



2014 AGM RESOLUTIONS

Extract from the National Conference
and AGM 2014 Conference Papers

RESOLUTION	PROPOSER	SECONDER	PAGE
WORKING PARTY A:			
A1. Sex Work - Decriminalisation	AIUK Board	-	46
A2. Sex Work – Partial Decriminalisation	AIUK Board	-	46
A3. Sex Work – No Position	AIUK Board	-	46
WORKING PARTY B:			
B1. Human Rights Act	Wirksworth & District Local Group	-	47
B2. Garment workers in Asian Countries	Jerry Allen	Peter James Murray	48
B3. Guantanamo	Canterbury Local Group	-	49
B4. Guatemala	Tom Sparks	Eilidh Douglas	50
B5. Sri Lanka Human Rights	Kingston Local Group	-	51
B6. Sri Lanka and the UN	Kingston Local Group	-	52
WORKING PARTY C:			
C1. Special Resolution Nominations Committee co-opted International Council Meeting	AIUK Board	-	53
C2. Nominations Committee Terms of Reference	AIUK Board	-	53
C3. Governance Training Budget	AIUK Board	-	55
C4. Governance Task Force Extension	AIUK Board	-	55
C5. Location of AIUK Annual General Meetings	AIUK Board	-	55
WORKING PARTY D:			
D1. Secret Policeman's Ball	Canterbury Local Group	-	56
D2. Secretary General's Global Council	York & Bury St Edmunds Local Groups	-	57
D3. Linking Members with Local Groups	Penzance Local Group	-	58
D4. Scottish Independence	Malcolm Dingwall-Smith	Gillian Melville	59
D5. Strategic Goals Consultation	AIUK Board	-	59
D6. Global Transition Program	Caroline Butler	Mark Froud	60

NOTE: PROXY VOTING ON SUNDAY

Delegates attending only one day of the AGM (Saturday 12 April) will not be present for the final debate and voting on AGM resolutions on Sunday 13 April.

However you can register your vote by proxy. If you wish to vote on the resolutions on Sunday, please complete a proxy form, and send it in by **12pm midday** on **Thursday 10 April 2014**. See www.amnesty.org.uk/agm or call **020 7033 1777**

WORKING PARTY A

A1. SEX WORK - DECRIMINALISATION

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

This AGM NOTES:

The current global consultation on a draft policy proposal that, if adopted, would mean that Amnesty International calls for the decriminalization of activities related to the buying or selling of consensual sex between adults

This AGM DECIDES:

That the position of AIUK's Board, in global consultative, deliberative or decision-making meetings, shall be:

Amnesty International should adopt a policy position to support the decriminalization of activities related to the buying or selling of consensual sex between adults

Proposers background note:

The International Secretariat (IS) has proposed a policy on sex work that would oppose *"the criminalisation or punishment of activities relating to the buying or selling of consensual sex between adults...based on the principle that consensual sexual conduct between adults – which excludes acts that involve coercion, deception, threats or violence – is entitled to protection from state interference"* (taken from the International Secretariat's policy consultation paper).

This is a controversial issue and the debate is highly polarised. AIUK's Board takes no position in the debate, other than believing that an AGM decision is needed to determine the position of our national section. We have presented three alternative policy positions intended to enable a broad debate at the AGM. They are mutually exclusive.

- *Global Policy on Sex Work A* summarises the IS policy proposal
- *Global Policy on Sex Work B* is intended to represent what is sometimes referred to as the "Swedish" or "Nordic" model, which seeks to reduce demand for prostitution by criminalising or punishing those who purchase sexual services, whilst allowing the decriminalisation of those who sell the services.
- *Global Policy on Sex Work C* suggests that the movement should not adopt a substantive policy position in this debate.

The Board will work with the Standing Orders Committee, AGM Chair and those who wish to propose alternative policy options in order to ensure that the AGM has a healthy debate and reaches a decision that provides a clear mandate for the section's representatives.

It is important to note that, at present, we expect that a decision on AI's global policy will be made by the International Board and that once a policy is adopted, it applies to the whole movement. It is also vital that we recognise that deeply-held but opposing views can be equally informed by a principled view of human rights. This requires our debate to be respectful of alternative positions.

AIUK is currently consulting its membership on this policy issue and we will inform the AGM of the outcome of this consultation (see <http://www.amnesty.org.uk/global-policy-consultation-sex-work> for further information).

Previous AIUK AGMs

This issue first appeared on the AGM agenda in 2008, when a local group proposed a resolution calling for AI to adopt a policy in support of decriminalisation. The AGM rejected this policy position but backed a call for an international review. In 2009, the AGM backed a Board resolution to the ICM that called for this review. Please note that the Board did not advocate any position. At the 2009 ICM, AIUK withdrew its resolution because, after tabling it, it became clear that there was insufficient support for it to succeed and defeat was inevitable.

In 2010, the AGM reiterated its call for a review following a motion submitted by another local group. The following year, the Board was informed that the International Secretariat was planning to carry out such a review, although this did not commence until 2012.

In 2012, the AGM adopted another resolution. This asserted an "inextricable relationship between prostitution and trafficking for sexual exploitation" and suggested that this be prioritised in any policy review. An inextricable link is explicitly rejected in the International Secretariat's current policy proposal.

Critics of Amnesty International have suggested that the International Secretariat's policy proposals have been unduly influenced by specific individuals who have a vested interest in sex work. The Board rejects this and believes that the AGM has correctly identified the issue as one that merits consideration but has not, so far, proposed any specific policy to the movement.

Resource Implications: None

A2. SEX WORK – PARTIAL DECRIMINALISATION

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

This AGM NOTES:

The current global consultation on a draft policy proposal that, if adopted, would mean that Amnesty International calls for the decriminalization of activities related to the buying or selling of consensual sex between adults

This AGM DECIDES

That the position of AIUK's Board, in global consultative, deliberative or decision-making meetings, shall be:

Amnesty International should adopt a policy position to support the partial decriminalization of activities related to the buying or selling of consensual sex between adults (allowing the criminalization or punishment of those who buy sexual services)

Proposer background note:

Please refer to Background Note for resolution A1, Global policy on Sex Work A

Resource Implications: None

A3. SEX WORK – NO POSITION

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

This AGM NOTES:

The current global consultation on a draft policy proposal that, if adopted, would mean that Amnesty International calls for the decriminalization of activities related to the buying or selling of consensual sex between adults

This AGM DECIDES

That the position of AIUK's Board, in global consultative, deliberative or decision-making meetings, shall be:

Amnesty International should not adopt a position on the buying or selling of sexual services

Proposer background note:

Please refer to Background Note for resolution A1, Global policy on Sex Work A

Resource Implications: None

WORKING PARTY B

B1. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Proposer: Wirksworth & District Local Group

The AGM instructs the board to:
oppose repeal of the Human Rights Act (1998).

In the run-up to the 2015 general election the organisation will lobby in support of the present Act.

AIUK to make available campaigning information for individuals and groups to use for local lobbying of MPs and parliamentary candidates.

This activity to continue after the general election if the then government threatens to repeal the act.

Proposer Background note:

THE HRA: TOO GOOD TO LOSE

The Human Rights Act (HRA) incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) into UK law. Before this, people from the UK had to take HR grievances to the European Court in Strasbourg.

The HRA is an effective way of ensuring that Human Rights are respected in UK law, with the Convention considered one of the best in the world, its prohibition of capital punishment being a key strength.

HOW THE ACT WORKS

Incorporation operates by requiring public authorities to work according to the Convention rights; judges to interpret existing laws to be compliant with them; and new laws also to comply.

The fifteen rights operate to higher or lower standards: e.g. the 1960 Convention allowed capital punishment, but today states must proactively protect life and must hold responsible enquiries in the event of suspicious deaths, especially those involving state officials. The Baha Mousa case, which AIUK supported, forced the then Labour Government into an independent enquiry, and became part of the pressure for higher standards of investigation of such deaths.

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY AND A POTENTIAL BRITISH BILL OF RIGHTS (BOR)

For the 2010 election, the Conservative Party pledged to

“replace the Human Rights Act with a British Bill of Rights” (Manifesto p79). Now party leaders regularly promise to “scrap the Human Rights Act” if they win a majority in 2015 (e.g. Teresa May, Guardian, 30.09.2013).

This move could weaken human rights in the UK by allowing fewer rights, but more likely by reducing the standards by which the rights operate, e.g. reducing the state's proactive and investigative duties (see above). Further the legal linguistic process of writing the Bill could be lengthy (e.g. Craies on Legislation, 2004, edited Greenberg), risking weaker rights protection until agreement of the new Bill.

The LibDem-Conservative Coalition agreed to keep the Act and set up a government commission to look into a UK Bill of Rights which would “incorporate and build on all the UK's obligations under the European Convention ...”. The Commission was divided, with seven for a Bill of Rights if based on the ECHR, and two against. The strongest pro-Bill argument was the public's lack of ownership of the HRA. However the minority commissioners felt ownership was strong in the North, and were suspicious that a new rewrite would be cover for diminishing rights standards (2nd Commission Report 2012, Introduction).

Board background note:

The 1950 European Convention on Human Rights and its protocols set out a number of fundamental human rights for member states of the Council of Europe¹. For many years, the Convention was not fully incorporated in UK law, meaning that those who alleged a violation of their Convention rights had to take a case directly to the European Court of Human Rights, in Strasbourg. This changed with the Human Rights Act 1998, which came into force in October 2000. It incorporates the mandatory convention rights into UK law and requires all public bodies to comply with those rights.

Amnesty UK work to date

In 2005 – 2006 AIUK engaged with the Department for Constitutional Affairs (DCA) to develop a positive narrative around the Human Rights Act (HRA) and to inform people of the rights the Act gave them.

During the 2010 General Election we urged political parties to ensure that human rights protection in the UK be strengthened, and certainly not weakened, through any process examining the role of the HRA or contemplating the adoption of a Bill of Rights and Responsibilities. We argued that fulfilment of the UK's international human rights obligations should be a guiding principle in any such deliberations².

In November 2011 AIUK submitted evidence to the independent Commission³ established to look at the HRA and consider whether it should be replaced by a ‘Bill of Rights’. Our evidence explained that we didn't oppose a Bill of Rights in principle, but the context of the debate indicated that the aim was a weakening of the mechanisms for enforcement of international human rights within the UK. We argued that any changes to the mechanisms of enforcing human rights in the UK should strengthen them and not reduce the power of the courts to enforce and uphold individual rights. The Commission failed to reach a unanimous conclusion and was subsequently disbanded.

AIUK has observed the negative narrative surrounding the HRA which has aimed to portray the Act as infringing on matters of national sovereignty and undermining the UK's legislative and judicial process. We are concerned that this narrative has had a negative impact on the broader debate on human rights. AIUK has therefore made efforts over the years to ensure that there is an informed debate on this issue.

We are currently members of the Human Rights Alliance, a coalition of organisations that work together to demonstrate why human rights are important and the central role that the HRA provides for supporting access to justice and rights in the UK.

Amnesty UK's existing plans

AIUK are currently discussing plans for the 2015 General Election. However, we anticipate that the HRA is likely to be the subject of political debate during the election period and we expect to incorporate it in our materials. The Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Act 2014, enacted by Parliament in January 2014, may impact on the way we approach this because it introduces expenditure controls and reporting requirements for non-party campaigning related to elections. We are assessing the implications of the Act for AIUK's campaigning and advocacy work during election periods.

NOTES:

- 1 To see the Convention and related texts, see <http://human-rights-convention.org/the-texts/>
- 2 Amnesty International UK: Groups Lobbying, General Election pack, 2010
- 3 Amnesty International UK: Response to the Commission on a Bill of Rights Consultation, November 2011

Resource Implications: *We estimate that the cost of materials and postage might be in the region of £5,000. Work around the general election is likely to require significant amount of staff time, covered from existing resources.*

B2. GARMENT WORKERS IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

Proposer: Jerry Allen

Seconder: Peter James Murray

The AGM instructs the board to:

The AGM calls on AIUK to advocate to the IS for a coordinated campaign to improve the labour rights of garment workers in Bangladesh, Cambodia and other Asian countries.

- 2,000 workers died when Rana plaza collapsed because employees were required to go to work in a building that had been judged unsafe.
- More than 100 workers died in the Tazreen factory fire when garment workers were required to continue working after the fire had been detected.
- Several major UK retailers have still not agreed to the 'Bangladesh Fire and Safety accord'.
- Garment workers striking in Cambodia for a living wage have been shot dead, intimidated, beaten, arrested and judicially persecuted.
- The textile and apparel sectors rely overwhelmingly on women workers, whose fundamental rights, particularly the right to form and join trade unions, to collectively bargain, and to strike, are routinely abused

There are several NGOs and Trade Union organisations working on these issues, both in the UK and worldwide. Such a campaign therefore offers an exceptional opportunity for collaborative work in partnerships.

Such a campaign would be particularly suitable for public activism and engagement, with retailers in all our high streets and communities.

Proposer background note:

The Bangladesh garment industry has grown considerably over the last few years. Bangladesh is the biggest producer in Asia, probably because a Bangladeshi worker is paid one quarter of a Chinese worker.

The Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers Employer Association (BGMEA) wields political power and influence. They are well represented in the Bangladesh parliament. This has helped to create a culture of impunity for factory owners. Transparency International ranks Bangladesh in the bottom tier of the Corruption Perception Index.

Wages are very low and access to drinking water, air circulation and fire safety equipment are very poor. Workers do not have contracts and can be arbitrarily sacked.

The vast majority (80%) of workers are women (3 million). They are subjected to sexual harassment and often lose their jobs when they are pregnant. Girls as young as 13 are forced to work up to 11 hours a day.

In April 2012, trade union organiser disappeared. His body was discovered two days later.

In November 2012 over 110 workers died in a fire at Tazreen factory. A Bangladesh government report blamed the owners' "unpardonable negligence". But the owners remains unpunished.

In April 2013 approximately 2,000 workers were killed when the illegally built Rana plaza factory collapsed.

A month after Rana plaza a Fire and Safety accord was established. However some retailers have not signed this and the implementation of the action plan is very slow.

This resolution proposes a campaign involving public activism and collaboration with partner NGOs and Trade Unions. The global unions, IndustriALL and UNI are campaigning to ensure that garment workers are able to work in a safe environment free from intimidation and exploitation, in which their rights and dignity are respected. UK unions have shown solidarity and support for garment workers' rights. Cambodia and Bangladesh are priorities because their workers are trying to organise through independent trade unions.

UK Unions are working with Labour Behind the Label, with War on Want and with other workers' and women's rights advocates. These coalitions give us an opportunity to work collaboratively and maximise our impact.

Amnesty can add considerable value to these campaigns with our ability to mobilise our activists to increase the pressure on the Bangladesh authorities and on UK retailers. We can also engage the Bangladeshi diaspora in the UK.

The corporate abusers in this case are the retailers on our high streets. The Shell campaign showed how Amnesty activists are effective at street campaigning.

Board background note:

It is important to remember that although AIUK can suggest or recommend a particular course of action to the International Board or International Secretariat, they may not agree to it. AIUK is one of more than fifty sections in the movement and our AGM cannot bind other parts of the movement.

Amnesty's work to date

In 2013 Amnesty International's priorities in Bangladesh have included challenging the death penalty and executions, insisting on press freedom and the right to protest and advocating for the human rights of the Pahari Indigenous peoples in Bangladesh's

Chittagong Hill Tracts region. See also, the implementation report for the 2013 AGM Decision A1.

In 2010 Amnesty International also issued an Urgent Action on Bangladesh, appealing for the release of arrested garment factory workers and labour rights activists, some of whom were beaten in custody. They had been protesting for pay increases and improved working conditions. In Cambodia, case files concerning two garment workers, Born Samnang and Sok Sam Ouen, were closed last year, following their acquittal on charges of murdering trade union leader Chea Vichea. We continue to call for those responsible for his murder to be brought to justice. Recently, Amnesty issued a public statement denouncing the violent repression by military police of a garment workers strike, which began on 24 December 2013. Four people were killed and dozens injured.

Amnesty's existing plans

Whilst we understand that there is some sympathy at the International Secretariat (IS) for the issues addressed in the resolution, it does not currently fall within their plans for research and campaigning projects. According to the IS Projects Database, the anticipated focus for Bangladesh is on witness protection, whilst work on Cambodia will maintain a focus on forced evictions. We are not aware of any long-term case files relating to garment workers in either of these countries. As in previous years, this does not preclude Urgent Actions and public statements reacting to developments that affect the human rights of garment workers.

Resource Implications: *No significant resource implications are attached to advocating a particular course of action to the International Secretariat.*

Should campaigning ensue, costs associated with country coordinator-led campaigning would be relatively small. More substantial campaigning or materials needs could cost £5,000 or more and other work might need to be deprioritised.

B3. GUANTANAMO*

Proposer: Canterbury Local Group

The AGM instructs the board to:

Re-examine all Amnesty's past, present and future work on Guantanamo.

The strenuous efforts made by Amnesty and all other human rights organisations have proved ineffective, the camp remains open – it is an abomination and a stain on the face of the civilized world.

Twelve years on 155 detainees still remain in Guantanamo, outside the American judicial system and without the protection of the Geneva convention. A change of approach is needed, Amnesty must be prepared to bring the truth to light and expose the British and American people to the appalling abuses of human rights that have been carried out in our names by our governments.

After 9/11 the Americans had the sympathy of the whole world, but the existence of Guantanamo has caused incalculable damage to the United States. Rendition and ill-treatment at black sites run by the CIA all over the world, plus, the secret prison at Bagram Air Base (declared “worse than Guantanamo” by the International Red Cross) compound the human rights abuses at Guantanamo.

Not one detainee has been charged with anything or offered a fair trial. Enough is enough.

Proposer background note:

In Ian Cobain's recent book: *'Cruel Britannia – A secret history of torture'* he describes the involvement of the British Government in the War on Terror.

“British ministers had second thoughts about prosecuting British Muslims captured in Afghanistan.

Government lawyers were warning that these men appeared not to have committed any offence under UK law, and there was deep anxiety that the US government would be furious if they were brought back to the UK and then released. Furthermore, police interrogations in the UK would not be as effective as interrogations conducted overseas. So ministers decided, in the words of a secret Foreign Office memorandum, that their ‘preferred option’ was the rendition of British nationals to Guantanamo.”

Amnesty's lack of work on the War on Terror needs to be addressed.

Ian Cobain also refers to the secret prison at Bagram in his book:

“The makeshift prison at Bagram was located in a disused factory... the interrogations took place on a first-floor landing. By the time the MI6 and MI5 officers entered the prison there were eighty-odd prisoners there, mostly Arab and Afghan fighters. A handful were British and it was immediately obvious that they were mistreated. Some of the prisoners were chained upright inside the pens, with hoods over their heads. Others were being beaten”.

Amnesty needs to relentlessly and vociferously challenge the British and American governments about the appalling abuse of human rights that is being carried out in our name.

Board background note:

*It should be noted that AIUK's Board can only thoroughly review work done by AIUK. A full review of the global campaign on closing Guantanamo would need to be commissioned and conducted by the International Board, rather than the AIUK Board as suggested in the resolution.

Amnesty UK work to date

Amnesty International began campaigning on Guantanamo Bay when the first transfers of detainees took place on 11 January 2002. In January 2009, President Obama pledged to close down the detention centre. However, the US Congress has blocked moves to implement this pledge. In his state of the Union address in January 2014, President Obama renewed his call on Congress to close down Guantanamo.

In 2009, the international movement's Counter Terror with Justice campaign, was subject to a detailed evaluation, commissioned by the International Secretariat¹. This evaluation highlighted where progress had been made and identified some successes of the campaign, including:

- Presidential commitment to closing Guantánamo and ending the secret CIA detention program
- US President Barack Obama banned the use of so-called “enhanced interrogation techniques” approved under the previous US administration, that amounted to torture or other ill-treatment

- Significant understanding of, and opposition to, rendition and secret detention was generated in Europe
- Parliamentary, criminal and judicial investigations opened in a number of European countries (e.g. Poland, Italy, Germany, the UK and Spain)
- The UK House of Lords in December 2005 ruled that torture 'evidence' was inadmissible in UK courts. Amnesty International intervened in the case.
- The UK government in March 2009 announced it would issue new guidelines for its agents operating abroad to ensure they are not complicit in torture
- A number of detainees who were the subject of AI campaigns were released. Home government campaigning was particularly effective for these people.

International Secretariat evaluations also noted weaknesses and challenges, including

- The focus on key campaigning objectives targeting the US and European governments has meant that violations in other countries have received less attention in relative terms
- One of the external consultants reported that the focus on Guantánamo continued beyond the point that the debate over closure of the camp had been accepted by key policy makers, and that AI could have more effectively focussed elsewhere

These observations were drawn from views expressed about Amnesty's work in regions such as the Middle East and North Africa. The evaluation suggested that the movement adopt a broader focus than the Guantanamo detentions.

Nevertheless Amnesty continues to call for the closure of Guantanamo and the UK section has continued to campaign on the issue. In June 2013 AIUK, in coordination with AIUSA, launched joint actions targeting Prime Minister David Cameron and President Obama, urging them to take action to expedite the release and return to the UK of Shaker Aamer and to close Guantanamo Bay.

Amnesty's existing plans

At present, we understand that the International Secretariat (IS) will continue to work on Guantanamo Bay and related issues that undermine human rights standards and ordinary principles of criminal justice. They envisage the approach being predominantly reactive with campaigning primarily reserved for strategic case files that are emblematic of the range of human rights abuses in question.

AIUK will use these IS materials to continue its campaign to close Guantanamo.

NOTES:

¹ For further information, see Counter terror with Justice: Evaluation and Bridging Project (ACT 40/ 001/2009)

Resource Implications: Assuming that there is no need to revisit evaluations conducted in 2009, the work envisaged in this resolution might require a fairly significant commission for external consultants. We would be unable to conduct this work within existing staff resources and external expertise might be important to ensure objectivity. It is hard to assess the time (and therefore) money required but it is likely to exceed £10,000. In addition, the review would require the diversion of some administrative and management time from other tasks.

B4. GUATEMALA*

Proposer: Tom Sparks

Seconded: Eilidh Douglas

The AGM decides that:

1. a. Amnesty UK will conduct research into the human rights situation in Guatemala with a view to developing effective actions where appropriate.
 - b. The research should address, but is not limited to:
 - The rights of indigenous peoples in Guatemala, including their social, economic and cultural rights;
 - The rights of indigenous peoples over land and natural resources;
 - Attacks on Human Rights Defenders;
 - The rights of trade unionists; and
 - Corporate accountability and the role of multinationals operating in Guatemala.
2. a. This AGM further decides that Amnesty UK will conduct a campaign to end impunity for human rights abuses in Guatemala. The campaign should address, but is not limited to impunity for:
 - Attacks against trade unionists;
 - Gender-based violence;
 - Attacks on human rights defenders; and
 - Human rights abuses committed during the internal armed conflict.
 - b. The campaign should also stress the importance that Ríos Montt and other high officials accused of committing large-scale and widespread human rights abuses amounting to genocide during the internal armed conflict are brought to trial. Such a trial must be fair and impartial, and must be conducted in line with international standards.

Proposer background note:

- The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification (CEH) estimates that over 200,000 people were killed or disappeared as a result of the conflict 1960-1996.
- The CEH concluded that:
 - Between 1981 and 1983 in the areas analysed acts of genocide against groups of Mayan People were committed, and it attributed these acts of genocide to agents of the State of Guatemala.
 - The systematic use of forced disappearance, the widespread use of rape, and the 'systematic use of torture' were employed.
- The CEH identified that these abuses were targeted against the Mayan population: 'The massacres, scorched earth operations, forced disappearances and executions of Mayan authorities, leaders and spiritual guides, were not only an attempt to destroy the social base of the guerrillas, but above all, to destroy the cultural values that ensured cohesion and collective action in Mayan communities.'
- In its submissions to the UN Committee against Torture in 2013, 'Amnesty International note[d] that there remains impunity for the vast majority of human rights violations and violations of international humanitarian law committed during the internal armed conflict. Of the 626 massacres recorded by the Historical Clarification Commission, only two have been investigated and resulted in convictions. Of the estimated 45,000 cases of enforced disappearances, only five cases have resulted in convictions.'
- General José Efraín Ríos Montt led the military government in Guatemala between 1982 and 1983. In 2011 and 2012 he was indicted for genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes. In May 2013 he was sentenced to 80 years imprisonment for genocide and crimes against humanity. The

verdict was overturned by the Constitutional Court later that month. His trial is expected to resume in 2015, pending a ruling on whether or not Ríos Montt is entitled to an amnesty.

- On the 5th February 2014 the Constitutional Court ruled that the Attorney General Claudia Paz y Paz must step down before the end of her term. Campaigners have raised concerns over the implications of the decision for the rule of law.
- Between 2000 and 2011 the Guatemalan Human Rights Commission documented a 681% increase in attacks on human rights defenders, peaking at 409 documented incidents in 2011. 2.2% of cases were prosecuted. Amnesty has identified at least 305 reported attacks during 2012.
- According to official figures, '560 women were murdered in Guatemala in 2012, 631 in 2011, and 695 in 2010'. Less than 4% of homicide cases result in a conviction.

Board background note:

*Conducting research on Guatemala's human rights situation is the responsibility of the International Secretariat. The AIUK Board therefore feels that implementation of the first part of this resolution is not within its power.

Amnesty's work to date

Over the past two years, the International Secretariat (IS) has published a range of reports, press releases, Urgent Actions and campaign actions on Guatemala. Impunity for human rights violations during the internal conflict has been a particular focus and the organization has repeatedly commented on the twists and turns of the Ríos Montt trial, deploring the deferral of justice for those who have already waited for decades, following the Constitutional Court's decision to annul the 2013 trial that resulted in his conviction for genocide and crimes against humanity.

Impunity for present day human rights violations has also been central to Amnesty's recent work, including in the 2013 submission to the Committee Against Torture. In March 2013, we issued an Urgent Action following the murder of human rights defender and trade unionist Carlos Hernández on 8 March in Chiquimula department, eastern Guatemala. Other appeals have addressed the systematic judicial harassment and impunity faced by women and indigenous people.

AIUK currently works on two long-term cases supporting Guatemalan human rights defenders. Norma Cruz leads a women's rights organization, Survivors' Foundation (Fundación Sobrevivientes), based in Guatemala City. We are also campaigning for justice for Yolanda Oqueli, who, on 13 June 2012, was shot by two motorbike assailants after taking part in a protest outside a mine site in San José del Golfo, a town about 35km from Guatemala City.

Amnesty's existing plans

On 31 May 2014 AIUK will be hosting a major conference at the HRAC to address impunity in Guatemala and to promote solidarity. This event is collaboration between AIUK, Guatemala solidarity groups and the ITUC and British TUC, amongst others. Keynote speakers scheduled are the indigenous community Association for Justice and Reconciliation (AJR) who initiated the long-running legal proceedings for genocide against Ríos Montt, as well as Yolanda Oqueli.

The trade union dimension of human rights abuses in Guatemala, together with our conference partnership with other UK-based activist groups such as BananaLink, mining justice network LAAMP, and central Americas women's solidarity network CAWN, means that there are opportunities for

collaboration to achieve human rights impact and involve new constituencies and communities in our work.

It is the Board's understanding that the International Secretariat is planning two projects that relate to this resolution and that, if approved, will yield campaigning opportunities, in addition to ongoing, reactive work (such as press releases and Urgent Actions). One is the Human Rights Defenders in Americas programme, which is not specifically focused on the country but may be relevant. The other project focusses on addressing impunity for abuses during Guatemala's internal armed conflict. This includes a particular emphasis on the Ríos Montt case.

Resource Implications: *Our Country Coordinator currently leads AIUK's work on Guatemala, with some staff support. Implementation of this resolution, based on International Secretariat research, could be done within existing resources, although it is possible that other projects could be deprioritized if work on Guatemala increases significantly beyond current levels.*

B5. SRI LANKA HUMAN RIGHTS

Proposer: Kingston Local Group

This AGM calls on Amnesty International UK Section to urge the UK Government to:

- Continue to hold the Sri Lankan Government to account for human rights abuses past, present and on-going within the whole of the state.
- Follow up the commitments it made following the 2013 CHOGM to expect the Sri Lankan government to "make progress on human rights, accountability, reconciliation and political settlement".
- Continue the call, made by David Cameron at the CHOGM in November 2013, for a "credible and transparent independent investigation into violations of humanitarian and human rights law, a meaningful political settlement with the North, including demilitarisation, and proper implementation of Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission LLRC recommendations"
- Challenge the culture of impunity and ensure that by using the term 'reconciliation' it does not allow any impunity for human rights abuses committed by either side during the conflict or since.
- Continue to bring attention to the humanitarian crisis in the conflict-affected North and East of Sri Lanka where there are up to 90,000 war widows, many unresolved disappearances.
- Continue to make it clear to that rape, sexual violence and harassment by military personnel or government agents, whether during the war or afterwards, is unacceptable and must stop.

Proposer background note:

We are satisfied that Amnesty UK Section implemented the 2011 Decision for Human Rights Accountability in Sri Lanka and continues to work robustly and pro-actively to changing developments; the International Secretariat has continued to make representations to the UN in this regard; the UK Section has also made strong representations to the UK Government both before and after the Commonwealth Head of Government Meeting in November 2013. Full details are outlined in the Implementation Report.

We express regret that the meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in November 2013 was held in Sri Lanka thereby appearing to condone the human rights record, both past and present, of the host government and its continued resistance to full independent and

international investigation into alleged war crimes by both sides in the armed conflict.

We note the UK's unique relationship with Sri Lanka, and the 300,000 strong Tamil community who have made this country their home; it is appropriate that the UK has a key part to play in helping to foster reconciliation and lasting peace on the island. We regret that the UK Government chose to attend the CHOGM in Sri Lanka, but welcome the news that, having made that decision, it took full opportunity to use the summit to bring international focus on the human rights record and raise these issues directly with President Rajapaska.

We welcome the call made by David Cameron MP for a "...credible and transparent independent investigation into violations of humanitarian and human rights law, a meaningful political settlement with the North, including demilitarisation, and proper implementation of Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission (LLRC) recommendations"

We note the visit made by David Cameron MP to the North of Sri Lanka, where there are up to 90,000 war widows, to witness the plight of those still held at 'welfare camps' as well as hearing evidence from the relatives of the many disappeared persons and to the continued use of sexual violence.

We welcome the statement from William Hague MP, of 21 November 2013, to "...deliver a clear message to the Sri Lankan government. That we expect them to make progress on human rights, accountability, reconciliation and political settlement."

Board background note:

Amnesty's work to date

AIUK has consistently lobbied the UK government to take a robust stance on the issue of implementation of justice and impunity, as well as ongoing human rights problems in Sri Lanka. We have had meetings with the Heads of the Sri Lanka and UN teams, the Heads of the Human Rights and South Asia departments and the Minister responsible for Sri Lanka at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). AIUK's Director also conveyed our concerns and recommendations in evidence to the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Individuals at Risk Team, supported by activists, has been able to build the profile of Prageeth Eknaligoda – a disappeared journalist, highlighting it as our key case at the Edinburgh Festival in 2013.

We were able to significantly increase campaigning and activism (notably at the 2013 Student Conference) in the lead-up to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, which took place in Colombo in November 2013. This resulted in a high media profile and, alongside the efforts of others, significant pressure on the UK government, as well as the government of Sri Lanka.

Whilst the position of the Sri Lankan government remains obstinate, the outcome of AIUK's campaign was a tougher and more outspoken position adopted by the FCO and Prime Minister than we had previously expected. This included a commitment to support a resolution at the next Human Rights Council meeting if Sri Lanka had failed to deliver any progress on addressing impunity.

In January 2014, AIUK, along with other organisations¹, met with the FCO Minister responsible for Sri Lanka and reiterated our call for the UK to take a robust stance at the 25th Session

of the Human Rights Council. AIUK will continue to work with the International Secretariat to ensure that all of our objectives addressing human rights in Sri Lanka are pursued.

Amnesty's existing plans

AIUK will continue to call for human rights accountability in Sri Lanka. This will include pressing for a full independent investigation into alleged war crimes by the Sri Lankan army and the Tamil Tigers (LTTE), challenging impunity and ensuring that civil society can operate without fear of harassment, intimidation and reprisals.

This work will continue in liaison with the International Secretariat and we will be undertaking advocacy work aimed at influencing the UK government and the wider international community to keep these issues on the agenda of the 25th Session of the UN Human Rights Council in March 2014 and beyond.

NOTES:

1 Human Rights Watch, Freedom From Torture, International Crisis Group

Resource Implications: *This work is currently within plans for our advocacy and Individuals at Risk work and we would not envisage significant resource implications, unless additional work is required, in which case other projects might need to be deprioritised.*

B6. SRI LANKA AND THE UN

Proposer: Kingston Local Group

This AGM calls on AIUK to make representations to the International Secretariat to:

Make representations to the UN Secretary General to follow up his *Internal Review Panel on United Nations Action in Sri Lanka* (14/12/2012) with a full report on what changes, if any, have been implemented within the UN structure to prevent any similar failure to protect civilians in future conflicts and if no significant reforms have been implemented to produce a timetable detailing what reforms are to be made.

Proposer background note:

This AGM notes a report, released 14 November 2012, by the UN Secretary-General's Internal Review Panel on United Nations Action in Sri Lanka, submitted to Ban Ki-moon, that offers a strong indictment of the UN's response to Sri Lanka's armed conflict. The report deals with a period of conflict in Sri Lanka when very grave violations of international law are alleged and where effective UN action might have averted some of the worst of the violations. Instead the text describes a scenario where UN officials repeatedly failed civilians they were entrusted to protect, while ignoring or downplaying mounting evidence of war crimes compiled by their own staff as they struggled to appease Sri Lankan authorities intent on restricting humanitarian space. [Source: Amnesty International Press Release 14/12/2013]"

Board background note:

It is important to remember that although AIUK can suggest or recommend a particular course of action to the International Board or International Secretariat, they may not agree to it. AIUK is one of more than fifty sections in the movement and our AGM cannot bind other parts of the movement.

Amnesty's work to date

Amnesty has acknowledged that the Report of the UN Secretary-General's Internal Review Panel on United Nations

Action in Sri Lanka¹, submitted to Ban Ki-moon and made public on 14 November 2012, highlighted serious flaws in the UN's response to Sri Lanka's armed conflict. The report highlighted that the UN failed to protect civilians during Sri Lanka's armed conflict which prompted Amnesty International to renew its call for an independent investigation into alleged war crimes by the Sri Lankan army and the Tamil Tigers (LTTE)².

The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) is understood to be following up on the implementation of the recommendations made in this report³.

Amnesty UK's existing plans

Current plans for work on Sri Lanka are set out in the Board Background Note to Resolutions B5.

NOTES:

- 1 http://www.un.org/News/dh/infocus/Sri_Lanka/The_Internal_Review_Panel_report_on_Sri_Lanka.pdf
- 2 <http://www.amnesty.org/en/for-media/press-releases/sri-lanka-how-un-failed-during-sri-lanka-s-armed-conflict-2012-11-14>
- 3 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, A/HRC/25/19, 18 December 2013

Resource Implications: Negligible

WORKING PARTY C

C1. SPECIAL RESOLUTION - NOMINATION COMMITTEE CO-OPTION

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

This AGM decides:

That in Article 21.5 of the Articles of Association of the Company the phrase "may co-opt one additional Nominations Committee member" be replaced by "may co-opt two additional Nominations Committee members".

Proposers background note:

The Governance Taskforce created by the 2013 AIUK AGM has considered ways in which the AIUK Nominations Committee (NC) can make a more effective contribution to the Section's governance. This resolution, and an accompanying ordinary resolution, are both based on the work of the taskforce and supported by the Board. They are intended to strengthen the NC, clarify its role, and improve its operations.

The ordinary resolution contains a new set of terms of reference for the NC; these are non-statutory and can therefore be implemented through an ordinary AGM resolution. The background note to that ordinary resolution gives details of the changes being proposed and the reasons for them. This Special Resolution makes one important change to the NC: it enables the three elected members of the committee to co-opt two rather than one additional member. The NC needs to search for potential board and sub-committee members with a wide and diverse range of specialist skills so having the power to co-opt two additional members with experience and connections in areas as diverse as finance, strategy, human resources and marketing will be highly beneficial.

Resource Implications: Negligible

C2. NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

This AGM adopts the following terms of reference for the AIUK Nominations Committee, in addition to those specified in Article 21 of the Constitution.

These terms of reference may be updated from time to time by decision of the AIUK AGM.

1. Membership of the NC

- Co-opted members of the NC will have the same rights and responsibilities as elected members.
- The following skills and experience are considered to be important to the NC and AIUK members standing for election to the NC should be able to demonstrate to its electorate some or all of the following:
 - (i) Substantial, relevant experience of finance, human resources, or strategy development.
 - (ii) Experience in headhunting and shortlisting.
 - (iii) Relevant connections to other parts of the UK voluntary sector which will enable them to identify candidates for posts within AIUK.
 - (iv) Experience in applying diversity and equality principles to recruitment processes.
- AIUK members standing for election to the NC must provide a written manifesto, which may be up to 500 words long.
- This manifesto must make explicit reference to the above criteria.
- This manifesto must be made available at a time to be determined by the election officer to enable it to be circulated to all those attending the AGM.

2. Function and operations of the NC

- The NC is a purely advisory body.
- In carrying out its work, the NC should abide by best-practice standards in relation to the fairness and transparency of its processes (including advertising, searching for, recommending and recruiting post-holders) in all of its work.
- The NC has three primary functions – to assist in the recruitment of board members, to assist in the recruitment of members of the board's subcommittees, and to assist in the recruitment of AGM/ National Conference office-holders.

2.1 Assistance with recruitment to the board

- The NC shall review with the Board the basic skills required for Board membership, and identify any specific skills shortages within the current AIUK Board membership.
- In conducting this search, the NC shall ensure that diversity and equalities issues are addressed.
- In cases where the Board decides to coopt one or more members, the NC shall be closely involved in the cooption process.
- The NC shall monitor and update as required the information contained in the Board Nomination Pack, and shall be consulted on all other materials relevant to encouraging people to put themselves forward in AIUK elections or to filling coopted positions.

2.2 Assistance with recruitment to the board's subcommittees

- The NC will review with the subcommittee chairs, the basic skills required for subcommittee membership, and identify any specific skills shortages within the current subcommittees.
- Subcommittee chairs shall facilitate the attendance of NC members as observers at subcommittee meetings when this is beneficial in assisting NC members to understand the skills

required by subcommittee members.

- The NC will actively seek candidates to stand for the subcommittees, to match the skills and criteria required ensuring diversity and equalities issues are addressed as far as is practical.
- The NC will advise the board and subcommittee chairs on how best to supplement their terms of reference with lists of expertise and skills required by their members.

2.3 Assistance with recruitment of AGM/National Conference office-holders

- The NC will actively seek people to Chair Working Parties for the National Conference/AGM

2.4 Organization and budget

- The NC will use a combination of face-to-face meetings and other means of communication (including video-conferencing and email) to carry out its work.
- Office support will be provided to this committee.
- Subject to the constraints of the overall Section budget, the NC will agree with the Board each year a budget adequate for its operations. This will normally be sufficient to cover two face-to-face meetings per year and appropriate attendance at board subcommittees in addition to AGM attendance by all members.
- The NC will review the processes by which it achieves its objectives and make improvements as required, and as technology becomes available.

3. Reporting by the NC

- The NC's annual written report shall also include a description of its work, including impediments to its work and proposals for remedying them.

Proposer background note:

This resolution arises from the work of the Governance Taskforce, which has correctly noted that a well-functioning nominations committee (NC) is an important part of AI governance. In the international arena, much work has been done in recent years to establish a successful International Nominations Committee, and it is appropriate for AIUK to take similar action.

The operation and remit of the Nominations Committee (NC) is outlined in Article 21 of the AIUK constitution. These state that the NC

- Shall consist of three individual members who are not Directors;
- The term of office of an NC Member shall be from the AGM at which they were elected until the end of the third AGM after such election.
- NC Members may be elected by the Members to fill any vacancies at any AGM
- An NC Member may be re-elected subject to a maximum continuous period in office of six years
- The NC Members may co-opt [one or two – depending on decisions to be taken at the 2014 AGM] additional NC Members, or any number of NC Members to fill any vacancies occurring between AGMs to serve for the period to the next AGM
- The NC shall hold meetings with the Board in order to become conversant with its roles and responsibilities. (Art 21.6)
- The NC shall provide an annual written report for the Members recommending the skills and experience it believes should be sought in the election of Directors.
- The NC shall also conduct a search for members possessing the desired skills and experience and encourage them to

become Directors.

- At the discretion of the Board the NC may also offer advice concerning membership of any sub-committees of the Board.

By developing the terms of reference further, this resolution would amplify the constitutional requirements to provide additional guidance on how the NC should be chosen, operate, and report. In case of doubt or ambiguity, the constitutional requirements take precedence.

The GTF has reviewed the operations of the existing AIUK NC and noted the following points:

- People do not generally know what the committee does before they get elected, so unsuitable people may be elected who have no relevant experience or skills. The NC needs people with high levels of strategy, human resources, or finance skill, or people who know enough about these to effectively find board or sub-committee members who have them. It needs people with links to the NGO community outside AIUK. However, current processes mean that AGM delegates have little information available to reach an informed judgement about candidate suitability.
- The NC has no budget for any substantial work.
- Lack of presence at regional AI meetings, so the NC cannot communicate directly with members to find out what they can offer.
- The NC has been almost invisible on the AIUK website: the only reference at <http://www.amnesty.org.uk/content.asp?CategoryID=11617#nominations> on the old website got wrong two out of the three members' names.
- The existing Terms of Reference is of uncertain provenance – there is no indication of where they come from and who approved them. In the interests of clarity, they should be approved by the AGM and all future changes should also be approved by the AGM. This avoids any suggestion of the board having undue influence over NC, which could be perceived as a conflict of interest, or of the NC itself acting *ultra vires*.

In the light of these weaknesses, a substantial overhaul of the NC's terms of reference is justified. The GTF believes that the proposals will significantly contribute to overcoming these weaknesses. But it also recognises that these changes will not automatically result in suitably qualified candidates coming forth for the NC, and that a considerable "selling job" is required in parallel with these changes. But neither of these points detracts from the value or importance of updating and improving the Terms of Reference, which is intended to enhance the profile of this important role and clarify its responsibilities.

Resource Implications: *The principal financial implication would arise in establishing a budget for the Nominations Committee. This would be agreed with the Nominations Committee but we do not anticipate it is likely to significantly exceed £2,000. The requirement for enhanced staff support is not anticipated to have a significant impact on resources or priorities.*

C3. GOVERNANCE TRAINING BUDGET

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

This AGM decides:

- That the Board has an annual budget of £35,000 in 2014 to spend on training throughout the year for members engaged in governance (members of the Board and its subcommittees)
- That this baseline budget of £35,000 increases in line with inflation from 2015 onwards
- That anything exceeding this budget will be reported separately in our annual report
- That this budget will be reviewed on an ongoing basis to ensure it provides for all future requirements, such as those that arise as a result of significant changes in the regulatory or economic environment
- That the Board will, in every case, first seek to secure such training pro bono through experts within the movement before drawing on this budget

Proposer background note:

Members appointed to a governance role ought to regularly undertake training to ensure that they are abreast of legislative changes and best practice developments relating to good governance. Having access to a regular budget to support training needs is a mark of good governance and enables and empowers members of the Board to plan ahead for regular, ongoing training to strengthen their skills and the skills of members of Board sub-committees for the benefit of the movement. Such a regular budget also enables AIUK to attract and retain the best candidates for governance roles. Finally, this resolution would also empower the Board to consider and implement training requirements for new governance member inductions or for the whole Board and/or subcommittees that may then require renewal year-on-year with the express support of the membership.

The Board already has the power to allocate and spend this or any other budget sum on training throughout the year. This resolution is intended to provide a regular and agreed annual amount for governance training with the express support of members. Any expenditure relating to governance training over and above the specified £35,000 would be reported separately in our annual report.

Training needs can be identified in several different ways throughout the year including a regular Board skills audit process, through published guidance from experts in good governance such as the NCVO or through ad hoc evaluations of Board practice (for example that carried out by Dame Anne Owers in 2011 or recommendations of the current Governance Task Force).

The Board will always, in the first instance, seek to minimise spend on training through turning to sources of expertise within the movement or through pro bono support. When using this budget, suppliers of training would need to go through AIUK's standard procurement process which ensures that we secure best value in our procurement activities, minimise and manage risk to AIUK, protect our reputation and translate our values into action.

Resource Implications: £35,000 allocation to a training budget, as indicated above.

C4. GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE EXTENSION

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

The AGM:

Reaffirms the importance of good governance and the need to review AIUK's governance and communications, in accordance with Decisions E4 and E5 of the 2013 AGM;

Notes the work done to date by the Governance Task Force

This AGM DECIDES:

That the term of the current Governance Task Force be extended for a further year, to July 2015

That the Governance Task Force shall provide regular recommendations to the Board and, in particular, to the January 2015 Board meeting, for incorporation into the business of that year's Annual General Meeting.

Proposer background note:

At the 2013 AGM, Decision E5 proposed by the Board, established a Governance Task Force to review a number of aspects of AIUK's governance and communications. At the same meeting, Decision E4 also called for the review of a number of important aspects of AIUK's governance. The Board and the proposer of E4 agreed to address both decisions through the Governance Task Force. You can view its full remit and other documentation, including reports, on the website, at <http://www.amnesty.org.uk/governance-taskforce>

Bringing together the reviews called for under two of last year's AGM decisions has avoided duplication of effort but it has created an even larger and more complex piece of work for the Governance Task Force to complete. Despite the best endeavours of its members, it has proved unrealistic to deliver the full range of recommendations to this year's AGM.

This resolution therefore extends the term of the Governance Task Force for a further year. In extending the term until July 2015, we remain clear that the Task Force is working to provide its key recommendations to next year's Annual General Meeting. However, we envisage that one or two subsequent meetings may be necessary to consider any AGM decisions and to allow the Task Force to reflect on its work. No other changes to its terms of reference or membership are proposed.

Resource Implications: Budget provision has been made for the GTF. We anticipate that the extension of the GTF will require up to 50 days of staff support time over 2014 and 2015.

C5. LOCATION OF AIUK ANNUAL GENERAL MEETINGS

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

This AGM decides:

That the location of AGMs can be fixed for up to a three year period in order to reduce costs to AIUK and that location be determined by the Board with a cost benefit analysis in mind. The AGM will take place either in Northern Ireland, Scotland or Wales in rotation at least once every four years.

That this decision supersedes Decision C2 of the 2008 AGM.

Proposer background note:

If we were able to book AGM venues for a three year period we would benefit from significant cost reductions as we would be able to benefit from venue discounts offered to organisations making multi-year bookings. We estimate these discounts to

WORKING PARTY D

amount to around £70K over a three year period. It would also free up staff time in having to source a new venue for each year and making the specific arrangements required for each venue.

We do however wish to continue to hold the AGM in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales in order to reflect the devolved nations and regions of the UK.

The last time the AGM considered this issue, it decided to alternate England and one of the devolved nations and regions in successive years. This resolution, if adopted, would replace the 2008 decision. However, AIUK would continue to take ethical considerations into account when choosing a venue, so cost considerations alone will not be the determining factor.

Resource Implications: *As indicated above. This could produce a saving of approximately £70,000 over three years.*

WORKING PARTY D

D1. SECRET POLICEMAN'S BALL

Proposer: Canterbury Local Group

The AGM instructs the board to: review the purpose, effectiveness and content of the Secret Policeman's Ball. This follows the revelations that the Secret Policeman's Ball held in 2013 lost a substantial amount of money. Despite its undoubted success in the past, it is time to consider whether it remains a brand of net benefit to Amnesty.

This AGM instructs the Board to:

- Commence an investigation – involving grassroots campaigners; youth, student and local groups; sub-committees and AIUK staff – into the costs and benefits of the Ball in relation to both the national and international movement.
- Ensure that all findings regarding the Secret Policeman's Ball be made available by the AGM of 2015.
- Ensure that the findings of the investigation, should the Ball be judged beneficial, play a part in future decisions over the running of the event.

Proposer background note:

It is time for dialogue over the importance of the Secret Policeman's Ball in the struggle for human rights. We feel the Ball fails to effectively address the awareness- and fund-raising challenges of the 21st century and are dubious of its hefty price-tag during a time of significant cutbacks across the organisation.

It was reported that the Secret Policeman's Ball of 2013 lost £750,000. Amnesty's official response to this was that this expenditure was very valuable as a method of marketing Amnesty, particularly in the USA, and as such was justifiable. We feel this post-hoc rationalisation of a failed event to be extremely questionable and would challenge Amnesty's view that the event was an effective way of spending money.

In terms of the Ball's content, whilst the Canterbury branch appreciates the evolution of comedy in tackling even the most serious issues, many of us have already passed on our concerns about some of the acts involved in this year's event because of the bullying, homophobic and misogynistic content of their performances. It could be argued that these performers violated in poor taste many of the principles for which Amnesty stands.

Board background note:

The most recent Secret Policeman's Ball was held in March 2012 at Radio City Music Hall New York and broadcast in the UK and the USA. The DVD of the show was launched in the UK in December 2012 and in the USA in February 2014 and we anticipate further international TV and DVD sales following this year's US DVD launch.

The single biggest fundraising challenge AIUK faces is in recruiting new supporters. To meet that challenge we need to raise the profile of the organization – without spending several million pounds a year on advertising. Therefore, the main objective of the Ball, agreed by AIUK's Board in May 2010, was to build the appeal of Amnesty's brand amongst a mainstream audience. This was established at the outset of the project and maintained as the primary objective throughout its development. The 2010 Board paper notes "it is vitally important that we see SPB as a brand building project. If we can raise some money around it, even better, but its key goal is to raise awareness of and support for Amnesty".

Following the event, we commissioned an independent evaluation of the Ball, conducted by GfK NOP following a tender process. This has been circulated to key constituent groups, was discussed by the AMSC in February 2013, and is readily available to any members on request. Members can view the evaluation at the AMSC stall at the AGM in 2014.

The evaluation concludes that:

"Overall, the Ball achieved significant successes in meeting its two main objectives via successes against its publicity and awareness KPIs, and achieving its objective in building the profile of and appeals of Amnesty and achieved a high percentage of publicity carrying Amnesty messages, and positive coverage...One of the most compelling metrics provided by Gorkana [who provided media evaluation] is the monetary value of this coverage equates to an advertising equivalent of £3,344,343."

Coverage of the Ball reached almost 78% of adults in the UK, with each adult being exposed to SPB coverage eleven times on average between December 2011 and May 2012. The majority of coverage was favourable, with only 1% assessed as slightly unfavourable.

The evaluation also made a number of critical observations and its recommendations include further evolution of the due diligence process in the selection of artists associated with Amnesty and to ensure that Amnesty UK have full control of the selection of content being broadcast.

A secondary objective of the Ball was for it to be cost neutral. Whilst the project team strove to achieve this, they also provided a careful and quantified risk assessment to the Finance Sub-Committee in November 2011, which highlighted a potential financial exposure of up to £620,000 and setting out the measures that would be taken should this occur. At the time of the GfK NOP evaluation, the projected net financial outlay was £740,000. This was higher than expected and was covered by one-off reductions in other parts of the 2012 marketing budget. During 2014, additional income of £25,000 has been secured from a US DVD release and further income is anticipated. We are projecting that the net investment in the Ball will stand at £642,000 by the end of the year.

The Board is committed to drawing on all findings and recommendations provided within this evaluation when

considering similar investment decisions in the future. During 2014, it intends to review an assessment that draws from the evaluations of a number of the recent Secret Policeman's Balls.

Resource Implications: *An evaluation of the 2012 Secret Policeman's Ball has already been conducted, the financial implications of this resolution would be dependent on the extent to which additional information is required and the methodologies that would be used to obtain it.*

D2. SECRETARY GENERAL'S GLOBAL COUNCIL

Proposer: York and Bury St Edmunds Local Groups

The AGM instructs the board to:

Draw up supportive proposals to strengthen the working of the Secretary General's Global Council (SGGC)

- a) to ensure that the members of the SGGC are recruited in line with AI's mission and values and
- b) for a suitable system of transparent accountability for the SGGC and
- c) to submit both sets of proposals to the International Board for their consideration with the request that the International Board introduce SGGC enhanced recruitment guidelines and an accountability process for the SGGC within 6 months of submission

Proposer background note:

This resolution welcomes the formation of the SGGC in March 2013 and aims to cement this initiative's extension of fundraising and development within AI's principles.

SGGC members:

- are a volunteer fundraising body of six to twelve "high net worth individuals"
- advise and assist the Secretary General on major donor fundraising, marketing and communications
- discuss human rights issues, hearing from policymakers and human rights defenders.
- learn about AI's priorities, campaigns and its impact
- consider ways to support this work.
- play an important role in generating support for AI's growth in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East.

The current recruitment guidance is narrow and there is no system of accountability beyond a single International Board representative. Given the importance of AI's public image to its core activities, limited guidance and the absence of a transparent accountability system for the SGGC pose a risk to AI's reputation.

Systems are needed to protect AI from potentially hostile media attacks. AI has a particular identity in that its actions are legitimised by moral authority coming from a global membership of committed citizens, and great credibility due to its independent and trustworthy work. This ability to speak truth to power must be maintained. Thus for example, whilst an individual SGGC member may be beyond reproach, regrettably they may be tainted in relation to human rights by association with corporate, party political or NGO organisations which could be used to diminish Amnesty.

The recruitment process must ensure that SGGC members support AI's values and human rights approach, rather than holding a general commitment to social justice; they are de facto AI ambassadors not simply donors. Suggested membership criteria are for people:

- of stature, who, strongly identifying with AI's purpose, share its ideals through individual actions and by association

and not those:

- actively involved in party politics or representing government
- identified as status seekers

To protect and support the SG in the appointments requires a robust system of accountability. As SGGC members will work intermittently and personally drawing on their networks, an over-bureaucratic form of accountability would be difficult. Nevertheless, accountability is important through an annual monitoring report to the International Board and the wider AI membership, access to advice and support for SGGC members from Amnesty, and identified points at which senior members of AI including directors and chairpersons are briefed on significant SGGC activity.

(ORG10 IEC02 2013 IEC Meeting Paper 2 March 2013 SG Global Networking Council: Terms of Reference

ORG10 IEC02 2013 IEC Meeting Paper 2 March 2013 SG Global Networking Council: Background and launch strategy, & recruitment guidelines

Press release 17th September 2013, AI Index: PRE 01/471/2013)

Board background note:

It is important to remember that although AIUK can suggest or recommend a particular course of action to the International Board or International Secretariat, they may not agree to it. AIUK is one of more than fifty sections in the movement and our AGM cannot bind other parts of the movement.

Background information on Secretary General's Global Networking Council (SGGNC)

The SGGNC is still a relatively new body, run by the International Secretariat (IS). The IS is responsible for recruiting to it and drawing up the guidelines for membership. The International Board welcomed the initiative when it was proposed to them in March 2013. In doing so, they were clear "that this council has no governance role and is in no way linked to AI's democratic decision making and accountability system"¹. The Secretary General is, of course, accountable to the International Board, which is accountable to the ICM. AIUK is not involved in the decision making process on invitations to join the Global Council.

Sections can influence the process of membership if the proposed member to the Council has a link with that Section. In this instance, the Section will share any due diligence it has and advise on the suitability of the individual.

Background information on Amnesty's fundraising and independence

Amnesty International has a range of policies and frameworks to embed good practice and principles around fundraising and other elements of Amnesty International's work. These include a new draft of the Global Fundraising Policy (due to be signed off in 2014) which, whilst positive and encouraging about fundraising, states:

"Our fundraising activities are not to impact on our organisational independence."

Significant activity of the SGGNC can be documented in the Secretary General's monthly report or raised at an operational level between the IS and relevant sections.

¹ IEC Decisions Report 85 ORG 72/002/2013

Resource Implications: *Negligible*

D3. LINKING MEMBERS WITH LOCAL GROUPS

Proposer: Penzance Local Group

This AGM regrets:

That there is no automatic link between national membership of AIUK and local Amnesty groups and that many members are not aware of the large amount of activism undertaken in their localities.

While some national members may have no wish to engage with a local group, there are many who will be interested in taking part in raising awareness, undertaking actions and fundraising within their local communities. We should make it easy for national members to engage with local groups and therefore, this meeting instructs the Board to:

1. Automatically provide members with the details of their local group.
2. Inform local groups of members residing in their locality with their consent.

Proposer Background note:

Unlike many other membership based organisations AIUK has no direct or automatic links between national members and local groups.

We accept that some national members will not wish to engage with the work of local groups and that many localities do not have an active or functioning group. However, we would argue that the best way of influencing local political views and raising Amnesty's profile is through local group activity. Other similar organisations have structures where national members are either allocated to local groups or at the very least, given their contact details.

It would seem eminently sensible for AIUK to make national members aware of all active groups within their area. At the same time local groups should be given the contact details of national members in their locality. This would greatly increase the ability of local groups to survive, grow and engage in local campaigning and fundraising.

In response to any argument that many national members might not wish to have their details passed to local groups the answer is quite straight forward. Give them the opportunity to confirm one way or another at the time they first sign up to join. This should be a relatively simple exercise and would only require ticking a box during the application process.

Board background note:

The Board is keen to support of the growth of local groups as far as possible including through connecting national members to them. The Board would equally encourage members of local groups to also become national members themselves.

Amnesty UK currently has in place a number of measures to inform new national members about their local groups:

- When new members are recruited via street fundraisers or 'door-to-door' recruitment they are informed about groups in

their area using a list which is held by the team manager on site.

- Everyone who joins Amnesty, through whatever means, either receives a welcome email or a welcome pack in the post, both provide information on how they can contact and join their local group.
- There is a page on the main website where people can enter their postcode to find details of how to contact their local group (<http://www.amnesty.org.uk/groups>).
- Also on the website when anyone joins or donates there is a pre-checked, data protection tick box which says: 'I would like to receive updates from Amnesty groups in my area. Unticking this box will stop Local Group communications.'

When local groups want to send out communications to members, then they can currently contact the AIUK Supporter Care team. This team can then send out email communications (often promoting sales, events etc) to all members in their area. To do this, a strict process must be followed to ensure Amnesty UK remains in accordance with the Data Protection Policy. This process means Amnesty UK has a single overview of communications going to members and avoids complaints from members who might receive a high frequency of communication from local groups – which has, on occasion, been a problem in the past.

Our current measures do not involve the transfer of personal data collected by Amnesty UK outside of the Human Rights Action Centre. Under our Data protection Policy, local groups are considered separate entities to Amnesty UK. This means that they are not covered by the policy or required to comply with its standards, which are designed to maintain the security of data from the point of collection to the point of destruction, as required by legislation. Please note that whilst local groups do not fall under AIUK's policy, we would encourage them to consider data protection obligations.

The Board is keen to support steps that enhance the health and vitality of local groups. However, it must also remain conscious of its legal obligations. If implementation of this resolution requires wider sharing of data, there would be a higher risk that data security could be compromised, with corresponding personal, legal and reputational risks. AIUK's current data protection policies and procedures would need to be reviewed and local groups receiving data may need to demonstrate compliance with legislation.

In addition to requirements arising from the need to safeguard data security, we would need to establish systems for updating changes to personal details and preferences, in a way that is simple and efficient for the individual member.

Resource Implications: *The resource implications of this resolution are not known. Systems and processes would have to be established to ensure all sharing of data is compliant with legislation and best practice. The cost and complexity of these systems is likely to depend on the data required and the use to which it would be put.*

D4. SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE

Proposer: Malcolm Dingwall-Smith

Seconder: Gillian Melville

The AGM decides:

That if the people of Scotland vote for Independence in the September 2014 referendum, the Board will work to protect and enhance human rights during the creation and early years of the new Scottish state by ensuring that sufficient attention, support and resources are dedicated to the Amnesty Scotland office and interested activists so as to allow for effective lobbying and campaigning during this period.

Proposer background note:

On 18 September 2014 the people of Scotland will take part in a referendum on the question "Should Scotland be an independent country?" In the event of a 'yes' vote, the current Scottish Government intends for Scotland to become independent on 24 March 2016.

In line with Amnesty's commitment to political impartiality, this resolution takes no position on a favored or likely outcome of that referendum. However, for ease of reading the following note is written on the assumption of a 'yes' vote. This resolution does not call for any action in the event of a 'no' vote.

The creation of a new state presents opportunities for and risks to human rights, both before and in the immediate years following a declaration of independence. The Scottish Government's White Paper on independence published in 2013 states that "an independent Scotland will have at its heart the respect, protection and promotion of equality and human rights". It is important that those responsible for creating and governing the new state are held to this statement.

A wide range of issues impacting on human rights will need addressed prior to independence, including how rights are enshrined in a new constitution and which international treaties the new state would sign up to. Directly following independence there will also be one-off opportunities to influence policy on issues such as the right of asylum seekers to work while their applications are considered.

At present AIUK maintains a hard-working lobbying and campaigning presence in its Scotland office, which has a strong track record of influencing Scottish government. This consists of 2.2 full-time equivalent staff and 1.5 full-time equivalent volunteers. To handle the significantly increased and complex work load, this resolution calls on the AIUK to ensure that sufficient attention, support and resources are dedicated to lobbying and campaigning in Scotland in the run-up to and in the first years of independence. Noting the on-going resource constraints within AIUK, the resolution leaves operational decisions on how this is to be achieved to the Board and management. This could take various forms and creative approaches should be explored. Options include taking on additional staff or volunteers in the Scotland office, seconding staff from London to the Scotland office, London staff providing support and expertise remotely, or making greater use of the skills and expertise in the voluntary activist base.

Board background note:

Amnesty's stance at present

Amnesty International (AI) considers the referendum on Scottish independence to be a key opportunity to advance human rights protections in Scotland and its role in defending human rights worldwide.

Our advocacy, activism and media campaign work during the referendum campaign will set out clearly our expectations of government in Scotland after the September poll. Amnesty believes that whoever governs Scotland after the referendum must demonstrate a strong commitment to human rights both at home and abroad.

In particular, we believe they must demonstrate:

1. A willingness to be bound by an international and regional framework of human rights;
2. A commitment to make basic rights such as an adequate standard of living, housing, and social security, enforceable;
3. A desire to play a strong role in enhancing the recognition of human rights internationally; and
4. A commitment to use Scotland's economic, as well as political, interests to advance human rights at home and abroad.

See our briefing document 'The Rights Referendum: The Future of Human Rights in Scotland' for more information.

Amnesty UK's existing plans

AIUK is in the initial stages of assessing the implications for our structures, staffing and work in the eventuality of a 'yes' vote, including how we respond to the opportunities and threats for human rights in Scotland.

As the proposers note, there are limits to our resources, including our policy and advocacy capacity. In the event of a 'yes' vote, there may be a need to balance resources allocated to this area of work with those required to meet other organisational needs and priorities.

Resource Implications: *These are not known at present but are potentially significant (possibly in excess of £50,000 if additional staffing and materials are required, substantially less, if not). The implications are likely to be dependent on the availability of appropriate support from within the membership and from the International Secretariat. They would also depend on the extent of competing priorities and needs in Scotland and across AIUK.*

D5. STRATEGIC GOALS CONSULTATION

Proposer: AIUK BOARD

This AGM DECIDES:

- That the Board will develop and implement a plan to consult with AIUK's membership on the composition of the Strategic Goals;
- That the Board will report the results of this consultation to the 2015 AGM;
- That the Board shall table a resolution at the 2015 AGM proposing the position to be adopted by AIUK's delegation to the next International Council Meeting.

Proposer background note:

In 2003 and 2009, the International Council adopted successive Integrated Strategic Plans, each of six-years duration. The current ISP comes to an end in 2015.

Last year, the International Council Meeting decided to replace the ISP with a set of Strategic Goals and required the International Board to launch a process of consultation that would culminate in decisions being taken at the next ICM.

This resolution is to ensure that the Board provides an opportunity for AIUK's membership to have a voice in that consultation and to set out their views on the future direction of

the movement.

At the outset of this consultation it is important to recognise that strong, coherent strategic goals are important to guide the movement's work between 2016-2020. The number of goals that are agreed will inevitably be limited and those that are agreed will present both opportunities for and constraints on AIUK. Although decisions will be made at the international level – and AIUK's views cannot therefore bind the movement – it is important that the section has a strong voice in the forthcoming consultation and at the 2015 International Council Meeting.

Resource Implications: *This is difficult to assess and will be dependent on the timing and, possibly, the materials produced by the IS, as well as the nature of any consultation agreed. However, financial costs are unlikely to be significant.*

D6. GLOBAL TRANSITION PROGRAM

Proposer: Caroline Butler

Secunder: Mark Froud

The AGM instructs the board to:

Provide regular quarterly updates on the implementation of the Global Transition Program, including:

- The ongoing progress of newer Sections, such as India and Brazil;
- Updates on Section that are being co-located with the new Regional Hubs in the Global South, such as Dakar, Johannesburg and Nairobi;
- Updates on the new forms of presence such as Nigeria, Egypt and Indonesia;
- The financial health of the funding Sections:

And to provide these updates to AIUK networks including AMSC, IISC Country Coordinators and Regional Reps.

Proposer background note:

This resolution welcomes positive news of developing Sections such as India and Brazil, received through varied means such as the member's magazine, the Chair's monthly letter, and as part of other comms.

This resolution also fully supports the enabling of empowerment of Section in the Global South in order to promote and strengthen human rights closer to the ground.

AIUK membership has supported an increase in the assessment payments to the International Secretariat in order to help fund the Global Transition Program, also known as Moving Closer to the Ground. Membership has also supported a major restructure at AIUK resulting in the loss of a number of staff in various roles, in order to make such funds available. The restructure has had significant impact on remaining staff, AIUK networks and active members.

Members are from time to time made aware, often through informal channels and via relationships with activists in other Sections, that some funding Sections face financial difficulties. Members are also aware that without significant increase in funds, AIUK may itself face financial difficulty by 2017/18. There is currently no single mechanism via which AIUK members can be provided with good quality information in order to be able to critically evaluate the impact and value of the changes made at AIUK in context of the successful implementation of the Global Transition Program.

Likewise there is currently no definitive source of information on the financial health of the various funding Sections.

Board background note:

Parts of this resolution fall outside of the Global Transition Plan (GTP)

Although the resolution calls for quarterly updates on the Global Transition Program, a number of the entities listed do not fall within the remit of the GTP. Amnesty's "new forms of presence" in Brazil, India, Kenya and South Africa are not part of the Global Transition Plan. They are a "deferred governance" presence, meaning that they are currently extensions of the International Secretariat (IS) but with locally elected governance systems envisaged in the future. In short, it is hoped that, in time, our offices and memberships in Kenya, India, Brazil, South Africa and beyond will develop into self-governing sections like AIUK. However, at present, even though they resemble sections in some ways, they are offices that are administered by the IS.

The Global Transition Program is separate to these "new forms of presence". It is a process of transferring regionally focused functions (including research, campaign co-ordination and media work) from the International Secretariat's headquarters in London to a number of IS hubs in different parts of the world, closer to their countries of concern. Hubs can however be co-located with national sections or with new forms of presence – which is potentially why the Global Transition Plan is often confused with the new forms of presence.

At present, we are not aware of any specific, formal arrangements for reporting to the movement on "new forms of presence" e.g. Brazil, India, Kenya and South Africa beyond normal IS reporting, which can include updates provided to bodies like the Chair's Assembly or Director's Forum, as well as bulletins issued by the Secretary General and International Board.

Other parts of this resolution do fall within the Global Transition Plan

The International Secretariat is however providing reports relating to the Global Transition Plan which will provide some of the content required for the regular updates referenced in the resolution. As highlighted at the International Council Meeting (and incorporated in the document setting out the ICM's decisions), quarterly reports on the Global Transition Plan will be provided to the International Board and the Global Management Team and can be made available to sections on request. In December 2014 an interim evaluation report will be produced and this will be shared with the Chair's Assembly and ICM in 2015. A final, full evaluation will take place and report to the Chair's Assembly and ICM in 2017. Both the interim and final evaluation report will be provided to members for circulation.

Furthermore, in recent years, the IS has significantly enhanced global financial reporting, including through the production of consolidated accounts, which are being made available quarterly. These will provide a high-level indication of the financial health of funding sections (for example, noting where sections have been unable to pay assessments in full, or where additional voluntary contributions have been provided to the international budget).

Resource Implications: *The collation and summarizing (where appropriate) of documentation and other reports provided by the International Secretariat or the movement is likely to require a fairly small investment of staff time but we do not believe that other resources will be required.*