MISSION AND VISION

Value Statement

- SALC believes in the promotion of democratic values, human dignity, substantive equality and non-discrimination.
- SALC focuses our work on communities who are marginalised and face challenges in accessing legal, social and environmental justice.
- SALC strives to foster an environment which respects the physical, mental and social well-being of our clients, partners and staff and encourages human flourishing.
- SALC strives to work in an inclusive, accountable, responsive, effective, consultative and empowering manner.

Vision Statement

SALC’s vision is that human rights and the rule of law are respected, protected, promoted and fulfilled throughout Southern Africa.

Mission Statement

SALC’s mission is to promote and advance human rights, democratic governance, rule of law and access to justice in Southern Africa through strategic litigation, advocacy and capacity strengthening.
Across the continent, human rights’ defenders (HRDs) face mounting obstacles in carrying out their work. Human rights defenders in many African countries are subjected to unwarranted attacks and increased characterisation as threats to national security. The past two years have seen an increase in the use of criminal justice systems in an attempt to deter HRDs through prosecution on deceitful and fabricated charges as well as detentions without charges.

In November 2018, SALC convened a three-day summit in partnership with regional and international human rights’ organisations, under the theme ‘Reflecting on Closing Civic Spaces and its Impact on Marginalised Groups in Southern Africa’. The meeting brought together experienced human rights activists, key population experts and lawyers from across Southern Africa to ventilate all issues requiring strategic litigation and advocacy aimed at improving the environment for human rights defenders in the region. The purpose of the summit was also to unpack the use of criminal laws against civil society and NGO regulation, and devise strategies to counter shrinking civic spaces and improve regional responses to attacks on HRDs. The takeaway from the summit was that new and more effective strategies need to be developed to protect human rights’ defenders against the backdrop of increasing pushbacks and closing civic space. These strategies include fearless lobbying of parliamentarians and political parties to seek their support; increased collaboration by civil society organisations and ongoing recognition, support and solidarity for those who activists who face adversity as part of their efforts to champion human rights.

Also concerning is the increased use of internet shutdowns over election periods and to deter protests. Going forward this will require close monitoring, proactive mobilising and technical strategies in order to safeguard the rights of association and assembly.

Kaajal Ramjathan-Keogh
August 2019

The 2017 - 2019 period has seen many important victories for SALC’s thematic programme areas. Key cases traversing international criminal justice, women’s rights, LGBTI persons’ rights and the rule of law are set out in this report. Alarmingly, the context in which many human rights’ defenders are operating undermines human rights defenders’ ability to uphold basic human rights.
101 CASES

MALAWI (27)
LESOTHO (6)
BOTSWANA (11)
ZIMBABWE (11)
ZAMBIA (17)
ESWATINI (12)
NIGERIA (2)
SOUTH AFRICA (7)
TANZANIA (1)
DRC (1)
NAMIBIA (1)
MAURITIUS (1)
KENYA (1)

NETHERLANDS (2)
SWITZERLAND (1)

SALC CASES PER COUNTRY

AFRICA

EUROPE
On 7 April 2017, the Southern Africa Litigation Centre appeared before the International Criminal Court (ICC) to argue that South Africa should be sanctioned for its failure to arrest President Omar Al-Bashir when he attended an African Union Summit in South Africa in June 2015.

This case dates back to 2015 when SALC pursued an arrest warrant for former Sudanese President Omar Al-Bashir when he attended an African Union Summit in South Africa. His presence in the country triggered South Africa’s obligation under international law, as a party to the Rome Statute, and under domestic law, to arrest President Al-Bashir for transfer to The Hague to face prosecution. President Al-Bashir is wanted for war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Two international arrest warrants have been issued for President Al-Bashir by the International Criminal Court.

Despite the arrest warrants, Al-Bashir was not arrested on arrival in South Africa, resulting in SALC approaching the North Gauteng High Court on an urgent basis to seek his arrest. The High Court issued an interim order to ensure President Al-Bashir remained in the country pending the finalisation of the legal proceedings and later ordered that he be arrested with immediate effect. In contravention of the court order, the South African government allowed Al-Bashir to leave South Africa. The government then took the matter on appeal to the Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA). In March 2016, the SCA ruled that the State’s failure to arrest Al-Bashir was unlawful.

The SCA held that South Africa is bound by the Rome Statute as incorporated into domestic law by the passing of our Implementation Act and that all forms of immunity, including head of state immunity, would not be a bar to the prosecution of international crimes or a bar to the surrender of persons charged with such crimes. This, in the court’s view, was wholly consistent with South Africa’s commitment to human rights at a national and an international level.

In December 2016, the ICC took a decision to convene a public hearing under Article 87(7) of the Rome Statute to discuss issues relevant to its determination of whether to make a finding of non-compliance by South Africa. SALC was admitted as an amicus curiae to make submissions before the Chamber. The hearing took place on 7 April 2017. SALC’s submissions sought to demonstrate that South Africa had clear domestic and international legal obligations to arrest and surrender President Al-Bashir to the ICC. The Pre-Trial Chamber of the ICC ruled that South Africa had failed to comply with its international law obligations as stipulated by the Rome Statute. SALC was assisted by Advocates Max du Plessis, Isabel Goodman and Lerato Zikalala.
On 23 February 2018, the Constitutional Court handed down a unanimous judgment in the consolidated applications in the State v Okah matter confirming that South African courts possess extra-territorial jurisdiction in respect of terrorism offences committed outside the country.

This followed the November 2017 hearing in which the Constitutional Court deliberated on the issue of whether South African courts possess extra-territorial jurisdiction for crimes of terrorism and serious offences committed outside South Africa, and whether this was limited to prosecutions for the financing of terrorism only. Justice Edwin Cameron delivered the unanimous judgment, dismissing Mr Okah’s cross appeals.

Mr Okah is a Nigerian citizen holding South African permanent residence. He was charged with 13 counts under The Protection of Constitutional Democracy Against Terrorist and Related Activities Act 33 of 2004 (the Terrorism Act). The charges relate to two bombings in Nigeria which took place on 15 March 2010 in Warri and on the 1 October 2010 in Abuja. Both bombings were intended to inflict maximum carnage and resulted in the death of at least nine people.

Mr Okah was in Nigeria at the time of the Warri bombings and in South Africa during the Abuja bombings. The High Court convicted him on all 13 counts and sentenced him to 24 years in prison. The Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA) however held that South African courts have extra-territorial jurisdiction only in relation to “the crimes of financing the offence,” and overturned the Warri convictions and reduced the sentence to 20 years.

The Constitutional Court found that the narrow interpretation adopted by the SCA resulted in an absurdity where a court would have jurisdiction to “prosecute the banker, but not the bomber”. The court stated that “the general duty to combat terrorism is broad. It commands a reading of the Terrorism Act that enables South Africa to participate, as a member of the international community, in the fight against an international and transnational phenomenon.

The conspicuous consequence of the contested interpretation is that it would pull the Terrorism Act’s teeth, rendering futile its expressed endeavour to give bite to this duty”. The undisputed facts before the trial court established that both the Warri and Abuja bombings were carried out in clear violation of international humanitarian law. Mr Okah intended for those bombings to be indiscriminate and deadly.

SALC was invited by the Court to make submissions and was admitted as amicus curiae. SALC’s submissions dealt with the interpretation of section 1 (4) of the Terrorism Act. SALC supported the State’s argument that the SCA erred in its narrow definition of “specified offence.” SALC submitted that a thorough reading of the entire Terrorism Act requires a broader meaning of the term “specified offence” which covers more than just the financing of terror offences.

The case is significant in confirming that South African courts possess extra-territorial jurisdiction in respect of terrorism offences. The Terrorism Act confers extra-territorial jurisdiction for courts to try crimes that occurred outside South Africa. The Constitutional court reinstated Mr Okah’s prison sentence of 24 years. SALC was represented in this matter by Advocate Kameel Premhid and Webber Wentzel Attorneys.
The Applicant in this case is a transgender man. He was assigned a female sex at birth. In challenging the Registrar’s refusal to change his identity marker on his ID document, he presented psychological and medical evidence before the Court regarding his innate gender identity and the significant trauma caused by the State’s failure to formally recognise his gender identity. The Applicant submitted that his identity document should reflect his gender identity, which only became apparent after his birth. The Applicant further submitted that the National Registration Act allows the Registrar to change any particulars of a registered person and to issue that person with a new identity card if there has been a material change to their circumstances. The Court held that the refusal to change the Applicant’s gender marker was unreasonable and violated his rights to dignity, privacy, freedom of expression, equal protection of the law, freedom from discrimination and freedom from inhumane and degrading treatment. The Court ordered the Respondent (the Registrar of National Registration) to change the gender marker on the Applicant’s identity document from ‘female’ to ‘male’ to protect his dignity and well-being. The Applicant was represented by Tshiamo Rantao and Lesego Nchunga and supported by the Southern Africa Litigation Centre.

On Friday 29 September 2017, the Lobatse High Court in Botswana handed down judgment in a case which challenged the refusal by the Registrar of National Registration to change the gender marker on the identity document of a transgender man. The Registrar of National Registration of Botswana also changed the identity document of transgender activist, Ricki Kgositau, who successfully brought a case on the legal recognition of her gender identity. SALC provided technical and legal support in this case.

These seminal cases demonstrate that courts in Botswana are champions of jurisprudence which acknowledges the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons and their right to equal protection before the law.
On 11 December 2018, the Constitutional Court confirmed the North Gauteng High Court ruling, that the former President’s actions in participating the in suspension of the SADC Tribunal in 2011 and signing the Protocol amending the Tribunal’s jurisdiction in 2014, were unlawful.

The SADC Tribunal was established by a treaty, the Protocol on the establishment of the SADC tribunal. When the protocol was adopted, it did not receive enough ratifications for it to enter into force. To solve this problem, the SADC heads of state and government, acting pursuant to its powers as a policy-making body of the organisation, decided to integrate the tribunal into the SADC Treaty as one of its organs by amending the SADC Treaty. This was done at Blantyre, Malawi on 14 August 2001. This amendment removed all obstacles that were preventing the tribunal from operating. On 18 November 2005, the SADC Tribunal was formally inaugurated, and it began to operate but was suspended in 2011 following a campaign against the Tribunal. In 2014, a new protocol for the tribunal was adopted. The new protocol changed the original jurisdiction of the tribunal by taking away its mandate to hear cases filed by individuals against States and only allowing it to hear cases brought by SADC member states against each other, also called interstate disputes. The suspension of the tribunal in 2011 and the adoption of the new protocol in 2014, were subject of a legal suit before the High Court of Pretoria (North Gauteng Division), in South Africa on 5 February 2018. A vast majority of the SADC member states, including South Africa, ratified other SADC protocols that still retain the SADC tribunal as a body responsible for dispute resolution. Many of these protocols also grant jurisdiction to the SADC tribunal to hear cases filed by individuals. For example: the SADC protocol on Gender, the SADC protocol on Finance and the SADC protocol on Corruption and others. The foregoing protocols were all ratified by South Africa before 2014, when the decisions to suspend the tribunal and adopt a new protocol on the tribunal, respectively, were taken. This means that the rights of South African citizens to access the tribunal were already vested. The same applies to citizens in other SADC countries which ratified the above SADC treaties before 2014.

The High Court heard arguments about the former President’s conduct regarding the Tribunal in a case brought by the Law Society of South Africa (LSSA) and others against the President of South Africa, among others. The Southern Africa Litigation Centre and the Centre for Applied Studies were admitted to join the case as amicus curiae. The Applicants requested the Court to determine that the former President’s action in participating in the decision that led to the suspension of the SADC tribunal in 2011 were unconstitutional. The Court was also invited to determine that the President acted unconstitutionally when he signed the 2014 Protocol. SALC argued that South Africa’s parliamentary ratification of the SADC Treaty and the First Protocol created a right for individuals to access a regional tribunal. As such, the 2014 Protocol, which was adopted by the SADC Summit hinders this access. Consequently, the President’s actions fail to be declared invalid and unconstitutional. On 1 March 2018, the High Court declared the President’s actions in participating in the suspension of the Tribunal in 2011 and signing the 2014 Protocol unlawful. The decision was then referred to the Constitutional Court for confirmation.

SALC was admitted as amicus curiae before the Constitutional Court. At the hearing SALC made submissions pertaining to relevant international and regional law legal basis for citizens to access a regional tribunal. These arguments were made to support the point that the suspension of the SADC Tribunal by the SADC Summit violated the rights of South African citizens to access Justice before the Tribunal. SALC was represented by Advocates Jathien Bhima and Thai Scott as well as Lawyers for Human Rights.
On 14 February 2018, the Lesotho High Court handed down a judgment in a landmark case on the rights of pregnant employees in the military: The case of Private Lekhetso Mokhele and Others v The Commander, Lesotho Defence Forces and Others. The Court further queried the basis for the Standing Order, enquiring whether pregnancy was an ailment and how it would make a soldier unable to carry out her duties, and, if that was the case, why the Commander did not proceed in terms of Section 24 of the Act which deals with the procedure where soldier is allegedly incapacitated.

In March 2016, the Commander of the Lesotho Defence Force (LDF) issued a Standing Order to the effect that any female soldier with less than 5 years’ service who became pregnant, wilfully or negligently, would be discharged from the force. The Applicants, two of whom were married, and one of whom subsequently had a miscarriage, became pregnant and were discharged from military service for willful disobedience of the Standing Order. They were discharged by the then Commander of the LDF, Lieutenant General Kamoli, and the Respondents were represented by Advocate Thembeka Ngcukaitobi. The Applicants submitted that the Standing Order itself was unlawful, unreasonable and irrational. In addition, they argued that the Standing Order was contrary to public policy and the common law principles of rationality, reasonableness and legality. The Respondents argued that the Applicants were represented by Advocate Mosaheng Rasekoai and supported by the Southern Africa Litigation Centre. The Applicants was unlawful, unreasonable and irrational because the reasons given by the Commander for its existence and application were unacceptable and objectionable, as the Commander appeared to place the army command in loco parentis to the Applicants and considered the Applicants as persons that were too young to engage in sexual activity, yet at the same time trusting them to handle weapons. The Applicants also argued that the fact that the same army provides for maternity leave for pregnant women in the army who have been in service for 5 years or more shows a contradictory stance and such differentiation was not justifiable. A further argument was also made, that other countries like Malawi, Zambia and South Africa had put in place maternity policies in the army that were equitable. The Respondents argued that the Commander was entitled to discharge the Applicants because he was empowered to do so in the best interests of the army for the purposes of army discipline. Secondly, that as the case was not a constitutional matter and merely a review, the Court should take a narrow approach to the case, without interrogating the appropriateness of the reasons given by the Commander for the policy. The Court adopted a robust approach in the case and raised questions about the lawfulness of the Standing Order itself, observing that the impugned order was not an order of a routine nature. The Court also observed that the Applicants were alleged to have breached a Standing Order, which was an offence itself, which, as provided for in the Act, attracted a maximum penalty of imprisonment. The Court further enquired whether pregnancy was an ailment and how it would make a soldier unable to carry out her duties, and, if that was the case, why the Commander did not proceed in terms of Section 24 of the Act which deals with the procedure where soldier is allegedly incapacitated. The Court rejected in its entirety. The Court viewed this a throwback to the patriarchal view that pregnant women are protected in employment. Importantly, the Court rejected the Respondents’ contention that pregnant soldiers must be discharged because they compromise the army’s operational capacity and jeopardize military discipline. The Court further queried the basis for the Standing Order, enquiring whether pregnancy was an ailment and how it would make a soldier unable to carry out her duties, and, if that was the case, why the Commander did not proceed in terms of Section 24 of the Act which deals with the procedure where soldier is allegedly incapacitated. The Court referred to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and its Optional Protocol which Lesotho ratified in 1995 and acceded to in 2004. Article 11 of CEDAW requires employers to ensure that pregnant women are protected in employment. Importantly, the Court rejected the Respondents’ contention that pregnant soldiers must be discharged because they compromise the army’s operational capacity and jeopardize military discipline. The Court viewed this a throwback to the patriarchal view that pregnant women are not fit to work and, therefore, are a disposable workforce, which view the Court rejected in its entirety.
The case began in March 2015 when a street vendor, the Applicant (Mr Mayeso Gwanda) in the case, was arrested by police while on his way to the market where he worked and charged with the offence of being a rogue and vagabond under Section 184(1)(c) of the Penal Code. The Penal Code provided that “every person in or upon or near any premises or in any road or highway or any place adjacent thereto or in any public place at such time and under such circumstances as to lead to the conclusion that such person is there for an illegal or disorderly purpose, is deemed a rogue and vagabond.” The offence of being a rogue and vagabond exists in the Penal Codes of many African countries and dates back to British colonial rule. The criminal case was stayed pending a constitutional petition in the Blantyre High Court challenging the constitutionality of the offence. The Applicant argued that section 184(1)(c) of the Penal code violates the right to dignity by being overbroad and giving law enforcement officers too much discretion, as well as negating the right to be presumed innocent. The Applicant submitted further that the enforcement of rogue and vagabond offences inevitably lead to arbitrary arrests given the wide powers of the police, which are influenced by police assumptions of criminality. These are often based on biases including those relating to poverty, gender, ethnicity and race. The Legal Aid Bureau, Centre for Human Rights Education, Advice and Assistance (CHREAA), Paralegal Advisory Services Institute (PASI) and Malawi Law Society were admitted as amicus curiae. On 1 September 2016, the Court heard arguments on preliminary procedural issues raised by the State. These were rejected by the Court on 4 October 2016.

Judgment was delivered on the merits on 10 January 2017 with the Court declaring the offence of being a rogue and vagabond unconstitutional and invalid. The main judgment was delivered by Justice Mtambo with concurring judgments by Justice Kalembera and Justice Ntaba. The Court found that the Applicant had made out a case that section 184(1)(c) of the Penal code violates, amongst other things, his dignity by being overbroad and giving law enforcement officers too much discretion, as well as negating the right to be presumed innocent. SALC and its partner organisation, the Centre for Human Rights Education Advice and Assistance (CHREAA) have been involved in ongoing advocacy on this issue. In the court case, SALC provided support in three amicus curiae applications, including the Legal Aid Board, CHREAA and PASI. Much work was also done by SALC after the judgment was handed down to ensure its implementation, including meetings with police, training of magistrates, and drafting plain language materials on the judgment.

On 10 January 2017, the High Court in Malawi declared the offence of being a rogue and vagabond unconstitutional.
Blogs and opinion pieces:
The Southern Africa Litigation Centre engages in advocacy efforts, including writing opinion pieces and blogs, to raise awareness regarding key human rights’ issues.

Read our Blog on albinism:

Read our Op-Ed on Forced HIV testing:
http://bhekisisa.org/article/2017-08-23-00-health-or-human-rights-false-dichotomy-could-fuel-a-resurgence-in-forced-hiv-testing

Read our article on TB and human rights:

SALC Submission to the SAHRC on xenophobia:
In 2017, the Southern Africa Litigation Centre made a submission to the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) on social cohesion and xenophobia in South Africa. This formed part of the SAHRC’s national hearing on xenophobia. In the submission, SALC called for the development of guidelines for xenophobia prevention, as well as the implementation of disciplinary measures against Department of Home Affairs officials who act contrary to the law.

Read SALC’s submission here:

Publication: an HIV Criminalisation Defence Case Compendium:
In countries all over the world, prosecutions of people living with HIV take place. These include prosecutions for the failure to disclose HIV status prior to sex (HIV non-disclosure). Prosecutions have also occurred for other acts such as breastfeeding. Convictions are common, including in cases where no intent to harm was established and no scientific evidence presented that transmission was possible or likely. The HIV Criminalisation Defence Case Compendium aims to support lawyers acting for those who are alleged to have put others at risk of HIV. It is based on research conducted in late 2017 and includes examples of criminal cases where strong defence arguments have resulted in acquittals or reduced penalties for persons living with HIV who have been accused of HIV exposure, non-disclosure or transmission.

Access the Compendium here:

Protection Frameworks for Refugees and Migrants in Southern Africa:
Refugees fleeing war or persecution are particularly vulnerable. If host countries do not offer protection, refugees may be condemned to an intolerable situation where their basic rights, physical security and lives are in jeopardy. SALC’s publication on Protection Frameworks for Refugees and Migrants in Southern Africa includes articles looking at South Africa’s asylum system, the arbitrary detention of migrants in Malawi as well as refugee protection in Uganda. It also considers the abuse of the refugee protection system.

Read SALC’s publication here:
Criminalisation of same-sex sexual acts in Botswana:

In May 2018, in commemoration of the International Day Against Homophobia, Tranophobia and Biphobia, Lesbians, Gays and Bisexuals of Botswana (LEGABIBO), the Southern Africa Litigation Centre (SALC), the UNDP and Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa launched a booklet entitled: “The law needs to change, we want to be free” – The impact of laws criminalising same-sex relationships in Botswana. The booklet aims to identify the impact of criminalisation of same-sex sexual acts on the lives of LGBT persons in Botswana and make evidence-based recommendations for law review.

Download the Booklet here:

SALC submission on the Road Accident Fund Benefits Scheme Bill:

SALC objects to the exclusion of undocumented migrants from the benefits of the proposed Road Accident Fund Benefits Scheme Bill (the Bill). There are significant numbers of asylum seekers, refugees and migrants, both documented and undocumented, in South Africa. South Africa’s immigration laws do not provide mechanisms for low skilled migrants to be able to regularise their immigration status. This leaves many migrants, including SADC citizens, without the ability to obtain any kind of immigration status. SALC expressed its concern that there are sections in the Bill that prejudice undocumented migrants in that no provision is made for their care and treatment should they become injured in a motor vehicle accident.

Access the supplementary submission on the Bill made by SALC here:

SALC’s Report on The Alignment of Eswatini’s Domestic law with recommendations of human rights mechanisms

It is more than seventy years since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted but the struggle to achieve full realisation of human rights remains a pressing reality. SALC’s Report on The Alignment of Eswatini’s Domestic law with recommendations of human rights mechanisms assesses how domestic laws of the Kingdom of Eswatini align with recommendations issued by three UN human rights monitoring mechanisms: the Human Rights Council (UNHRC), the Human Rights Committee (HRC) and the Committee on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (CEDAW Committee).

Access the report here:

SALC’s Report on the Closing of Civic Spaces:

SALC’s Closing Civic Spaces Report is a collection of articles from human rights practitioners, activists and human rights defenders operating in the Southern Africa region. The articles highlight contemporary issues of concern and paint the political and socio-economic context in which human rights defenders operate. The publication forms the background for a regional conference bearing the same title which took place in Johannesburg from 14 to 16 November 2018. The conference and publication came about through a collaborative effort between SALC, ARASA, the International Commission of Jurists, Media Legal Defence Initiative, the Southern Africa Human Rights Defenders Network and the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights.

Read the Report here:
Southern Africa Litigation Centre | Biennial Report 2017-2019
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Judge Sanji Mmasenono Monageng

Judge Sanji Mmasenono Monageng served as a Judge of the International Criminal Court, in The Hague, The Netherlands from March 2009 until June 2018. She served as a Judge of the Pre-Trial Division until 2012 when she was transferred to the Appeals Division where she served until June 2018, when her term at the Court came to an end. She also served as the 1st Vice President of the Court from March 2012 to March 2015. Previously, Judge Monageng served as an expert High Court Judge in the Kingdom of Swaziland, under the auspices of the Commonwealth Secretariat. Prior to this, she served as a Judge of the High Court of the Republic of the Gambia in the same capacity. She started her legal career as a Magistrate in the Republic of Botswana. Judge Monageng was also a member of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights appointed by the African Union, between 2003 and 2009, and was appointed as the Commission’s Chairperson in November 2007. She also served as Deputy Chief Litigation Officer in the United Nations Observer Mission to South Africa in 1994. Judge Monageng served as the founder Chief Executive Officer of the Law Society of Botswana for many years. She possesses expertise in women’s human rights issues, indigenous peoples and communities and children among others and human and humanitarian rights generally. Judge Monageng is one of the founder Trustees of the Southern African Litigation Centre. She is a member of the International Association of Women Judges, the International Commission of Missing Persons and the International Commission of Jurists, the Chartered Institutes of Arbitrators, London, Botswana and South Africa, among others. She presently practices as an Arbitrator and Mediator. Judge Monageng rejoined the Board of Trustees in 2018.

Dr Mark Ellis

Dr Mark Ellis is the Executive Director of the International Bar Association (IBA) the foremost international organisation of bar associations, law firms and individual lawyers in the world. Twice a Fulbright Scholar at the Economic Institute in Zagreb, Croatia, Mark Ellis earned his J.D. and economics degrees from Florida State University and his PhD in International Criminal law from King’s College, University of London. Prior to joining the IBA, Dr. Ellis spent ten years as the first Executive Director of the Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative (CEELI), a project of the American Bar Association (ABA), providing technical legal assistance to twenty-eight countries in Central Europe and the former Soviet Union, and to the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in The Hague. Mark is a frequent speaker and media commentator on international legal issues. He has published extensively in the areas of international humanitarian law, war crimes tribunals, and the development of the rule of law. His op-eds have appeared in The New York Times, The International Herald Tribune, The Sunday Times (South Africa) and The Times (London). Dr Ellis is a founding board member of SALC and also rejoined the SALC Board in 2018.

Rahim Khan

Abdool Rahim Khan is admitted as an attorney of the High Court of South Africa (T.P.D.) in 1977 and as an attorney of the High Court of Botswana in 1981. He is in private practice in Botswana.

Keith Baker

Keith Baker is a UK London solicitor and has been an individual member of the International Bar Association for approximately 25 years, specialising in cross-border private client work.

Zohra Dawood

Zohra Dawood is the Director of the Centre for Unity in Diversity. She was previously with the Open Society Foundation.

Sternford Moyo

Sternford Moyo has been a legal practitioner in Zimbabwe for 34 years. He is the Chairman and Senior Partner of Scanlen & Holderness.

Beatrice Mtetwa

A prominent media lawyer and human rights defender, Beatrice Mtetwa has appeared in numerous high-profile cases in Zimbabwe. In a country where the law is often used as a weapon of persecution, she has defended those targeted, at great personal risk. She is a past president of the Law Society of Zimbabwe and is the recipient of numerous human rights awards.
### Statement of Comprehensive Income for the Year Ended 28 February 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and donations</td>
<td>18 962 114</td>
<td>23 485 033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting income</td>
<td>40 175</td>
<td>139 659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received</td>
<td>590 971</td>
<td>312 891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal cost awards</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>1 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating and office costs</td>
<td>17 011 657</td>
<td>21 975 043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration costs</td>
<td>2 255 664</td>
<td>1 705 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, courier and stationery</td>
<td>1 178 205</td>
<td>655 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent, water electricity and security</td>
<td>82 133</td>
<td>153 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and accommodation</td>
<td>395 500</td>
<td>306 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project expenses</td>
<td>12 680 110</td>
<td>18 449 060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and contributions</td>
<td>2 075 88</td>
<td>1 820 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS FOR THE YEAR</strong></td>
<td>1 950 45</td>
<td>1 509 991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFER TO SUSTAINABILITY FUND</strong></td>
<td>(1 853 311)</td>
<td>(1 485 604)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFER TO EQUIPMENT FUND</strong></td>
<td>(57 100)</td>
<td>50 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF THE YEAR</strong></td>
<td>304 114</td>
<td>228 9286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT END OF THE YEAR</strong></td>
<td>344 160</td>
<td>304 114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement of Financial Position at 28 February 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>209 082</td>
<td>151 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESERVES AND LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated funds</td>
<td>5 180 560</td>
<td>3 230 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>209 082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 617 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>12 053 797</td>
<td>11 355 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>344 159</td>
<td>304 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred income</td>
<td>209 082</td>
<td>151 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for leave pay</td>
<td>4 617 31</td>
<td>2 774 008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total reserves and liabilities</strong></td>
<td>12 053 797</td>
<td>11 355 283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>