## **AGM DECISIONS IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE - OCTOBER 2015**

This draft report sets out the progress of AGM decisions implementation. If AIUK members wish to make further enquiries about the implementation of a decision, they should feel free to contact the relevant Board member through the email address provided below.

All other enquiries should be directed to the Supporter Care Team <u>sct@amnesty.org.uk</u>

Decision	Title	Board member responsible	R	Notes
No			Α	
			G	
A1S	To move the provisions of the	Sarah O' Grady	Bl	These decisions have been implemented.
(2015)	memorandum into the Articles of Association	Sarah.O'grady@amnesty.org.uk		The Memorandum and Articles of Association have been revised and the correct version is available to view
A2S	To address the use of gendered	Sarah O' Grady		in the accountability section of the website's
(2015)	terminology in the memorandum and articles of association	Sarah.O'grady@amnesty.org.uk		governance pages.
A3S	To update references to legislation	Sarah O' Grady		
(2015)		Sarah.O'grady@amnesty.org.uk		
A4S	To clarify the decision-making process	Sarah O' Grady		
(2015)	for removing a Director who fails to	Sarah.O'grady@amnesty.org.uk		
	attend three consecutive meetings			
	without good cause			
A5S	To facilitate decisions being taken	Sarah O' Grady		
(2015)	outside Board meetings	Sarah.O'grady@amnesty.org.uk		
A6S	Nomination Committee Co-option	Ruth Breddal		
(2015)		Ruth.breddal@amnesty.org.uk		
A7S	Terminology	Sarah O' Grady		
(2015)		Sarah.O'grady@amnesty.org.uk		
A8 (2015)	Constitution & Standing Orders	Sarah O' Grady	G	A membership consultation on constitutional change is
	Review	Sarah.O'grady@amnesty.org.uk		in progress. At the time of writing, approximately 1500

				responses have been received. Initial conversations have been held with AIUK's lawyers to help prepare the approach to submitting resolutions to the 2016 AGM.
B1 (2015)	Al's Strategic Goals 2016-19	Ruth Breddal Ruth.breddal@amnesty.org.uk	Gy	<ul> <li>This decision has been implemented to the extent possible</li> <li>The 2015 ICM agreed AI's global Strategic Goals for 2016-2019. The goals agreed are expressed at a higher level than we anticipated at the 2015 AGM. They are:</li> <li>Amnesty International will work towards a world in which:</li> <li>1 Everyone knows and can claim their rights (reclaiming freedoms) <ul> <li>Those defending human rights are safe and supported</li> <li>People know their rights and are empowered to claim them</li> <li>People can claim their rights to speak out, organize and challenge injustice</li> </ul> </li> <li>2 Human rights and justice are enjoyed without discrimination (securing equal rights for all) <ul> <li>Discrimination and identity-based violence are reduced</li> <li>Progress towards equality on the basis of gender, sexual orientation and gender identity and expression is achieved</li> <li>Economic, social and cultural rights are better realized in people's lives</li> </ul> </li> <li>3 People are protected during conflict and crises (responding to crises) <ul> <li>Those responsible for human rights abuses are held accountable and victims have access to justice, truth and reparation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- People affected by or fleeing conflict, crisis,
torture or persecution have access to
adequate protection and assistance
- Civilians are better protected through
effective action by international, regional and
national institutions and mechanisms
4. Human rights abusers are held accountable
(ensuring accountability)
- Human rights governance and accountability
are strengthened at the national level, with a
particular focus on supporting delivery of
Goals 1–3
- Regional and global human rights mechanisms
are reinforced where national human rights
protection is failing
5. To best achieve this, we will be a truly global
human rights movement of people defending
human rights for all (maximizing our resources
and engagement)
- Amnesty International is a larger, stronger
and more diverse movement, with
strengthened capacity to achieve human
rights impact.
- Active participation of a more diverse
constituency is strengthened at all levels of
Amnesty International's work.
The Board believes that there is an explicit reference to
both 'new' and 'signature' issues and that the balance is
appropriate.
The goals do not make an explicit connection between
economic, social and cultural rights and civil and

				<ul> <li>political rights, not least because of the high level at which the goals are expressed. Nevertheless, the Board believes the relationship is implicit and inherent in Amnesty's belief that human rights are universal and indivisible.</li> <li>The ICM did not agree plans for action for the strategic goals (this was never intended). However, it did discuss the draft 'theories of change' that are being developed by the International Secretariat. We welcome the approach being taken and believe that it is step forward in translating the goals into actions.</li> <li>We are aware that resourcing and restructuring discussions continue at the International Secretariat and that some of these discussions are intended to facilitate the pursuit of the Strategic Goals and Global Campaigns.</li> <li>Though not an ICM decision, the International Board's presumption is that 80% of the work undertaken by the IS and AI's sections and structures will be devoted to the implementation of the global campaigns and strategic goals. The remaining 20% is for reactive and 'locally relevant' work. This is a welcome recognition of the importance of flexibility. Whether it is adequate is a question that is best answered in the light of experience.</li> </ul>
B2 (2015)	Strategic Goals 2016-19 (Trade Union rights)	Ruth Breddal Ruth.breddal@amnesty.org.uk	Gy	This resolution has been implemented to the extent possible. The specific wording sought by the AGM decision did not readily translate into the strategic goals resolutions

				<ul> <li>tabled at the International Council Meeting. The Strategic Goals have therefore not changed in line with the resolution. However, AIUK delegates were active on this issue and their contributions are reflected in narrative sections referring to trade union rights in the ICM outcome document (referring to Working Party 1). This says:</li> <li>The working party also attempted to define areas of best practices, as follows:</li> <li>Working with trade unions and using their networks, which has produced a significant response for Amnesty International campaigning. Additionally, trade unions are present in areas where Amnesty International needs to have presence, but has not yet been able to establish itself. The movement must remain clear and be mindful of the associated risks this relationship;</li> <li>Building a coalition of HRDs which would bring together human rights organizations and trade unions.</li> </ul>
B3 (2015)	Amnesty International's Stance on Abortion – Pro-choice	Please contact the Board through the Supporter Care Team	G	Initial discussions on the approach to consultation took place at the ASC, June 2015. Consultation planned through online questionnaire to members later in autumn 2015.
B4 (2015)	Addressing impunity in Guatemala	Tom Hedley tom.hedley@amnesty.org.uk	A	The call for a Commission of Inquiry at the ILO remains in abeyance for tactical reasons in light of the TUC's evaluation of likely resistance in the Governing Body.

				Opportunities for progress are under permanent review
B5 (2015)	Violation of the rights of Colombian Activists, including trade union leader Huber Ballesteros	Tom Hedley tom.hedley@amnesty.org.uk	A	In June, AIUK hosted a meeting between the Colombia Team and UNISON and UCU, at which our team committed to further research regarding Ballesteros. It was noted that restructuring/relocation of the Team was causing near-term capacity constraints in terms of new casework.
C1 (2015)	The United Kingdom: Rendition and Torture	Cris Burson-Thomas cris.burson- thomas@amnesty.org.uk	G	Staff have developed a plan of action to implement when the Intelligence and Security Committee finally delivers its report (date unknown). This will be a key moment for mobilisation. Staff are also reviewing the Stop Torture campaign (to be completed in October). As part of this review, the team will be considering how to implement this resolution, which involves reaching judgements about the extent to which the broad range of international work in the campaign can be narrowed and how to continue work relating to this resolution when the Stop Torture campaign comes to an end. AIUK staff are engaging with the proposers of this decision and are planning to visit Colwyn Bay group, when they will discuss this issue and future approaches.
C2 (2015)	Asylum detention in the UK	Tom Sparks tom.sparks@amnesty.org.uk	G	Initial discussions on immigration detention took place with the Asylum-Seekers Local Action Network, April 2015. Our intention is to determine the focus of any project on detention once the results of the Shaw Inquiry are known (expected later this year).

				It should be noted that the summer has been an extremely busy time for AIUK's refugee programme, with an increased (and more positive) political and media focus on the current refugee crisis.
C4 (2015)	AIUK will undertake research into the wrongful detention of torture and trafficking victims in British detention	Tom Sparks tom.sparks@amnesty.org.uk	G	See above
B1 (2014)	Human Rights Act	Tom Sparks tom.sparks@amnesty.org.uk	BI	<ul> <li>This resolution has been implemented.</li> <li>The Human Rights Act campaign received priority status during and after the general election. Campaign and supporting information was provided to groups and AIUK also procured print and digital advertising.</li> <li>The campaign continues as a priority in our plans for 2016 and beyond.</li> </ul>
B2 (2014)	Garment workers in Asian Countries	Jerry Allen Jerry.allen@amnesty.org.uk	Gy	This resolution has been implemented to the extent possible AIUK staff and country coordinators have been working with the IS to develop work in this area, and we did establish a campaign goal, but it is now clear that this will not be a priority for the IS country team and therefore we consider that this resolution has been implemented to the extent possible by AIUK.
B4 (2014)	Guatemala	Tom Sparks/Tom Hedley tom.sparks@amnesty.org.uk tom.hedley@amnesty.org.uk	G	The Guatemala conference hosted by AIUK in 2014 remains the most substantive (and successful) outcome of the resolution. On-going work rests primarily with the Country Coordinator with IS and TU Community Organiser support.
C2 (2014)	Nominations Committee Terms of	Ruth Breddal	G	Although this resolution was adopted in 2014 and is

	Reference	Ruth.breddal@amnesty.org.uk		effectively self-implementing (by creating new terms of reference), we are continuing to monitor it. The 2015 AGM was the first time that the new process of nominating and electing Nominations Committee members was considered. There was only one candidate for elections. She is continuing to liaise with the Board and other governance bodies and making a positive impact on the work of the committee.
D2 (2014)	Secretary General's Global Council	Hannah Perry hannah.perry@amnesty.org.uk	А	A draft proposal is in development for discussion at the October Board meeting.
D3 (2014)	Linking members with local groups	Eilidh Douglas eilidh.douglas@amnesty.org.uk	G	In progress
D6 (2014)	Global Transition Programme	Harrison Littler harrison.littler@amnesty.org.uk	A	At every International Council Meeting, the International Board presents a report on the state of the movement. Relevant information from this and other ICM discussions will be forwarded to the relevant membership bodies during the autumn, alongside AIUK's delegation report (which is currently being finalised)
A5 (2013)	Disability and Human Rights	Hugh Whitby hugh.whitby@amnesty.org.uk	Gy	<ul> <li>This resolution has been implemented to the extent possible.</li> <li>Following the adoption of this resolution, AIUK liaised with its proposers and promoted their campaign – the WOW petition – to members. The petition successfully reached its target of 100,000 signatures, triggering a Parliamentary debate on the need for a human rights impact assessment of government cuts to benefits for disabled people.</li> <li>Whilst we have continued to offer support and encouragement, AIUK has faced three obstacles to deeper engagement in this area. First, competing</li> </ul>

	priorities (including work on mass surveillance and the Human Rights Act) have prevented us from freeing up staff time. Second, and more importantly, AIUK's policy on austerity measures is underdeveloped and this is a complex area of human rights law and standards. Third, there has been a very limited amount of research and campaign work undertaken by Amnesty on the rights of disabled people more generally, and probably not enough to sustain a network as traditionally constituted at AIUK.
	We were therefore pleased to vote for a successful ICM decision in 2015 that calls on the International Board to consider human rights issues raised by austerity measures (which will take some time to complete). Whilst we look forward to the results of this work and remain alive to future opportunities in the disability rights area, we feel that the resolution has been implemented to the extent possible.