

REPORT ON THE PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION of AGM/EGM RESOLUTIONS

This report has been approved by the AIUK Board of Directors.

NB: This report contains the following information:

- EGM decisions 2013
- AGM decisions 2012
- AGM decision from 2011 that were on-going.

There are a number of changes to this report in order to progress Decision C3 from AGM 2012. These are:

- The name of Board member responsible for taking the resolution forward has been added to each resolution (applicable to EGM 2013 and AGM 2012 decisions onwards);
- Noting the authors of this report;
- A Glossary defining what each status descriptor means;
- Being clear where we have partially met or been unable to advance a resolution by clarifying why this is the case.
- Agreeing that when an allocated Board member does not continue on the Board beyond the current year, and the decision is on-going, a new Board member will be allocated in May. New names will be published in the Board minutes following the AGM.

Glossary:

- **The resolution has been implemented:** The resolution has been implemented and there is no further action required.

- **This resolution has been implemented and will occur annually:** The resolution has been implemented and will be implemented on an ongoing basis annually. For the purposes of the Implementation report, it will not need to be reported on again;

- **This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:** All steps have been taken to advance the decision and it is AIUKs judgement that we have implemented the resolution to the best of our abilities. As such, its implementation will not be reported on again;

- **The implementation of this resolution is on-going:** The decision has been partially or fully implemented but there is continued scope to do further work. This work will be reported on again at the next subsequent AGM;

- **No implementation required:** It has been decided after exploring the issues that there is no longer a need to take further this resolution. The Board will be clear why this is the case.

EGM 2013 Resolutions:

These Resolutions were passed at the Extraordinary General Meeting that took place on the 12th January 2013.

Special Resolution 1: Amend Articles for Special Resolutions

Board member: Ciarnan Helfertey

The implementation of this resolution is on-going:

We are in the process of making this change. The Articles of Association will be updated in accordance with this decision in advance of the 2013 AGM.

Special Resolution 3: International Reporting

Board member: Ciarnan Helfertey

The implementation of this resolution is on-going:

The Finance Sub-Committee of the Board and the Trustees of the AIUK Charitable Trust continue to work with the IS to further improve reporting on the impact of the AIUK assessment payment. The Board have formally made the IS aware of this resolution being passed at the AIUK EGM and the need for it be implemented.

The Board's resolution to the 2013 AGM also seeks to aid the implementation of this resolution by seeking to establish clear performance indicators for measuring the impact of Amnesty International. This to improve and strengthen governance mechanisms within the movement and establish clear financial and impact reporting mechanisms from the IS to sections and to report on progress at the next AGM.

Special Resolution 6: Reorganisation and Budget

Board Member: Ciarnan Helfertey

The implementation of this resolution is on-going:

In response to 6a, the Board paused implementation of the proposed reorganisation of AIUK staffing structure pending the outcome of the 2013 AGM at which the Board is seeking consent to implement this reorganisation.

In response to 6b, the Finance Sub-Committee on 5th February of the Board received updated budgets for 2013-2017. These will be further refined by the Finance Sub-Committee on 27th February with a recommendation to the Board's meeting on March 2nd.

Special Resolution 7: Section / Trust Implementation

Board member: Ciarnan Helfertey

The implementation of this resolution is on-going:

Please see implementation above. The Board of Trustees meeting of the 5th February invited the Finance Sub-Committee of the Board to assist in its consideration of the outcomes of the EGM.

2012 AGM DECISIONS:

Decision A1: Human Rights and the Democratic Republic of Congo

Board Member: Rona Keen

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible.

As per the decision passed, AIUK informed the International Executive Committee of this AGM decision by letter in July 2012. Subsequently, AIUK staff also met with the proposer in August 2012 to discuss the way forward in implementing this resolution. Finally, the proposer also met with IS staff working on the DRC and this contact was followed up by AIUK staff. Outside of our request to the International Secretariat, AIUK also met with the authors of the Justice First report and we wish them success in their campaign.

AIUK has opted into the Protection of Civilians campaign, as passed in the AGM decision, as a priority for country coordinator-led campaigning. Wider AIUK planning and prioritisation has not proceeded as normal due to the Cost and Priorities Programme that is underway.

The Chair of the IEC responded in October. He confirmed that the DRC was prioritised within IS work plans but did not address our specific request that additional resources be invested to assess risks to returned asylum seekers. Separately, IS staff have informed AIUK staff that research on civilians at risk is the priority and that there are insufficient resources to systematically address the issue of returns. It is unlikely that the IS will investigate the issue of returned asylum seekers in the foreseeable future.

Decision A2: Refugee/Asylum Seekers – Still Human Still Here

Board Member: Collette Crill

The implementation of this resolution is on-going:

AIUK continues to be active on a range of refugee-related issues. This has included electronic communications and action on “push backs” to Libya of asylum seekers and a Still Human, Still Here action targeting MPs on the issue of welfare support for asylum seekers. Additionally, earlier work conducted by AIUK on abuses by private security companies during the process of enforced returns has been backed up by the House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs, which echoed many of our conclusions.

Recently, we have also initiated a research project to ascertain why so many initial decisions to refuse asylum are overturned on appeal. This work will continue into 2013 and we will report back at AGM 2014.

As per the decision, we have also sought to increase coverage of refugee and asylum issues in the Amnesty magazine, including a two page spread in the July 2012 edition. A meeting between key staff, the relevant board member, the proposers and other local groups in the West Midlands has been arranged for the end of February 2013 to discuss further implementation and AIUK's wider refugee and asylum work.

Decision A3: Street Children in Brazil

Board member: Katie McSherry

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

AIUK wrote to the International Executive Committee in July 2012. The IEC Chair responded by stating:

“there are currently no plans or projects which focus on street children in Brazil or in the rest of the region during this OP [Operational Plan]. The work completed at the International Secretariat is guided by the Critical Pathways which have not prioritised street children and there are therefore no expectations to select this issue under OP3 either”

Putting aside the internal planning jargon, the message we have received is that the IS is not planning to undertake work on this issue.

This is disappointing, however, it should be noted that during 2013, the IS is undertaking a consultation with all sections/structures on possible global campaign priorities for 2014. Currently under consideration is a campaign proposal on Brazil and forced evictions in the run up to the 2014 World Cup

and 2016 Olympics. It is important to note that whether the campaign is chosen as a global campaign or not, this work will still happen. In order to advance the decision to request the IS research human rights violations against street children in particularly Brazil, AIUK are participating in the consultation and will advocate that the impact of forced evictions on street children be part of the campaign.

A4: Guantanamo Bay

Board member: Peter Murray

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

As per the first and third part of the decision to publicise events and demonstrations concerning Guantanamo, on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the detention centre still being open and in the run up to the Presidential elections, AIUK secured excellent media coverage. We had a blog picked up in the Huffington Post (http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/neil-durkin/guantanamo-is-the-future-still-orange_b_2456896.html?just_reloaded=1); Letter to The Times and a comment article by Kate Allen published on Public Service Europe (<http://www.publicserviceeurope.com/article/2929/guantanamo-is-indictment-of-us-failure-to-tackle-terrorism>).

As requested, the profile of the work on the case of Shaker Aamer has been considerably increased by his incorporation within the International Secretariat's global Individuals at Risk portfolio. AIUK now has a structured case file with clear objectives, guidelines and consents on the case. This is a big step forward in terms of a more consistent and effective approach to campaigning on his case across the movement. The case file has also given us a clear steer in terms of what we are allowed to say/ not say on Shaker's case which had previously been unclear. The case has been incorporated into the global portfolio, in part, due to our strong lobbying for its inclusion.

To support the objectives of the case, AIUK delivered the following: new e-communication to activists and supporters, campaigns mailing to local groups, a SMS action through Pocket Protest and a new petition for Shaker to coincide with the 11 year anniversary. There are further planned activities such as the handing in of the petition to the US Embassy by our Director on the 14th February 2013 (Shaker's 11 year anniversary in detention).

AIUK has made significant progress in establishing Shaker's case as part of the international Individuals at Risk portfolio. His case is emblematic of both the wider historical human rights abuses that have taken place as well as

those continuing to this day. With the renewed focus on his case, we have a clear strategy for change.

No work has been undertaken specifically on Ahmed Belbacha's case over the past year. Throughout 2012 and continuing into 2013 the USA team has been in the process of redeveloping our portfolio of Guantanamo-related Individual at Risk cases so that it is comprised of a selection of strategic cases which are emblematic of the vast range of human rights violations associated with Guantanamo, at the moment this includes casefiles for Maher Arar, Mohamed Al-Qahtani, Adnan Latif, Hussein Almerfedi, and Shaker Aamer.

All campaigning undertaken on these cases also includes calls for the resolution for the cases of other detainees, such as Achmed Belbacha, held with charge or trial at Guantanamo.

B1: The Human Rights of Environmentally Displaced Persons

Board Member: Harrison Littler

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

As per the decision to request the IS examine the issue of environmentally displaced persons, in a letter of July 2012, AIUK requested that the IEC examine this issue. In October, the Chair of the IEC replied, acknowledging that environmental issues are a factor in displacement and that AI has addressed human rights issues in communities affected by environmental change. More substantively the response states that:

“In the refugee context, the IS has participated in various discussions on environmentally induced displacement (often, and inaccurately, referred to as climate refugees) within the framework of the UN, as well as in the UK as part of a network coordinated by Climate Outreach and Information Network (COIN).

Our current assessment is that existing human rights standards are sufficient to deal with human rights abuses in the context of displacement linked to environmental factors. However, these standards will not be adequate if the predictions of displacement of tens of millions due to climate change materialise. There are some discussions internationally about developing a framework to deal with this kind of displacement, which we follow”.

The response suggests that the IS is not yet ready to identify “environmental displacement” as a specific category for protection beyond the bounds of

existing standards but they are keeping the situation under review. AIUK will continue to monitor the situation.

B2 International Sport Organisations and Human Rights

Board member: Cris Burson-Thomas

This implementation of this resolution is ongoing:

AIUK sent a letter to the Chair of the International Executive Committee informing them of this decision. In his reply, the Chair of the International Executive Committee stated that with respect to the potential ICM resolution from AIUK, *“the Chair of the 2013 ICM is anxious to deal with issues of interest to sections and the membership through innovative and participative means where possible...Raising resolutions on these issues is not the only, and possibly not the most effective way to get an issue on the floor of the ICM.”*

In his response, he also drew attention to the current event-by-event approach to work on sport and human rights.

It is our assumption that the intent of this AGM decision was to move beyond discussion on whether we should do this work and seek a decision from the ICM on this issue. The following resolution to the 2013 ICM has been submitted by AIUK:

“The International Council DECIDES

- *That the International Executive Committee shall develop a policy on international sporting organisations and the prevention of human rights abuses, addressing their constitutions and accountability processes, the planning and organisation of events, participation and discrimination, sponsorship and procurement and any other area likely to have a human rights impact;*
- *That the IEC shall develop a comprehensive strategy, to include*
 - *Assessment of the human rights impact (positive and negative) of major sporting events;*
 - *Lobbying and campaigning to ensure the adoption and compliance of major international sporting organisations with appropriate human rights standards*
 - *An assessment of whether UN or other IGO standard-setting mechanisms might assist the mainstreaming of human rights considerations into the decisions of international sporting organisations.”*

We would also note that on the horizon are also potential opportunities to take this work forward under some of the proposed IS global campaign priorities for 2014. Sections/structures are currently being consulted on potential candidates for global campaigns during 2013. Included in these proposals are a campaign proposal on Forced Evictions, with a potential focus on Brazil (as mentioned in update for 2012 AGM Decision A3) in the run up to the 2014 World Cup and 2016 Olympics and a separate campaign proposal on Qatar 2022 World Cup and labour exploitation of migrant workers.

AIUK will seek to influence, through its submission to the consultation, the possibility of bringing these two proposals together under one overarching sports and human rights framework and monitor the progress of the development of these campaigns.

B3 Campaigning for Trade Union Rights

Board Member: Tom Hedley

This resolution is on-going:

AIUK drew the IEC's attention to this AGM decision in a letter of July 2012. The Chair of the IEC responded in October, stating that

"A dedicated campaign on Trade Union rights is not something which is possible given the prioritisation of work as part of the critical paths...However, within the people on the move critical pathway, we have a focus on labour rights of migrants workers...As noted by the AIUK AGM, the IS is working to support AIUK's efforts to develop a global trade union strategy".

The letter also drew attention to potential relationship with the ITUC. AIUK will seek to influence the development of the labour rights of migrant workers campaign to ensure that trade unions are a relevant part of the strategies.

More broadly, attempts to develop a global trade union strategy with the International Secretariat have stalled, primarily due to their limited staff capacity in the context of the 'Moving Closer to the Ground' change process. Nevertheless, AIUK continues to believe that the potential for engagement with trade unions at the international level remains high and of benefit to Amnesty International and its work. We also recognise that our capacity to mobilise with unions in the UK, and to implement our partnership with the TUC, requires a two-way dialogue with the IS to maximise alignment and impact. We will therefore continue to keep this issue under review.

Meanwhile, Amnesty UK will continue to support the IS through our global trade union adviser role.

B4 Workers and Women's Rights in the Middle East and North Africa

Board Member: Tom Hedley

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

AIUK drew the IEC's attention to this AGM decision in a letter of July 2012. The Chair of the IEC responded in October. He confirmed that

"women's rights form part of the agreed body of work...on the MENA Crisis and Transition priority. The key focus is to press for gender equality within the processes of constitutional, legislative and institutional reform, rather than on the economic participation of women, although there is obviously a link between the two".

He continued:

"Trade union rights are not the main focus of any agreed OP2 project on MENA, although it is expected that there will continue to be some work on cases of repression of trade unionists with the OP2 project 'Iran: Repression of dissent".

AIUK's work on the Middle East is framed by the priorities of the International Secretariat and, necessarily, the crisis in Syria has become a focal point for our work on the region of the past twelve months. However, staff and activists have continued to work in support of women's human rights within the transition process and through solidarity with women's rights defenders, particularly in Egypt.

AIUK has continued to collaborate closely with the TUC on MENA labour rights casework, especially regarding Bahrain, and with the University and College Union on women workers' rights in MENA. Our strong trade union rights campaigning on Iran remains a bedrock of this work.

C1 Regional Representation and Coordination

Board Member: Hugh Whitby

This resolution is on-going:

AIUK is committed to retaining a continued staff presence in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Although a freeze on recruitment in the context of the *Cost and Priorities Programme* has prevented us from permanently filling

vacant posts in Wales and Scotland (as elsewhere in the organisation), we will do so as soon as possible. Temporary staffing arrangements have been put in place in Scotland while recruitment in Wales will commence as soon as possible.

As per the decision to inform groups of AIUKs work in the regions, the Nations & Regions team are increasingly involving local supporters and activists in their campaign work. Local and student activists are regularly informed about forthcoming events and campaigns – via communication with the Regional Representatives or STAN representatives – or directly to local and student groups through phone calls, email, social media and briefings at group meetings and regional conferences. Improved monthly e-newsletters to supporters in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland in 2013 and improved sections on the re-launched AIUK website, as well as a growing local social media presence, will further enhance communications to the wider support base in the nations.

The staff team is increasingly making use of nations-based local and student activists to ensure effective regional campaigning. This was evident in constituency-based lobbying work in Scotland and Northern Ireland in support of the Arms Trade Treaty in 2012 and is being factored into N&R Team planning for work on Afghanistan and Women's Rights in 2013/2014. A similar approach will be taken with devolved level campaign work on issues such as the Northern Ireland Bill of Rights and the promotion of human rights in the context of Scotland's referendum on independence. The same approach will be taken in Wales when staffing is re-established.

Recently, Regional Representatives have been invited to contribute their views on how the decision could be applied more broadly to improve coordination of activist constituencies in all AIUK regions.

C2 AIUK Legal and Taxation Structure

Board Member: Brian Landers

This resolution is on-going:

As per the decision to undertake a review of the legal and taxation structures of AIUK to ensure taxation benefits are maximised, AIUK has now completed the review.

Following extensive preparation work, a special meeting of the Trust and Finance Sub Committee was held on 12 July 2012 date to consider the available options. Expert opinion was sought from leading charity lawyers,

Bates, Wells and Braithwaite. It was clear from the legal advice that whilst the pursuit of human rights is now a statutorily acceptable charitable goal, the means by which AIUK and others might seek to achieve that do not sit so clearly within this legal definition. This relates in particular to activities which are designed to achieve a change in the law. A careful balance is therefore required to avoid AIUK's charitable status and our ability to take an independent line on human rights issues being threatened in any way. The strong advice received is that should a concerted attack be mounted on Amnesty our present structure would protect us against any claim that we were using charitable funds for "political" purposes. If the structure were to change in any of the ways considered there is a risk of losing that protection.

Because of this the review has concluded that AIUK's legal structure is correct at this time and that AIUK needs to maintain a considerable 'non-charitable' operation, whilst ensuring that a proportion of our work can be clearly defined as charitable, in order to make the most of gift aid income. The Board has however asked the SMT to pursue any opportunities to attract more of our income to the charitable trust within the existing legal framework.

The Board and SMT now need to make arrangements to correct the democratic deficit caused by the high number of AIUK supporters who give to the Trust over the minimum membership fee but who do not have voting rights. The ability to bestow voting rights upon this group of people is entirely at the Board's discretion as per the existing Articles (particularly clauses 4.1 and 4.3). The 2013 Board Resolution also sets out to establish a Governance Taskforce and this issue will be taken forward by that group.

C3 Implementation of AGM Decisions

Board Member: Sarah O'Grady

The implementation of this resolution is on-going:

AIUK published the 2012 AGM Decisions on the AIUK website immediately following the 2012 AGM and in the first available edition of the Amnesty Magazine. This included an invitation for Members to register their interest in the implementation of Decisions. Initially there were some technical problems with the email address, but these were resolved.

At the May Board meeting, Board members were designated to oversee the implementation of each Decision and communicate with the relevant Members. The details of those who registered an interest were passed to the relevant Board members.

The Cost and Priorities Programme has made this a difficult and disruptive year for Staff and has dominated Board agendas. Implementation was expressly included, however, on Board agendas in July and December and also at meetings of the Active Members Sub-Committee.

A copy of the interim implementation report (Dec 2012) was circulated to the proposers, interested Members and the Board in early January, almost a month before the deadline for submitting AGM 2013 resolutions.

Whilst implementation of this AGM decision has been progressing, the new system has not worked as smoothly as we would have wished. In particular, we did not meet the part of the Decision stating that it would be best practice to issue a statement to interested Members after each Board meeting. There has been a variable level of communication with interested Members. We do believe that the on-going implementation of Decision C3 is a significant improvement on previous practice, which we hope has been helpful to Members and has increased transparency.

We will continue to improve on the implementation of this Decision and report back on progress to the AGM 2014.

C4: Prostitution

Board Member: Sharmila Kar

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

In July 2012 we wrote to the Chair of the International Executive Committee notifying him of this decision and requesting further information. In October 2012, the Chair of the IEC reported that an IS adviser commenced work in April on “the many issues related to punitive policies and laws in the sexual and reproductive rights, including sex work, same-sex relations, drug use during pregnancy, abortion, contraception, adultery, etc”. He stated that this will be an 18 month project to map existing and desirable AI work in these areas and to map the barriers to AI’s involvement. The project also envisages a tool-kit to assist AI members to engage in advocacy to end the illegitimate use of criminal law and other punitive measures to police sexuality and reproduction.”

The project has included looking at where governments use punitive laws in order to control sexual behaviour - which differs depending on the context but could include: criminalisation of same sex relations, criminalisation of abortion, or sexual relationships outside of marriage etc. Within this there are

some difficult and complex areas including issues around drug-use during pregnancy.

The IS are aiming to develop the toolkit for October 2013, and that will include the development of a draft policy that should take into account the background and many reasons behind involvement in prostitution.

The Chair of the IEC acknowledged our request to prioritise policy development in the area of prostitution but this does not equate to operational prioritisation, which AIUK is not able to demand.

Update on 2011 AGM decisions that were carried over for implementation:

A1 Professional Networks

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

The 2012 AGM report stated that during 2011, AIUK had 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 had 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 had 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.

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

2013 Update:

Following the review, these recommendations were identified to take our work on networks forward:

** Amnesty needs to develop a more strategic approach to working with networks, better understand their role and work closely with network leaders to make them more effective.*

** Overall, activist-led networks need to have a greater clarity of purpose, develop a more participative approach across the whole of each network and*

with other activists groups as well as improving communication and planning processes

** While networks have grown considerably in numbers, the majority of its members are less engaged. Different forms of network should be tested (smaller more informal types of network /or time-bound specific networks) to determine if other forms would be more suitable.*

At the appropriate time, once resources have been confirmed, these recommendations will be taken forward.

A2 UK Detainee Inquiry

This decision has been implemented to the degree possible:

The 2012 AGM report stated that 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 intended to provide the Government with a report on its preparatory work to date, and we hoped that this would be made public. The Government statement said that they still intended to hold an independent, judge-led inquiry when the police investigations had 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 2012, these failings caused AI and its partner organisations to cease cooperation with the inquiry.

In November 2012, 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.

2013 Update: There has yet to be a resolution to the outstanding case of Abdelhakim Belhaj one of the Libyan nationals who's case is subject to a police investigation. Therefore the situation regarding the Detainee Inquiry remains un-changed.

However, AIUK have been active in lobbying for changes to the Justice and Security Bill, which if introduced would see the practice of Closed Material Procedures (CMPs) extended into civil cases. We have undertaken a series of actions including lobbying Ministers, Shadow Ministers and parliamentarians in both the House of Commons and House of Lords. We secured some positive amendments at the Lords Stage of the Bill, but these are currently under threat at the Commons Committee. We undertook an online action to lobby MPs which elicited a large number of responses both supporting and opposing our calls. We are currently briefing MP's with the aim of mitigating the worst excesses of the Bill.

A4 Arms Control

This decision has been implemented:

The 2012 AGM report noted that 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 an on-going high priority campaign for AIUK.

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. The IS also organised an international meeting on the Arms Trade Treaty Campaign with AI Morocco in December 2011 (AIUK provided significant financial support for the meeting). 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.

2013 Update:

The Control Arms Campaign remained a top priority at both the IS and AIUK in 2012 in the lead up to the UN Arms Trade Treaty Conference in July 2012. Following the delay in agreeing a strong and effective ATT at this meeting, AIUK and the IS continued to prioritise this work and allocate significant resources to it in the lead up to the final UN Conference in March 2013. Campaign materials for all activist constituencies have been produced during this period. At the time of writing AIUK is in the final stages of preparation for the last campaign push on the ATT between February and March. This resolution has been fully implemented.

B4 Human Rights Accountability in Sri Lanka

This implementation of this resolution is on-going:

The 2012 AGM report stated that 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 on-going.

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 continued 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 continued 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>

2013 Update: We continue to press the UK government to take a robust stance on the issue of implementation of justice and impunity issues. We do not feel that the LLRC will deliver justice and continue to press for an independent UN inquiry and this was subject of an AI report published in August 2012: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/ASA37/010/2012/en>.

We have also had meetings with the Heads of the Sri Lanka and UN Teams at the FCO and sent a briefing to the Minister prior to his visit to Sri Lanka in February 2013. In particular we have focussed on the deterioration of human rights situation and the failure of the LLRC to deliver justice. We have urged the UK government to support the US resolution that will build on resolution 19/2 at the 22nd Session of the Human Rights Council (February – March 2013). The UK government will support the resolution and will also look at opportunities to use the November 2013 meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) to raise human rights.

As the meeting is being held in Colombo they are also considering UK government representation if there is a failure of Sri Lanka to comply with human rights standards. We have requested a meeting with the Minister to

be de-briefed by him following his recent visit to Sri Lanka. We will report back at the 2014 AGM on on-going implementation.

B5 AI Collaboration with Trade Unions

This resolution has been implemented:

The 2012 AGM report stated that 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 included 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 had 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 also planned to meet with the Minister of Labour to highlight our concerns.

We had anticipated that the memorandum of understanding with the TUC would be updated during 2012, and that AIUK and the global movement would have adopted a trade union strategy to take the movement through to 2016. At the heart of this strategy was 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 occurred in the spring, with a view to potential partnership.

2013 Update:

The organisational challenges of moving closer to the ground mean that it has not yet been possible, for capacity reasons, to adopt a global trade union strategy. Nevertheless, AI UK continues to lead the movement in an advisory capacity. An emerging area for collaboration relates to labour exploitation of migrant workers, and AIUK have facilitated exchanges between the Secretariat and the global unions including ITUC as we look at how to take this new priority forward. Trade unions contributed to the consultation on the costs and priorities programme, emphasising the human rights impact of our

collaboration and highlighting the importance of global dialogue in achieving local goals. Following the consultation, the proposed new structure provides for continuity in the staffing and functions of our trade union work.

C5 Board Transparency

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

The 2012 AGM report stated that over the past two years, AIUK has made a number of steps in increasing its transparency and accountability. In particular

- The introduction of a formal feedback mechanism allowing comments and complaints to be raised by members and the general public, with a process for escalating a complaint if the complainant feels it has not been adequately addressed.
- The introduction in 2010 of an Annual Report on AIUK's activities including compliance with the International NGO Accountability Charter
- Moving the organisation's planning and reporting process to have a greater focus on human rights impact.

In relation to Board transparency, the minutes of Board meetings are now also automatically circulated to those members who have requested them.

During 2011, an open information policy was 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 was 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 was in the process of establishing an efficient method to ensure that this information can be easily distributed to those members who express an interest in governance issues.

2013 Update:

In July 2012 the UK section strengthened its agreement with the IS on how the IS reports back to AIUK Section on how it spends any monies raised by AIUK. This Memorandum of Understanding commits the IS to report quarterly on any human rights and impact resulting from AIUK grants and to establishing a project databases giving details of the how these grants are have and are being used.

In December 2012 AIUK also published the Open Information Policy. To support this work a revised list of key accountability documents is now listed on the AIUK website at the following address:

<http://www.amnesty.org.uk/content.asp?CategoryID=12409>.

Any Open information request will be logged internally and collectively reviewed quarterly to enquire that the principles policy is applied in practice.

IEC Decision reports (formally IEC Information Bulletins) and previous meetings minutes and agenda's from the Chairs Forum can be accessed from the IS intranet. Work is in progress to update AIUK's 'Access to IS intranet policy', widening access. This policy was first issued in April 2011 formalising how the section grants access to key activists.

D4 Transparency of Financial Information

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

The 2012 AGM report stated that AIUK now received 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 full implementation report for Decision C5.

Details of the number of IS staff earning above £60,000 per year are now also 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.

2013 Update:

During 2013, we have made the following also available to view on the website:

- *Details of IS's expenditure against budget*
- *Management accounts Q3 2012*
- *Annual projected budgets produced by the IS*
- *2013 Budget Information pack for the movement*

And as noted previously, all details of all employment contracts > £60 000 are available within AI's annual accounts (on AI website):

*These are all available to view on the Amnesty website at the following address:
<http://www.amnesty.org.uk/content.asp?CategoryID=10096>*

D5 Amnesty International Governance

This resolution has been implemented to the degree possible:

The 2012 AGM report stated that 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.

2013 Update:

Two organisations 'Compass Partnership' and 'OnBoard' were appointed to conduct an independent review of the International Executive Committee (IEC) and to support implementation of its recommendations, as

required by Decision 1 of the 2011 International Council Meeting (ICM). This review is available on www.amnesty.org.uk.

This review of the IEC against the Compass governance standard showed that it currently meets 31 of the characteristics of effective governance fully, eight partially and it does not meet 14 of the characteristics.

Implementation of the recommendations is ongoing and the IEC reported to the 2012 Chair's Assembly on progress against the report recommendations. The IEC is due to report again to the 2013 ICM.

Ensuring the full implementation of the recommendations contained within the report remains a key priority for the AIUK delegation to the 2013 ICM.