

## CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014

### 1. Purpose of this report

To inform members of AIUK of the discussions which took place at the 2014 Chairs and Directors meeting in order to:

- Be accountable to members as the Chair and Director of AIUK
- Inform members of the discussions which took place

### 2. Executive Summary

The Chairs Assembly meets annually. It is not a decision making body unless the ICM has specifically delegated decisions to the meeting. It has a role of bringing the leadership of our movement together and ensuring that as work progresses between ICMs that Sections are able to ask questions, hold the International Board (I.B) to account, and contribute to the key consultations in front of the movement. It is attended by all Section and Structure Chairs, by members of Advisory Committees where Sections are not yet established, by the International Board and senior International Secretariat staff including the Secretary General. The Director's Forum is the annual meeting of all Section, Structure and National Offices Heads. It is where Senior staff across the movement address the key management challenges, hear from the Secretary General on key issues and direction and where he consults and involves Section heads as appropriate.

On occasion the meetings are held jointly and this was the case for 2014. The Chair's Assembly and Directors forum held separate sessions on fundraising to reflect the different roles. In addition the Chairs had a separate session to elect from among their number to the Chairs Assembly Steering Committee which is responsible for creating the agenda for the following year's meeting. The meeting was held just outside Reading and lasted from Friday evening 20 June to Sunday 22 June 2014.

The agenda for the meeting reflected the key issues that were addressed at the 2013 ICM and which will be the basis for decision making at the next ICM in 2015. Governance Reform and Strategic Goals being key, as was continued accountability on the Global Transition Programme. The discussions were clear and participation was from across the movement. Consultation processes were clarified and we left the meeting with clear understandings of the consultation to follow. Campaign briefings set out the change we seek in the world and set the context for the need for good and strong governance. The continued focus on fundraising was welcome as we seek to grow and have even greater impact. The sex work policy was discussed and the International Board asked the meeting key questions on how decisions should be made and took the advice of the meeting. On this issue the view of the Board of AIUK was that the decisions on this policy should be made at the 2015 ICM and we were pleased that the IB took the decision to do this.

### 3. UK representation at the meeting

Sarah O'Grady – Chair of the Board

Kate Allen – Director

### 4. AIUK's Objectives at the meeting

**CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014**

AIUK's Chair and Director sought the following outcomes in their approach to the discussions:

- Enhanced governance of the international movement, focussing on the next steps in governance reform including process for consulting with members.
- Understanding of emerging ideas on strategic goals and process through to the 2015 ICM.
- Understanding on the implementation of Moving Closer to the Ground, including human rights impact
- Advocate AIUK Board's view that the Sex Work Policy decision should be made at the 2015 ICM
- Understanding of progress on key 2013 ICM decisions and thinking towards 2015 ICM.
- To contribute to the continuing raising of the profile and importance of fundraising for the movement.

**5. Summary of the meeting**

The meeting was chaired by Janet MacLean from AIUSA, the Chair of the 2013 ICM. The International Board were present as were the Chairs, Directors and Advisory group members of 68 sections, structures and National Offices. The Secretary General and his Senior Leadership Team were also present including Julie Verhaar the new Director of Fundraising who takes up her post in September. In addition the IS staff heading up our new offices in Dakar, Nairobi, Johannesburg and Hong Kong were also present. Key IS campaign staff also attended to brief the meeting on the priority campaigns.

AIUK's Chair and Director considered the meeting to be very purposeful. The atmosphere was one of joint endeavour to ensure that the key elements of the agenda were addressed. There was generally satisfaction in the meeting with the progress of work since the last ICM and a great degree of consensus in the room from sections as that progress was discussed. Sections did have differences of views on how the Sex Work Policy should be decided and the discussion was respectful of those differences. There were no formal votes taken at the meeting though on occasion straw polls were taken and this report will cover those occasions.

**6. Key discussions**

- Campaign Briefing
- Strategic Goals
- Global Transition Programme
- Accountability session with International Board and Secretary General.
- Governance reform
- Sex Work Policy
- Fundraising and growth
- Regional meetings.
- Chair's Assembly Steering Committee
  - Induction for new chairs
  - Conflict Management Assistance Group

**7. Campaign Briefing**

## CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014

The meeting had two campaign briefings; the Stop Torture campaign and My Body My Rights (MBMR). Jessie MacNeil-Brown campaign manager for MBMR informed us of the launch of the campaign in Nepal. Rameshwar Nepal (Director of AI Nepal) explained that the campaign has focussed on the discrimination practiced against women with uterine prolapse. AI Nepal has partnered with other civil society organisations AI Sweden were also on the panel and felt the campaign had got off to a good start. Anna Lindenfors, Director of AI Sweden said that her section was building on the success of the previous Stop Violence Against Women campaign and were now focussing on maternal health in Sierra Leone and access to abortion in Nicaragua. She also told us that fundraising for those two areas were proving successful.

Sara MacNeice, campaign manager for the Stop Torture campaign detailed the launch of that campaign and the importance of the global attitudinal survey. In the Philippines the campaign was launched to survivors of torture as we wanted them to hear from AI about our campaign. Sara outlined the next steps in the campaign including the global day of action for Stop Torture on 26 June.

Key IS campaign staff outlined the successes of being very clear on what we were seeking to achieve in the Stop Torture campaign but also the need to work towards a clearer narrative on MBMR. Key lessons for the future were to ensure that research is in place and to have a greater gap between launches of priority campaigns.

### 8. Strategic Goals

The key paper is CA and DF 2014 Strategic Goals ORG 41/012/2014. The movement is developing its next overarching strategy named 'Strategic Goals' for 2015 to 2019. This will be a key debate at the 2015 ICM where decisions will be taken.

At the meeting Chairs and Directors were updated on Phase 1 of the consultation and specific views were sought on two questions;

- Should the strategic goals be all encompassing?
- What criteria should be used for taking decisions on what to prioritise?

In addition the process through to 2015 was set out.

Phase 1 was an analysis about our content and priorities and emerging ideas and took place from Feb-May 2014. AIUK fed in the results of our consultation with members and that document is attached as annex 1

On the two questions there was a straw poll on should the strategic goals be all encompassing and there were no votes in favour. All sections felt that some room should be left to ensure local support for growth and local relevance amongst other reasons. We did not go on to give a percentage to the work outside strategic goals and will no doubt return to this.

On criteria for prioritising there was a full discussion. The paper before the meeting set out criteria and the meeting added and emphasized some of those, including;

- Why now? Why should the work be done in the next four years.

## CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014

- What are other human rights organisations doing?
- Link to core values.
- Possibility to raise funds and grow the movement.
- The need for market research to inform our decision making.
- Important to build on what we are good at.
- The need for flexibility and ability to respond to what happens in the world.
- The need to be able to respond to armed conflicts quickly.

Other issues raised included the importance of Human Rights Education and concern that our work here not be forgotten.

In terms of the process so far, two key points were made. The input from our sections in the global south had not been at the same degree as from the north. Some sections also asked that we think about how we are communicating in terms of the languages used.

The session stayed with the process of consultation and there was little discussion on content. This would happen in the next stage.

On process a first draft of strategic goals will be issued by August and consultation will go through to October. In November/December redrafting will take place and the IB will draft ICM resolutions. By this stage it is hoped that there will be areas of emerging consensus. The chair of the meeting urged sections to fully participate. Her hope was that this would mean that by the ICM we could focus on key areas and choices. She drew on the process for agreeing core standards as the model she had in mind.

The next draft (August) will therefore see us moving to outcomes that we want to see in proposed strategic goals. To assist sections in consulting with members the IS is developing a web platform with multiple languages. The next draft will also have annexes which give rationales i.e what has been said and what has been done with it. Regional meetings are planned and sections from the global south have said they have been waiting to engage with the first draft rather than spend their restricted resources on the first round of consultation. The IS indicated that it was open to requests from sections for assistance as we enter the next phase.

### **9. Global Transition Programme**

The Secretary General reminded us all of the reasons for the programme – establishing a truly global movement and greater impact. The GTP has had significant oversight from the IB. In addition the Global Management Team has had a GTP work stream for the last 18 months.

Two members of the Senior Leadership Team, Richard Eastmond, Senior Director for Organization Development and Human Resources, and Minar Pimple, Senior Director of Global Operations reported on progress. Richard noted that the GMT Reference Group Report from January 2013 had eight categories of recommendations with 43 individual recommendations and had been endorsed by the 2013 CA/DF which met in Amsterdam. He reported that 42 of the 43 recommendations had been implemented. The 43<sup>rd</sup> was a longer piece of work for the IB on accountability. In addition a staff survey had taken place and a programme of work was established in response. There had not been many questions on the GTP by the Chairs in the preparation for the meeting. Minar described

## CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014

progress in setting up Wave 1 hubs in Johannesburg, Dakar, Nairobi and Hong Kong. Wave 2 (2014) would be Mexico City and Bangkok (though this was now under review given recent developments in Thailand). In addition, Nigeria was in our sights with a similar model to Brazil and India. Wave 3 (2015) would be decisions about our presence in Europe, Middle East and North Africa (MENA), and a second hub in South America. Many lessons had been learnt from Wave 1, in particular around the business case, consultation process and transition planning.

The four Regional Directors were introduced to the meeting:

Muthoni Wanyeki – East Africa Regional Director

Deprose Muchena – South Africa Regional Director

Stephen Cockburn – West African Deputy Director of Campaigns

Trini Leung – Hong Kong Acting Regional Director

Each Director had a short time to address the meeting. Muthoni Wanyeki based in Nairobi described work on conflict, freedom of expression and freedom of assembly. One challenge was how to work with sections, north and south. The hub is finalising a report on anti-homosexuality legislation and she felt much of the focus would be on solidarity. Trini Leung, based in Hong Kong said she could see how a hub could work closely with sections in regions. The hub had taken the lead on the 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Tiananmen Square, had worked with AI Japan on press coverage for the release of Iwona Hakamada and was supporting AI Taiwan in its work. She emphasised the importance, particularly on press work of the hub being in the same or close time zones. Deprose Muchena, based in Johannesburg described a South Africa which was rising economically but declining in human rights terms. He described work in Zambia on freedom of expression and in Mozambique where the government was proposing a law that rapists should marry their victims. He was developing strategic partnerships with human rights defenders and other organisations. Steve Cockburn, based in Dakar described the conflict in his region: Mali, Central African Republic (CAR) and Gambia. There are eight sections in the region and all are keen to work together with the hub to grow the movement in their region. There was still work to do to build the hub and recruit staff from within that region.

The meeting went on to hear a report from Esteban Beltrán who chairs the GMT sub group on GTP implementation. The role was to monitor and assist with implementation and to have an overview on evaluation. The discussion which followed these presentations included sections and offices from Côte d'Ivoire, Zimbabwe, Senegal, Burkina Faso, Kenya, Philippines, and Japan welcoming the establishment of hubs and describing how they feel greater support and connection to the movement. AI Mexico described the presentations as “an inspiration”.

Sections from the north asked about how we make greater north/south connections. The session ended with the Secretary General noting that:

- More thought was needed on bringing north and south co-operation together.
- Investment in southern sections had increased in recent years from £4.5 million to £9 million. The challenge now was to maintain this investment.

## CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014

- The south had not in the past had integrated support from the I.S and hubs were now putting this right.

The session was a hugely positive one. There are lessons to be learnt from phase 1 and not everything went smoothly by any extent. However the sections in the regions with hubs and hub leadership were infectious with their excitement at the progress made.

### 10. Accountability session with International Board and Secretary General

The Chair of the IB Nicole Bieske set out the four priorities for the IB until the next ICM in August 2015. They were Strategic goals, Governance reform, Fundraising and the Global Transition Programme all of which had substantial items on the agenda. Alongside those the IB was engaged in a process of continuing its own development. Bernard Sintobin reported as Treasurer of the IB. He informed the meeting that income and expenditure are more or less on target. He referred the meeting to the improved information that comes from the IS on the global budget. He outlined progress on the assessment and restricted giving projects and indicated that the November International Finance meeting is an important next point of discussion and consultation. The Remuneration Committee had met and following the appointment of Salil Shetty to his second four year term (starting 1.7.14) his pay had been increased by 2.5%.

The SG also reported on the human rights achievements and challenges of the year. He detailed some of his travel over the year. He congratulated section colleagues in troubled parts of the world doing great work, and he informed the meeting that our standard action report for the year would show that our activist and supporter base was now at 7.5m. He told the meeting that the IS could have done better on the sex work policy and would learn from that experience. He outlined the campaign learning which has been incorporated into the two global campaigns and was pleased with the successful launches.

Following both presentations there were over 20 questions and answers which complemented the papers before the meeting. Many focused on the GTP, fundraising, and the global campaigns. It was a good session to hold our leadership to account and the meeting seemed pleased with the answers.

One important question concerned the reported loss at Greenpeace of several millions of pounds due to currency speculation by a member of staff. The meeting was informed by George MacFarlane, Senior Director for Organizational Services at the International Secretariat that there were systems in place which ensured that this sort of loss couldn't take place in Amnesty. He said that it was not impossible to have smaller losses as we hedged our funds against currency fluctuations but he assured the meeting that there were strict controls and the Greenpeace situation could not occur.

### 11. Governance Reform

Sarah Beamish member of the IB leading on governance reform led on this discussion. She reminded us that good governance meant better human rights work. She outlined that successful governance led to a more democratic, effective and efficient movement. She rejected the notion that we had to

## CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014

choose between democracy and efficiency. She said we will do both and well. She set out the key issue for consultation as:

- Internal accountability
- Role and organisation of the ICM and the Chairs Assembly
- Decision making including the resolutions model and voting arrangements

The meeting was organised into tables and discussion took place and was fed back in plenary .Key points that were made included:

- strengthening the link between governance and human rights
- support for not contrasting democracy and effectiveness
- thinking deeper about the historical power imbalances in the movement (north/south, funder/fundee)
- be clear about the definition of member and consistent across the movement
- questions about the frequency of and delegation sizes of ICMs
- the role of regional meetings in our decentralised model
- the cost of governance and bench mark this with other movements/international NGOs
- learn from other international NGOs

One contribution was that we should think as if we were creating a new movement and design a greenfield excise where any governance model could be considered. The Chair of the session tested this out by taking a straw poll of Chairs. It was overwhelmingly the case that Chairs did not want to do this. They wanted evolution not revolution.

A further concern during this session was the number of consultations underway in the movement at any one time. There were concerns at how sections could do justice to such a range of important issues and involve members effectively given the volume and often short timescales.

In concluding the session Sarah Beamish said that membership definitions and a paper on new forms of presence are being worked on and that we will see papers in the last quarter of 2014. In addressing the number and length of consultations she reminded the meeting that this work was requested by the 2013 ICM. She set out the timetable for resolutions on Governance reform which will be published in January. These will not be the final product, they will be for consultation ahead of the ICM in 2015. She also said that a focus group would be set up to look at papers and resolutions before they were circulated more widely. There would be detailed communications in October detailing where the governance reform work stood including feedback from sections and a comparator analysis. The ICM preparatory committee, the Chairs Forum Steering Committee and former IB members would also be consulted.

### **12. Sex Work Policy**

**CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014**

Michael Bochenek acting Director of Law and Policy outlined the results of the consultation in which 34 sections had taken part. The result of the consultation was general agreement that sex workers should not be criminalised. Beyond this there was not consensus.

There was a full debate involving contributions from over 20 sections. The question of whether a decision on our policy should be taken by the IB in October or by the ICM in 2015 was put to a straw poll. The number of sections wanting the decision to be made at the ICM easily carried the day. In addition the feeling in the room was that it was good that we had agreement on not criminalising sex workers and as we consulted further we need not spend time on this, and also that we should bring the whole policy together in 2015 and not make separate policy announcement along the way.

The decisions following the meeting were:

- a policy will not be adopted by the Board later this year and the policy will be considered during the ICM in 2015
- most sections would like further consultation / research and Mike Bochenek was considering four countries which would establish geographical diversity. He was provisionally considering a Latin American country with a LGBT focus, a project led from the Johannesburg office where we had staff expertise on the issue, SE Asia where we had a history of reporting on abuses, and a country which operated the Swedish model to see how it worked.

In the meantime we would not take a partial policy position.

Earlier in the meeting the Secretary General had reflected that the IS could have done a better job in the way in which this consultation had taken place and that important lessons had been learnt. We felt that this acknowledgement assisted the meeting in holding a positive and forward looking discussion on an issue which was proving controversial for the movement to reach consensus on.

**13. Fundraising and Growth**

Following the successful session on fundraising at the 2013 ICM this was followed up with specific fundraising sessions, one for the Chairs and another for Directors. In addition a separate workshop on major donor fundraising was held. The aim was to ensure that at this crucial time of change we are maximising our fundraising opportunities and ensuring that we develop a culture of philanthropy in the Movement.

The Directors session had presentations from Chris Holm International Growth and Innovations Director, Ananth Guruswamy Head of AI India, Erika Guevara-Rosas Regional Director for the Americas at the International Secretariat and Kate Allen.

The Panel showed the range of our expertise in fundraising and heard from AI India who are currently raising a third of their running costs from their 40,000 paying members and have plans to



**CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014**

reach 60% of running costs in the next two years. The difficult message from Chris Holm was that as a Movement our investment in fundraising was declining. We simply are not investing enough in our growth. There are exceptions to this, AI Sections in Ireland, New Zealand, Spain, France and Australia are doing very well. We looked at the elements of this and a key need is to have an ambitious goal. The example of AI Australia is one which the meeting was inspired by. This is a section heading towards a goal of 500,000 activists and supporters. Kate Allen shared the experience of a Northern Section shifting from 30-40% in the assessment. She talked of the plans in AIUK to set ambitious goals in the coming months and the need for our own internal movement rules (in the assessment and restricted giving) to ensure that they did not hold fundraising back.

The Chairs had a separate session on fundraising led by Claire Mallinson, Director of AI Australia. She reminded Chairs of the commitment made at the ICM to increase fundraising, however, in reality there was a 9% reduction in investment in fundraising across the movement in 2013, so Sections didn't deliver on the commitment. A lot of Sections were projecting flat or declining income, which had serious implications for the movement. Claire said however that the good news was that this could be changed. She mentioned that some Sections have quite large reserves and encouraged Chairs to think about whether these could be used more widely in funding growth elsewhere where the return on investment was much higher eg contributing to the Fundraising Innovation Fund. It was necessary to make tough decisions now but they would be even tougher down the line if not made now.

The Chair of AI France talked about the investment in fundraising it had made last year. With the support of its AGM, it had invested 2 million Euros from its reserves, used to increase its membership, activism and income.

The Director of AI Kenya talked about how the financial support from the movement had enabled AI to increase its presence and impact. An example was that the media now come to AI Kenya not only on housing rights and forced evictions, but other human rights issues. He was grateful for the trust that Chairs of Sections had shown them by investing money in AI Kenya, either directly or indirectly. They are now also looking to raise money from foundations and major donors and have recently secured a \$100,000 donation from a donor who had seen how AI's activism had secured real change regarding enforced evictions and holding the government to account. AI Kenya has a strategy to grow by 2020 so that it can contribute money to the global movement. At the moment however it still required financial support.

The Director of AI Australia told of the difficulties it was facing which led to an ambitious growth strategy which didn't involve incremental growth but fundamental changes. In 2009 AI Australia had 50,000 activists and supporters, 140 Local Groups and an income of 5m; in 2014 it has 350,000 activists and supporters, c200 Local Groups and an income of nearly 30m. As a consequence it has been able to achieve real human rights change.

All Chairs were asked to complete a short questionnaire and then held discussions in small groups to share experience, followed by a plenary session.

## CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014

The session ended with a powerful message from the Director of AI Australia – that if we are not doing our best to raise money, then we are not doing our best for human rights and human rights defenders.

In addition to the plenaries there was a workshop on major donor fundraising lead by Catherine Casey Head of Major Donor Fundraising at the IS. She led a panel which included the Head of AI India, Switzerland, Chair of AI USA and Kate in recognition of the fact that AIUK is at the forefront of the movement in this type of fundraising. It was a very useful session drawing on experience in the room which included the experience of our Secretary General who joined this work shop.

### 14. European Regional Meeting

At most Chairs and Directors meetings it is usual to hold a regional meeting and that was the case on this occasion. The main subject of discussion was the impact of moving closer to the ground on our European operations. At the moment our resources are spread across an IS team based in London and the European Institutions Office based in Brussels and funded by European sections. The Secretary General outlined the challenges of looking at our organisation in Europe. He noted

- That Europe is different as it had the European Union
- That we have many strong, capable and well resourced sections in Europe and this is different from our presence in other continents
- that we should go back to the same principles which had driven our reorganisation in other parts of the movement ie human rights results, efficiency and impact
- We needed an office in Brussels to undertake advocacy
- that capacity building is seen as important and valuable for our small sections in central and eastern Europe and we had to make this work
- he set out the additional challenge in that we needed to consider how we worked in Central Asia and further East in Europe

In the light of these issues and following discussion at the European Directors Forum in Warsaw in May 2014, the way forward would be to consider a set of parameters and establish a working group to take the thinking forward. The aim was to have proposals for discussion and consultation in 2014 and for implementation in 2015. The Regional meeting noted this and it was agreed to formally involve Board Chairs at the next European Directors meeting in November.

### 15. Chairs Assembly Steering Committee (“CASC”)

The role of the CASC is to ensure that mechanisms and procedures are in place in order that the Terms of Reference of the Chairs Assembly (as agreed at the CA in 2012) may be implemented.

Their work includes the induction of new Chairs which took place on the Friday afternoon and in the development of governance leadership. It will be looking at the role of the Chairs Assembly within the context of governance reform between now and the ICM in 2015.

Elections took place. Komola Yovo of AI Togo and Lulu Barrera of AI Mexico were re-elected.

**CHAIRS ASSEMBLY AND DIRECTORS FORUM 21 AND 22 JUNE 2014**

**16. Inductions for New Chairs**

On the Friday afternoon, the Chair attended an induction for new Chairs which was run by the CSFC.

**17. Conflict Management Assistance Group (“CMAG”) – Conflict Management Workshop**

On the Sunday evening and Monday, the Chair attended a Conflict Management Workshop run by the CMAG. It was attended by c2 dozen Chairs and Directors. Experiences of various conflict situations were shared by the attendees, the trainers led a variety of sessions including skills for preventing a conflict and building trust. Attendees also worked in small groups and undertook some role play.

**18. Finally**

As AIUK’s representatives at the meeting we were encouraged by the picture of a movement making progress on many fronts. We were pleased by the progress since the 2013 ICM and inspired by meeting and hearing from the new heads of our Hubs in Dakar, Nairobi, Johannesburg and Hong Kong. The continuing focus on fundraising alongside governance and strategic goals was also welcome. Finally, we felt privileged to meet with our colleagues from around the world and to see the collective leadership of our movement debating with such commitment and purpose.