

**AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL
UNITED KINGDOM SECTION**

**NOTICE OF THE
2022 ANNUAL
GENERAL MEETING**

Saturday 25 June 2022

**AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL**



AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

UNITED KINGDOM SECTION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL UNITED KINGDOM SECTION (AIUK SECTION) to be held as a hybrid meeting on Saturday 25 June 2022 from 10:00 to 18:00 at the Human Rights Action Centre, 17-25 New Inn Yard, London EC2A 3EA. Members will also be able to access the meeting online.

Participating in the meeting

The AGM will be held at the Human Rights Action Centre, 17-25 New Inn Yard, London EC2A 3EA (HRAC). Subject to UK Covid-19 regulations and government guidance, members may attend in person. Information on how to join the meeting electronically can be found in the Chair's letter and at www.amnesty.org.uk/agm. In the event that government guidance on social distancing and gatherings means that it is not possible to hold an in-person meeting, the AGM will take place online. Members planning to attend the HRAC are requested to register their attendance at www.amnesty.org.uk/agm so we can contact you in the event of any last-minute venue changes and to ensure we have adequate space at the HRAC to allow for social distancing.

The business of the AGM will be to:

1. receive the report of the Directors and audited accounts for the year ended 31 December 2021;
2. receive and, if thought fit, adopt the report of the standing orders committee;
3. consider and, if thought fit, pass the resolutions printed below, which shall be proposed as Special and Ordinary Resolutions;
4. receive the report of the Nominations Committee;
5. approve the re-appointment of BDO LLP as external auditors and authorise the Directors to approve their remuneration;
6. receive the budgetary estimates of the Directors for the current and ensuing financial periods; and
7. if an election is required, to elect the AGM Chair for 2023, members of the Standing Orders Committee and Members of the Members and Directors Appeal Committee.

All AIUK Section members are entitled to attend and vote at the AGM. A member of AIUK Section is also entitled to appoint a proxy to attend, speak and vote on their behalf. A proxy need not also be a member of AIUK Section.

A form to nominate a proxy and to vote on the AGM resolutions is, for members that are receiving this notice by post, enclosed and for members receiving this notice electronically the form is available to download from [amnesty.org.uk/agm](https://www.amnesty.org.uk/agm), or you can email agm@amnesty.org.uk for a copy, or otherwise by post from AIUK, 17-25 New Inn Yard, London EC2A. If you prefer to submit your proxy form and vote online, please go to www.amnesty.org.uk/vote. You will need to enter your Voter Reference Number and PIN. Completed forms must be returned by the means set out in the proxy form, and arrive no later than **9am Thursday 23 June 2022**.

S1-S3 are submitted as Special Resolutions and are intended to make certain amendments to the Articles of Association of AIUK Section. Summary and background notes have been provided for each resolution in order to provide supplementary explanation. These do not form part of the substantive text to be considered.

By order of the Board

Michelle O'Keefe

Michelle O'Keefe,
Company Secretary,
6 May 2022

Amnesty International
United Kingdom Section
(incorporated and registered in
England and Wales
under number 01735872)

The Human Rights Action Centre,
17-25 New Inn Yard,
London EC2A 3EA

FINANCIAL RESOLUTIONS

F1

Resolution title: Financial statements

Resolution summary: A routine resolution to receive the financial statements and reports.

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

Resolution text: This AGM to receive the Report of the Directors and the audited accounts of AIUK Section for the year ended 31 December 2021.

Proposers background note: Receiving the financial reports is a formal part of every AGM. The audited financial statements have been approved by the Board and can be found on the AIUK's website www.amnesty.org.uk/aggm.

F2

Resolution title: Appointment of auditors

Resolution summary: A routine resolution to reappoint BDO LLP as auditors and to authorise the Board to determine their remuneration.

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

Resolution text: This AGM to reappoint BDO LLP as Auditor of the Company, to hold office until the conclusion of the next General Meeting at which accounts are laid before the Company, and to authorise the Directors to approve the Auditor's remuneration.

Proposers background note: AIUK Section is required by law to appoint auditors at

each AGM. The Board recommends that BDO LLP be re-appointed, with the audit fee at an amount to be agreed by the Board.

SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS

S1

Title: To remove from the articles of association the requirement that a member be 14 years old or over

Summary: A Special Resolution to remove from the Articles of Association the provision that members of AIUK Section must be 14 or over.

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

Resolution: The AGM hereby resolves by way of Special Resolution that the Articles of Association of AIUK Section are altered by:

- a) Deleting the words "provided that they are 14 or over" in Article 1.1.25
- b) Deleting the words "provided that they are 14 or over" in Article 1.1.32

Proposers background note: This Special Resolution removes a constitutional impediment to the implementation of AGM Decision O5, adopted at the 2021 AGM. The decision called for the removal of age restrictions for AIUK Section membership.

At present, the definition of family member and individual member contained in the Articles restricts membership to 14 years and over. Articles 1.1.25 and 1.1.32 therefore need to be amended to remove this provision.

The Articles of Association provide the Board with the power to set criteria for membership. Removal of the age restriction in the Articles does not, therefore, automatically mean that membership will be open to under-14s following the AGM. Work is underway to identify and implement the required measures to ensure that Amnesty International UK Section is a safe and welcoming environment for members who are under the age of 14. The Board will wish to retain the existing age restriction until it is satisfied that all required safeguarding and other measures are in place.

S2

Title: Amend the articles of association and rules to create a second vice-chair role

Summary: Amend the Articles of Association and Rules to create a second Vice-Chair role on the board.

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

Resolution: The AGM hereby resolves by way of Special Resolution that:

- 1) the Articles of Association of AIUK are altered by:
 - amending article 1.1.54 by changing “Vice-Chair” to “Vice-Chairs” and “the Vice Chair “ to “Vice-Chairs”
 - deleting article 45.6.2 and replacing with the following wording “ two Vice-Chairs, who shall serve until the first Board meeting after the third Declaration Date after their appointment”
 - amending article 45.7 by changing the word “Vice-Chair “in the second sentence to “Vice-Chairs”
 - amending article 45.10 by adding the words “one of“ before the words

- “the Vice-Chair” and changing “Vice-Chair “ to “Vice-Chairs” and
- 2) the Body of Rules of AIUK (adopted in accordance with Article 52 of the Articles of Association) are altered by:
 - amending rule 6.2.2 by changing the word “Vice-Chair” to “Vice-Chairs”.

Proposers background notes: The Articles of Association provide that the AIUK Section Board is to elect a Chair and a Vice-Chair from among the elected board members.

The role of the Vice-Chair is to: support the Chair of the board; provide informal feedback and perspective; and share the Chair’s workload.

The Chair and Vice-Chair of AIUK Section have a heavy workload and the board therefore wishes to create a second Vice-Chair role to help spread the workload between the senior board members.

The suggested amendments to the Articles of Association and Rules provide for a second Vice-Chair to be appointed on equivalent terms to the current Vice-Chair role.

S3

Title: Amend the articles of association to change the resolution submission date

Summary: Amend the Articles of Association to increase the period of time between the date that proposed resolutions are received and the date of the AGM.

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

Resolution: The AGM hereby resolves by way of Special Resolution that the

Articles of Association of AIUK are altered by amending article 26.2.2 by deleting “90 days” and replacing with “120 days.”

Proposers background note: Resolutions to be considered by the members at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) must be received by AIUK no later than 90 days before the date of the AGM.

Once received the resolution: is considered by the Standing Orders Committee (SOC), to ensure it is compliant with the Standing Orders; any suggested amendments agreed with the proposer; AIUK staff research the subject matter of the resolution (for example whether similar work has already been undertaken by the movement, risks associated with the proposed action, etc) and provide a briefing note to the board to assist their consideration of the resolution; a board meeting is convened to consider the resolution; staff prepare a board background note – which is sent to the SOC for consideration; and any final amendments are signed off by the board. The resolution and background notes are incorporated into the AGM notice which is sent to the printers and emailed/posted to circa 100,000 members.

The AGM notice (incorporating the resolutions) has to be received by members 45 clear days before the AGM. When allowing for postage this provides a mere 42 days in which to comply with the extensive requirements of the Articles and Standing Orders and provide a response to the resolutions. 42 days does not provide adequate time for this process.

Discussions with resolution proposers have had to be cut short to enable the AGM notice to be sent out within the strict time limits set out in the Articles.

In order to provide members with more time to discuss the text of their resolutions with the SOC, staff to research the subject matter, and the board to consider their responses and discuss them with the proposers of the resolution, it is proposed that the time limit for receipt of resolutions be changed from 90 days to 120 days before the date of the AGM, providing a further 30 days for all relevant parties to consider and discuss the resolutions.

ORDINARY RESOLUTIONS

01

Title: Clarity in the process for designating Prisoners of Conscience.

Summary: Amnesty International needs to clarify the process by which it declares a person as a Prisoner of Conscience.

Proposer: Richmond and Twickenham Group

Resolution: This AGM requests that, in the interests of credibility and accountability, the Amnesty International UK Section Board calls on the International Secretariat (IS) to clarify publicly the process by which it decides to designate Prisoners of Conscience and to publish the promised review of its overall approach to the use of the term Prisoner of Conscience.

The Section Board should argue that the lack of clarity in the process has resulted in past and current controversies with the potential not only to damage Amnesty’s reputation but also the cases of prisoners themselves. It has led

Amnesty's supporters and critics alike to engage in debates – some bordering on endorsement of conspiracy theories – about Amnesty's complicity in supporting the policies of specific states, and hypocrisy for designating some persons as Prisoners of Conscience but not others.

Further details on the review of the term's usage and a resulting process should be adapted for publication on at least one prominent page of the IS website. Specifically, which relevant organisational structures decide? Are there more detailed criteria against which they make decisions? What conditions prompt and/or prevent review of a person's case? How often is this process reviewed?

Proposers background notes: Amnesty International defines a "Prisoner of Conscience" as "someone [who] has not used or advocated violence or hatred but is imprisoned because of who they are (sexual orientation, ethnic, national or social origin, language, birth, colour, sex or economic status) or what they believe (religious, political or other conscientiously held beliefs". This definition is available on the International Secretariat (IS) website at <https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/detention/> (accessed on 26 March 2022).

The IS posted two statements in English (in February and May 2021) re-designating Aleksei/Alexei Navalny as a Prisoner of Conscience following backlash to its previous withdrawal in January 2021. Not only is the IS unable to agree on a standard transliteration of Navalny's first name, it did not sufficiently consider the implications of withdrawing his designation on Navalny's case and Amnesty's reputation:
<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/02/aleksei-navalny-prisoner-of-conscience/>

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/05/statement-on-aleksei-navalny-status-as-prisoner-of-conscience/>

Other recent examples of debate about Amnesty's decisions not to designate specific persons as Prisoners of Conscience include the cases of Chelsea Manning and Julian Assange. The articles argue that there has been a lack of detail and clarity in both the IS and AIUK's responses to external inquiries about these cases:

<https://www.thecanary.co/us/us-analysis/2019/04/05/amnesty-international-still-doesnt-recognise-chelsea-manning-as-a-prisoner-of-conscience/>

<https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2019/05/23/assa-m23.html>

<https://citizentruth.org/amnesty-international-navalny-a-prisoner-of-conscience-but-not-manning-assange-or-mandela/>

Board background note: The Board supports the resolution in principle. The Board believes greater clarity and transparency around the process of designating a Prisoner of Conscience is important. The Board also notes that this process is currently subject to a review by the International Secretariat.

Amnesty work to date: As the proposers of this resolution rightly note, the International Secretariat is currently carrying out a review into the usage of the Prisoner of Conscience designation. This review was prompted by the feedback surrounding the Alexei Navalny case. The Chair of the AIUK Section Board has already contributed to the beginning of this review process.

Amnesty current plans: As noted, the International Secretariat is already carrying out a review into the process for designating individuals as POCs. This is likely to clarify who can and cannot be granted POC status (the issue at the heart of the Navalny case). A decision on what information (if any) to put in the public realm is not likely before the review is complete.

Resource Implications: This resolution has no significant resource implications for AIUK beyond the time involved in communicating with the International Secretariat. No information can be made publicly available by Amnesty International UK on its own initiative.

02

Title: Greater campaigning support for Julian Assange, press freedom, and the Human Rights Act.

Summary: Amnesty International UK should campaign more actively for the release of the journalist Julian Assange by associating his case with related threats to press freedom and the current UK government's assault on the Human Rights Act.

Proposer: Richmond and Twickenham Group

Resolution: This AGM calls on the Amnesty International UK (AIUK) Section Board to instruct the UK Section to provide greater support for the case of the journalist Julian Assange in campaigning for his release prior to his extradition to the USA.

Julian Assange's potential final route to appeal his extradition will be the European Court of Human Rights in

accordance with protections under the Human Rights Act (HRA) 1998. Given AIUK's concerns about the current UK government's proposal to "overhaul" the HRA, we propose that AIUK should liaise with supporters of Julian Assange and others to prepare a campaign on the impacts that his case and related cases have had and could have on press freedom and human rights in general.

Proposers background notes: From 2010, Julian Assange and WikiLeaks published millions of secret leaked US government documents revealing human rights violations including war crimes in Iraq and Afghanistan. Assange subsequently sought asylum in the Ecuadorian embassy in London to avoid extradition to Sweden and then to the USA. The 2016 Judgement of the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention concluded that both Sweden and the UK had been responsible for the 'arbitrary detention' of Assange. In 2019, the Ecuadorian embassy handed Assange to the British police and, on the same day, the US demanded his extradition.

On 10 December 2021, High Court judges ruled that Assange could be extradited to the USA. They chose to believe US assurances that he would not be subjected to the cruel prison regime of Special Administrative Measures. The US has previously broken such assurances, and Amnesty International has said: "should the UK extradite Julian Assange in reliance on such an agreement with the US it would violate a peremptory norm of international law (the absolute ban on torture), its international human rights treaty obligations and its own domestic law".

Assange has been isolated in Belmarsh maximum security prison for over 1,000

days awaiting a decision on extradition to the US on Espionage Act charges which relate to the publication of these leaks. These charges carry a prison term of 170 years, plus a further five years under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.

The decision to allow Assange's extradition to the US puts both his life and the freedom of the press in peril. He has already suffered 11 years of loss of liberty and arbitrary detention. UN Rapporteur on Torture Nils Melzer found that Assange has been subjected to "psychological torture" and that "unprecedented legal devices have been used against him. The use of those will place a chilling effect on journalism." Assange's mental and physical health have seriously deteriorated as a result. He suffered a mini-stroke during recent court proceedings.

For coverage of Assange's case, we refer to a statement by Amnesty's Europe Director Nils Muižnieks and an online petition calling for Assange's release:

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/12/us-uk-travesty-of-justice-as-extradition-appeal-fails-to-recognise-that-it-would-be-unsafe-for-julian-assange-to-be-sent-to-the-us/>

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/petition/julian-assange-usa-justice/>

Board background note: The Board opposes this resolution because, although we recognise the serious human rights issue at stake, this is already a well-resourced and well-publicised campaign on which additional campaigning by AIUK is likely to have limited impact.

The Board believes linking Julian Assange's case to the Human Rights

Act campaign would tie both issues to a specific campaigning approach which may not be effective.

The Board also believes AIUK should use its resources strategically to elevate the cases of lesser-known Human Rights Defenders who are at risk, especially those who are not well-supported.

Amnesty work to date: Amnesty has done a wide range of work on Julian Assange's case, in the UK and globally. We plan to continue that work. AIUK will continue to comment in the media, and share actions issued by the IS with activists.

Amnesty current plans: We receive many requests to campaign on specific individuals and have to make difficult choices, which are informed by an assessment of AIUK's added value. Julian Assange is experiencing an egregious threat to his human rights and Amnesty is calling for the US to drop the charges against him and for him not to be extradited to the US. However, his case is well-supported by effective campaign groups and our assessment is that AIUK's ability to make a significant difference on his case is less than on the case of other lesser-known people for whom Amnesty is one of only a few, if not the only, voice in their defence. A recent external evaluation of our "Brave" campaign on Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) found that AIUK should look to involve lesser-known HRDs in future campaigns.

We are preparing a major campaign this year as we expect the Government to propose new legislation to undermine the Human Rights Act. We have previously worked with people who have used the Human Rights Act to show its relevance to everyday life, for instance the families of the victims of Hillsborough. It is not

clear whether the issues involved in the Julian Assange case would supplement or detract from broader campaigning in defence of the HRA.

Resource implications: Building a bigger campaign on Julian Assange's case is outside of existing staff resources and would require a reduction in our work with other individuals at risk.

03

Title: Prisoner of Conscience Status for Mohammed El Halabi of World Vision, imprisoned without trial in Israel

Summary: Mohammed El Halabi's continued "pre-trial" imprisonment by Israel is unjust and Amnesty should consider raising his case in our priorities and designating him a prisoner of conscience.

Proposer: Lewes Amnesty Group

Resolution: This AGM calls for new support for Mohammed El Halabi, who has been imprisoned without charge or trial since 2016 by the Israeli Government.

We request Amnesty International UK and the International Secretariat that Mohammed El Halabi's case be escalated as a priority by the IPOT research team, so that he can be designated formally as an Amnesty Prisoner of Conscience.

Proposers background notes: For many years, Mohammed El Halabi worked for World Vision, an international aid organisation in Gaza. He was arrested by Israel in July 2016. The charges could not have been more serious: transferring 7.2 million US dollars a year from World Vision to Hamas. This despite the

fact that World Vision's entire budget for Gaza over this time was a fraction of this amount, and even though two independent audits concluded that no money was missing.

Mohammed has been imprisoned by Israel without trial for more than 5 years. There have been dozens of court dates. He has been separated from his family and lost his freedom.

Mohammed's imprisonment clearly has nothing to do with embezzlement, and everything to do with an attempt to discredit NGOs and aid agencies working in Palestine, by trying to link them to allegedly terrorist groups.

Board background note: The Board supports this resolution. However, the AGM should note that decisions relating to Prisoner of Conscience status are made by the International Secretariat and Amnesty International UK is unable to influence the process.

Amnesty work to date: Amnesty International has previously issued a statement on the case of Mohammed El Halabi <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2016/08/israel-opt-secret-trial-of-gaza-aid-worker-will-not-deliver-justice/>

However, we have not done any sustained campaigning on his case. There are some reasons for this including capacity of the team and multiple competing priorities for casework in IOPT. The International Secretariat are supportive of the principle of this resolution but will need to undertake all of our usual due diligence and consent gathering before we can begin campaigning.

Amnesty current plans: Amnesty International launched a major new

campaign in 2022, calling for an end to Israel's system of apartheid against Palestinians. We are also continuing with work on JCB and their continued trading with illegal Israeli settlements, and campaigning on the case of Janna Jihad. We therefore have a full slate of IOPT campaigning to undertake in 2022 and do not currently have plans to campaign on Mohammed El-Halabi's case.

We understand that the International Secretariat is supportive of the principle of this resolution but will undertake its usual due diligence processes and consent gathering before movement campaigning can take place. However, if the IS is able to make a POC designation for Mr. El Halabi or issue an Urgent Action or other Individuals at Risk designation, AIUK would support increased work on this case. As with much of our casework, this is likely to be led by country coordinators and local groups.

Resource implications: AIUK section is already committed to a full slate of IOPT campaigning in 2022 so we wouldn't be able to divert significant staff campaigning resources to this case. However, staff would be able to support activists wishing to campaign on the case, with limited resource implications, in line with other cases in the AIUK Individuals at Risk portfolio. We note that this is dependent on an appropriate designation of Mohammed El-Halabi's case by the International Secretariat.

04

Title: Raising awareness of human rights violations in corporate supply chains and pushing for UK legislation.

Summary: This AGM motion calls on Amnesty to raise awareness of the issue

by encouraging groups across the UK to campaign on human rights violations in supply chains and push further for UK due diligence legislation.

Proposer: Amnesty International Society at the University of Edinburgh

Resolution: This AGM instructs AIUK to campaign against Human Rights violations in corporate supply chains in particular by:

- i) promoting the issue within Amnesty and to the wider public
- ii) developing a campaign with material to enable youth, student and local groups to raise awareness on the issue in their communities
- iii) creating material for a petition and letter-writing to MPs for legislation on mandatory human rights due diligence in the UK
- iv) increasing lobbying activities at the UK government for such legislation
- v) continuing to collaborate with other civil society groups in a wider campaign.

Proposers background notes: The UK Modern Slavery Act is insufficient as a tool to address human rights violations in corporate supply chains. As an example, there are 1.56 million children working in the chocolate industry, 95% of which are engaged in hazardous work such as using sharp tools, carrying heavy loads and spraying agrochemicals. NGOs have signed open letters to the UK government to create a 'failure to prevent' law which would oblige corporations to prevent human rights violations in their operations and supply chains. Amnesty has signed these letters. Nevertheless, the issue is not well-known and there is no active campaign by Amnesty. The EU has just published a proposal for EU wide legislation and

more needs to be done to ensure that the same happens in the UK.

The Amnesty International Society at the University of Edinburgh has created a working group (Supply Chain Justice) to campaign on the issue. Taking the chocolate industry as an example that students can identify with, the working group launched a Valentine's Day Campaign which reached over 800 students through personal discussions. With funding from the Edinburgh University Student Council leaflets, stickers and free ethical chocolate were distributed. Additionally, posts on social media reached as many as 1500 people at a time. The group has been featured in two University Magazines, attended BBC Scotland Debate Night as audience members and has organised a panel discussion with the Managing Director of Pacari UK, the Chief Executive of the Scottish Fairtrade Forum and Dr Amanda Berlan. Other students are generally engaged with our campaign and are shocked to find out about the circumstances in the chocolate industry.

The success of our own campaign demonstrates the need for similar campaigns across the UK. As of now, there has been no people's movement on the issue of business and human rights but only open letters by NGOs. The Corporate Justice Coalition has started a petition to the UK government to force the issue into Parliament last October. This petition currently has about 60,000 signatories. By bringing the issue to the AGM and submitting a resolution, we hope to bring the issue as a campaign to other youth, student and local groups. As one student group, we can only reach so far but with other groups, we can push for change by 1) raising awareness and 2) pushing for legislation.

Board background note: The Board supports this resolution.

Amnesty's work to date: AIUK has a long-standing track-record of working on business and human rights, including on supply chains. It has played a leading role in advocating for government action to enhance rights respecting corporate conduct, including through its advocacy for a National Action Plan. We have called for mandatory due diligence legislation and currently pursue this goal by supporting and participating in the Corporate Justice Coalition, which has successfully raised the profile of human rights due diligence within UK politics.

The International Secretariat also has a track record of highlighting human rights issues in corporate supply chains. Examples include highlighting abuses in the palm oil and cobalt industries, Amazon cattle-ranching and labour rights abuses in Amazon's warehouses. More recent work has focussed on downstream supply chains, particularly with regard to social media platforms, data harvesting, artificial intelligence algorithms, surveillance technologies and other harmful end uses of products.

Examples of work on this issue can be found at:

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2016/11/palm-oil-global-brands-profiting-from-child-and-forced-labour/>

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/afr62/3183/2016/en/>

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/07/brazil-cattle-illegally-grazed-in-the-amazon-found-in-supply-chain-of-leading-meat-packer-jbs/>

<https://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/black-friday-amazon-putting-workers-lives-risk-during-shopping-rush-new-report>

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/POL3014042019ENGLISH.pdf>

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/research/2018/03/online-violence-against-women-chapter-1/>

<https://www.amnesty.org.uk/resources/jcb-off-track>

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2017/06/artificial-intelligence-the-technology-that-threatens-to-overhaul-our-rights/>

<https://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/eu-proposed-legislation-artificial-intelligence-falls-short>

Current and future plans: AIUK's 2021 AGM approved an eight-year strategic plan. Our focus this year is to develop plans for the six agreed priorities of human rights frameworks, anti-racism, freedom of expression, individuals and communities at risk, human rights crises, and economic, social and cultural rights. The strategic plan recognises corporate power as a cross-cutting issue and over the course of 2022 and into 2023, we will integrate work on business and human rights into these plans. In the meantime, we will maintain our support for the Corporate Justice Coalition.

The International Secretariat is working on a number of projects relating to supply chains. These include a focus on the extractive industry, mass battery technologies and the need for more responsible sourcing models and tighter government regulation on battery supply

chains. Outputs will include reports on Electric Vehicles and on forced evictions in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Research on Xinjiang, China will include an investigation into corporate complicity in the crimes against humanity and the IS will explore the relationship between national employment policies and ethnic persecution in other provinces (particularly Inner Mongolia and Tibet).

Resource implications: AIUK plans for 2022 do not include provision for significant campaigning on corporate supply chains. If the resolution is passed, planning work for 2023 would take into account campaigning work in this area.

05

Title: Pay Policies and Disclosure Requirements of AIUK

Summary: AIUK to adopt more equitable and transparent pay policies

Proposer: Thanet Group

Resolution: That Amnesty International UK adopts the following pay policies and disclosure requirements:

1. Pays a minimum of the living wage to all employees as detailed by the Living Wage Foundation.
2. No zero hours contracts, unpaid interns or anything similar.
3. That the Board attempts to limit the maximum salary paid to any individual to four times the living wage as detailed by the Living Wage Foundation.
4. If the annual salary paid to an individual exceeds four times the living wage as detailed by the Living Wage Foundation then:
 - The individuals precise remuneration, name and job title

are disclosed on the Amnesty website and Annual Accounts in a remuneration report.

- The Board are to provide a summary as to why this individual is having to be paid that salary.
- This remuneration report to be easily accessible on the Amnesty website no more than two clicks away from the homepage.
- Included in this remuneration report and Annual Accounts are the number of staff whose remuneration is £20,000 or more, in salary bands of £10,000, together with current Amnesty pay policies.

Proposers background notes: The current pay policy per the 2020 accounts:

4. Policy on pay for employees including senior staff

The UK Section operates a pay and reward policy that aims to attract and retain the best talent needed to take forward our ambitious human rights work within the UK. We aim to pay all roles at the median salary level for the sector and ensure that all elements of pay are fair and transparent and easily understood by our employees. We periodically undertake benchmarking exercises using established salary surveys.

Current retention levels:

Job Title	Years with Amnesty
CEO (now retired)	21
Director of Supporter Campaigning and Communications	22
Acting Director of People & Culture	5
Director of Fundraising	8
Director of Chief Executive's Office	22
Acting Director of Corporate Services (job-share)	5
Acting Director of Corporate Services (job-share)	12

No data is available for other Amnesty staff.

There is no mention of the living wage or interns. AIUK Human Resources state AIUK is a living wage employer and there are no zero hours contracts or unpaid interns.

The National Council for Voluntary Organisations in April 2014 produced a report entitled "Report of the Enquiry into Charity Senior Executive Pay and Guidance For Trustees on Setting Remuneration". Points four and five derive from that report.

As of June 2021 a London employee earning four times the living wage amounts to 21,157.50 x 4 = £84,630. From the 2020 Accounts:

£000s	2020 Total Numbers	2019 Total Numbers
0-60	209	241
60-70	14	9
70-80	6	2
80-90	0	0
90-100	4	3
120-130	1	0
140-150	0	1
Total	234	256

The remuneration report disclosure in 2020 would have effected approximately five employees. Who are probably the management team. This is what the report recommends.

AIUK Human Resources state that currently only the senior management team are paid more than four times the living wage.

The report states “there is strong anecdotal evidence to suggest that the publication of comparative data in other sectors has inflated salaries, with individuals using the information to attempt to “leapfrog” others”.

The Board need to be aware of this when paying greater than four times the living wage. Examples of skills that justify paying more:

- A proven history of increasing membership.
- An excellent communicator - a large social media following, writing articles for the press.

- A proven history of effective fundraising.

Board background note: The Board opposes the resolution as currently worded. The Board supports the principle of equitable and transparent pay policies, including points 1 & 2 which reflect existing practice within AIUK. Regarding point 3, the Board considers the salary range and multiple between lowest and highest salary when deciding on any salary within the board’s responsibilities to set. However, the Board does not believe that the proposers have provided a sufficient rationale as to why a four-times multiple is appropriate. Regarding point 4, the Board will explore the feasibility of sharing more information on individual salaries taking into consideration legal implications (e.g., individual data protection).

Amnesty work to date: AIUK offers competitive terms and conditions to enable us to attract and retain the best talent to deliver our human rights work.

We are a living wage employer and do not offer zero-hours contracts or have unpaid interns. Apprentices are paid on our pay scales with minimum salary higher than the living wage.

A pay and grading project was completed in 2018, resulting in a new pay scale, which was benchmarked with the NGO and wider not for profit sector.

The starting point of our pay scales are benchmarked to the median of the market. All staff salaries, apart from the Chief Executive Officer, are covered by a collective agreement with the Union. As a rights championing organisation, it is not appropriate for the Board to undermine negotiated agreements with the Union. The Boards of the UK Section

and Amnesty International UK Section Charitable Trust set the CEO's pay. The grades for all roles are determined using a job evaluation system to ensure equity and transparency.

We review pay levels on an annual basis with any increases subject to a test of affordability. We do not make any additional salary payments by way of bonus or long-term incentive schemes.

Our published accounts show the total costs of employment of our key management personnel and the breakdown in bands of staff salaries paid above £60,000, in compliance with the UK Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP).

Amnesty current plans: AIUK will undertake a full benchmarking of pay scales within the next three years. We will also explore the feasibility of sharing more information on individual salaries.

Resource Implications: Implementation of this resolution could impact AIUK resource if it involved the enforced departure of individuals whose salaries would be greater than the proposed four-times multiple.

06

Title: Financial Efficiency of AIUK Section.

Summary: AIUK Section to produce plans to reduce non-campaign costs.

Proposer: Thanet Group

Resolution: This AGM decides that AIUK Section should become a famously frugal and efficient organisation.

To achieve that management and staff should produce a short report (without the use of external consultants) detailing plans to reduce costs and present this to the 2023 AGM for members to vote on.

The culture of AIUK Section should in future recognise that money given to AIUK Section in the form of membership fees and donations is freely given by members to do good in the world. AIUK Section should be famously frugal and efficient custodians of this money in order to maximise that good.

Proposers background notes: The following facts are why the Thanet Group is requesting that AIUK Section become a frugal and efficient organisation (all figures provided by the AIUK Finance Group):

AIUK use of consultants:

- I attended the 2019 AGM workshop "Human Rights in the UK". It was run by an external consultant. When asked how much he charged he stated £600 per day. His job was to collect and collate opinions. The cost of that report - £40,000. The report produced is "Amnesty International UK Strategy 2022-2030"
- The report into racism at Amnesty by external consultants is projected to cost £100,000.
- Annual amount spent on professional fees (which includes consultants):

Year Ended 31 December	GBP£
2021	768,543
2020	1,033,153
2019	1,224,348
2018	1,329,072
2017	1,310,783

Some costs could be reduced:

- The amount of money spent at the 2019 AGM appeared excessive. Cost of the recent “Covid” AGM £91,000 compares to £220,000 for the 2019 AGM.
- AIUK annual spend on flights (finance group states all flights are economy class):

Year Ended 31 December	GBP£
2021	1,317
2020	3,152
2019	41,097
2018	41,138
2017	49,171

- Visiting the London offices in 2016 there appeared to be unused space. With Covid on average only 20 people per week are using the office space. The property is owned by Amnesty, running costs amount to approximately £500,000 per annum.
- Relocation out of London would save approximately £900,000 per annum by removing the London weighting from salary costs.
- I receive a digital copy of the Amnesty magazine. If all members did this there would be a saving of £280,000 per annum.

Board background note: The Board opposes this resolution because budget setting and oversight of financial performance is the Board’s legal responsibility. An AGM is not an appropriate forum for making detailed spending decisions.

The AGM has endorsed an ambitious eight-year strategy and the Board

believes that achieving the associated human rights impact will require significant investment.

Amnesty’s work to date: We actively seek value for money in all we do. We respect where funds have come from and look to maximise the impact they can have.

The Board has a legal responsibility to make balanced and adequately informed financial decisions, considering the long term as well as the short term, to enable us to achieve our objectives. The Board considers the level of resources which should be applied when setting annual budgets.

We have an ambitious strategy which requires investment to achieve our objectives.

Amnesty’s existing plans: We have policies around allowable business expenses, which seek to avoid excessive costs by providing guidance around economy travel, meal values and hotel costs, whilst enabling us to carry out our work across the UK and around the world.

Sometimes we need to use external providers, either because we are legally obliged (e.g., the audit), or require independent specialist advice where we lack staff expertise. Such professional services could be required across a range of areas, which might change year to year. Our focus on Inclusion, Diversity, Equity and Anti-racism, and the independent inquiry into institutional racism at AIUK was specifically mandated at the 2021 AGM. We have reduced AGM costs by using the Human Rights Action Centre (HRAC) in London and making the AGM accessible online.

We see the HRAC as an important collaborative space for staff and activists. In 2022, we will be making changes to the interior layout of the HRAC to realise these benefits and explore potential income generation opportunities. The HRAC is owned by the Amnesty International UK Section Charitable Trust, not the AIUK Section.

Resource implications: We are already working to an approved budget and longer-term financial strategy. Seeking cost reductions across our operations would be disruptive, and cause delays to the projects which will enable us to achieve our strategic objectives agreed previously by the AGM.

The Section Board has no control over Trust expenditure, as the Trust is a completely separate legal entity with its own Board of Trustees.

07

Title: Remove the required annual affiliation fee and block vote, for local groups.

Summary: Remove the annual affiliation fee of local groups and the entitlement to a block vote of ten at the AGM.

Proposer: Thanet Group

Resolution: The AGM decides to remove the annual affiliation fee and AGM block votes for local groups. The Board should bring forward the necessary amendments to the articles and rules for the 2023 AGM.

The Board should also consider removing the annual affiliation fee and AGM block votes for student groups and youth groups.

Proposers background notes: The Treasurer of the Thanet Group retired. You find out what someone did when they leave.

The group took a look at the work and went – no thanks. Eliminate the cash and you eliminate the work.

With the help of the AIUK finance group it looks like it is possible for the group to go cashless. We will set up a Just Giving page for each event that we run. A QR code will be produced for the Just Giving page. Attendees can scan that and pay for the event / make a donation using their smartphone.

Another advantage of this method is that if it is a donation then Just Giving can claim the Gift Aid for AIUK. Which after Just Giving fees will add 18% to the donation.

We have yet to try this method - hopefully we can make it work.

It eliminates the need for a bank account and dealing with cash. One effect is that we will not have the ability to pay the annual local group fee of approximately £70. That gets paid out of the money we receive for quiz nights. The AIUK finance group suggested that the members of the Thanet Group pay the fee.

I asked the AIUK why we pay this money and was advised it was to have the block vote at the AGM. Nobody could explain why things were set up this way. Removing this fee reduces admin for head office and allows us to not to have a bank account.

I know of somebody who is trying to start a local group from nothing, and

she was not happy in having to pay the group fee herself.

Board background note: The Board opposes this resolution as it would seem to remove Local Groups from AIUK's democratic participation.

Amnesty work to date: The UK Section's Articles of Association set out the categories of membership (article 9) and allow the Board to determine the rates payable for each category (article 15). Voting entitlements of each category of membership are laid out in article 29.5, and how Groups may cease their membership status is in article 14.1. In addition to AGM votes, groups also enjoy other membership rights, such as reserved seats on the Board (article 36.1) and the right to propose AGM resolutions.

The current Group annual membership rates, set by the Section Board, are £72 (Local) and £21 (Youth and Student). Each category of Group member receives 10 votes at the AGM.

Local Groups typically have a bank account to manage expenses and income, but this is not compulsory.

As an annual five-year average, Local, Student and Youth Group membership payments generated £14.5k income to the Section. Over the same period, the per annum average donation from Local Groups raised £93k (£82k for the Section and £11k for Amnesty International UK Section Charitable Trust ('the Trust')); from Youth Groups raised £42k (£21k Section; £21k Trust); from Student Groups raised £17k (£6k Section; £11k Trust).

Amnesty current plans: The 2022 Fundraising Plan includes provision

for a review of affiliate and group membership rates.

Resource and democracy implications:

Removing voting rights from Local Groups removes their participation in Amnesty UK democracy. Those associated with Groups could maintain democratic participation by becoming Individual members at a cost of £48pa (standard) and £12pa (concessionary). We are uncertain whether the resolution proposers are suggesting that, in addition to Groups losing their right to a block vote and the requirement to pay a membership fee, that Groups also be removed from membership of the Section. If this is the case, it would follow that Groups would also lose their power to nominate two seats on the Section Board, vote in the Section Board elections and propose resolutions at the AGM.

Removing Group fees would incur a loss of circa £14.5k in membership income for the Section per annum (£12k Local Groups; £2.5k Student and Youth groups).

As changes to membership categories and associated voting rights require amendment of the Articles of Association, staff time would be required to draft the necessary special resolutions for the 2023 AGM.

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL

