

2011 AGM Decisions:

A1 Professional Networks

Implementation of this decision is ongoing

During 2011, AIUK has undertaken a review of its existing networks to assess their health, areas for potential development and viability of new networks. A working group of representatives from each of the existing networks has taken part in three meetings and a survey was sent to 17,000 network members to gain their views on the effectiveness of their networks. We received approximately 350 responses.

Staff have also analysed network data to better understand behaviours, motivations and types of actions taken, as well as undertaking external research on networks within the human rights field and the third sector to learn from good practice.

The review will publish recommendations in the first half of 2012. These will be discussed with existing network committees. We will provide a further report to the 2013 AGM.

A2 UK Detainee Inquiry

This decision has been implemented and work is ongoing

In January 2012, the Government announced its intention to close down the Detainee Inquiry, due to the decision by the Metropolitan Police and Director of Public Prosecutions to launch further police investigations into UK involvement in unlawful transfer of two individuals to Libya. The Detainee Inquiry will provide the Government with a report on its preparatory work to date, and we hope that this will be made public. The Government statement said that they still intend to hold an independent, judge-led inquiry when the police investigations have been concluded.

The decision to end the inquiry followed 18 months of advocacy, campaigning and media work by Amnesty International and other NGOs criticising the Protocol for the Inquiry as falling short of international human rights standards. In August, these failings caused AI and its partner organisations to cease cooperation with the inquiry.

In November, 5,015 people supported an online membership action setting out the standards for a proper inquiry. However, the decision to scrap the inquiry and focus on the police investigations is good news because the limitations on the inquiry meant that it could not be credible. We will consider the report of its work so far when it is published and, once the police investigations have been concluded (this may take 1-2 years), we will continue to push for a credible, independent inquiry into allegations of UK involvement in human rights violations.

The advocacy and public campaigning work carried out by AI and other NGOs will make it more likely that the next inquiry will be human rights compliant. We have laid the groundwork with civil servants and Ministers as to what the key issues are that they will need to get right next time.

AIUK has raised the ratification of the Convention on Enforced Disappearances with the FCO and Ministry of Justice. We will continue to do so at an official level and will mobilise the membership when appropriate.

A3 LGBT Rights Campaigner

This decision has been implemented to the extent possible

In July 2011, a meeting was held between AIUK staff, AIUK LGBT Network members, IS staff, and the proposer of this motion to discuss AI's LGBT Strategy and areas where AIUK could support the work.

The IS outlined various areas of potential focus, stressing that resources were limited and prioritisation would be necessary. Work on de-criminalisation of homosexuality is likely to focus on human rights defender work in Cameroon, Uganda, South Africa and Kenya. This is likely to broaden out into human rights education work. Other projects are likely to focus on Europe (Transgender and inter-sex project and) and a continued focus on Pride events in the region. In Latin America, the focus is likely to be on violence against LGBT individuals and possible work on recognition of relationships.

AIUK will look to support any of these projects where a UK contribution is requested. Since the AGM, we have focused casework around Jean-Claude Roger Mbede from Cameroon, who was also included in the Write For Rights Campaign 2011. We also participated in an international Mayoral action on St Petersburg in response to proposed discriminatory legislation. AIUK maintained its presence at UK Pride events in 2011 and are currently planning a full season of activity again in 2012, including a strong presence at World Pride, taking place in London. We will also participate in Baltic Pride, Riga in 2012.

Staff support for our LGBT work continues to be part-time, which we believe to be sufficient to deliver AIUK's contribution to the international strategy and projects (although it should be noted that contributions of time are provided to this work from other AIUK teams, in addition to the work of the LGBT campaigner). During 2012, we are also looking to develop the size, skills and capacity of our LGBT Network to lead more of our campaigning in this area. A new LGBT Facebook Group is to be established.

A4 Arms Control

This resolution has been implemented and work is ongoing

AI's Arms Control Campaign is one of the three priority campaigns in the current Global Priorities Statement for the whole AI Movement. It is also a high priority campaign for AIUK.

The IS have allocated more resources to this work and have issued a series of campaign action circulars and new materials over the last six months. They organised an international meeting on the Arms Trade Treaty Campaign with AI Morocco in December 2011 (AIUK provided significant financial support for the meeting).

Within AIUK, the Arms Control Campaign has received a substantial budget and additional staff support. We participated fully at the UN Prep Comm in July 2011 and February 2012 sending a staff delegation. AIUK has developed a political and campaign strategy that focuses on maintaining strong UK Government support for an effective ATT during negotiations culminating in the July treaty conference.

A Campaign Action Bulletin was sent out to all activists in December 2011. We are in the process of producing a range of campaign materials for all activist constituencies for 2012 and have developed a public campaign concept focusing on David Cameron. All teams at AIUK are involved in planning and delivering a full public campaign on this area during 2012.

"Controlling the Arms and Security Trade" has been identified as one of twelve "critical pathways" (or programmes of research and action) designed to implement the current Integrated Strategic Plan. We therefore anticipate that work on the Arms Trade Treaty, as well as on general patterns of arms transfers and cases, will continue through the next four years at least.

B1 Solitary Confinement

This decision has been implemented to the extent possible

This AGM decision was forwarded to the International Secretariat, which advised that it had moved away from commissioning studies and instead looked to adopt accessible policy positions connected to AI's work on key issues within the Integrated Strategic Plan. It had no plan, therefore, to initiate a study into all issues relating to solitary confinement. Whilst AIUK can make requests to the International Secretariat and IEC, it cannot compel them to take a course of action set out in an AGM decision.

B2 Religious Freedoms

This decision has been implemented to the extent possible.

During 2011, the International Secretariat finalised the 12 "critical pathways" that it will use to take forward the human rights issues described in the current

Integrated Strategic Plan. One of these is entitled “Protecting People’s Freedom of Expression and Freedom from Discrimination”. One of the themes for this work is ending discrimination based on race, ethnicity and religion, with objectives including increased respect for freedom of religion and conscience, including intra-religious minorities.

The ‘critical paths’ do not represent campaigns in themselves, at least in the traditional, time-limited sense sometimes employed within AI. Instead, they are ongoing programmes of work that are pursued through specific research and campaigning projects. At the time of writing, a number of relevant projects were envisaged for 2012 and 2013 addressing countries and regions that include Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, China, Europe and Pakistan. In some cases, the projects address capital punishment for “apostasy”, reform to blasphemy laws and state failure to protect religious minorities, including Muslims, Christians and others. We anticipate that additional work will take place in response to events, through press releases and casework.

AIUK is confident that the movement would resist attempts to reintroduce a resolution to the UN on Defamation of Religions, as it has done previously.

In addition, in June and December 2011, AIUK’s Director discussed with the Foreign Secretary, at his Human Rights Advisory Group, the FCO’s new approach to Freedom of Religion and Belief and the manner in which the FCO should address issues around women’s rights and religion.

In January 2012, AIUK’s Director participated in a round table meeting with the Archbishop of Canterbury on questions of human rights and faith including issues arising from the hostility of the Anglican Church in Africa to LGBT rights.

B4 Human Rights Accountability in Sri Lanka

The decision has been implemented and work is ongoing.

The International Secretariat made representations to the United Nations that the UN Panel of Experts on Sri Lanka should avoid reliance on the conclusions of the *Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission* (‘LLRC’), as set up by the Sri Lankan Government in May 2010. The UN Panel of Experts stated that the commission was ‘fundamentally flawed’. AI has recently published a full-length report on this:

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/ASA37/008/2011/en/76ea6500-a9f5-4946-bf2b-7fc08bc5e37a/asa370082011en.pdf>

Calling for an investigation has been a major focus of AI’s work over 2011 and there have been several public statements to this effect. However, the UN Panel of Experts was not mandated to conduct investigations. Initially AI had called on UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to order an investigation, as AI believes he had the authority to do so after he received the final report. Ban Ki-Moon then transmitted the report to the UN Human Rights Council for its

consideration, so AI's recent calls have been for the HRC to take cognisance of the report and demand monitoring of the LLRC and ultimately potentially pass a resolution calling for an investigation. Our work on this issue remains ongoing.

At this stage, AI is not making any calls yet on the temporal mandate (the period of time to cover all allegations of abuse) as this work is at too early a stage. If an investigation is launched, it is likely that it will be limited in scope initially, covering the final phase of war.

On the issue of witness protection, AI continues to highlight lack of witness protection as a reason for not engaging with the LLRC and as a supporting rationale for the argument that Sri Lanka is unwilling or unable to implement justice mechanisms that meet international standards. This is detailed on our report on the LLRC and in our letter declining the invitation to make representation before the LLRC:

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/ASA37/015/2010/en>

Finally, AI continues to call for unhindered access for all relevant UN and humanitarian agencies, NGOs and journalists. We have repeatedly called for all individuals held without charge under various pieces of security legislation to be charged or released and for ICRC access to all places of detention, for example: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/for-media/press-releases/sri-lanka-repressive-laws-remain-despite-end-state-emergency-2011-08-26>

B5 AI Collaboration with Trade Unions

The decision has been implemented and the work is ongoing.

Amnesty's collaboration with the global unions, including the ITUC, continues to deepen, supported to a significant degree by AIUK's investment in the "global trade union adviser" role to the movement. Achievements in 2011 include intensive collaboration in the UK and with the global unions in relation to emerging threats to fundamental workers' rights in the USA and Fiji, continued casework collaboration, which saw the early release of Su Su Nway (Burma) and Mansour Ossanlu (Iran), and new commitments in defence of migrant domestic workers' rights under Amnesty's "people on the move" priority.

We have also taken forward a major collaborative project between AIUK and AI Turkey, working with two federations and eleven unions to press the government of Turkey to ensure the full guarantee of the rights to form and join trade unions, to strike and to collectively bargain (as contained in the

International Labour Organisation's core labour conventions). A May Day statement in defence of workers' rights was widely reported in the Turkish press and Turkish workers signed 20,000 action cards in support of our appeal. Amnesty will be meeting with the Minister of Labour to highlight our concerns.

We anticipate that the memorandum of understanding with the TUC will be updated during 2012, and that AIUK and the global movement will adopt a trade union strategy to take the movement through to 2016. At the heart of this strategy will be a commitment to intensify our collaborations with unions here in the UK and with the ITUC and the global unions. In December, an IS-led delegation visited the ITUC and a return visit is planned for the spring, with a view to potential partnership.

C1 Board Election Manifestos on the Website

This decision has been implemented.

This resolution has been implemented with all Board manifestos now on the website.

C2 Publicising AGM Positions

This decision has been implemented.

All AGM posts (role, duties involved and abilities required) involved in the running of the national conference and AGM are now advertised through the website and two editions of the Amnesty magazine (Nov/Dec and Jan/Feb). The posts will also be advertised in youth, student and local group mailings. The AGM Teller positions will be advertised in a "We look forward to seeing you at the National Conference and AGM" email due to be released on 2 April 2012.

C4 AIUK Strategic Direction

No implementation required.

This AGM Decision welcomed and approved the AIUK Strategic Direction 2011-2016 document included in last year's conference papers. No further action was required.

C5 Board Transparency

This decision has been implemented and the work is ongoing.

(The wording of this resolution's implementation was amended and agreed by the AGM – it therefore reads different from the previously published 2011 AGM Implementation Report)

While the C5 decision made some specific recommendations, the Board approached the implementation of this decision within the wider context of the 2009 ICM resolution which has a much wider objective of improving the overall level of governance within the Amnesty movement.

The Board felt that a simple response of publishing board agendas, minutes and papers as requested by the C5 decision in the absence of the wider governance work would have been less productive in the longer term aim of improving governance. The scope of this wider work is covered within the attached point by point response to the 2009 ICM resolution and the Board would emphasise that we have brought in external expertise from London City University Centre for Charity Effectiveness to help challenge the Board in its operations.

Since its March meeting Board papers the minutes of Board meetings are issued with the papers to all members who have made a request to receive Board minutes and agendas will be published for information purposes in commencing with the May 2012 meeting. Those members wishing to receive these are asked to apply through the following web address - <http://groups.google.com/group/aiuk-mob>.

During 2011, an open information policy has been developed to guide the organisation in how information should be shared with the members and the wider public. The basic principle behind the policy is that we will release information on request unless there is an established good reason not to do so. However, the provision of information should not present unreasonable costs or risks to AIUK. The policy holds that governance materials, such as agendas, minutes and papers will be available to members. The only instances where items might not be available would be where there is a duty of care to individuals, security or privacy issues, or confidentiality (legal, commercial or contractual) issues. However, these instances would be infrequent.

The Board is also conscious of the need to be more proactive in its communication of governance issues, in relation to both AIUK and the governance of the international movement. This will not only ensure that AIUK members are better informed of governance matters, and increase its transparency and accountability, but also assist in the improvement of standards of governance.

In light of the policy, the Board is now establishing an efficient method to ensure that this information can be easily distributed to those members who express an interest in governance issues.

Point by Point Response re Decision 10 of 2009 ICM
AIUK Board response is given in italics under each item

The International Council

Part A – Principles

DECIDES to adopt the following principles for the movement's democratic governance at all levels:

1. **Impact Focus:** The final and main objective of AI's governance is ensuring maximum human rights impact.

The Board is fully conscious of the need to ensure our human rights impact is the objective of the organisation. During 2011 the internal planning process has been revised to ensure that the organisation has clear focus on the delivery of five outcomes in relation to Arms Trade Treaty, Middle East and North Africa, Forced Evictions, Human Rights in the UK, and Growth also ensuring they are aligned with global priorities set by the international movement. Where possible one item on each Board agenda will provide a direct focus on our human rights work.

2. **Inclusiveness:** Internal and external stakeholders must be meaningfully involved in AI's governance.

The make-up of the Board is determined by the constitution of AIUK Section and includes reserved places for certain categories of members to ensure some internal stakeholder groups are not excluded. In addition the Board co-options take account of other members who possess certain skills required to ensure a good standard of governance.

3. **Diversity and Gender:** AI's governance bodies must be diverse and gender-sensitive.

The Board has to operate within the limits of our constitutional arrangements but within these constraints is committed to seeking a diverse and gender sensitive balance. Data is collected annually to monitor this and is included within the public Annual Report. During 2011 as part of the governance work it was identified to the Board that this needs to be extended to sub committees and this will be progressed in 2012. A diversity analysis will also be undertaken at the 2012 AGM.

The Board is also working with the Supporter Relations team on the information we gather from new and current members and how we can close the gaps on this data collection to improve our decision making and engagement in governance and the early results of this were presented to the Board at its March meeting.

4. **Quality Participation:** AI's discussion and decision-making culture must be based on mutual trust, competency, transparency, evidence-based information, open minds, a collaborative and constructive approach, and mutual respect.

The Board operates under a Code of Conduct which incorporates these principles along with others seen as best practice for operating within the UK not for profit sector, such as the Nolan principles, as the way it operates. The Code is reviewed annually and, through a completely separate piece of work during the year, was reviewed by National Council of Voluntary Organisations (NCVO) governance unit who have suggested one change to be made in the next annual review in relation to grievance procedures.

5. Transparency: As a rule, all governance related information must be freely accessible to AI members. Confidentiality is the exception.

This was discussed in detail at the February Board meeting where it looked issue in the wider context e.g. in relation to all information rather than just governance related information and in relation to the wider public rather than just that of the members. The Board agreed how governance information should be shared wider with the presumption being that information should be open with a presumption of disclosure. It also defined those circumstances where information might not be shared in more detail – the reference in the ICM resolution to confidentiality is correct, but was not deemed adequate without greater detail. These changes are now in place and the March papers have been shared accordingly and we will highlight to the members the ability to receive this information.

6. Accountability: All of AI's governance structures must be part of an internationally integrated accountability system.

The integrated accountability system is clearly one that will be defined by the international movement, but AIUK is one of the leading sections in terms of its accountability and compliance with the INGO accountability charter – indeed we have not just reached the minimum level as achieved by the International Secretariat, but reached the second level of compliance (known as Level B). The Board of AIUK is clearly accountable to the AGM through its reports and also maintains oversight on the feedback mechanism through a nominated Board member during the year with the whole Board reviewing feedback on an annual basis.

7. Effectiveness and Efficiency: AI's governance structures, systems and processes must be as simple, clear and effective as possible in order to make best use of the movement's limited governance resources.

This has been one of the main areas of focus that the Board has had since the 2011 AGM – work in this area has included;

- Identifying the key issues that the Board needed to spend its time and resource on over the year*
- Establishing a common shared view on what the governance structure is within AIUK*
- Establishing clear role descriptions for the roles of Chair and Vice Chair of the Board*

- *Reviewing the sub committee structures and how their work is best integrated into the Boards work including how they report to the Board and how the Board sets their objectives*
- *Reviewing the process for appointments to sub committees*
- *Reviewing and revising the way Board meetings are structured and papers presented to them being clear on what the Board is asked to do.*

In carrying out this work we have brought in external expertise from London City University Centre for Charity Effectiveness and the National Council of Voluntary Organisations to challenge the Board in its development.

Part B - Mechanisms

In order to improve the movement's compliance with the above principles
DECIDES:

Inclusiveness

- **Consultation:** Consulting relevant external stakeholders before making decisions will be standard AI procedure, both at the national and international level. In each consultation, all AI entities participating will disclose which internal and external stakeholders were consulted and their feedback.
- **Advice:** Advisory committees and working groups at all levels, national boards, national AGMs, the IEC and the ICM will involve external stakeholders in order to make best use of their know-how, expertise and skills and in order to ensure that their perspectives and voices are heard when decisions are made.

The February Board meeting reviewed issues around consultations and confirmed that consultation should be as wide as possible, especially where the Board deems the issue to be significant or a difficult one to resolve. The Board did not feel that it was possible to set out a prescriptive framework around when it would use which form of consultation, however the Board is willing trial different ways of consultation. As an example in the early summer 2011 the Board used a separate webspace for members to contribute to the discussion on the resolutions and issues to be debated at the International Council Meeting.

Diversity and gender and quality participation

- All AI entities will have mechanisms in place to ensure that decision-making bodies have the right mix of knowledge, skills and experience, are diverse and gender balanced (e.g. through the use of nominations committees).

As highlighted above there are some constitutional issues in relation to this, but AIUK is committed to seeking a diverse and gender sensitive balance in decision making bodies.

Transparency

- **Communication:** Normally, information about the status of pending governance decisions (e.g. when the decision is due to be made; what information it will be based on) will be freely available to AI members.
- **Open access:** Normally, discussions of pending decisions and feedback received in formal consultation processes will be freely available to AI members. In exceptional cases where confidentiality is of a crucial importance, the relevant governance entity can identify the consultation as confidential and restrict access accordingly.
- **Justification:** Each formal decision taken by an AI governance entity will contain the following elements: background and rationale of the decision, final text of the decision, validity and applicability of the decision explaining whom the decision is addressed to, whether the decision is a recommendation or binding, and whether the decision is for the international or the national levels or for both.

These are useful guiding mechanisms as the Board continues to implement the resolution and the decisions taken at the February Board meeting. Where there are future consultations on governance issues then the Board will ensure these are utilised and will be happy to inform members of them, using the google group as the most appropriate mechanism that is currently in place.

Accountability

- **Objectives:** Every strategic decision will include key performance indicators and benchmarks against which success can be measured. All Sections, Structures and the IS will agree, commit and set out in writing their contribution to the movement's strategic objectives, including benchmarks and key performance indicators.
- **Reporting:** The INGO Accountability Charter contains the minimum requirements for the accountability of all Sections, Structures and the IS. The IEC will ensure that all parts of AI report in ways that enable AI as a whole to fulfil the requirements of the Charter.
- **Non-Compliance:** AI entities which do not report as required or whose report shows that they do not fulfil their obligations towards the movement may have to face sanctions as decided upon by the IEC.

AIUK's objectives have been aligned with those of the international movement and the 2011 operational plan is quite explicit in this. AIUK reports to the International Secretariat though the movement wide reporting process how its activities and resources are directed towards the movements strategic objectives. As noted in section 6 above, AIUK complies with the INGO accountability charter and has gone beyond the minimum requirements by achieving Level B of the Global Reporting Initiative (a higher level than the International Secretariat has achieved to date).

Effectiveness and efficiency.

- **Clarity of roles:** All AI entities ensure that all stakeholders participating in discussion, consultation and decision-making processes will be clear at all times about their roles. Each of these different participatory activities carries different access requirements, different rules of engagement and different responsibilities, which will always be made clear, transparent and explicit.
- **Strategy:** AI governance bodies will prioritize strategic decision-making.

Point 7 under principles covers the substantial work that the Board has done to date on this area

D1 One Financial Amnesty

This decision has been implemented.

The assessment model included in Decision 18 of the 2011 International Council Meeting will increase the resource AIUK contributes to the international budget over time. Some moves have been made to ensure the transition does not undermine the ability of AIUK to maintain its strong activist base, in particular the ICM extended by five years the original 2016 target for allocating 40% of Amnesty's global resources to the international budget. However, there are still challenges in the difficult economic environment that AIUK faces. For the current 2012 year, the AIUK Board is in discussion with the IEC over the level of assessment that will be paid.

D2 Changes to International Governance

This decision has been implemented.

The discussion and eventual decisions of the 2011 ICM reflected most of the points raised in Decision D2. The one area where AIUK's view was not in the majority was in relation to IEC compensation, where the ICM decided to permit IEC members to claim compensation for loss of earnings in addition to normal expenses. However, these were limited to a maximum of £2,000 per calendar year, per IEC member. Such payments must be approved by a Payments Committee and be reported to the movement.

D3 Solidarity with Staff at the International Secretariat

This decision has been implemented to the extent possible and is ongoing.

In relation to the union recognition issue raised in the motion, the trade union and management at the International Secretariat reached a new recognition agreement in August 2011. There will be other staff changes at the IS with the “Moving Closer to the Ground” process and we maintain links with the IS Organisational Development department to ensure AIUK is aware of these changes and, where appropriate, we provide advice.

D4 Transparency of Financial Information

The implementation of this resolution is ongoing.

AIUK now receives quarterly reports from the IS detailing expenditure against budget and reports after IEC meetings. For details of how this is to be communicated to the AIUK membership, see the implementation report for Decision C5.

Details of the number of IS staff earning above £60,000 per year are contained within the statutory accounts of Amnesty International Limited, the legal company that employs the IS staff, and are published on the AI website. The report from Dame Anne Owers also recommended that disclosure be reviewed to ensure it is in line with best practice.

D5 Amnesty International Governance

The implementation of this resolution is ongoing.

The issue of the payments to the ex-Secretary General and her Deputy was a major focus at the 2011 ICM where AIUK argued strongly that the issues highlighted in the report from Dame Anne Owers needed to be taken seriously by the IEC (AIUK did contribute its views to the review). A decision was adopted at the ICM that set in train a number of actions, requiring the IEC to report regularly to the Chairs Forum and the 2013 ICM on implementation progress. The resolution covered a wide range of issues but primarily focused on improving the performance of the IEC. A first report to the movement was issued in late 2011.

In terms of the reporting on these governance issues to the membership please refer to the implementation report for resolution C5.

AGM Decision D5 also asked for the salary ranges of AIUK senior management team to be published. These are contained in the AIUK Annual Report and in the AIUK Statutory Accounts, a copy of which is contained in the AGM conference pack. Both these documents are also on the AIUK website.

2010 AGM Decisions

The Implementation Report presented to last year's AGM, stated that all of the decisions adopted in 2010 had been implemented, with the following exceptions. This report provides an update.

A1 Prostitution

This decision has been implemented

In calling for a review of the issue of prostitution and human rights, this AGM decision is similar to Decision B5 adopted at the 2009 AGM. This earlier resolution called for AIUK to table a resolution to the 2009 International Council Meeting calling for a review. As last year's implementation report noted, the UK delegation did indeed table a resolution but withdrew it "due to evident anxiety within the movement about the resolution, leading to a lack of clear evidence that the resolution would succeed if pushed to a vote".

The Board noted that the issue of prostitution/sex work is controversial and widely contested. However, it continued to believe that a review of AI's positioning was desirable, although the likeliest way of achieving such a review is by highlighting its relevance to the actual research and campaigning work conducted by the movement, rather than raising the issue in a more abstract manner (given the failure to make headway with the ICM resolution). The approach appears to be vindicated by the International Secretariat's approach to wider policy studies (as described in the implementation report for Decision B1, above).

To this end, in January 2011, AIUK responded to a consultation paper issued by the IS on possible strategies for work on migration. The response contained the following paragraph:

As AIUK noted at the 2009 International Council Meeting, work on trafficking for the purposes of sexual exploitation tends to bring Amnesty into close contact with protagonists of different forms of responses to prostitution/sex-work. We continue to feel that reflection is needed at the International Secretariat on this question and this paper reinforces that view, as it suggests the need to look at root causes of migration, which include both 'push' and 'pull' factors.

The International Secretariat is now in the process of recruiting an advocate/adviser for an 18 month special project to analyse human rights laws, standards, and practice pertaining to criminalization in the following areas: abortion, same-sex sexual conduct, sex outside of marriage, **sex work**, transmission of HIV, women's conduct during pregnancy, sexual and reproductive health and rights information provision, and drug use. AIUK will monitor this project.

A2 Reporting States' Extra-Territorial Human Rights Impacts

This decision has been implemented to the extent possible and work is ongoing.

Last year, the Board noted that the scope of this AGM decision is potentially vast, as many states have very significant extra-territorial impacts, including through the actions of the corporations that are registered in their jurisdiction. Consequently, resource and methodological challenges apply to the International Executive Committee or International Secretariat in implementing this decision.

The Board also highlighted how the IS had identified the need to focus on the foreign policies and extraterritorial impact of emerging global and regional powers like China, India, Russia and Brazil.

Since then, the decision has been referred to the International Secretariat, which advises that the issues raised are “very much on our radar both with regard to the issue of extraterritorial obligations and with regard to the requirement that businesses at a minimum respect human rights”. Additionally, a research project has been proposed to examine the impact of Chinese corporate activity (alongside continued work on the activity of Western corporations). Amnesty’s growth projects are proceeding for some of these countries (notably India, Brazil and Russia), which will be the best way to ensure the longer-term creation of capacity to monitor the extra-territorial impacts of major powers.

Whilst the potential scope of the resolution remains vast, the Board believes that the steps taken by the IS and the direction it is heading in are positive.

A3 Climate Change

This decision has been implemented to the extent possible and work is ongoing

In last year’s Implementation Report, the Board highlighted how Decision C2 of the 2009 AGM had led to the development of a database “tag” for urgent action cases where there was an environmental dimension. During 2011, a dozen Urgent Actions were issued that were ‘tagged’ in this way. These mostly related to human rights defenders working on issues like land rights and access to resources. AIUK is in the early stages of discussing possible partnerships with environmental organisations to support these kinds of actions.

In 2011, AI Peru submitted a resolution to the International Council Meeting on this issue, which AIUK was prepared to support. However, the Peruvian section withdrew their resolution, opting instead to sponsor an ICM seminar on the issues. Participants included representatives from Greenpeace and the Centre for International Environmental Law. Attendees heard how human rights language could be useful in climate change debates and that the movement’s existing work, particularly on extractive industries, complements the work of climate change (for example, by tackling the hidden subsidy to costs of production that occur when companies and governments fail to respect human rights).

The report from the International Council Meeting (AI Index: ORG 52/001/2012) states that “in order to grow this work, Amnesty International will continue to develop its partnership with Greenpeace International and explore opportunities to work with other related organizations such as Earth Justice. Amnesty International will continue to push for legal standards and intervene in courts to create more tools for addressing violations related to climate change”.

B3 Children’s Human Rights

This decision has been implemented

Last year, the Board reported that although the International Secretariat does not have a body of work specific to children’s rights, they are covered through existing work and projects. Examples that were noted included work on child soldiers in Africa and on female genital mutilation in Europe.

The International Secretariat explained that it engages in ongoing evaluation of its research work to assess whether children are disproportionately impacted by the human rights abuses that Amnesty is documenting.

The Board reported that the movement’s current approach to child rights has enabled AIUK’s Children’s Human Rights Network to take action or share information on a range of cases and issues, including the execution of child offenders, the impact of forced evictions on children, mandatory pregnancy and virginity tests for schoolgirls and sexual violence.

Throughout 2010 and 2011, AIUK’s Belfast Office helped to facilitate a process to achieve justice and reparation for victims of institutional child abuse in Northern Ireland, culminating in the announcement of an official inquiry.

However, the Board did not regard the 2010 decision as fully implemented, noting that AIUK would take opportunities to advocate for further work on children’s rights, particularly at the 2011 International Council Meeting. Accordingly, in August, AIUK supported an AI France resolution that resulted in ICM Decision 3:

The International Council

DECIDES to integrate the work on the rights of the child within the Movement in such a way that the profile of Amnesty International’s work on these rights is raised, giving more importance to advocacy initiatives, activism and campaigns, and making greater use of partnerships.