russian forces. It is further alleged that tear gas was used by Russian soldiers against civilians who were sheltering in a cellar, followed by the indiscriminate shooting of

those who were inside. The applicant claims violations of both Articles 2 and 3 of the Convention. She also alleges a breach of Article 13 due to the fact that she had no effective remedy, and claims that she has been threatened over her application to the court, in breach of Article 34. The court has decided to tie the issue of whether the domestic remedies were exhausted to the merits of the case, and will rule on this at a later date. The application has been declared admissible.

Tangieva v Russia (57935/00) (18 May 2006) concerns the killing of several members of the applicant's family in Grozny, allegedly by Russian forces. The applicant claims that there has been a violation of Article 2 with regard to the killings, as well as a breach of Article 3 as a result of the loss of her family members, the ordeal she has suffered and the need for her to move away from where she lives. She also claims she had no available effective remedy, contrary to Article 13, and that the government has failed to disclose certain relevant documents contrary to Articles 34 and 38(1)(a) of the Convention. The court has decided to tie the issue of whether the domestic remedies were exhausted to the merits of the case, and will rule on this at a later date. Furthermore, the application has been declared admissible.

Makhauri v Russia (58701/00) (18 May 2006) concerns looting soldiers in Grozny. On noticing that they had been spotted by the applicant and two others, it is alleged that the soldiers marched them to a courtyard and shot the three women. By pretending to be dead, the applicant survived the attack. The other two women died. The applicant alleges breaches of Articles 2 and 3, as well as Article 13. The Court has declared the application admissible.

Musayev v Russia (57941/00), ***Magomadov v Russia*** (58699/00) and ***Labazanova v Russia*** (60403/00) (13 December 2005) This case concerns the indiscriminate shootings of the applicants' relatives, allegedly by Russian forces, in the Novye Aldy area of Grozny, Chechnya on 5 February 2000. The applicants argued that Articles 2, 3 and 13 of the Convention had been breached. The Court held the applications admissible.

Zolotukhin v Russia (14939/03) (8 September 2005) The applicant, a Russian national, claimed that his rights under Articles 3, 5, 6 13 and Article 4 of protocol 7 of the Convention had been violated following the manner of his arrest by the Russian authorities, his subsequent detention and repeated detention for the same offence. The Court held that the claim was admissible under Article 4 of Protocol 7 (the applicant's repeated detention).

Alikhadzhiyeva v Russia (68007/01) (8 December 2005) The applicant, a Russian national living in Chechnya, argues that her and her son's Convention rights have been breached following his disappearance after arrest by Russian forces. She argues violations of Articles 2, 3, 5 and 13. The Court held the application admissible.

Magomadov & Magomadov v Russia (68004/01) (24 November 2005) Both applicants, residents of the Chechen Republic, allege that their own and their brother's Convention rights have been violated following his arrest and disappearance, and the subsequent disappearance of the first applicant, by Russian

forces. The Court held that investigation of breach of their Article 2, 3, 5, 13 and 34 rights warranted investigation and declared the application admissible.

Bitiyeva & Iduyeva-Bisiyeva v Russia (57953/00 & 37392/03) (20 October 2005)

The first applicant (an active political figure and anti-war campaigner) argues that her Article 3, 5 and 34 rights have been breached, following her detention by Russian forces. Following the first applicant's murder in May 2003, the second applicant (her daughter) claims breaches of rights under Articles 2 and 3. The Court held the applications admissible.

Lopata v Russia (72250/01) (3 May 2005) concerns the destruction of the applicant's

house during a rocket attack on Grozny on 10 January 2000 and the subsequent injury of the applicant during a rocket attack on a refugee convoy on 23 January 2000. The applicant complains of violations of articles 2, 3, 8 and 13 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol 1 of the Convention.

Dobrokhotova v Russia (53247/99) and ***Romashina v Russia*** (56850/00) (16

September 2004) concern the applicants' residence within the "sanitary security zone" (SSZ), the area of excessive pollution, around the steel factories in the city of Cherepovets. The Cherepovets City Court had upheld the applicants' applications to be re-housed but the decision has not yet been enforced. The applicant's claim before the court under Article 8 of the Convention has been declared admissible.

Zolotaryeva v Russia (53695/00) (16 September 2004) also concerns the SSZ in

Cherepovets. The applicant is a pensioner, labour veteran and an invalid, notwithstanding which the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation has refused to consider any appeals by the applicant.

Ledyaeva v Russia (53157/99) (16 September 2004) also concerns the applicant's

residence within the SSZ. The applicant's situation is aggravated by the fact that her existing house was in a state of disrepair. The applicant refused to be relocated (temporarily) during 1999 whilst her house was being renovated because the alternative accommodation was still within the SSZ and was not of an appropriate standard. Her refusal led to the council disclaiming earlier decisions of the Cherepovets City Court ordering that she be re-housed.

Six cases have been declared inadmissible:

Belenky v Russia (62439/00): On 11 May 2006 the European Court of Human Rights rejected the applicant's complaints under Articles 6,8 and 13 and declared the application inadmissible.

Izatov v Russia (1530/04): On 12 April 2006 the European Court of Human Rights,

with three judges sitting, declared that the application did not satisfy the requirements of Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention. The case was accordingly declared inadmissible.

Akmedov v Russia (57951/00): On 9 July 2004 the European Court of Human Rights, sitting as a committee of three judges, decided that the application failed to meet the

requirements of Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention in that it did not indicate a violation of the rights and freedoms set forth in the Convention.

Bazaev v Russia (58414/00) on 15 November 2004 the European Court of Human Rights, with three judges sitting, declared the applicant's case inadmissible. The complaints did not satisfy the requirements of Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention, and therefore did not indicate a violation of the rights of the Convention and Protocols.

Elsanova v Russia (57952/00): on 15 November 2005 the European Court of Human Rights declared that the applicant failed to demonstrate the requirements of Articles 2, 3, 8, 13, 34 and Article 1 of Protocol 1, which she claimed Russia had breached. Therefore, her application to the Court was declared inadmissible.

Muradovy v Russia (3785/04): on 13 May 2005 the European Court of Human Rights, with three judges sitting, declared the applicant's case against Russia inadmissible. The complaints did not satisfy the requirements of Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention, and therefore did not indicate a violation of the rights of the Convention and Protocols.

A number of EHRAC's other cases have reached the stage of 'communication' to the Russian Government, and the remaining are being progressed at various stages.

(6) Provision of advice internationally

EHRAC's expert advice is also sought by other NGOs, including the Russia Justice Initiative (formerly Chechnya Justice Initiative), the movement "For Human Rights Cooperation in International Human Rights Protection (Sodeistviye), Human Rights Watch, Institute of Religion and Law, Demos/Committee Against Torture (Nizhny Novgorod), Sutjazhnik and others.

In addition, Professor Bill Bowring is providing legal advice and representation in various pending ECHR cases from Hungary, Estonia and Latvia, for example in the Zdanoka case (see Section C(5g) above). This case, and the other cases being conducted against Hungary, Estonia and Latvia, in all of which the applicants are ethnic Russians or Russian speakers, are important in demonstrating that EHRAC will take up human rights issues arising across the region, that EHRAC adopts an even-handed approach, and that it is not solely focused on cases against Russia.

EHRAC has provided legal advice and/or assistance to the following organisations and individuals:

2004

Front Line - relating to an anti-impunity case of the Russian-Chechen Friendship Society (RCFS).

Dr. Belyav, Counsellor on International and European Law and Senior Lecturer, Institute of State Administration (Frankfurt am Main) - on bringing cases before the ECtHR.

Institute of Religion and Law (Moscow) - regarding a claim of just satisfaction and re claiming damages in a case concerning religious freedom.

Moscow Bureau for Human Rights - on a pending ECHR case.

The Becket Fund for Religious Liberty, Washington DC - in respect of a pending ECHR case concerning the closure of a mosque in Baku, Azerbaijan.

Article 42 of the Constitution (Georgia) - on problems associated with the establishment of bar associations in Georgia.

Demos (Russia) - re the application of Article 6 to criminal proceedings.

2005

Art Sans Frontieres - regarding cases of forcible dislocations in the Soviet era.

The son of an applicant to the ECtHR regarding a pending ECHR case.

DEMOS - on a pending ECHR case.

An individual on helping a Chechen family apply to Strasbourg.

Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute and WHO Collaborating Centre, Institute of Psychiatry Advice - concerning using the ECHR in relation to psychiatric patients.

Films By Jove - in relation to a pending ECHR case.

Most Mira - regarding a family made homeless and then accidentally left off the list of victims and regarding the exhaustion of domestic remedies and the time constraints in bringing a case before the ECtHR.

Serm Rating Agency - regarding a case concerning corruption of government and economic management in Moscow.

Institute for Religion and Law (Moscow) - concerning a pending ECHR case relating to a police raid on an Evangelical Church in Izhevsk.

Amnesty International - on the situation regarding an attempt to extradite a Chechen woman from Germany to Russia.

A Moscow advocate on the situation regarding the case of a former "boevik".

Article 42 of the Constitution (Georgia) - regarding the appeal procedure in the Grand Chamber and regarding time constraints on bringing a case to the ECtHR.

Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA) - on the application of the ECHR to Abkhazia and other issues related to a pending ECHR case.

Strategic Litigation Program at the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights - on whether the media would be permitted to be involved in a pending ECHR case regarding the banning of an "Equality Parade" in Poland.

Stichting Russian Justice Initiative - on a pending ECHR case.

An Uzbek refugee in the Netherlands - on what course of action she should take to discover and enforce her rights as a refugee.

2006

Article 42 of the Constitution (Georgia) - on the enforceability at a European level of the right to appeal in Georgia and regarding the structure in the UK (in order to compare with Georgia) of lawyers' associations.

Advice and help for a Chechen and his lawyer making an application to the Court.

Stichting Russia Justice Initiative (SRJI) - on the admissibility of a pending ECHR case.

Human Rights Watch - on the attitude of the ECHR to officers' roles in cases of hazing.

Sutjzhnik - on whether it is possible to argue that domestic remedies have been exhausted due to financial restraints upon the applicant.

An individual - on possible remedies to help him gain rights to which he is entitled as a former Chernobyl resident.

(7) UK Legal team

Members of the Bar Human Rights Committee of England and Wales have been 'recruited' to join EHRAC's legal team, and to assist with ECHR casework and/or human rights training.

Cases have been referred for advice to, inter alia, Miriam Carrion (36 Bedford Row & Bar Human Rights Committee), Matthew Happold (Reader in Law, University of Hull), Samantha Knights (Matrix Chambers and Bar Human Rights Committee), Professor Douwe Korff (London Metropolitan University), Joe Middleton (barrister, Doughty Street Chambers), Tim Otty (barrister, 20 Essex Street Chambers & Bar Human Rights Committee), Jemima Stratford (barrister, Brick Court Chambers & Bar Human Rights Committee), Paul Troop (barrister, Tooks Court Chambers & Bar Human Rights Committee). In addition Caroline Buchan (barrister) conducted research into the Ogden actuarial tables for use in the project's cases (in respect of calculating victims' compensation claims).

(8) Legal Consultant in Moscow

An advertisement for a legal consultant to work with the Memorial lawyers in Moscow for three months from September 2003 was widely circulated in the UK and internationally in May 2003.

In July 2003 an experienced human rights barrister and fluent Russian speaker, Miriam Carrion, was appointed as Legal Consultant to the project in Moscow. From 8 September until 5 December 2003 Miriam Carrion worked in the project's Moscow office, providing advice and support to the Moscow lawyers and to the regional fieldworkers on a wide range of issues, including advice on evidence, ECHR jurisprudence, drafting pleadings, and case and file administration and management. She has subsequently continued to advise on individual cases.

In May 2004, the recruitment process for 2004 commenced and a practising lawyer based in the Netherlands, Maxim Ferschtman was appointed in July as Legal Consultant for Year 2. Mr. Ferschtman, a fluent Russian speaker, has previously worked as a registry lawyer at the ECtHR responsible for applications brought against the Netherlands and the Russian Federation. During the course of his consultancy, he continued to work on updating the litigation plan for the future and providing advice and assistance on individual cases, and by advising on written submissions drafted by the lawyers in the Moscow office. In December 2004, Mr. Ferschtman conducted a two day training seminar for Memorial-EHRAC and Stichting Russia Justice Initiative lawyers and fieldworkers on ECHR litigation practice, including: collection of evidence; the exhaustion of domestic remedies, and filing memoranda in reply to the Government.

After a recruitment campaign over the summer of 2005, Drew Holiner was appointed as the legal consultant for 2005. Mr Holiner is a practising advocate and a member of the St. Petersburg Bar. He is fluent in Russian and has trained and assisted lawyers applying Convention law in domestic litigation and handling complaints to the European Court from a wide range of jurisdictions, including Armenia, Finland, France, Georgia, Russia, Serbia & Montenegro, Turkey and the United Kingdom. Mr Holiner assisted with the organisation and delivery of the annual training seminar and the recruitment of a new lawyer, as well as providing guidance with ongoing casework in the Moscow office. He also travelled to the regions to work intensively with EHRAC's regional lawyers. Additionally, Mr Holiner gave training to Stichting Russia Justice Initiative prior to a merits hearing in one of their cases at the European Court. Instead of three month period as in previous years, Mr Holiner spent two periods of one month in Russia (see Section A 1 above).

(9) Legal Training

An essential goal of this project has been to provide co-ordinated and sustained human rights training and capacity-building in the form of ongoing advice and assistance on human rights cases (through meetings and contact by way of email, fax and telephone). This work has been supplemented through a series of more formal training seminars and workshops. At each such seminar or workshop, EHRAC has emphasised that ongoing support and assistance would be available, via the Moscow

and/or London offices. The seminars have been preceded by needs assessment work and we have striven to provide interactive sessions which are highly relevant and focused. Extensive feedback has been sought, which has then been used in the planning and design of subsequent sessions.

From 16th-18th September 2003 an intensive three-day training seminar was held in Moscow for 19 Memorial staff and 7 delegates from other Moscow-based NGOs which bring ECHR cases (see the delegate list at Annex I).

The training sought to provide practical advice in bringing cases before the European Court of Human Rights (see the agenda at Annex I). The seminar covered the following aspects of human rights litigation: recent developments in ECHR law and procedure; matters of evidence; research and drafting pleadings; conducting hearings; Article 41 claims; judgments and their aftermath. Delegates were required to draft pleadings and take part in a mock Court hearing.

The seminar was followed by an NGO roundtable, which was attended by representatives of the key Moscow-based human rights NGOs, including Memorial, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Chechnya Justice Initiative, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch (see the full list at Annex J). This roundtable discussed developing an ECHR litigation strategy and effective collaboration and cooperation (see Agenda at Annex J).

With financial support from the Foundation for Civil Liberties, Philip Leach, Bill Bowring, Douwe Korff, and Eric Metcalfe from Justice (British Section of the International Court of Justice) took part in a Round Table meeting on Alternative Reporting to UN Treaty Bodies in Moscow, December 2003, organised by the Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute (HRSJ) of London Metropolitan University, to which EHRAC is affiliated.

Between 21st and 24th September 2004, EHRAC held its second annual training seminar, at the Golitsino Centre in Moscow - 'Taking cases to the European Court of Human Rights', attended by 34 delegates (see Annex K for the participants list). This training programme followed the groundwork laid down in the first training session on the European Convention on Human Rights held in 2003 (see Annex I for the agenda). The programme concentrated on the practice and procedure of the ECtHR, and the development of skills in legal drafting and advocacy. Training sessions included practical case studies in work groups for the delegates in respect of both procedure and substantive matters. The case study was devised to reflect local conditions and problems in Russia as accurately as possible (see Annex K for the case study). A moot court hearing was held on the final day.

For the first time, several 'legal clinic' sessions were held, to enable delegates to discuss their current cases and the common problems they face, on a one to one basis with the trainers.

The trainers comprised highly respected academics and practising lawyers, included a Russian lawyer from the Registry of the ECtHR. The experts led sessions on various

themes, including litigation from the European Court's perspective, the admissibility of Russian cases, drafting of pleadings and recent developments in the substantive law.

Feedback forms completed at the end of the training programme by the delegates were universally positive, indicating a high level of satisfaction at the quality of the training materials, subject matter covered, the trainers and the delivery method (see Annex L for report on feedback questionnaire).

In September 2004, HRSJ hosted a three-day study programme in London for Russian Judges and Parliamentarians as part of the EU TACIS project "Development of a System of Administrative Justice in the Russian Federation". The UK visit provided a range of expert opinions on how the reforms with similar objectives have been and are being implemented in the UK, illustrating the characteristics of different types of systems of administrative justice, and signalling reasons for the different approaches to this issue. The UK study consisted of visits to the Administrative Court (Royal Courts of Justice, London), the Law Commission, the Law Society, the Employment Appeals Tribunal, the DCA, EHRAC and public law barristers at Doughty Street Chambers, as well as a roundtable at Ladbroke House with academics from London Metropolitan University and the University of Oxford.

From 14th – 15th December 2004, in conjunction with the Stichting Russia Justice Initiative (SRJI), EHRAC held a further training session on the practicalities of conducting cases before the European Court of Human Rights both at domestic level (the gathering of evidence and the exhaustion of domestic remedies) and in making submissions to the court. The programme started with practical sessions on planning the evidence-gathering process, conducting interviews and summing up and analysing the results of those interviews (see agenda and participants' list at Annex M). The course continued with sessions on identifying issues under the Convention and how best to go about gathering evidence in relation to them. The second day continued with the study of government observations and the process of replying to them. Finally, the course concluded with a presentation on making oral submissions to the court.

The two-day course was conducted by EHRAC's legal consultant Maxim Ferschtman (see previous section) and was attended by thirteen lawyers from EHRAC, including our regional legal caseworkers and Moscow lawyers and the director of EHRAC's Moscow office, Tatiana Kasatkina and lawyers from SRJI. The training session took place at the office of SRJI.

In June 2005 EHRAC held a one-day legal clinic in St. Petersburg: "Utilising the European Court of Human Rights – strategies and developments", led by Philip Leach. The workshop was attended by delegates from the Russian Committee of Lawyers for Human Rights Protection, *Memorial*, St. Petersburg University, the Advice Centre for Refugees, Gordeev & Partners, Yuri Schmidt & Partners, Bellona and Citizen's Watch. See Annex N for the training agenda and list of participants.

The following month, in July 2005, several EHRAC-*Memorial* project lawyers presented talks and participated in panel discussions at a conference entitled "The

Human Rights Academy” sponsored by the Ford Foundation, ABA/CEELI and the General Consulate of Great Britain at the St. Petersburg Institute of Law. Moscow project lawyers, Kirill Koroteev and Dina Vedernikova were panel participants in two different discussions concerning litigation relating to the European Convention on Human Rights at the European Court. Natasha Kravchuk (Moscow project lawyer) presented a lecture on the international protection of children’s rights and Olga Tseytlina (Regional lawyer), spoke on refugee and migrant rights. See Annex O for the programme of the event.

In September 2005, the project conducted its third annual three-day training seminar. This was again held in the Golitsino Centre, Moscow and was entitled “Human Rights in Russia – Implementing Strategic Litigation”. The seminar was attended by a total of 40 delegates representing 20 organisations including NGOs, universities and law firms (see Annex P for a list of participants).

The focus for the third year was strategic litigation, something which was felt to be lacking among NGOs working on the ground in Russia. The shift away from training directly on ECtHR practice and procedure was due to the general increase in prior knowledge in this area among participants and the provision of training on this subject by other organisations. The seminar included the following sessions: “Discrimination in Russia – a strategic response”, “Enforcement of ECHR judgments” and “Chechnya – where do we go from here?”. Several legal clinics sessions were held to enable the delegates to discuss actual cases they are dealing with and common problems they face on a one-to-one basis with the trainers. See Annex P for the full training agenda.

Besides EHRAC’s legal team, the trainers included such experts as Samantha Knights of Matrix Chambers, Tanya Lokshina, chairperson of DEMOS, Maria Voskobitova of the International Protection Centre and Anna Demeneva of Sutyazhnik. See Annex P for the biographies of the trainers.

Feedback forms completed at the end of the training programme were very positive. The participants found the content useful and thought the speakers were knowledgeable. They found the seminar “very useful”, “interesting”, “well-organised” and of a “high professional level”. A summary of feedback can be found at Annex L .

The Moscow lawyers and several of the Regional lawyers have also been invited to attend or act as trainers at an increasing number of events. Thus the cascade effect of passing on knowledge to other organisations and lawyers has really begun to happen from 2005. Below is a summary of these seminars and conferences.

Events at which Russian project lawyers have been speakers or trainers:

Date	Event	Organiser(s)	Who
Mar 03	Seminar on Developments in the Russian Law for lawyers from the Chechen Republic	Memorial, Civic Assistance Committee, UNHCR	Kirill Koroteev spoke on the admissibility of Chechen ECHR applications.
May 05	International Human Rights Litigation	The Netherlands Helsinki Committee	Dina Vedernikova

May 05	Protection of children's rights: national and international mechanisms	Volgograd Region Ombudsman for Children's Rights	Natasha Kravchuk & Dina Vedernikova
July 05	Strengthening the role of law enforcement bodies in the struggle against disappearances in the Chechen Republic	Council of Europe, Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Russian Federation	Kirill Koroteev spoke on: 'ineffectiveness of investigations of human rights violations in the Chechen Republic'
July 05	Summer School - Academy of Human Rights	Centre of legal clinic education of St Petersburg, Institute of Price Oldenurgsky	Natasha Kravchuk, Dina Vedernikova, Olga Tseytlina & Kirill Koroteev
Aug 05	Conference on the Commissioner's Report on the Russian Federation	Memorial, Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe	Kirill Koroteev spoke on: 'ineffectiveness of investigations of human rights violations in the Chechen Republic'
Oct 05	International Human Rights Mechanisms: developing strategic cases	Perspektiva Regional Organisation of Disabled Persons	Natasha Kravchuk & Dina Vedernikova
Nov 05	Seminar on Developments in Migration and Law Practice	Memorial, Civic Assistance Committee, ECRE	Kirill Koroteev spoke on hearings before the ECtHR in the Chechen cases
Nov 05	International conference on Inclusive Education	Perspektiva Regional Organisation of Disabled Persons	Natasha Kravchuk
Nov 05	Application of Articles 9, 13 and 14	Russia Justice Initiative	Dokka Itslaev
Dec 05	Training on articles 2, 3 and 5 of the ECHR	Memorial, Grozny, for lawyers working in Chechnya	Dokka Itslaev
Dec 05	UN System of human rights protection	Liberty House Organisation	Natasha Kravchuk
Mar 05	Practical school for young lawyers on international protection of human rights	Sutyazhnik, Yekateriburg	Dina Vedernikova provided training on Article 14

Events attended as participants:

Date	Event	Organiser(s)	Who
Jun 03	Conference on the Coalition's strategy after the adoption of the Federal Law on Alternative Civil Service	Coalition for Democratic Alternative Civil Service	Kirill Koroteev
Jan 04	Legal Protection of Individual Rights	International Helsinki Federation	Kirill Koroteev
Feb 04	Seminar on developments in migration law	Memorial, Civic Assistance Committee	Kirill Koroteev
Nov 05	Application of Articles 9, 13 and 14	Russia Justice Initiative	Eleonora Davidyan
Dec 05	10th Anniversary of the Russian Family Code Conference	Russian Academy of Justice of the Ministry of Justice	Natasha Kravchuk
Dec 05	Consultation meeting with NGOs and national human rights	Council of Europe	Dina Vedernikova

	institutions on their input into the monitoring of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities		
Feb 06	Follow-up Litigation Survey to the Practical Training in International Human Rights Litigation, with an emphasis on non-discrimination, minority rights and the ECHR	The Netherlands Helsinki Committee, Soesterberg, Netherlands	Dina Vedernikova & Natasha Kravchuk
Mar 06	Training course on international human rights and humanitarian law, international procedures and diplomacy	Geneva for Human Rights, Global Training Programme	Dina Vedernikova & Natasha Kravchuk

On a large number of occasions Prof Bowring has been able to take the opportunity to explain the role and purpose of EHRAC to Russian audiences, and to seek assistance for the project. Below is a non-exhaustive list of events he has attended over the course of the project.

Date	Location	Description
Mar 03	Pyatigorsk, Russia	In March 2003 he provided human rights training under the TACIS project "Legal Protection of Individual Rights in the Russian Federation" in a seminar entitled <i>Chechnya: The Protection of Individual Rights and Armed Conflict</i> .
Apr 03	Nazran, Ingushetia	Trainer for the Council of Europe North Caucasus Project, giving lectures on European human rights protection for students of Chechen State University from Grozny.
Jun 03	Pyatigorsk, Russia	Participated as a trainer and "judge" for the Russian NGO "Sodeistviye" at a training on the ECHR.
Jul 03	Moscow	Spoke at a conference organised by the Moscow-based Institute for Law and Public Policy on reform of criminal justice in Russia.
Aug 03	Anapa, Krasnodar Krai	Participated as a trainer in a Council of Europe seminar on national minorities.
Oct 03	Ust Kachka, Perm Oblast	Participated as a trainer in a Council of Europe seminar on national minorities.
Oct 03	Moscow, St Petersburg, Samara and Pyatigorsk	Key speaker in a speaking tour on racial discrimination and the police, organised by Amnesty International's Resource Centre.
Oct 03	Strasbourg	Took part in a Conference for the fifth Anniversary of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities.
Nov 03	Vienna	Took part in the General Assembly of the International Helsinki Federation spoke on EHRAC and its work.
Nov 03	Togliatti, Samara Oblast	Participated as a trainer in a Council of Europe seminar on national minorities.
Dec 03	Uppsala, Sweden	Participated and gave papers at a conference on the fifth Anniversary of the Russian Constitution, including responding to a paper on the ECHR and the Russian Constitution given by Judge Anatolii Kovler, the Russian judge at the European Court of Human Rights.
Feb 04	Moscow	Trainer in the TACIS Winter School lecturing on litigation before the ECtHR, later in the same visit serving as judge at the Jessup International Moot Court Competition.
Mar 04	Khabarovsk, Russia	Lectured at a Council of Europe workshop for the Russian Militia (police) on ethnic minorities and problems of migration in the Russian Far East.
Jun 04	England	Made a presentation on "The Rule of Law in Russia" at the Royal Institute of International Relations (Chatham House) round table seminar 'The Predatory

		Russian State’.
Sep 04	Astrakhan	Took part in a Council of Europe training for senior judges from the Southern Federal Okrug where he was one of three speakers, with Pavel Laptev, the Russian representative at the Strasbourg Court, and Yurii Kalinin, head of the Russian penitentiary system.
Oct 04	Strasbourg	Participated as Council of Europe expert in a meeting on Education Policy and Minorities in Russia.
Nov 04	Moscow	Took part in work on creation of a system of administrative courts in Russia.
Nov 04	Oslo	Participated and presented a paper at a conference at the Norwegian Institute for International Relations on “Russia in a Common European Legal Space”.
Jan 05- May 05	Georgia	Trainer for a British Council managed TEMPUS Tacis project ‘Reform of the Procuracy’. Five visits to Georgia.
Feb 05	Moscow, Russia	Judge at the Russian National Round for the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition
Mar 05	London	HRSJ hosted a roundtable discussion with the Moscow Helsinki Group. Topic: Finding a balance between the goals of Russian authorities and human rights NGOs.
Mar 05	London	Guest Lecturer for the Russian MIRIBUS MBA students at the LondonMet University
Jun 05	Oslo, Norway	Roundtable Seminar Participant—Law, Judicial Practice and the Russian Petroleum Sector: The Changing Role of the State (Sponsored by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
Jun 05	Nizhny Novgorod, Russia	Representing the Human Rights Committee of the Bar of England and Wales and Front Line, the International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, investigating the situation concerning the actions of state bodies in relation to the Russian-Chechen Friendship Society and Nizhny Novgorod Society for Human Rights
Jul 05	London	London Met—Opening speaker at the Summer School, to visiting Moscow State University Public Administration students – ‘Britain and Russia – similarities, differences, convergences, divergences’
Sep 05	Frankfurt, Germany	Teaching at the Europa University Viadrina’s Human rights Summer School in Frankfurt on Oder, Germany,, attended by students from Central and Eastern Europe as well as UK, USA etc.
Sep 05	Moscow, Russia	Guest lecturer at Moscow State University, presentation to over 100 students on “The Theory of Human Rights”.
Sep 05	Abakan, Russia	Representing the Council of Europe at the International Conference on ‘Siberian Indigenous Languages and Cultures in a Changing Russia’.
Oct 05	London	King’s College. Presentation to School of Law on Human Rights in Russia.
Nov 05	Leeds	Leeds University. Talk at the Centre for Democratisation Studies on ‘Democracy and National Minority Rights in the ex-USSR’
Nov 05	London	Spoke on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law at conference entitled “Chechnya: After Maskhadov” presented by MARCCH and SOAS.
Nov 05	London	Student Law Society, spoke about EHRAC
Dec 05	Brussels, Belgium	European Parliament--Speaker at a conference entitled “Countering Violence and Creating Justice in the Caucasus”. Prof Bowring spoke on EHRAC’s cases
Dec 05	London	Frontline Club. Presentation on violations of the right to freedom of expression in Russia for ARTICLE 19.
Jan 06	London	Presented lecture at the Society for Co-operation in Russian and Soviet Studies entitled ‘Trials of Human Rights in Russia’
Mar 06	London	Spoke at the European Civil Liberties Network conference ‘Turning the tables on the state - achieving human and social rights in the 21st century’

ECHR Litigation Manual

In February 2006 EHRAC published a Russian-language training manual on litigating cases at the European Court of Human Rights (Обращение в Европейский Суд по правам человека, Moscow, 2006, ISBN 5-902962-02-1). The manual is a substantial practical reference work (528 pages) about European Court litigation, with a particular focus on Russian issues. It includes four chapters adapted and translated from Philip Leach's book *Taking a Case to the European Court of Human Rights* (2nd Edition, OUP, 2005) and specially written chapters by Russia specialists on domestic litigation with a view to Strasbourg, admissibility issues in Russian cases and judgments on the merits in Russian cases. An ECHR case study and precedent ECHR pleadings also provide an invaluable training resource.

Five thousand copies were printed in Moscow and have been disseminated widely across the Russian Federation to lawyers, NGOs, human rights ombudsmen, universities and libraries. See below at 2 (v) for more information concerning the dissemination of this publication.

There has been considerable interest in the manual and enquiries have been received from all across the former Soviet Union. Initial and consequent feedback from recipients suggests that people are finding the manual to be an exceptionally useful resource.

(10) Internships

In December 2003, EHRAC organised the first annual mini-internships for Russian lawyers in London and Strasbourg. Each of the three lawyers in the Moscow office took part in the internship: Dina Vedernikova, Kirill Koroteev and Ruslan Yandarov.

The internship programme (see Annex Q) provided the lawyers with exposure to a number of UK-based organisations with a high profile in the human rights field drawn from government, the legal profession and the NGO sector. The interns were able to visit and discuss their respective experiences with NGOs including Interights, Amnesty International, AIRE Centre (Advice on Individual Rights in Europe), Liberty and Justice. They were also given the opportunity to meet officers from the Russia desk at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to learn about their work and discuss the work of Memorial. The International Human Rights Committee of the Law Society and leading civil liberties solicitors firm Bindman & Partners provided the perspective of the legal profession. The interns also made presentations on human rights in Russia to Prof Bowring's students taking the MA in International Relations and LLM in Human Rights at London Metropolitan University.

The interns observed the European Court of Human Rights hearing in the case of *Hirst v United Kingdom*, concerning the current prohibition under English law on convicted prisoners voting in elections whilst in detention. Together with Philip Leach, they met Court Registry lawyers to discuss the working practices of the Court. Meetings were also held with a Court Section Registrar and with the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Alvaro Gil-Robles.

As noted in section A.1. above, the internship scheduled for the Autumn of 2004 was held back until February 2005, because of the lack of any scheduled European Court hearings in the Autumn of 2004.

The combined second and third mini-internships were held concurrently from 20 February to 4 March 2005. Six project staff members participated:

Natasha Kravchuk – Moscow office lawyer
Dokka Itslaev – Regional lawyer, Chechnya
Isa Gandarov – Regional lawyer, Ingushetia
Irina Ananieva – Regional lawyer, Ryazan
Olga Tseytlina – Regional lawyer, Saint-Petersburg
Vladimir Gaydash – Regional lawyer, Krasnodar

They were accompanied by Professor Bowring to Strasbourg to the European Court to attend the Grand Chamber hearing in the case of *Nachova v Bulgaria* concerning the killing of two Roma men by police officers who were attempting to arrest them. Before returning to the UK meetings were held with Natalia Brady, a registry lawyer with the European Court of Human Rights and Frederick Sundberg of the secretariat of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

Activities in London included three training sessions conducted by either Philip Leach or Professor Bowring, several sessions on legal English run by EHRAC's translators (during which participants received comprehensive Russian-English legal glossaries) and meetings with the Parliamentary Human Rights Group, Law Society, Amnesty International, Interights and Russia-desk officers at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the British Government. See Annex Q for the full programme.

The feedback provided by participants showed that virtually all the elements of the programme were highly useful for every participant. See Annex L for a collation of feedback responses.

EHRAC has also hosted many ongoing interns in its London and Moscow offices as detailed under (2) Staffing.

(11) The Media/dissemination of information

In December 2002 information about EHRAC's launch, together with contact details was circulated widely within the UK and internationally, including the Council of Europe; UNDP, Department for International Development (UK), Foreign & Commonwealth Office (UK), the Law Society and the Bar Council. Representatives from the BBC, the Guardian and other national media attended the EHRAC launch in May, which was also covered by the University bulletin, *The Metropolitan*.

EHRAC targeted various specific newspapers/journals to publicise its launch. In January 2003 an article about the project was published in the *Times* newspaper, and in February there was coverage in *Time Magazine*. Articles were written for the UK

national and legal press: the Law Society Gazette in April 2003, Legal Action in May 2003, the Guardian in October 2003, the New Law Journal in February 2004.

Leaflets were produced by the EHRAC office, with contact information and brief details about the project. A second version of the leaflet, with photographs, was produced early in 2005 (Annex R) paid for by London Metropolitan University. A Russian leaflet was also produced in June 2005 in Moscow (Annex S).

EHRAC launched English language web pages within the London Metropolitan website in January 2004 (www.londonmet.ac.uk/ehrac) as a means to raise awareness about the results of the project and advertise our need for volunteers. It has been proved successful, in that there was a sharp increase in general public enquiries about the project, offers from volunteers to assist, and organisations wishing to establish links. Surprisingly, there was also a notable increase in enquiries from Russia following the launch of the English website. Since then, the EHRAC website has been considerably developed, with sections on casework, training, internships, voluntary work and media/journals (<http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/EHRAC>). It has been noted that the EHRAC website has been highly ranked by Google and other search engines, reflecting the wide interest in its contents.

The development of the English language website continued in 2005 and the material on existing pages was updated and supplemented. A new section was added dedicated to EHRAC's ECHR casework. This section hosts Court decisions, judgments and hearing transcripts, summaries of cases, pleadings and submissions to the Committee of Ministers made on behalf of applicants concerning the enforcement of judgments. The section containing journal articles has also been greatly enhanced over the last few months meaning that the website is now a better resource for legal practitioners and students.

The English website now receives between 3,000 and 6,000 hits per month with the most popular sections being those containing journal articles and reporting on the litigation work.

In January 2004 a website/information technology consultant was engaged by Memorial in Moscow to prepare and develop web pages concerning this project to be added to Memorial's existing website (www.ehracmos.memo.ru/index.html).

The content of the Russian website was substantially enriched in 2005/06 (and moved to <http://ehracmos.memo.ru/>). It largely mirrors the English-language website, but with a focus on capacity building materials for lawyers and NGOs in Russia interested in the ECtHR. The Russian website receives around 3,000 hits per month.

The project carries out substantial presswork in both Moscow and London. During 2004, the London office issued four press releases. Extensive press relations were conducted prior to the merits hearing in the first six Chechen cases before the European Court of Human Rights in October 2004. The consequent widespread publicity has contributed to increasing awareness of the situation in Chechnya and the human rights mechanisms available to victims of violations. Coverage was given by

Newsweek (Russia), the Financial Times, the BBC World Service, The Guardian, The Daily Telegraph, Le Monde, The Herald and The Chicago Tribune amongst others.

In 2005 extensive press work was undertaken in relation to the judgments in the first six Chechen cases and the landmark environmental pollution case, *Fadeyeva v Russia*. A total of nine press releases were disseminated in 2005, six of them in relation to the Chechen judgments (delivery and implementation). Over 2005-2006 a total of 18 articles referring to EHRAC's work appeared in the English-language press including pieces in: *The Financial Times, The Daily Telegraph, The Guardian, The Chicago Tribune, The Times* and *The Washington Post*. Extensive online coverage was also received, particularly in respect to the Chechen judgments, in many languages particularly Russian, English and French. A substantial number of articles have also been written for various publications by EHRAC, see section 2(iv) below.

In addition, Professor Bowring has been interviewed by the BBC on several occasions in relation to the project and human rights issues in Russia. Furthermore, Professor Bowring, Philip Leach and Kirill Koroteev were interviewed in Moscow in June 2005 by the Russian television channel, Ren-TV regarding the *Fadeyeva* judgment.

Copies of EHRAC press releases and articles, and selected media reports are attached (See Annex T).

(12) Human Rights NGO liaison

The project has constantly sought to maintain strong, effective and friendly relations with other national and international human rights NGOs, notably those working on human rights in Russia, with frequent meetings being held in Moscow, London and elsewhere. The purpose of such networking is to make known the work of EHRAC, to avoid the duplication of work, to enhance communication between NGOs, and to maximise the effectiveness of civil society.

Meetings have been held in Moscow to liaise with other human rights NGOs in Russia, which are currently conducting ECHR litigation and/or providing human rights training. In January 2003 Bill Bowring and Philip Leach met Malcolm Hawkes, Veselin Popovski and Victoria Webb of the TACIS project "Legal Protection of Individual Rights", which works in partnership with the Russian NGO "Movement for Human Rights" (Lev Ponomaryov) and Maria Pulzetti and Yelena Yezhova of the Chechnya Justice Initiative in Moscow, to discuss our respective projects and the potential for collaborating, where appropriate, and avoiding unnecessary duplication of work. On his frequent visits to Moscow Bill Bowring also met and discussed the project with Karina Moskalenko of the NGO "Sodeistviye, Cooperation in International Protection of Human Rights" which shared a building with the TACIS project; Svetlana Gannushkina of the "Law and Migration" NGO; Valentin Gefter of the Institute for Human Rights (Sergei Kovalyov); Tatiana Lokshina of the Moscow Helsinki Group; Anna Neistadt of Human Rights Watch; and Natalya Taubina of the Foundation "For Civil Society", and Director of the Moscow Research Centre for Human Rights.

In May 2003, the director of Amnesty International's Resource Centre in Moscow visited the EHRAC office. Information sheets about the project have been drafted in Russian for dissemination by the Amnesty office to potential ECHR applicants.

In Moscow in June 2003, Philip Leach met with Veselin Popovski and Victoria Webb of the TACIS project "Legal Protection of Individual Rights", with Maria Pulzetti of the Chechnya Justice Initiative and with Borislav Petranov of the Ford Foundation.

In September 2003, EHRAC held a NGO Roundtable in Moscow for human rights NGOs in Russia, in order to discuss primarily international human rights litigation. It was attended by 40 delegates from organisations including the following: Memorial (from various offices across the Russian Federation), Chechnya Justice Initiative, the International Helsinki Federation, the Legal Protection of Individual Rights (TACIS project), the Ford Foundation, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Law and Migration, the Centre for the Development of Democracy and Human Rights, the Nizhny Novgorod Human Rights Society, the Independent Legal Expert Council, Sutyajnik (Yekaterinburg), Dobroe Delo, the Mothers' Rights Foundation, the Human Rights Institute and Faith, Hope, Love. The Round Table was introduced by Philip Leach followed by a series of 5-10 minute presentations by the delegates to stimulate discussion and debate. The presentations focused on Human Rights NGO litigation strategy and the interplay between litigating and campaigning. The delegates then considered the issues which arose from these presentations in the context of the Russian Federation in a discussion session chaired by Professor Bill Bowring. The discussion covered the priority areas for European Court litigation and the development of a litigation strategy as well as collaboration between NGOs and how to effect change after judgments had been handed down.

In September 2004, a second NGO Roundtable was held at the Ismailova Conference Centre in Moscow. It was introduced by Professor Bill Bowring and Tatiana Kasatkina of *Memorial*. Introductions were followed by a presentation by Philip Leach on the subject of "Pragmatic Reform or the Denial of Access to Justice? – The European Court and Protocol 14". Following the presentation there was a roundtable discussion on the subject of "Russia in Strasbourg: Managing Media and Public Reactions" chaired by Valentin Gefter of the Human Rights Institute.

At this second NGO Roundtable there was again an impressive range of organisations represented by those attending including *Memorial*, Migration and Law, Sutyajnik, EIDHR, Russia Justice Initiative (formerly Chechnya Justice Initiative), the Urals Centre for Constitutional and International Human Rights Protection, the McArthur Foundation, Dobroe Delo, the Human Rights Institute, the St. Petersburg Bar Association, the Slavic Legal Centre, Mothers' Rights and Institute for Religion and Law (See Annex U for participants list and agenda).

A third EHRAC/Memorial roundtable for human rights NGOs took place in September 2005 in Moscow. Professor Bill Bowring (EHRAC) and Tatiana Kasatkina (*Memorial*) introduced the programme. Bill Bowring then chaired a panel discussion entitled "Enforcing European Court Judgments - what now for Russia". The panel comprised Tatiana Lokshina (Demos), Oleg Orlov (Memorial), Olga Shepeleva (Demos) and Philip Leach (EHRAC).

More than 50 participants from a variety of organizations attended the roundtable, including, among others, Sutyajnik, *Memorial*, Stichting Russia Justice Initiative, the Institute of Religion and Law, Moscow State University, the MacArthur Foundation, the Russian Academy of Justice, Amnesty International, Ford Foundation, and the Moscow Helsinki Group (See Annex V for the agenda and full participants list).

(13) Council of Europe

In order to provide information about the project, in February 2003, Philip Leach met with representatives of the Council of Europe Human Rights Monitoring Section (Andrew Drzemczewski and Johan Friestedt), an official in the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights (John Dalhuisen) and the Council of Europe official responsible for human rights training in Russia (Kristina Pencheva).

EHRAC has been actively engaged in the process surrounding the proposed reforms of the European Court of Human Rights. Philip Leach has been working with NGOs (including Amnesty International, the AIRE Centre (Advice on Individual Rights in Europe), Liberty, JUSTICE and Interights) in drafting responses to the various reform proposals and has attended certain meetings of the Steering Committee on Human Rights (CDDH), the committee of government experts which is tasked with putting forward proposals for reform of the Court. He attended a CDDH consultation meeting with NGOs in Strasburg on 25 February 2004. This work has contributed to the reform of the rules relating to the Committee of Ministers' process concerning the implementation of European Court judgments, which will have the effect of increasing the involvement of civil society in the process. In May and November 2005 joint submissions were made to the Council of Europe together with the AIRE Centre and Amnesty International on the reforms of the ECHR system.

(14) Other Advocacy Initiatives

In January 2004 EHRAC became a co-signatory, together with other leading UK-based human rights NGOs, to a letter to the UK Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw, concerning the proposed reforms of the European Court of Human Rights (see further (13) above).

In 2003 and 2004 EHRAC submitted written observations to the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee's inquiry into the Annual Human Rights Report of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (see Annex W).

In November 2004, on behalf of EHRAC, Philip Leach attended a meeting for London-based NGOs hosted by Philip Alston, UN Special Rapporteur on Arbitrary Executions, and spoke about the problems being encountered by applicants in Chechnya.

Together with the Stichting Chechnya Justice Initiative, in 2004 EHRAC has sent Memoranda to the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women and the UN

Special Rapporteur on Arbitrary Executions in respect of the threats and attacks being experienced by European Court applicants from Chechnya (see further at 2 below).

EHRAC has been in regular contact with other Council of Europe bodies, notably the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights and the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights of the Parliamentary Assembly (PACE), concerning the ongoing intimidation and harassment of litigants from Chechnya who have pending cases at the European Court.

(15) Previous Reporting to the EC

A brief initial report was submitted to the EC in March 2003 (this has been posted on the EHRAC website).

In March 2003 officials from the EC delegation in the Russian Federation met with *Memorial* (Tatiana Kasatkina and Kirill Koroteev) in Moscow to discuss the project. In October 2003, Prof Bowring and Brigitte Voland of London Metropolitan University's European Funding Unit met with Jean Jacques Lauture and Bernard Lhoest in Brussels to discuss the progress of the project.

In April 2004, the first interim narrative report and the first interim financial report was submitted to Mr Bernard Lhoest, the Task Manager in Brussels. In July 2004, Prof Bowring and Philip Leach met with Alexey Pankin, Monitor with the TACIS and Balkans Monitoring Programme, in Moscow, to report on the progress of the project, following which a 'monitoring report' was submitted to the EC by Mr. Pankin. In September 2004, Prof Bowring, Philip Leach and Tina Devadasan met with Tatiana Bokareva, Projects Officer of the EC Moscow Delegation who had taken over the responsibility for the project from Brussels. In October 2004, Tatiana Kasatkina met with Tatiana Bokareva to discuss the progress of the project. In November 2004, Tina Devadasan met with Tatiana Bokareva to discuss the progress of the project and has kept in regular contact with the EC's Moscow office staff.

In January 2005, Tatiana Bokareva visited the Moscow office at its new location, and discussed the project with the staff and lawyers. The second interim report was submitted to Tatiana Bokareva in May 2005 and was also posted on the EHRAC website. In June 2005, Prof Bowring, Philip Leach and Tina Devadasan met with Tatiana Bokareva in Moscow to discuss the progress of the project. In September 2005, Tatiana Bokareva attended the third annual NGO round table and met with project staff. In March 2006, Philip Leach and Tina Devadasan met with Anna Tomarovskaya (EIDHR project officer) and Dr Clelia Rontoyanni (Political Advisor) in Moscow to discuss the work of the project.

In March 2006, EHRAC provided a comprehensive set of documents to Ludmila Kaidashova, the EC monitor for the end of the project. She also interviewed Philip Leach by telephone regarding the results of the project.

2. Please list all materials and publications (and no. of copies) produced during the project (please enclose a copy of each item, even if you have already done so in the past).

Please state how your publications are being distributed and to whom.

The project's publications include training materials, information leaflets, bi-annual Bulletins, a training manual and various articles (in the national and legal press).

(i) Training Materials

At the training seminar on 16-18 September 2003, each of the 27 delegates was provided with an extensive ring binder file of 'core' human rights documents in Russian, including forms, resolutions, judgments and reports produced by the European Court, the Committee of Ministers and other Council of Europe bodies. These documents form a core bundle which are essential for litigating before the European Court of Human Rights. Each NGO represented at the seminar retained at least one set of these documents for future use. In addition, each NGO was provided with at least one set of the documents (including a CD-ROM) produced by Nottingham University under the auspices of its project: 'Human Rights Monitoring: Training Materials for Russian NGOs', 2000-2003 (for which Bill Bowring was the Adviser, for the UK government's Department for International Development), incorporating a range of documents relating to human rights from multifarious sources. Delegates were also provided with Russian versions of the Council of Europe booklets on: Articles 5, 6, 8 of the European Convention and Article 1 of Protocol 1.

Further training materials, including case study documents, were produced for the second annual training seminar held in Moscow in September 2004. Fifty copies were produced for the participants, with additional copies for colleagues in their respective offices. At the 2005 training session participants received two chapters from the forthcoming 'EHRAC training manual' (see below) and notes on the lectures to be given during the course of the seminar. (see Annex I for contents list of 2003 training materials, Annex K for 2004 and Annex P for 2005).

(ii) Information Leaflets

Leaflets in Russian and English were produced about the project, its aims, objectives and activities for the purpose of raising awareness and fundraising (1,500 copies). A second, colour version of the leaflet, with photographs, was produced early in 2005 (1,000 copies). See [Annexes R](#) and [S](#).

(iii) Bi-annual Bulletin

The first EHRAC-Memorial Bulletin was published (Russian/English) in June 2004. The Bulletin incorporates developments in international human rights law and practice which are of relevance to Russian lawyers and NGOs, including in respect of the Council of Europe and UN mechanisms. Contributors have included project staff, as well as other Russian lawyers and human rights experts and activists.

The first Russian edition had an electronic and print copy circulation of 2,500 with 1,000 hard copies published. An additional 200 copies were handed out to the participants at the project's second annual training seminar, for distribution to

colleagues in their region, and a further 100 copies were circulated during the NGO Roundtable in Moscow. We were also contacted by the ombudsman of Stavropol requesting that 70 ombudsmen from across the Russian Federation be put on the mailing list. The English version had an electronic circulation list of 350.

The second EHRAC-Memorial Bulletin was published in December 2004. The Russian version circulation was increased to 3,000. The Russian print run was increased to 2,000 copies as EHRAC had continued to receive requests for copies from individuals, NGOs and institutions in Russia. We were also approached by organisations such as the European Council for Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) for permission to publicise the Bulletin, and the Moscow Summer School of Human Rights requested 35 copies for distribution amongst their students. 40 copies were disseminated at the workshops of the Dagestan Bar Association, 10 copies were provided to Jurix (Lawyers for Constitutional Rights and Freedoms, Moscow) and a further 20 copies to the Moscow Helsinki Group at the workshop for Anti-discrimination Initiatives. Several Russian NGOs have also placed the Russian edition on their websites or asked to publicise it to their members including the Centre for Peacemaking and Human Rights Initiatives, the Legal Centre for Information and Analysis and the Civil Assembly. The English version again had an electronic circulation list of 350.

The third issue of the bulletin was disseminated in June 2005. Again 2,000 hard copies of the Russian bulletin were produced. These copies were sent to those on the existing mailing list and were also distributed by Moscow office staff at meetings, press conferences and training sessions, including, 50 copies disseminated at a Migration and Law seminar in October 2005 in the Moscow Region, 50 copies at the Human Rights Summer School in Saint Petersburg in July 2005 and 20 copies at the Centre for Democracy and Human Rights seminar on UN Mechanisms of Human Rights Protection in Moscow in September 2005. The third issue of the Russian bulletin was circulated electronically to around 2,500 contacts and the English bulletin to around 400.

The fourth issue of the bulletin was produced in December 2005. The print run of the Russian bulletin remained 2,000 copies and the electronic circulation around 2,500 contacts. Again hard copies were disseminated at relevant events including 100 copies provided to the Moscow Helsinki Group for distribution at a training session for ombudsmen in March 2006 in Moscow and 50 disseminated at a Migration and Law training seminar in April 2006 also in Moscow. For the first time, the fourth issue of the bulletin was also produced in printed format in English (1,000 copies) - previous English versions had only been electronic. The English version is being disseminated by the Moscow office to potential funding contacts, embassies, etc. and the London office is also using the English bulletin for fundraising and awareness-raising purposes. The circulation of the electronic version of the fourth issue was around 400.

The figures given above are in fact a conservative estimate of the number of bulletin recipients. Many of the recipients subsequently pass the bulletin on to colleagues or local mailing lists and all issues of both the English and Russian bulletins are available for download from the project websites. The Russian version has also been posted on the website of the Centre for Clinical Legal Education: www.lawclinic.ru.

Therefore the actual circulation of the bulletin is much higher. Furthermore, in early 2006 pages were added to both the Russian and English websites to allow people to subscribe to the electronic version, as well as download back copies. This facility generates several new subscriptions a week.

We believe demand for the Bulletin has been high because the publication is unique (including, for example, the latest developments before the ECtHR pertaining to Russia).

Copies of the Bulletins are included at Annex X and the Russian print dissemination lists can be found at Annex Y.

(iv) Articles

Various articles were drafted by project staff for publication in the national and legal press. These included:

an article in *The Times* (Jan 2003), a short piece in the Law Society Gazette (April 2003), Legal Action Magazine (May 2003), a letter published in *The Guardian* (Oct 2003), an article in New Law Journal (Feb 2004), an article in the Socialist Lawyer (June 2004), a feature in The BEARR Trust Newsletter (June 2004) a letter published in *The Guardian* (Sept 2004), an article in *European Human Rights Law Review* (April 2005), a piece in *The Times* (July 2005), an article in *Environmental Liability* (August 2005), articles in *The Middle Templar*, *Counsel* and *Times Higher Education Supplement* (December 2005), a letter in *The Guardian* (January 2006), a response in *The Guardian* (February 2006) and an article in *Legal Action* (February 2005) See Annex T. Where articles are felt to be relevant and permission has been successfully obtained from copyright holders, these articles are translated (where necessary) and posted on the project websites.

(v) Training Manual

In February 2006 EHRAC published a Russian-language training manual on litigating cases at the European Court of Human Rights (Обращение в Европейский Суд по правам человека, Moscow, 2006, ISBN 5-902962-02-1). Five thousand copies were printed in Moscow and have been disseminated widely. See Annex Z for a dissemination list.

An advance flyer advertising the publication was twice circulated to all of EHRAC's contacts in Russia inviting people to order a copy of the manual. Contacts were also asked to pass on the information to colleagues who may also have been interested in receiving a copy. Additionally, the flyer was also posted on the Russian project website and on www.hro.org (a Russian Human Rights website), the website of Sutyazhnik: www.sutyazhnik.ru, an information website of the Khanti-Mansiysky Autonomous Region: www.ugrainform.ru and a resource website for NGOs: <http://db.ngo.ru>. People requesting the manual in Moscow were asked to collect their copies from the Moscow office and all other requests were mailed across Russia.

Copies were sent to all 58 branches of the Memorial Human Rights Centre and a total of 500 copies were sent to Chechnya and Ingushetia for distribution by EHRAC's

regional lawyers to prosecutors, judges and lawyers in the region. A number of organisations were provided with large quantities of manuals for dissemination at training sessions and to legal staff. These organisations included: Stichting Russia Justice Initiative, Moscow State University, The Institute of Religion and Law, Sutyazhnik, ABA/CEELI Russia, YURIX, Civic Assistance Committee, Moscow Helsinki Group, DEMOS, Independent Legal Expertise Council and the Russian-American Judicial Partnership.

EHRAC was also contacted by the Human Rights Ombudsman for Krasnodar Krai, who requested that manuals be sent to all the Human Rights Ombudsmen across Russia and also requested 55 manuals for dissemination to libraries in his region and at training sessions run by the Ombudsman's office at schools, colleges and universities. University law libraries and main city libraries across Russia were also targeted from a database of all Russian libraries

The text of the manual can also be downloaded from the project websites and permission was given to electronic libraries to include a link to the text on the EHRAC websites in their searchable databases (Centre for Journalism in Extreme Situations: www.cjes.ru, Clinical Legal Education: www.lawclinic.ru, the Clinical Legal Education Foundation: www.clef.ru and the University of Minnesota Human Rights Library <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/>).

(vi) Other Publications

EHRAC co-operated with the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights and Stichting Chechnya Justice Initiative in writing and publishing a manual on legal ethics: "Chechnya and European Court of Human Rights: Ethics and Obligations". Some 1000 copies were distributed in late 2004 to human rights NGOs and lawyers in Russia.

In July 2005 a book was published by EHRAC in conjunction with Memorial, Stichting Russia Justice Initiative and ECRE containing the Russian translation of the ECtHR decisions in the first six Chechen cases. A total of 3,000 copies were published and distributed by the collaborating organisations. European Court judgments are only published by the Council of Europe in either English or French. Judgments are not routinely translated by the Russian authorities into Russian. This publication seeks to ensure the wide availability of a Russian version of these important judgments, notably in the north Caucasus region itself.

3. What problems have arisen and how have these been addressed?

There were initial delays in the recruitment of Moscow staff, perhaps reflecting the relatively modest salaries available. However, an intensive recruitment drive meant that all the posts in Russia were subsequently filled.

Following the departure of regional fieldworkers Roman Maranov in the beginning of November 2003 and Elena Samburova at the end of December 2003, an active

recruitment drive for additional fieldworkers was carried out, but without success initially. However, in May 2004, Dokka Itslaev, head of the Urus Martan branch of Memorial was recruited and Olga Tseytlina (St. Petersburg) was recruited in October 2004.

Following threats to the family of Ruslan Yandarov, the third lawyer in the Moscow office, Mr Yandarov left the project to seek asylum in the US in April 2004. Once again, due to the modest rate of pay, and the nature of the work, we faced some difficulty to find a replacement until January 2005.

The Administrator of the Moscow office, Katya Newman, also left the project for a post with a British commercial company in October 2004. She was immediately replaced by Elena Ryzhova, as Project Co-ordinator the following month. Elena Ryzhova formerly worked at the Moscow Helsinki Group and had good previous experience of the operation of an NGO and EC funded projects.

At the end of July 2004, the administrators/landlord of the building where the Moscow office was located gave four weeks notice to vacate to carry out extensive renovation works. The timing was very inconvenient, as August was a holiday period, and there was great difficulty locating suitable premises within the project's financial resources. Furthermore, it coincided with the preparations for the training seminar, NGO Roundtable and Steering Committee meetings that were due to be held in early September causing much disruption to the organisation. However, suitable premises were subsequently located and the London office was able to assist with most of the preparations and the relocation was carried out the week prior to the training.

At the end of September 2005, Kirill Koroteev left the position of full-time lawyer to study for an LLM at the Sorbonne, Paris. Mr Koroteev was one of the project's original Moscow lawyers and he had a large caseload. In order that he be able to continue working on cases that he had already started, it was decided that as of 1 October 2005 he would be paid a fee to act as Case Consultant and continue working on his existing cases for EHRAC from Paris (with administrative support provided by the Moscow office). His departure from the Moscow office however necessitated the recruitment of a third lawyer to assist with the office's growing workload.

Some difficulties were experienced in recruiting this third lawyer as the salary offered was low (due to the deduction of the fee to Kirill Koroteev). However, Eleonora Davidyan was finally recruited to start on 1 November working four days a week.

As staff in London began processing the first ECHR cases, it became apparent that a budget for translating the enormous number of case documents (from Russian to English) had inadvertently been omitted (the sheer quantity of documents could not have been anticipated). However, with the assistance of the Amnesty International office in London (in particular the Russia Campaign staff) it was possible to recruit a series of volunteer translators to carry out this work. Funding for translation was subsequently obtained from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

In the light of the vulnerable position of Chechen applicants, we sought to find a way of communicating confidential matters concerning the ECHR casework in a secure

way between the UK and Russia. On advice from other NGOs and information technology experts, we explored the possibility of using the PGP encryption system, however, this caused considerable technical problems. We have also been advised by some security experts that even such an encryption system is not secure.

In response to increasingly serious reports of intimidation by the authorities of Chechen applicants to the European Court in the winter of 2003, EHRAC, Memorial and the Chechnya Justice Initiative came together to produce detailed memoranda concerning such incidents. In December 2003, Philip Leach, Dina Vedernikova and Kirill Koroteev met with one of the European Court Section Registrars, Mr Soren Nielsen, and, separately, with the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Mr Alvaro Gil-Robles, to consider what action could be taken in relation to the reports of intimidation. In January 2004, follow-up letters were sent to Mr Nielsen and Mr Gil-Robles on behalf of EHRAC, Memorial and the Chechnya Justice Initiative. Furthermore, memoranda outlining the extent of the threats and intimidation were sent in 2004 to the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women (prior to her mission to Russia and Chechnya in December 2004) and to the UN Special Rapporteur on Arbitrary Executions (who has also been seeking permission from the Russian authorities to visit Chechnya).

On 15 November 2005, Prof. Bowring was denied entry to Russia whilst travelling to observe trial proceedings in Nizhny Novgorod on behalf of the Bar Human Rights Committee and his Russian visa was cancelled. His inability to travel to Russia did present a challenge for the project as Prof. Bowring frequently met with project staff whilst on visits to Russia for other reasons. However, no project activities requiring his presence in Russia had been scheduled for late 2005 or early 2006, which therefore limited the impact on the project. There are indications that Prof. Bowring may be granted a new Russian visa by the end of 2006.

4. Please outline any activities and publications foreseen in the agreement that have not taken place and any other changes to the foreseen activities or timetable, explaining the reasons for these.

All activities and publications foreseen in the agreement have taken place. All changes to the project timetable are detailed under Section A: Compliance with the grant agreement.

5. Please indicate the number of victims (primary and secondary) you had initially targeted and the number you have actually reached. Try to determine the cost/person of the globality of the services you offer.

The application submitted to the EC anticipated the project processing around 60 cases a year over three years – the number of victims per case being dependent on the circumstances of each individual case.

The project began with 28 cases that had been lodged with the Court by *Memorial* over the period 1999-2002. As of 30 March 2006 it was working on a total of 85

cases. Over the course of the entire project the project's lawyers have represented the applicants in a total of 95 European Court cases. In addition to the cases which project lawyers have themselves conducted, the project has provided substantial advice to other organisations and lawyers about ECHR cases. Over the course of the project the London office provided advice on 40 additional cases. For the period January – March 2006, the Moscow office provided assistance on nine additional cases. Prior to 2006, the Moscow office advised on about 100 other cases, between 2003 and 2005 (although precise records were not retained). When assistance to other NGOs is taken into account, the project has accordingly worked on more than 235 European Court cases.

In addition to the direct beneficiaries of the litigation work, the project has provided substantial support and assistance to many other people, in the form of training. The seminars conducted by the project provided training to a total of 68 lawyers and/or NGO staff (with many individuals participating in more than one event). A further 35 other people attended at least one of the roundtable events. In addition, the project's Russian lawyers provided training at thirteen events led by other organisations during the reporting period. Assuming even a modest number of attendees at these events (10-15), a further 150-200 people have benefited from training provided by the project's lawyers.

Training materials produced by the project have benefited (and will continue to benefit in the future) a wide audience. Five thousand hard copies of the training manual have been produced and disseminated across the Russian Federation. It is expected that many of the copies will be used by more than one person per organisation, especially those that have been provided for libraries. The text of the manual is also available for download from the project's websites and links to this appear on several other relevant websites as detailed above.

The various editions of the Russian and English bulletins have also been disseminated to a wide audience totalling around 5,000 recipients for the most recent issue and are circulated by other organisations and are available for download from the project's websites. The websites in themselves also contain training materials that will be of benefit to lawyers and NGOs working on human rights cases. Although statistics are available for the number of website hits per month it is impossible to know how many of these hits are repeat visitors and how many people have already been included as beneficiaries in one of the categories detailed above, however a very rough estimate might be in the region of 2,500.

All the project's staff in Russia are also beneficiaries in respect to the ongoing training and support which they have received, including feedback and guidance on legal work, participation in the mini-internship programme and training seminars, capacity-building on NGO management, fund-raising and general administration. Interns in the Moscow office also constitute beneficiaries of the project.

Type of beneficiary	Estimated number
Primary applicants to the ECtHR and their immediate family members	533
Training participants (1)	68
Round table participants (2)	35
Training provided by Russian project lawyers (3)	175
Recipients of publications (training manual, bulletin, etc.) (4)	8,000
Visitors to the website (5)	2,500
Russia staff members (6)	17
Moscow office interns	11
Estimated total number of beneficiaries	11,339

(1) Some training participants have attended more than one of the events organised by the project therefore the total number of participants is less than the sum of the figures given for attendees under project activities.

(2) Excluding those who are already counted under training.

(3) Participants of training sessions organised by other organisations where lawyers working on the project have been trainers or speakers.

(4) It is impossible to give an accurate figure for the number of people who have benefited from publications produced by this project. Besides the number of hard and electronic copies circulated directly by EHRAC, copies are forwarded on by other people and can be downloaded from the project website. The figure of 8,000 is likely to be a conservative estimate and reflects the fact that many of the recipients of the bulletin and training manual will overlap.

(5) Who make use of the training materials provided on the websites.

(6) Over the duration of the project. Nine of these beneficiaries also participated in the mini-internship programme.

The total cost of the project was 1,050,916 euros (1,071,962 euros less 21,046 euros unused contingency). Thus the cost per beneficiary was: 92.68 euros

Aside from these more or less quantifiable beneficiaries, the number of people who will benefit in years to come from the cascade effect of skills being passed on by training participants, the use of experts trained by the project by members of the public, and from the jurisprudence created by the project's cases and its contribution to the overall improvements to domestic law and the respect of human rights will be considerable and is impossible to quantify.

C. Results, Impact, Multiplier Effect and Evaluation

1. What results have been achieved during the reporting period (based on the results anticipated in the terms of reference)? Please quantify these results, where possible.

To 31 March 2006, 222 applicants, together with approximately 317 additional victims in 85 current European Court cases have been given advice and/or assistance in pursuing their cases against the Russian government. A further 10 cases have been handled by the project. (numbers of applicants and victims in the non-current cases pending). This has included extensive work on the first six cases relating to Chechnya, which were decided by the European Court (on 24 February 2005). The cases concern some of the most egregious human rights violations which have ever been before the European Court, including extra-judicial executions, deaths caused by artillery and/or aerial bombardment, torture, disappearances and destruction of homes.

EHRAC has represented applicants at two hearings before the European Court of Human Rights (Fadeyeva – July 2004; the ‘first six’ Chechen cases – October 2004).

A total of eight judgments have been handed down in eleven of the project’s cases and a further thirteen have been declared admissible.

A total of five Memorial lawyers in Moscow and eight field workers in the regions of Russia have received the support and assistance of human rights experts in the UK, in respect of the law, practice and procedure of the European Convention. Advice has been given in writing and by e-mail and telephone. Access has also been given to experts, such as forensic pathologists and environmental and ballistics experts. The Memorial lawyers and field-workers have also had the support, advice and assistance of an experienced human rights lawyer in Moscow, acting as a litigation consultant, for three months in the first two years and two months in the third year.

In addition, EHRAC has provided detailed legal advice to more than 15 human rights NGOs, including Stichting Russia Justice Initiative, Human Rights Watch, Institute for Religion and Law, Demos and Article 42 of the Constitution and a further 11 individuals and lawyers in regard to one or more ECHR cases.

In 2003, 27 delegates from Memorial, Migration and Law and the Chechnya Justice Initiative received in-depth human rights training over three days from international experts in this field. Delegates included lawyers from Moscow, Ryazan, Nazran, Perm, Pyatigorsk, Grozny, Urus-Martan and North Ossetia. Each was provided with an extensive collection of key human rights documents (in Russian). In 2004, some 34 delegates from Chechnya Justice Initiative, Sutyajnik, Dobroe Delo, Institute of Religion and Law, Moscow Helsinki Group regional branches of Memorial (Nazran, Ryazan, Moscow, Krasnodar, Urus Martan, Grozny) and Migration and Law (Vladikavkaz, Kazan, Saratov, Voronezh, Novorossiysk, Yekaterinburg, Chelyabinsk), and one individual applicant attended the training seminar.

Fifteen delegates attended the June 2005 training seminar in Saint Petersburg. They represented: Russian Committee of Lawyers for Human Rights Protection, Memorial, Saint Petersburg University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Advice Centre for Refugees in Saint Petersburg, Gordeev & Partners, Open Legal Advice Bureau Saint Petersburg, Bellona, Saint Petersburg Institute of Law, Saint Petersburg State University and Citizen's Watch.

The 2005 September training in Moscow was attended by 40 participants representing Memorial (Gudermes, Grozny, Moscow, Nazran, Novorossiysk, Ryazan, Saint-Petersburg, Tambov and Urus-Martan offices), Centre for Democracy and Human Rights, Chechen Committee of National Salvation, Moscow State University, Sutyajnik, Mothers' Right, ABA/CEELI, St Petersburg State University, St Petersburg Institute of Law, OSI, Perspectiva, North West Centre for the Social and Legal Defence of Roma, Stichting Russia Justice Initiative, Yury Schmidt & Partners, Ford Foundation, DFID, Institute of Religion and two practising lawyers.

In 2003, this project brought together approximately 34 representatives from the leading human rights organisations in Russia to discuss appropriate strategy, tactics and co-operation in handling European Court litigation. These NGOs included Memorial, Chechnya Justice Initiative, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch,

Sodeistvie – Co-operation in International Protection of Human Rights and Institute for Religion and Law. This seminar has provided the basis for continuous dialogue and co-operation.

In 2004, some 46 delegates were once again brought together for a presentation by Philip Leach on the subject of 'Pragmatic reform or the Denial of Access to Justice' – the European Court and Protocol 14 which was followed by a roundtable discussion on 'Russia in Strasbourg: Managing Media and Public Reactions'. Again there was an impressive range of organisations represented by those attending including Sutyajnik, Chechnya Justice Initiative, the Urals Centre for Constitutional and International Human Rights Protection, Debroe Delo, the Human Rights Institute, the St. Petersburg Bar Association, the Slavic Legal Centre, Mothers' Rights Foundation, Amnesty - Russia Resource Centre, Independent Legal Expert Council, Institute of Religion and Law, Centre for Social and Labour Rights, Jungle World, regional branches of Memorial (Nazran, Ryazan, Moscow, Krasnodar, Urus Martan, Grozny) and Migration and Law (Vladikavkaz, Kazan, Saratov, Voronezh, Novorossiysk, Yekaterinburg and Chelyabinsk).

The 2005 round table was chaired by Professor Bill Bowring. It comprised a panel discussion entitled "Enforcing European Court Judgments - what now for Russia". The panel members were Tatiana Lokshina (Demos), Oleg Orlov and Tatiana Kasatkina (Memorial), Olga Shepeleva (Demos) and Philip Leach (EHRAC). More than 50 participants from a variety of organizations attended the roundtable, including, among others, Sutyajnik, Memorial, Stichting Russia Justice Initiative, the Institute of Religion and Law, Moscow State University, the MacArthur Foundation, the Russian Academy of Justice, Amnesty International, Ford Foundation, and the Moscow Helsinki Group.

The first Russian edition of the EHRAC-Memorial Bulletin had an electronic and print copy circulation of 2,500. An additional 200 copies were handed out to the

training participants from various NGOs, for distribution to colleagues in their region, and a further 100 copies were circulated during the NGO Roundtable in Moscow. We were also contacted by the ombudsman of Stavropol requesting that 70 ombudsmen from across the Russian Federation be put on the mailing list. The English version had an electronic circulation list of 350. It is also placed on the EHRAC web pages where it can be downloaded by anyone visiting the site.

The second EHRAC-Memorial Bulletin was published in December 2004. The Russian version's circulation was increased to 3,000. EHRAC has continued to receive requests for copies from individuals, NGOs and institutions in Russia. We have also been approached by organisations such as the European Council for Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) for permission to publicise the Bulletin, and the Moscow Summer School of Human Rights requested 35 copies for distribution amongst their students. 40 copies were disseminated at the workshops of the Dagestan Bar Association, 10 copies were provided to Jurix (Lawyers for Constitutional Rights and Freedoms, Moscow) and a further 20 copies to the Moscow Helsinki Group at the workshop for Anti-discrimination Initiatives. Several Russian NGOs have also placed the Russian edition on their websites or asked to publicise it to their members including the Centre for Peacemaking and Human Rights Initiatives, the Legal Centre for Information and Analysis and the Civil Assembly. Several Russian NGOs have also placed the Russian edition on their websites. The English version again had an electronic circulation list of 350.

The third issue of the bulletin was disseminated in June 2005 and the fourth issue in December 2005. The print run of the Russian bulletin remained 2,000 copies – these copies were disseminated to the existing mailing list and were also passed on by Moscow office staff at meetings, conferences and training sessions. The electronic circulation of the Russian bulletin includes around 2,500 contacts and the English list around 400. Many of the recipients subsequently pass the bulletin on to colleagues or local mailing lists therefore the real circulation is much higher. For the first time, the fourth issue of the bulletin was produced in printed format in both English (1,000 copies) and Russian (previous English versions had only been electronic). The English version is being disseminated by the Moscow office to potential funding contacts, embassies, etc. and the London office is also using the English bulletin for fundraising and awareness raising purposes.

It must be stressed that circulation numbers should not be limited to the above figures, as all editions of the Russian and English bulletin can be downloaded from the English and Russian websites. Furthermore, the bulletin is posted on the websites of other Russian NGOs and is publicised by other institutions. In late 2005 an automated page was added to the Russian website allowing people to subscribe to the electronic circulation of the bulletin and details of how to subscribe to the English mailing list were added to the English website. Subscription requests for both languages have since been received at a steady rate.

Furthermore, strong links have been created with the national and international media during this period (press, TV and radio). See Annex T for non-exhaustive lists and copies of all print and online coverage received by the project.

2. What is your assessment of the results of the project? Include observations on the extent to which foreseen goals were met and whether the project has had any unforeseen positive or negative results. (refer to Logframe Indicators).

The project has achieved its stated aims, as originally set out in the grant application, including the following:

- a specialist office has been set up in Moscow;
- regional liaison officers operating in five locations have been appointed in Russia;
- a UK-based support structure has been established;
- there has been an increase in the number of human rights cases being taken to the European Court of Human Rights;
- the capacity of *Memorial* to bring human rights cases has been considerably enhanced; and
- the project has disseminated a considerable amount of information (through bulletins, the website, press releases, press coverage, training manual, etc.) relating to human rights developments of relevance to Russian NGOs and lawyers.

The project has received widespread publicity and has been welcomed by human rights NGOs and international institutions working in this field. The project has undoubtedly benefited from being established within two effective and supportive organisations: *Memorial* and London Metropolitan University.

Very effective working relationships have been established, particularly between the lawyers in Moscow and in London, and with other national and international NGOs and inter-governmental institutions.

A number of the Chechen applicants, and members of their families, have faced considerable threats and intimidation from the security forces acting in that region. Such intimidation was, however, not wholly unanticipated. As set out above, the project responded by raising such issues with the Council of Europe bodies, including the Court itself, the Commissioner for Human Rights and the Parliamentary Assembly, which in turn raised the problem with the Russian authorities. There have been no other unforeseen negative results.

3. What has been the impact on both the beneficiaries &/or target group (if different) and the situation in the target country or target region which the project addressed?

The beneficiaries of this project comprise: (a) women and men in Russia (notably Chechnya) who seek redress from the European Court of Human Rights for human rights violations committed against them or members of their family; (b) human rights organisations and human rights lawyers in Russia who provide advice and assistance to the victims of human rights abuses.

The publication by the European Court of the admissibility decisions in the first six cases concerning Chechnya represented a very important development, which was the subject of widespread publicity. Similarly, there was a great deal of interest in the oral hearing of these cases in Strasbourg in October 2004 and again in the Court's judgment in favour of the applicants (February 2005). For the victims of human rights abuses in Chechnya, these decisions signalled that remedies may be attainable before an international human rights forum such as the European Court, where domestic authorities offered none. In the face of continuing appalling human rights violations in Chechnya and Ingushetia, the European Court system offers a means of making these abuses known internationally, as well as achieving redress.

For the Russian government, these decisions signal that it will be called to account in the European Court for such violations. Individual officials may be named in Court judgments and/or required by the European Court to give evidence. Besides the payment of compensation to the applicants, the project has made formal submissions to the Committee of Ministers to the effect that the judgments in the first six Chechen cases also require the Russian government to conduct a full investigation into the incidents, prosecute those responsible and make changes to domestic law (including the military field manuals).

Through the monitoring of the enforcement of these judgments positive developments have been achieved for the applicants in these cases. For example on 17 April 2006 the investigations into the criminal cases concerning the death of the relatives of the applicants in *Khashiev v Russia (57942/00)* and *Akayeva v Russia (57945/00)* (judgment of 24 February 2005) were reopened following a request from *Memorial* to the Prosecutor's office in Chechnya in connection with the ECtHR's judgment in these cases.

In some instances an application to the Court alone has been sufficient to ensure improvements for an applicant. For example, in May 2006 the EHRAC-Memorial Moscow office received news of a positive development in regard to the applicant in one of the project's cases. In an application lodged with the Court, the applicant, a prisoner, alleged that he was being severely beaten by prison staff, prohibited from praying, forced to stay outside the prison building in winter in inadequate clothing, punished after writing to the authorities or to his relatives regarding his situation and that his life was consequently in danger. After the application was submitted to the Court, the authorities were immediately asked to respond to the allegations. As a result, the applicant's situation improved dramatically and the head of the administration promised the applicant's family that he would support their request to transfer the applicant to a prison closer to their home.

This project has provided expert technical support in order to develop the skills and experience of a body of lawyers and field workers in Russia who will be able to continue to pursue international human rights litigation and to pass on their knowledge and skills to their colleagues. *Memorial's* capacity, has already been significantly enhanced in particular in terms of utilising international human rights mechanisms, but also as regards organisational capacity – fundraising, administration, management, etc.

Generally, awareness of the European Court mechanism has risen over the project period in the Russian Federation. While in 2002, 4,006 cases were lodged against the Russian Federation this figure has risen annually to reach 8,781 in 2005² showing that more people are aware of and willing to make applications to the Court.

4. How has the project promoted gender equality?

The project has indiscriminately represented the rights of both women and men at the European Court. The project has assisted roughly equal numbers of male and female applicants and victims, who are also directly affected by the violation. To date the project's cases have involved 105 male and 117 female applicants and 187 male, 114 female and 21 unknown victims. Of these victims, around twice as many men as women are primary victims (who have been killed or disappeared). This is due to the fact that gross human rights violations disproportionately affect men. More women (32) than men (25) are secondary victims (those also directly affected by the alleged violation).

London Metropolitan University operates an equal opportunities policy. Furthermore, the project's Director in Russia is a woman. Eleven of the other seventeen staff members employed during the course of the project have been women.

In 2004 submissions were made to the UN Rapporteur on Violence Against Women (see C (14) above).

5. How has the project advanced the rights of children?

The project has advanced the rights of children in a number of ways.

A total of 43 victims in the project's cases were under 18 at the time of the alleged violation and 13 minors are applicants (in conjunction with adults). For example, in the case of *A and Others v. Russia* one of the allegedly abducted men was the father of a young child. In *D and A v. Russia* three of the applicants are young children whose father was detained and subsequently disappeared. The applicant in *Gusev v. Russia* was a minor at the time of his alleged detention in a small, crowded, poorly lit cell, with inadequate health or hygiene provisions. In the environmental pollution case of *Fadeyeva v. Russia* children were also living in an apartment within the Sanitary Security Zone around a steelworks.

Children's rights is one of the areas that this project is seeking to address specifically by implementing a programme of strategic litigation in this field. Natasha Kravchuk (one of the project's Moscow lawyers) has a special interest in the field of children's rights and has provided training on the rights of the child at several events conducted by other organisations (see above). Children's rights were also one of the focuses of

² European Court of Human Rights, *Survey of Activities 2002 & Survey of Activities 2005*
<http://www.echr.coe.int/ECHR/EN/Header/Reports+and+Statistics/Reports/Annual+surveys+of+activit y/>

our training seminar in Moscow in September 2005. An initial hurdle will be the fact that many of the children in Russia suffering from human rights violations are in the care of the State, which raises difficult questions as to who is entitled to act on their behalf.

Finally, by assisting parents and providing them with the opportunity of achieving redress for human rights violations committed against them their children are also assisted by the moral and financial compensation potentially received.

6. How and by whom have the activities been monitored/evaluated? Please summarise the results of the feedback received, including from the beneficiaries.

(i) Steering Committee

A Steering Committee has been established comprising representatives from the contributing organisations: Memorial, London Metropolitan University and the Bar Human Rights Committee of England & Wales, all of whom have extensive experience of human rights works in both domestic and international contexts.

Its membership is as follows (as at 31 March 2006):

- Professor Bill Bowring (London Metropolitan University)
- Peter Carter QC (Bar Human Rights Committee)
- Aleksandr Cherkasov (Memorial)
- Rupert D’Cruz (Bar Human Rights Committee)
- Svetlana Gannushkina (a member of the President's Commission on Human Rights as well as of Memorial, founder of Civil Assistance)
- Tatyana Kasatkina (Memorial)
- Philip Leach (London Metropolitan University)
- Tanya Lokshina (Demos)
- Oleg Orlov (Memorial)
- Aidan Rose (London Metropolitan University)

Steering Committee meetings were held in Moscow in June 2003 and September 2003 (see the Steering Committee Agendas at Annex A and the Steering Committee Minutes at Annex D). At the first meeting the Steering Committee reviewed the ‘founding documents’ for this project, including the contract with the European Commission, the grant application and the budget. At both meetings, the Steering Committee has been presented with detailed narrative and financial reports relating to the project which have been reviewed and discussed in order to ensure the project’s compliance with its stated aims and objectives. The Steering Committee also approved its own terms of reference (Annex B) and a Partnership Agreement (Annex C).

The third Steering Committee meeting took place in London in April 2004 when a thorough review of the progress of the project was undertaken. The committee considered an evaluation report on the progress of the project, prepared by Tatyana Lokshina, Programme Director at the Moscow Helsinki Group.

The Committee also discussed the volume of cases being handled and where the violations were taking place. The committee noted that although the majority of the cases were from Chechnya, another five environmental cases from Cherepovets had been lodged and declared admissible. Also, in view of the overwhelming number of victims of human rights violations wishing to be represented in the European Court of Human Rights, the Committee discussed whether EHRAC should only take cases which would set important precedents and have some strategic impact.

The Committee also discussed the problem of intimidation of existing and potential applicants and how to deal with that, including the use of Council of Europe mechanisms. Discussions at the third meeting of the steering committee included the question of recruiting new Memorial fieldworkers after the departure of Elena Samburova and Roman Maranov.

The fourth Steering Committee meeting was held at the Golitsyno conference centre, Moscow, in September 2004. The Committee discussed the forthcoming judgments of the European Court and considered how to manage the media attention following their publication, expected the following Spring. The Committee considered how best to deal with the dissemination of information following the delivery of the judgments and whether an NGO roundtable should be convened.

The fifth Steering Committee meeting took place in Moscow in September 2005. This meeting considered the activities of both the London and Moscow offices over the past year, the interim financial and narrative reports submitted to the EC in the Spring of 2005, the report of the external audit carried out by Price Waterhouse Cooper, fundraising efforts undertaken by both offices and the report written by an external evaluator (Dr. Robert Dunbar, University of Aberdeen) commissioned to assess the project (pending minutes to add more information).

(ii) Project Evaluation

In January 2004, Tatiana Lokshina, Programme Director at the Moscow Helsinki Group, who is a highly experienced and respected Russian human rights researcher and activist, was commissioned to provide an evaluation of the project to date. Tatiana Lokshina reported to the Steering Committee meeting in April 2004.

In August 2005, a second evaluation was conducted by Dr. Robert Dunbar, Reader in Law at the University of Aberdeen. A third evaluation was conducted by Catharina Harby (Legal Consultant at the AIRE Centre (Advice on Individual Rights in Europe)) to cover the period from Summer 2005 to the end of March 2006 (see Annex AA for these evaluation reports).

(iii) Other feedback

The feedback received from Memorial and other NGOs and lawyers in Russia has indicated that the support provided by this project is highly valued and highly rated.

Feedback from the training seminars was obtained by requesting both delegates and trainers to fill in questionnaires. The feedback obtained was very positive – 100% of participants found the topics of the training interesting and were highly impressed by the quality of lectures, and a majority found training materials useful. Positive

feedback was also received from the NGO roundtables in all years and for the mini-internships (see feedback summaries at Annex L).

Initial feedback regarding the litigation manual has been immensely positive. For example the Human Rights Ombudsman for Krasnodar Krai wrote that: “Allow me to salute you and express my great thank for the project that you are implementing [producing the litigation manual]. It is of considerable importance to us. It will help us to fill the gap that currently exists in our public and university libraries.” Other recipients have said that the manual is “extremely useful for us” and a “quality and modern manual”. Positive feedback has also been received in response to the biannual bulletin. For example, several Russian NGOs have contacted EHRAC to say that the bulletin is “very useful” for them and that they disseminate it among their own contacts and Nicole Piche, the Coordinator of the All-Party Parliamentary Human Rights Group wrote that “I find these bulletins, and the other information you send, very informative.”

7. What impact has the project had on your organisation (and on your partners, if applicable)?
--

EHRAC was itself established in order to implement this project, thus the project has shaped the organisation and its activities. Offices, structures and working practices were established in London, Moscow and five Russian regions as detailed in Section C(1), (2), (3), (5a) and (5b). By implementing this project EHRAC has gained substantial experience and knowledge about operating in and collaborating with organisations in the Former Soviet Union. This knowledge will be extremely useful in its continuing work and expansion into other countries.

The successes of this project and the credibility given to the organisation by EC funding have meant that EHRAC has been able to fundraise to ensure the continuation and development of its work beyond the end of this grant. Funding secured by EHRAC for the continuation of the project is detailed at Section E(2).

The impact of the project for *Memorial* has been beneficial in terms of capacity-building and synergy with other projects. As a result of the project a number of *Memorial's* staff and offices have gained intensive training and much experience of litigation at the European Court of Human Rights – knowledge which is being passed through the organisation to other employees and offices. *Memorial* staff involved in the project have also benefited from operational capacity training in relation to running an NGO, including document management, file retrieval systems, administration skills, fundraising and project and workload management. These skills will undoubtedly be of benefit to *Memorial* in the future. Furthermore, the substantive work of the project complements the work carried out by other *Memorial* Human Rights Centre projects (Ethnic Discrimination, Migration and Law and the ‘Hot Spots’ monitoring programme). The project has also allowed *Memorial* to build closer contacts with other Russian and international NGOs working in a similar field.

8. How is your organisation ensuring that the results obtained / the lessons learned from the project, are being made public?

The work of this project has been regularly communicated to interested international and national institutions, to other human rights NGOs in this field, and, through the media, to the public at large. See for example C (1) and 2 (iv) .

In December 2002 information about EHRAC's launch, together with contact details was circulated widely within the UK and internationally, including the Council of Europe; UNDP, Department for International Development (UK), Foreign & Commonwealth Office (UK), the Law Society and the Bar Council.

The EHRAC office in London was publicly launched with a lecture by the former British Minister, Lord Frank Judd, on 13 May 2003 at the University. Lord Judd, the former Council of Europe Rapporteur for Chechnya, spoke to an invited audience of representatives from government, the media, human rights organisations, the Law Society and the Bar Human Rights Committee. The event was co-sponsored by Amnesty International and Bindman & Partners, a leading firm of solicitors in London dealing with human rights and social justice cases. Representatives from the BBC, the Guardian and other national media attended the EHRAC launch, which was also being covered by the University bulletin, *The Metropolitan*.

EHRAC targeted various specific newspapers/journals to publicise its launch. In January 2003 an article about the project was published in the *Times* newspaper, and in February there was coverage in *Time Magazine*. Articles were written for the UK legal press: the *Law Society Gazette* in April 2003, *Legal Action* in May 2003, and a letter was published in the *Guardian* in October 2003. In 2004 the following were published: an article in *New Law Journal* (Feb 2004), an article in the *Socialist Lawyer* (June 2004), a feature in *The BEARR Trust Newsletter* (June 2004), a letter published in the *Guardian* (Sept 2004) an article in *European Human Rights Law Review* (April 2005) a piece in *The Times* (July 2005), an article in *Environmental Liability* (August 2005) articles in *The Middle Templar*, *Counsel* and *Times Higher Education Supplement* (December 2005), a letter in *The Guardian* (January 2006) and an article in *Legal Action* (February 2005). In addition to these pieces written by EHRAC, there has also been substantial press coverage journalists have written about EHRAC's cases or work as detailed at Section C(11) and also Annex T .

Press releases are frequently issued about significant case developments (See Annex AB) and project staff have developed good working relationships with a number of international journalists. There was significant press coverage internationally concerning the European Court hearing in the first six Chechen cases in October 2004. A number of project staff in Russia and in the UK did interviews with national and international television, radio and newspaper journalists. The Moscow office held a press conference in October 2004 prior to the hearing of the first six Chechen cases before the ECtHR. It was attended by over twenty journalists from a variety of TV (CBS, Ren-TV, BBC) radio (Echo Moskvyy), magazine (Newsweek Russia) and newspaper (AP, ARD, Izvestia) media. Following the receipt of the judgment in the

Fadeyeva environmental case in June 2005, Professor Bowring, Philip Leach and Kirill Koroteev were interviewed in the Moscow office by the television channel Ren-TV.

Leaflets have been produced by the EHRAC office, with contact information and brief details about the project. See C (11) and C (15) (ii) above.

The bi-annual EHRAC-Memorial Bulletin is published in Russian and English, and is circulated extensively in print and electronic media. It incorporates recent developments in international human rights law and practice with a focus on areas with special significance for Russia, as well as the progress of the project casework. See C (11) and C (15) (iii) above.

As described above, both the Moscow and London offices operate websites providing a great deal of information about the work of the project, which are regularly updated.

Regular meetings have been held with representatives from Russian and international NGOs (as set out at section C (9) above). The purpose of such networking has been to make known the work of EHRAC, to avoid duplication of work, to enhance communication between NGOs, and to maximise the effectiveness of civil society.

Furthermore, in order to provide information about the project, meetings have been held with representatives of international organisations, such as the Council of Europe and the UN. In February 2003, Philip Leach met with representatives of the Council of Europe Human Rights Monitoring Section (Andrew Drzemczewski and Johan Friestedt), an official in the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights (John Dalhuisen) and the Council of Europe official responsible for human rights training in Russia (Kristina Pencheva). Project staff have had a series of other meetings with Council of Europe representatives since 2003. Bill Bowring and Philip Leach have had regular meetings with various Council of Europe officials, during which he briefs them on the work of the project. In November 2004, Philip Leach met with Philip Alston, the UN Special Rapporteur on Arbitrary Executions, in order to discuss the work of the project in Chechnya. Regular contact has been maintained with the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights), notably in respect of the harassment of applicants in Chechnya.

9. The success of the project depended on various assumptions (see Logframe). Have these influenced the results?
--

The project has received the active commitment and participation of lawyers and NGOs in Russia (particularly Memorial) and in the UK. This project has been able to recruit staff in Russia and in London with the requisite skills and experience.

As set out above, the European Court applicants in Chechnya have experienced substantial harassment and intimidation at the hands of the security forces in that region. Furthermore, some difficulties have been experienced by the lawyers/fieldworkers in the regions of Chechnya and Ingushetia. We have ensured

that both the Council of Europe bodies, and the international press, have been aware of these problems, which has resulted in the cases achieving a higher profile.

It is anticipated that the new Russian NGO law, which came into force on 1 April 2006, may potentially hinder the work of the project in the future, although no direct negative consequences have yet arisen for EHRAC or *Memorial*.

In January 2006, accusations of spying were made by the Russian authorities against employees of the British Embassy in Moscow, which was alleged to be linked in some way to the Embassy's funding of NGOs. However, the project did not experience any negative repercussions from the Russian authorities in relation to this.

10. Describe how the impact of this project will continue after the support from the European Commission has ended. Are there any follow up activities envisaged?

Due to the length of time during which cases are pending before the European Court, much of the litigation work, which has been conducted during the project period, will only come to fruition over the next few years and as such will have an impact on the lives of the applicants, their families and the wider society in years to come.

This project has created many resources, which will continue to have an impact on the human rights situation in Russia for many years. The resources contained on the project websites, the bulletins and the training manual contain a wealth of information of use to lawyers and NGOs taking cases to the European Court of Human Rights. The training provided by the project will not only enhance the future work of participants, but will no doubt be passed on to colleagues and to other organisations and individuals where participants at EHRAC training seminars subsequently act as trainers at regional events. This cascade effect has already begun with the project's Moscow, and certain regional, lawyers providing training at seminars conducted by other organisations.

Furthermore, EHRAC has secured funding to ensure the continuation of the project in both London and Russia for the coming year (see E(2) below) and Memorial has several funding applications pending. The format of the project will remain largely the same with minor changes reflecting the natural development of the project.

D. Partners and other Co-operation

Each partner organisation should write a one-page assessment on its role and co-operation in the project. This is not limited to the questions in this section and can use its own format.

EHRAC

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this project (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Give details about the division of responsibilities, transfer of expertise, and overall co-ordination of the partnership(s). |
|---|

EHRAC and *Memorial* have created a very effective working relationship, which has developed and strengthened over the course of the project. Both organisations have worked diligently to establish operating systems in order to ensure good communications between Moscow and London, and with the regional offices in Russia, coordinated primarily by the Project Manager in London and the Project Coordinator in Moscow.

Identifying key issues and cases to be the subject of European Convention litigation has been the primary responsibility of the Moscow and regional lawyers. They have conducted these cases with the advice, support and assistance of EHRAC's legal team and other UK lawyers via the Bar Human Rights Committee. Practical human rights knowledge and expertise has been, and continues to be, effectively shared between London and Moscow and the other regions of Russia, including European Court case law and procedure, case file management and broader questions relating to establishing a viable litigation strategy. The capacity of *Memorial* to conduct European Court cases has already been significantly enhanced. The knowledge transferred to *Memorial* staff working on the joint project is already being passed on to colleagues and other NGOs, as project staff are acting as speakers and trainers at seminars across Russia.

EHRAC has been responsible for designing the programme for training events and the NGO round table, identifying and inviting suitable trainers and collating and producing training materials. *Memorial* has been responsible for organising the events (renting premises, hiring interpreters, etc.). The identification of participants has been a joint activity based on the contacts of both organisations. EHRAC has had overall responsibility for producing the project's publications (bulletin and training manual). *Memorial* project staff have contributed articles and part of a chapter to these. *Memorial* has also overseen the printing and dissemination of the publications. Both EHRAC and *Memorial* have undertaken presswork to highlight the project's successes.

Overall co-ordination is being monitored by an effective Steering Committee comprising representatives from EHRAC, *Memorial* and the Bar Human Rights Committee of England & Wales.

2. Is the partnership to continue? If so, how? If not, why?

The partnership between EHRAC and Memorial will continue in the future. EHRAC has secured funding to ensure the continuation of the project in both London and Russia for the coming year and Memorial has several funding applications pending. The format of the project will remain largely the same with minor changes reflecting the natural development of the project. EHRAC has also recently formalised a partnership to carry out litigation work and training with the Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA) and is investigating a partnership with another Russian organisation dealing with religious discrimination.

Experts from the Bar Human Rights Committee will also continue to provide advice and guidance on cases to *Memorial* lawyers within the framework of the project.

3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and state authorities in the project countries? How has this relationship affected the project?

EHRAC's relationship with the British Government has been very positive. The former British Government Minister Lord Frank Judd was the keynote speaker at the EHRAC launch event, which was also attended by several representatives of the Foreign & Commonwealth Office.

EHRAC staff have met with Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO) staff on several occasions over the course of the project. In 2004 the FCO decided to provide EHRAC with a proportion of the match funding for this project from its Global Conflicts Prevention Fund. A further substantial grant was obtained from the FCO in 2006.

EHRAC was invited to attend, and facilitate, an NGO seminar concerning Russia which was organised by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in March 2004. EHRAC's director Philip Leach was invited to attend a seminar organised by the FCO's Eastern Research Group entitled "The North Caucasus in 2006: Prospects and Responses" in March 2006.

In January 2006, accusations of spying were made against employees of the British Embassy in Moscow. However, the project did not experience any negative repercussions from the Russian authorities in relation to this and a letter was received from Anthony Brenton, the British Ambassador to Russia, confirming its continuing support of EHRAC.

Over the period of the project, Prof Bowring worked on several occasions with Russian state representatives (see above) including senior members of the judiciary, state service, and parliament, as well as the Russian judge and state representative at the Strasbourg Court. He maintains cordial relationships with all of them.

On 15 November 2005, Prof Bowring was denied entry to Russia whilst travelling to observe trial proceedings in Nizhny Novgorod on behalf the Bar Human Rights Committee and his Russian visa was cancelled. His current inability to travel to Russia does present a challenge for the project, as he is unable to conduct training or

meet with staff there, however in March 2006 both EHRAC's Director, Philip Leach and Project Manager, Tina Devadasan, travelled to Moscow and on to Novorossiysk to meet with the project's lawyer in the region and potential clients and encountered no difficulties. Furthermore, there are indications that Prof. Bowring may be granted a new Russian visa by the end of 2006.

4. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this project been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

This is the only grant that London Met has received from the EC in relation to the target group in question.

5. How do you evaluate co-operation with the European Commission services?

Information and advice has been sought and obtained from the EC at various stages throughout the period of the project to date. The EC representatives have been very co-operative and helpful to the project.

The Project Manager, Tina Devadasan, maintained frequent contact with Mr Jean Jacques Lauture, previously Head of Operations and Coordination in Europe and Mr Bernard Lhoest, Task Manager for the project over the period 2003/2004. Prof. Bowring and Brigitte Voland, Head of the European Funding Unit met with Mr Lauture and Mr Lhoest in Brussels in October 2003 to discuss the progress of the project.

In July 2004, Ms. Tatiana Bokareva, Project Officer of the EC Moscow Delegation took over the responsibility for the project. Ms. Bokareva has been very available and approachable to the project and has been contacted over several issues. She has always done her utmost to be as helpful to the project as possible. EHRAC has particularly appreciated her quick responses to queries and assisting with requests for budget amendments and the extension of the project. These have allowed the project's work to continue uninterrupted.

Sean Carroll and Juana Mera of the Press and Information Section of the Delegation of the European Commission to the Russian Federation have been most helpful in approving press releases for dissemination at very short notice when Court decisions have been received. Their fast responses have allowed the project to achieve excellent press coverage.

Memorial

1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this project (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Give details about the division of responsibilities, transfer of expertise, and overall co-ordination of the partnership(s).

Throughout the project there has been a good working relationship between *Memorial* and EHRAC. There has been contact on a daily basis via telephone and e-mail making for strong communication between the two partners. Planning meetings have been held as per the 'plan of activities' of the grant application, as well as additional meetings held ad hoc with Prof. Bill Bowring during his frequent visits to Moscow and when project staff have been in the UK on various business.

The Director and Coordinator in the Moscow office work together with the Director and Project Manager in the London office to manage the project, as well as the day-to-day project activities. The Project Coordinator and Project Manager liaise closely and regularly on administrative issues, finance related matters (staff contracts, salaries, quality of receipts/invoices, financial accounting) and the planning and implementation of project events.

The lawyers in the Moscow office work on their respective cases with the help and support of Philip Leach and Prof. Bill Bowring as well as lawyers from the Bar Human Rights Committee, who provide guidance by email and telephone. In addition, case meetings have also been held between *Memorial* project lawyers and EHRAC's lawyers whenever this has been possible (during visits to Moscow or the mini-internship in London for example).

Ongoing support is provided by EHRAC's lawyers in regard to casework which includes the preparation of applications to the European Court, maintaining correspondence with the court registry, preparation of cases for Strasbourg representation and drafting of further observations on admissibility, merits and just satisfaction. The training seminars organised by the project (Sept 2003, Sept 2004, June 2005 and Sept 2005) were a further opportunity for the transfer of knowledge and capacity not only to *Memorial* project staff, but also to other training participants, many of whom came from the regional branches of *Memorial*.

In addition to preparing submissions to the Court and liaising with applicants, the Moscow lawyers have provided training to other organisations and seek to obtain publicity in the Russian media for project activities. *Memorial* lawyers working on the project in the regions assist with identifying potential cases, liaise with the Moscow office lawyers and carry out duties such as finding and interviewing applicants and witnesses and keeping applicants informed about the progress of cases. Thanks to the training provided by the project some of the regional lawyers have now also begun drafting themselves.

Overall, the project has been carefully monitored by the senior management of the London and Moscow offices, as well as by the Steering Committee, in which all the

partner organisations (London Metropolitan University, *Memorial*, Bar Human Rights Committee of England and Wales) are represented.

2. Is the partnership to continue? If so, how? If not, why?

The partnership is to continue in the future. Funding has been obtained by EHRAC to continue the project's work using a similar format to the previous three years and *Memorial* is currently awaiting funding decisions in response to applications recently submitted by the Moscow office.

3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and state authorities in the project countries? How has this relationship affected the project?

Memorial has not experienced significant problems with the state authorities over the duration of the project. *Memorial* was not named as one of the organisations being funded by the British Embassy employee accused of spying activity. Furthermore, *Memorial* has not, to date, experienced any direct adverse effects of the new NGO law, which came into force on 1 April 2006. However, *Memorial* is concerned about the effects of the new law on donor organisations, not all of which are willing to undertake the new registration process and who have reduced the amount of funding provided to *Memorial* this year. Project staff have always been successful in visa applications for travel to the UK and other EU countries on project business.

Memorial has experienced no particular problems from the authorities arising from the establishment of this project. There has been no formal contact with the authorities, but there is no doubt that the authorities are aware of the project. There were some very negative comments made by various public officials, including the head of the section in the Duma responsible for the international protection and the Russian Presidential Office's Representative for human rights in Chechnya, in response to the admissibility decisions in the 'first six' Chechen cases. Whilst the human rights ombudsman (Plenipotentiary) of the Russian Federation, Mr Lukin, has been very positive about these decisions, neither the State authorities nor public officials have mentioned *Memorial* or any other NGO in relation to these decisions.

Memorial is constantly making requests to the General Prosecutor's Office for further, more detailed information about developments in numerous investigations. Investigators from the Military Prosecutor's Office visit *Memorial* to get additional evidence on selected cases. After the European Court delivered its decisions in the "first six" Chechen cases some of our applicants have been intimidated by the security services in Chechnya and have been pressed to withdraw their applications to the European Court.

4. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this project been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

Memorial has not previously received any grants from the EC to work specifically in this field.

5. How do you evaluate co-operation with the European Commission services?

Cooperation with the European Commission services has been good. Since the transition of project monitoring from Brussels to Moscow, the Moscow office Director and Project Coordinator have met with Tatiana Bokareva on several occasions in Moscow. She has always been very helpful and has answered questions quickly.

Bar Human Rights Committee

1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this project (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Give details about the division of responsibilities, transfer of expertise, and overall co-ordination of the partnership(s).

Bill Bowring is a founder and Executive Committee member of the Bar Human Rights Committee of England and Wales (BHRC) and therefore works closely with them on a regular basis. Peter Carter QC who is a member of the Steering Committee is the Chairman of the BHRC. There is a very close co-operation and working relationship between EHRAC and the BHRC.

The UK network of lawyers working on the project cases are primarily made up of the members of the BHRC. The BHRC contributes articles towards the case bulletin and website, and members participate as trainers in the courses held in Russia.

The project has been highlighted in the 2004 and 2005 Annual Reports of the BHRC.

2. Is the partnership to continue? If so, how? If not, why?

Members of the BHRC will continue to provide expert advice on cases taken by EHRAC and its partners.

3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and state authorities in the project countries? How has this relationship affected the project?

The BHRC has not experienced any problems with state authorities in regard to its contribution to this project.

4. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this project been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

BHRC has not received any grants from the EC with regard to strengthening the same target group.

5. How do you evaluate co-operation with the European Commission services?

Due to its role within this project, BHRC has not had contact with European Commission Services

E. Other

1. How was the visibility of the EU contribution ensured in the project?

The project gratefully acknowledges the funding provided by the European Commission in each of its published documents, which also incorporate the EC logo.

Prof. Bowring and Philip Leach of EHRAC and Tatiana Kasatkina of *Memorial* and the Moscow and Regional project lawyers frequently participate in a variety of fora (please refer to C (9)) in the capacity of human rights trainers and activists, and use these opportunities to raise awareness of the work carried out under the auspices of this project and always refer to the generous support and financial contribution of the EC.

The Russian and English websites, press releases and publications (leaflets, bulletin and training manual) all carry the EC logo and text attributing the financial support of the project to the EC.

2. Did the grant help secure new sources of funding for your organisation or your partner, if applicable? Please give details.

EHRAC met with representatives of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) of the UK government in 2003 to discuss possible funding opportunities. The FCO was able to consider our application because the EC grant had established a viable organisation with a life of (at least) several years. In 2004 the FCO agreed to provide EHRAC with match funding in respect of case translation costs, cases expenses, mini-internships, training costs, funding and raising awareness initiatives.

An organisation in Switzerland, *Action des Chretiens pour l'Abolition de la Torture* (ACAT) and the UK-based *Oakdale Trust* also provided some financial support in 2004.

In 2005, a three-year grant was secured from the US-based *MacArthur Foundation* to begin in May 2005. Part of the first year of this grant constituted match funding for the project. This grant also facilitated the creation of a new position in the EHRAC London office: a Development and Public Relations Officer. One of the main functions of this position is to assist in fundraising.

Over the Summer of 2005 applications were made to a number of large grant making organisations for the continuation of the project after the end of EC funding. The credibility given to EHRAC by EC support and the fact that the organisation was now in its third year (again permitted by EC funding) played no small role in these organisations firstly agreeing to consider an application from EHRAC and secondly in awarding funding.

Thus, in late 2005, EHRAC was awarded substantial grants from *The Oak Foundation* (UK), *The Sigrid Rausing Trust* (UK), *Open Society Institute* (US) and repeat funding from the *Foreign and Commonwealth Office*, all to commence in early 2006 and supporting the project in a similar format to that as for the past three years. Small repeat donations were also received from ACAT and the *Oakdale Trust* and a donation from *The Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust*.

3. Please add any further information that would help the Commission to make a balanced assessment of the project.

4. The Commission wishes to publicise the results of projects. Do you have any objection to this report being published on the EIDHR website? If so, please state your objections here.

We have no objections. However, Annex G Case Progress Database contains near exhaustive details of our applicants and the cases, and must therefore be kept strictly confidential.

Name of the person responsible for the project: **Philip Leach**
Signature:Location: **London, UK**

Date report due: **30 Sept 2006** Date report sent: **19 July 2006**