

July 2010

Dear friends,

Together with Kate Allen, Director of AIUK, I welcome the report (attached), *Amnesty International, Working with others: an independent review, Findings and recommendations*, which our external reviewers Mindy Sawhney and Ravindran Daniel submitted at the end of the review jointly commissioned by the International Secretariat and AIUK. The report, which we make publicly available, identifies both strengths and deficiencies in our operations, and highlights areas for improvement.

The report acknowledges that we have been engaging “in dialogue at all levels on the fundamental questions of terror and counter-terror for a considerable period of time”, and that our policy on armed groups is a “robust basis” on which to further develop such work. We are committed to continuing our opposition to human rights abuses by states and any other actor in this context, without compromise, and to addressing any shortcomings on our part. With regard to the case of Moazzam Begg, there is no question that our actions on his behalf while he was unlawfully detained were right and based on appropriate research.

As senior leaders of Amnesty International, we take full responsibility for the deficiencies identified by the report, including for not ensuring that the concerns around our collaboration with Moazzam Begg and the organization Cageprisoners, which he directs, were properly addressed before January 2010. We addressed them promptly then, when Gita Sahgal, on our request, articulated her own concerns in a memo. We regret her decision not to engage internally at the time, or with the review. However, we have since examined these concerns, seeking any additional inputs internally and externally to ensure we had all available information.

We confirm that we find no reasons in principle why we should not have worked with Moazzam Begg and Cageprisoners, or to rule out further cooperation with them, on the issue of Guantánamo Bay and other unlawful detentions. Any decision regarding future collaboration with Moazzam Begg and Cageprisoners will be taken in discussion with them and on the basis of the lessons learned through this review, in the same way as we would approach any other collaborative initiative. We regret that differences of opinion within Amnesty International have led or contributed to the threats they were subjected to following media coverage since February.

Beyond this specific case, we have critical work to do to improve our approach to working with others, as pointed out in the report, as we seek to strengthen and expand our partnerships. We share the overall assessment of the reviewers that “[a]lthough deficiencies are present both in existing processes and in their application”, these are “within the normal limits of the complexities and imperfections of organisational life within the [human rights] and wider NGO sector”. However, we aspire to higher levels of achievement for both our processes and the people involved, in the interests of our work for human rights.

We will now develop a plan for implementing the report’s recommendations. As in the case of our follow-up to other reviews, we will seek staff input throughout this process. Specific tasks ahead will include:

1. Developing AI-wide strategies and operational tools for our approach to working with others, and more broadly to partnerships, as we continue the debate we have had in the movement around the Integrated Strategic Plan. Particularly interesting in this context is the reviewers’ recommendation of “creating space for rightsholders to speak for themselves”, on an AI platform, with “no criterion for access to the platform, save a direct experience of a [human rights] violation”.

2. Improving our “due diligence” processes, fostering in this context better coordination and consultation among staff at all levels and across functions, and between the International Secretariat and sections and structures, to ensure that decisions are taken at the right level and with the right inputs.
3. Embedding the gender and diversity mainstreaming we are deeply committed to across all thematic and country work, from the development of strategies to their operational implementation.
4. Strengthening management practices to enhance our responsiveness to concerns, but also to ensure that everyone, staff and managers, takes responsibility for their own views and actions.

The public controversy around these issues in the last few months has not been conducive to the kind of constructive debate we should be having among human rights activists. However, we look forward to engaging further with women’s rights organizations, Muslim human rights organizations, and other human rights groups and activists from diverse backgrounds, especially as we develop further our work on terrorism and counter-terrorism, and pursue gender and diversity mainstreaming. We will be exploring appropriate forums to pursue such dialogue.

As with much of our work, the completion of this review is not the end of the story for many of the issues that it has addressed. Rather, it is a building block, as we strive to improve our efficiency and accountability, ultimately aiming at achieving greater human rights impact.

Together with Kate Allen, I wish to thank Mindy Sawhney and Ravindran Daniel for their intensive, broad-ranging and rigorous work, completed to deadline within a tight timeframe.

Along with the reviewers, we wish to extend our thanks to Abdullahi An-Na’im and Lynn Welchman who made themselves available to advise the reviewers; to the human rights activists who contributed to the review; and of course to all the AI staff and volunteers who also shared their time and perspectives, while continuing to carry out their daily work for human rights.

With best wishes,

Claudio Cordone
Senior Director for Research and Regional Programmes

Amnesty International
Working with others: an independent review

Findings and recommendations
July 2010

Mindy Sawhney and Ravindran Daniel

Contents

A) Introduction	4
B) Scope	5
C) Method	6
E) Overall assessment.....	11
F) Key issues.....	12
G) Recommendations	14
Appendix 1: Terms of Reference.....	17
Appendix 2: Amnesty International's work with Moazzam Begg	20
Appendix 3: Overview of Amnesty's range of work with others	23

Abbreviations

AI	Amnesty International
AI IS	Amnesty International International Secretariat
AI UK	Amnesty International UK Section
CAP	Content Approval Process
CBO	Community-based organisation
CCR	Center for Constitutional Rights
CTWJ	Counter Terror with Justice Campaign
GS	Gita Sahgal
HR	Human Rights
ISOP	International Secretariat Operating Plan
MB	Moazzam Begg
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
OSG	Office of the Secretary General
PIP	Project Initiation Panel
S/s	Sections and Structures
SD	Senior Director
SVAW	Stop Violence Against Women Campaign
UN	United Nations
WCADP	World Coalition Against the Death Penalty
WHR	Women's Human Rights

A) Introduction

Amnesty International (AI) has commissioned this independent, high-level review in order to help the organisation identify and engage with the learning arising from the allegations made by Gita Sahgal (GS), formerly Head of the Gender Unit, regarding its work with Moazzam Begg (MB) and Cageprisoners in an internal memo dated 30 January 2010 and an article published on 7 February 2010 in *The Sunday Times*.

Throughout the course of this review, AI has offered full cooperation and demonstrated a genuine desire to open itself up to examination. We would like to thank all AI staff and volunteers, past and present, for the time and candour they afforded us. We would also like to note our appreciation of the many interested individuals and organisations who partner with AI, for their frank feedback and their transparency in sharing with us some of the dilemmas they encounter as they navigate these complex, evolving issues.

B) Scope

The scope of the review was to consider three inter-related areas:

- the basis upon which AI worked with MB and Cageprisoners, and how it responded to any concerns raised
- the wider issues raised for the organisation as it works with others
- the 'mechanics' of the organisation: the ways in which the internal decision-making processes, accountability structures, and culture help or hinder it to develop appropriate and effective relationships with external organisations.

It is important to note what we do **not** do as part of this review:

- we do not undertake due diligence on any AI partner; rather we explore how AI undertakes such work
- we do not examine the conduct of either GS as an employee or AI as an employer, and the associated human resource processes
- we do not examine how AI responded to the media.

C) Method

The senior leadership of the AI International Secretariat (IS) and AI UK Section developed a Terms of Reference for an independent review commencing in May 2010 to be completed by the end of June 2010, following recommendations made by an internal fact-finding exercise initiated by the AI IS in response to GS's internal memo and completed in March 2010.

As external consultants with complementary expertise, we were appointed in April 2010 to conduct the review, and we began our work in May 2010. In addition, AI made available to us two specialist advisors. Engagement with the advisors was not mandatory, and we were free to seek advice from other experts instead of or in addition to that offered by the advisors.

We conducted approximately 85 semi-structured, **confidential** interviews with staff (past and present), representatives of the governance structure, and external stakeholders exploring the areas outlined above. We approached the principal signatories of the three petitions submitted to AI, all the individuals named in GS's initial memo, and GS, and asked them to participate in the review process. Unfortunately some, including GS, did not choose to participate in the review. However, both MB and Asim Qureshi of Cageprisoners were interviewed for this review.

In addition, we asked staff to put themselves forward for interview, and to recommend other staff and external stakeholders whom we should interview. We also examined a considerable quantity of written material including external reviews, policy papers, email correspondence and procedures manuals. We greatly benefited from the generous sharing of insightful documents from external stakeholders.

D) Findings

This Section summarises our findings. We collected a vast amount of data, but we restrict ourselves here to providing our assessment of the critical issues.

Our findings are:

On Moazzam Begg and Cageprisoners:

1. No-one internally or externally contests that MB was a victim of gross violations of human rights (HR) and therefore that it was appropriate to work on his case. Further, no claims are made regarding any direct links to terrorist groups or terrorist activities
2. MB was among the earliest Guantánamo detainees to be released, and he provided valuable information to AI and other HR organisations campaigning against the abuses in Guantánamo. MB was widely interviewed by television channels and radio stations, and became a well-known voice for the rights of Guantánamo detainees, independently of his association with AI
3. Allegations against MB have included doubts regarding his activities in Afghanistan in 2001 and its possible implications regarding his associations and/or views on the Taleban and known 'Islamist' militants/extremists.¹ Thus many of the concerns raised by GS relate to MB's perceived ideology. MB has publicly refuted the allegations made against him by GS and others, including those which cast doubt on his personal commitment to HR
4. AI's policy is generally not to comment on any ideology - although this policy position is contested
5. We find that the initial information collected on MB to aid work on his case before his release - though sufficient to support the calls made by AI on his case - was not followed up with the compilation of a comprehensive dossier after his release when he began working with AI on its campaign against Guantánamo Bay. Due diligence undertaken on MB and/or Cageprisoners was inadequate for the purpose of collaboration that developed; limited fact checking was frequently repeated by staff on an event-by-event basis, and there appears to have been little building upon or transfer of institutional knowledge
6. Even had adequate due diligence been undertaken, it may not have altered the material nature of AI's work with MB and / or Cageprisoners

¹ *Islamist* is used here to describe subscription to a particular ideology in relation to state formation and societal regulation

7. AI's initial clarity of purpose regarding its engagement with MB blurred over time, especially as international protection for the resettlement of detainees became an increasing focus and MB participated in AI's advocacy in that regard
8. This contributed to an inadvertent positioning of MB as a figurehead due to uncoordinated and unmonitored activity with MB across the Movement, especially in relation to AI's global Counter Terror with Justice campaign (CTWJ)
9. The scale of AI's engagement with Cageprisoners is limited
10. AI has consistently asserted its preparedness to consider any information that would alter its in principle acceptance that MB and Cageprisoners are appropriate external parties to undertake joint activities with
11. As far as we can determine, no specific concerns were raised with AI IS about MB by external organisations prior to GS's public statements
12. Managers and staff were aware of GS's longstanding general concerns about working with religious groups and fundamentalism. In response to these concerns in early 2009 the Policy Programme was given approval and funding for a project led by GS on the impact of fundamentalisms on women's human rights (WHR) and on the space for the work of women HR Defenders. Later that year, the Gender Unit was given additional resources to look at the impact of Taleban rule on the rights of women in the Pakistan/Afghanistan border regions
13. From the data we have available, we find that concerns about MB and Cageprisoners were raised to managers and other staff. Unfortunately, we did not speak directly with GS and are therefore not able to clarify what, if any, evidence she presented to her colleagues to support her allegations. However, managers failed to proactively engage with these concerns through formally requiring GS to provide substantiation for the allegations or, failing this, to withdraw them. However, when GS raised her concerns with managers at AI IS in mid-January, she was asked to document them in a memo. Managers responded promptly to GS when she sent them her memo of 30 January including by establishing a fact-finding exercise with a request to GS to contribute to it.

On terrorism and counter-terrorism:

14. AI has been engaged in dialogue at all levels on the fundamental questions of terror and counter-terror for a considerable period of time
15. A 2009 AI policy on armed groups provides a robust basis upon which AI can build its future work in this area
16. Although AI has done some work, it has yet to make a full contribution to the topic of armed groups practices that impact on women such as restrictions of movement, and the denial of education and employment through direct or indirect violence
17. To date, AI's main activity on terror and counter-terror has been under the auspices of its global CTWJ campaign
18. Two external evaluations commissioned by AI IS acknowledged the campaigning successes of the campaign and also noted significant shortcomings including:
 - An emphasis on the victims of HR violations as a consequence of counter-terror measures, without a balancing focus on the victims of terrorism
 - Balancing the nuance and depth of research with the accessibility of campaigning messaging
 - An uncritical orientation towards information provided by detainees' advocates
 - Giving insufficient weight to research topics which disproportionately affect women.

On gender and WHR:

19. The recently concluded SVAW campaign represents a six-year global AI commitment and contribution to advancing women's rights which was generally well-received
20. Anxiety remains that the relationships and expertise developed in the course of the campaign will not be transferred and built upon
21. Observation suggests that there is an uneven understanding of a gendered approach within AI, although among some staff and managers, there is a high level of commitment, expertise and understanding of gender and WHR issues
22. Two initiatives are being seen as important litmus tests for AI's credentials in the area of gender and WHR:
 - The progress of the Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming Taskforce
 - The depth to which a gendered approach is seen to be embedded in the new Demand Dignity campaign, and other current and future campaigns.

On working with others:

23. AI works with a range of actors with differing agendas, levels of capability and capacity, and values in order to meet a number of aims achieved through a variety of activities
24. A number of policies and principles exist which have some application to this activity but these are not proactively shared at a corporate level and are inconsistently evidenced in behaviour
25. Relationship risk assessment and management seems to work well:
 - At the country level where the continuous, sustained engagement leads to a natural balance in partner selection to manage both the fact and perception of impartiality and credibility
 - Corporate fundraising
26. Challenges include:
 - Imprecise nomenclature and a lack of standard documentation such as Memoranda of Understanding
 - Identifying responsibilities for relationship management and the related knowledge management challenges
 - Working with others on thematic campaigns within specific timeframes which can lead to a projectized view of relationships, rather than relationships sustained over a period of time through various shared interests and activities
27. Managing the increasing complexity of more potential partners who also have a view on the legitimacy and attractiveness of one another.

On 'organisation mechanics':

28. The AI Movement is not a monolith; rather it is a highly negotiated system which is currently attempting to move closer to the model of 'One Amnesty'
29. Significant re-structuring is underway at AI IS, and more widely the Movement is seeking to grow its contribution to the global South
30. Overall staff do feel able to raise concerns and feel that this has become increasingly easier to do
31. However, some staff perceive that communications to managers do not receive an adequate response: equally, the purpose, audience and the action desired is not always clearly communicated.

E) Overall assessment

Assessments regarding which external individuals and organisations to work with, and then the degree to which ensuing decisions should be communicated and agreed upon internally are made on a daily basis by AI staff. Although deficiencies are present both in existing processes and in their application in the small number of cases we examined, we assess these to be within the normal limits of the complexities and imperfections of organisational life within the HR and wider NGO sector.

This is not to say that AI does not have critical work to do - for example, in mainstreaming gender so that it becomes an embedded and organic part of the 'lens' through which the organisation views the world around it and the potential scope for its actions, and in creating processes and behaviours that ensure AI staff consistently achieve the high standards they set themselves for the integrity and impact of their work. The appetite of AI and many of its external stakeholders to engage in the learning from this controversy provides a good foundation for the development of resourceful, creative and compelling solutions to these complex challenges faced both by AI and the wider sector.

F) Key issues

We identify five inter-related issues underpinning the findings:

i) An insufficiently structured approach to working with others

AI has signalled its strategic intention to work with others in its Integrated Strategic Plan. At the tactical level, AI has also developed detailed agreements with other organisations for particular events or actions. However, partnership strategies do not appear to be sufficiently specified at the level of individual campaigns, Sections, and regional / country programmes. This reduces the organisation's opportunities to manage actively the scope and balance of its external collaborations, and to make strategic choices about in which relationships to invest its resources.

ii) The reliance on individual professional judgement

Reliance on the individual professional judgement of staff is both necessary and appropriate. In recent years, AI has invested resources for staff training and development. However, it has made little formal corporate investment in actively developing the quality of the professional judgements made in the area of partnerships, or in the development of systems to ensure the judgements of individual staff are AI-congruent.

iii) Ambiguity in cross-functional working

The AI structure requires a high level of negotiation between teams and functions within the AI IS and between the AI IS and S/s – some of which lack the resources (time, skills) to undertake such negotiations. In the course of delivering a high volume, varied programme of work at pace there is often considerable ambiguity and contestation about both the subject and object of consultation, advise, approval and accountabilities.

iv) Overuse of successful work methods

The ways of working that have historically enabled AI to be successful in its campaigning may be being applied to other areas of organisational life where they may be ineffective. The preference for these work methods seems to have contributed in some cases to:

- An over-reliance on 'hard' formal written procedures and guidelines at the expense of focussing on the 'soft' aspects of inter-personal relationships and the 'climate' within and between teams
- Deeper listening to the underlying concern which may be implicitly or explicitly contained in a communication
- The crowding out of dialogue on the 'lenses' through which AI constructs problems and evaluates success - for example, investing time in reflecting on how AI chooses the issues to campaign on and how these choices may be being shaped by unexamined assumptions and values

v) *An insufficiently well-developed 'systems' view*

AI has instigated at least five critical developments which, taken together, 'add up to' an imperative for significant change in the organisation's 'DNA'. The five key developments we have identified are:

- A shift from the mandate to the mission
- The expansion of the scope for Sections to work on their own countries
- The commitment to working in partnership
- The desire to move from 'speaking for' victims to creating the space for rightsholders to speak for themselves
- A high level commitment to mainstream gender.

These key elements demand further development of a comprehensive 'organisation systems' view, to ensure that AI moves from where it is to where it wants to be.

G) Recommendations

In this Section we make a number of recommendations to AI that we believe will help it to strengthen its work with others. Prior to the recent media coverage, the organisation had already committed to building effective partnerships during the period 2010-2016, and a number of initiatives are already underway: some of our recommendations overlap with these initiatives.

In addition, it should be noted that full implementation of our recommendations will require a significant investment of resources. It is beyond the scope of this Review to specify the investment needed or to advise AI about the relative importance of responding to the issues here and its other commitments.

We make four principal recommendations, and for each we recommend a series of actions:

1 Further articulate the partnerships framework

- 1.1 Articulate partnership strategies at IS Operational Plan, thematic campaigns, country work and S/s levels which cover priority, purpose, selection process, success measures, and exit mechanisms
- 1.2 Consider managing the organisational risk of creating space for rightsholders to speak for themselves through the development of an AI platform for the voiceless to speak for themselves. There should be no criterion for access to the platform, save a direct experience of a HR violation
- 1.3 Develop a small number of tools to aid staff to construct their working agreements with others, including:
 - Develop an agreed nomenclature for work with others
 - Create a 'Partner Pack' to include 'A rough guide to AI', mission, values, mutual expectations
 - Create templates for MoUs and other joint working agreements for staff across the Movement to modify according to their needs.

2 Strengthen support and accountability for the exercise of professional judgement

- 2.1 Specify what a due diligence process for work with others should entail. Important aspects will include:
 - Scalability and 'reasonableness' given AI is a NGO
 - Assessments through the 'lenses' of all parts of AI's mission and strategy
 - Encouraging the management – not avoidance – of risk
- 2.2 Require due diligence work to be recorded, and explore how such information can be stored, added to and shared appropriately within AI IS and with S/s

- 2.3 Actively promote a dialogue with staff and stakeholders to develop principles to guide partnership working, and how these principles can be applied. The dialogue itself should be designed as an intervention to create a corporate approach
- 2.4 Require staff to participate in peer learning and review as part of Continuing Professional Development, and ensure professional judgement is explicitly addressed through staff evaluation processes
- 2.5 Audit organisational practice via periodic sampling, to include both AI and partner perspectives.

3 Improve internal communications

- 3.1 Strengthen organisational norms regarding the preparation and circulation of written communications including a statement of the desired action the author wants the recipient to take
- 3.2 All external evaluations should elicit a formal written management response
- 3.3 IS should formalise its systems to track and analyse stakeholder comments and complaints (as AIUK has done), and consider investing in its capability to analyse stakeholder feedback across the Movement.

4 Operationalise a 'systems' view

- 4.1 Locate an organisation development responsibility within the OSG and identify a programme of work to support AI to embody its intention to mainstream gender, work with others, give voice to the voiceless and be effective across its wider mission. Concretely this will involve:
 - Strengthening organisational change management capability
 - Ownership from both the governance and executive structures
 - Systematic alignment of core processes – planning, budgeting, performance management, recruitment – to the overarching vision
- 4.2 Create periodic, well-structured space and resource (e.g. two days, every 18 months) for staff to dialogue on the fundamental parameters of the organisation. A pressing early subject for this space should be the specific challenge religious fundamentalism poses for AI's policy of not commenting on ideology
- 4.3 Support the work of the Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming Taskforce, and consider how its leadership, staffing and resourcing can be strengthened
- 4.4 Nominate a Gender Advisor for each thematic campaign
- 4.5 Invest in the process of team formation for thematic campaigns (including the interface between AI IS and S/s) as a means of improving overall organisational performance in cross-functional working. By enabling teams to define and then hold colleagues accountable for adhering to their own 'work rules', inter-functional communications should be strengthened. Design considerations include:
 - Scheduling and budgeting for a programme of periodic, structured team reviews, involving contributors from AI IS and the S/s
 - Such reviews should consider both the campaign's progress and also how the team is functioning, and draw upon the perspectives of external stakeholders AI is working with

- SDs should champion the team formation and review process, and at some stage could consider a second-level evaluation to explore the wider lessons for cross-functional working
- 4.6 Strengthen AI UK PIP and CAP processes with specific sections on gender and partners
- 4.7 Create guidelines for external evaluations that reflect AI strategy including a requirement to consider partnership and gender.

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

Terms of reference for a review in response to the concerns raised about Amnesty International's work with Moazzem Begg and Cageprisoners,

24 March 2010

Background

The issue of how Amnesty International (AI) works with others, and in particular how we give voice to victims without appearing to embrace their views, has come to the fore most recently around AI's relationship with Moazzam Begg, promoting two main areas for review – the criteria and considerations for joint activities with others, and the related internal communication and decision-making systems.

The International Secretariat and UK Section have decided to undertake this review as a joint project, at the request of the interim Secretary General and AIUK's Director.

The point of departure is a fact-finding exercise which was initiated by the International Secretariat senior managers immediately after Gita Sahgal documented her concerns in writing and before she went public. The exercise is now complete and recommends a more comprehensive analysis of the range of issues raised, and is one input into the review.

Scope

The review, looking specifically but not exclusively into the case of AI's collaboration with Moazzam Begg and Cageprisoners, should aim at providing recommendations in the following areas:

- *Partnerships and collaboration*: including the criteria and considerations that inform decision-making on work with other organizations and individuals; the nature of our different relationships and the way that they change and evolve over time; our approach to assessing the effectiveness of relationships; our approach to relationships where we do not share all of the goals or values of another organisation or individual; how we manage the perception of approval of these goals or values arising from collaboration; our approach when partners from one strand of work disagree or fundamentally object to partnerships in other areas; due diligence and our approach to identifying, and managing risk
- *Internal communications and decision-making*: including our, approach to internal debates and our systems for sharing information about concerns, and for consultation and decision-making.
- Aspects to the public controversy triggered by the Sunday Times on 7 February will be considered to the extent that they are relevant to addressing the two main issues above

Observations are likely on AI's past, current and future work on counter-terrorism/terrorism and women's rights. These will be collated and fed into relevant IS and AIUK review and planning processes.

Observations on the benefits and effectiveness of working in partnership, and issues relating to our responsibilities to partners, are also expected.

Out of scope

- Appraisal of Gita Sahgal's decision to go public and her related actions, together with comments on consequential human resource processes.
- Aspects of AI's public response not relevant to the two main issues under review.

Methodology and process

External reviewers

The IS and AIUK will commission appropriate individuals who are external to either of these entities. It is presently suggested that two reviewers be commissioned to work as a team, in order to balance understanding of the issue of working with others, especially in the context of counter-terrorism and women's rights, and issues that are more concerned with organizational systems.

Once appointed, the reviewers will determine the methodology that they choose to employ and decide independently on matters such as who to interview and what documents to request. IS and AIUK management will assist them in communicating this methodology to staff and other stakeholders

External input

External organizations or individuals with a particular perspective on the recent issues will be invited to contribute to the process, in a manner to be determined by the reviewers. These may include a selection of those who have submitted petitions, as well as partners in our work on counter-terrorism and human rights.

Interim report

The reviewers will produce an interim report to be delivered to the IS and AIUK, allowing them to raise particular points for further exploration or elaboration.

Final report

Having received comments on the interim report and having undertaken any further work required, the reviewers will develop a final report that sets out recommendations. A summary of these recommendations may be provided in addition to the full report.

The IS and AIUK may wish to provide a senior management response to the final report.

Timeline

The review is to take place as speedily as possible while ensuring that there is adequate time for reviewers to provide a report of high quality. A final timeline will be produced once the reviewers have been commissioned and have determined their methodology.

Confidentiality and non-attribution

Individuals who wish to feed into this process may provide their submission directly to the reviewers, with their names clearly indicated. Normal procedure should be that these contributions are not confidential, though people can ask for their inputs to the reviewers to remain confidential.

All points included in the interim or final report will be non-attributable. No quotations will be used and no names will be cited. This excludes comments already in the public domain.

The final report should not refer (directly or indirectly) to individuals who are not already in the public domain, to relationships between staff, or to similar privileged information.

The reviewers will be invited to brief the interim Secretary General and AIUK Director confidentially on issues that they consider to be important but unsuitable for inclusion in the final report.

All documentation relating to this review remains internal to AI and must not be shared externally unless and until explicit permission is granted in writing. Circulation limitations on outputs and inputs will be clearly stated.

Final report and/or its summary

The reviewers will be responsible for drafting a summary of their report and decide what information should be made available to staff, AI members, the media and the general public. Legal advice would be made available.

Before finalizing their summary to be made publicly available, the reviewers will seek the advice of the IS and AIUK, while retaining their authority to make the final decision.

Support to the reviewers

The IS and AIUK will provide the reviewers with the logistical and administrative support required, and full access to documents an individuals subject to their consent.

Appendix 2: Amnesty International's work with Moazzam Begg

AI International Secretariat's work with Moazzam Begg

November 2005	AI IS/ AI UK /Reprieve Conference on Guantanamo detainees and their families, MB invited to meeting and is a key speaker at the Press Conference with AI, Reprieve, Manfred Nowak (UN Special Rapporteur on Torture) and Paul Hunt (UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health). AI facilitates meetings between former detainees, including MB, and the two UN Special Rapporteurs
June 2007	A briefing paper entitled "Off the Record: US Responsibility for Enforced Disappearances in the 'war on terror'", is jointly produced and launched by AI, Cageprisoners, the Centre for Human Rights and Global Justice at NY University School of Law, Human Rights Watch and Reprieve; MB is quoted in the joint press release as Director of Cageprisoners, along with officials of the other five organizations
Mar 2008	IS interviews MB for an internal project, 'Listening to Individuals', focused on AI's work on individuals whose cases had been taken up by AI, examining the effects that the relationship with AI had had on them, assessing their perspective of what it was like to be an AI 'case', and reviewing practice and suggesting means of strengthening ethical practice in AI's work with individuals.

AI's work on Moazzam Begg's case (including references in AI publications)

Feb 2002	MB's father Azmat Begg contacts AI after the enforced disappearance of his son (Pakistan Team and US Team stay in contact with the family up until MB's release and produce a range of documents)
July 2003	AIUK releases paper entitled "Government must act now for Guantánamo detainees", mentioning MB as one of the prisoners detained without charge; his case is likewise mentioned in a range of similar documents focused on human rights concerns produced since
Apr 2004	Azmat Begg speaks to AI UK Section National conference
June/ Sept 2004	AI includes MB's story in an Urgent Action Call for detainees to be tried or released, and for better medical care for the detainees.
May 2005	MB is quoted in AI's Annual Review: Local Action, Global Impact
2006	MB requests permission from AI to include photographs from the conference in his book; these were provided by AI IS and the conference is mentioned in the epilogue of his book, <i>Enemy Combatant</i>
	An AI Germany coordinator and AI IS facilitate contact between MB and a prominent German journalist; MB introduces the journalist to other former detainees; some of these accounts were included in a book published in October 2006: <i>Hier spricht Guantánamo</i>
	MB and other former detainees are included in the "Voices Against Torture" Campaign on the AI website
	AI publishes the transcript of a short interview with MB talking about torture, mistreatment and detainee suicide
Jan 2007	AI uses MB's case study and quotes in the "USA: Close Guantánamo - symbol of injustice" report
April 2008	AI quotes MB in a report entitled "USA: In whose best interests? Omar Khadr, child 'enemy combatant; facing military commission" (other reports in the same time frame which include a reference to MB include "USA: A case to answer. From Abu Ghraib to Secret CIA Custody: the

	case of Khaled al-Maqtari” and “USA: to be taken on trust? Extraditions and US Assurances in the ‘War on Terror’”)
Nov 2009	AI condemned the decision to allow the use of secret proceedings in the UK in a civil lawsuit against British intelligence services over alleged complicity in the ill-treatment of seven former Guantánamo Bay detainees, one of whom was MB.
Mar 2010	AI cites the case of the seven former detainees, including MB, in a report titled: “Time for an inquiry into the UK’s role in human rights violations overseas since 11 September 2001”
Apr 2010	Article on the tour of CCR, Reprieve, MB and AI in the AI Magazine ‘The Wire’

AI Sections’ work with Moazzam Begg

Apr 2005	MB lights candle at the opening of AI UK’s Annual General Meeting (AGM), Azmat Begg addresses the AGM
2006	MB addresses the AI UK AGM
Jan 2006	AI UK quotes MB in campaigning material condemning torture allegations and illegal detention on behalf of the US government
Sept 2006	AI UK quotes MB as part of a press release promoting a research report on Pakistan’s cooperation in the enforced disappearances of Pakistanis and other alleged “terror suspects”
Nov 2006	Belfast Festival: AI lecture with MB as key speaker
Feb 2007	AI UK quotes MB in a press release following a research report on the trade of torture equipment in the EU
Apr 2007	Book launch: Bad Men by Clive Stafford-Smith, MB attends as panellist along with a local MP and AI UK director Kate Allen
July 2007	Public meeting and launch of exhibition - ‘Guantánamo: Portraits of injustice’, MB speaks, along with AI, Reprieve, Sarah Teather MP and others.
Aug 2007	At screening of the film “Taking Liberties”, which includes the case of MB, AI UK promotes an action against torture
Oct 2007	AI UK launches new campaign called “Unsubscribe” utilising social networks and new communication technologies, endorsed by people and organizations including Anita Roddick, the NUS, Bebo and MB, who said: “Removing freedoms gives rise to hostility and leads to terrorism; terrorism allows governments to justify the restriction of liberty. We must Unsubscribe to both”.
Nov 2007	Lecture as part of the Reading University Social Justice Week - MB speaks about Guantánamo
March 2008	MB addresses, via videolink, the AI USA AGM
May 2008	AI group talk held by MB
Sept 2008	AI UK and MB announce the winner of the “You can’t jail minds” poetry competition for UK school students; MB awarded the prizes
Nov 2008	AI Annual Lecture in Belfast
	AI UK Conference: West Midlands, MB speaks
Mar 2009	Lecture Wells Cathedral - MB speaks about his experiences in Guantánamo
Apr 2009	Annual Spring Open Meeting, organised by Welwyn Hatfield & East Herts AI Group, MB and representative from AI UK both speak
July 2009	Film screening (Hunger), MB attends discussion panel
Oct 2009	Norwich AI Group’s talk - MB speaks about the film “The Dark Side” and his experiences in Guantánamo
Jan	MB takes part in the “Bring Shaker Aamer Home” Event organised by

2010	Victoria Brittain, during which AI UK Director participated in an all-women delegation to Downing Street – MB was present at the event but was not part of the delegation.
	Meetings between AI Luxembourg, Reprieve, CCR, MB and all major political parties in Luxembourg, as well as the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and related press conference.
Feb 2010	Meetings between AI Sweden, CCR, Reprieve, MB and several Swedish parliamentarians as well as the Swedish Minister of Justice. Seminar open to the public at AI Sweden’s headquarters with CCR, Reprieve and MB, MB giving a presentation on “the aftermath of September 11 and the treatment of prisoners in Guantánamo ”
	Meetings between members of the German Social Democratic Party, the Christian Democratic Party, the Liberal Democratic Party, the Linke (Left) Party, the Political Director of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and lawyers from the Centre for Constitutional Rights (CCR), Reprieve, AI Germany and MB. Press conference in Berlin and public event at the Technical University with panel members from AI Germany, CCR, Reprieve and MB where MB spoke about his detention
	Meeting between AI Ireland, MB, Reprieve, CCR and senior officials from the Irish Departments of Justice and Foreign Affairs to discuss the resettlement of cleared detainees and the role of the Irish Government in facilitating extraordinary rendition flights. Meeting between MB, AI Ireland and three members of parliament from opposition parties and members of the Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs. Public Event called “Life after Guantánamo ” at the Irish Aid offices with MB, AI Ireland, Reprieve, CCR.

Appendix 3: Overview of Amnesty's range of work with others

Working with others is part of the daily reality of almost every staff member, including:

- At the IS: regional and country researchers and campaigners, thematic campaigns teams, policy experts, individuals at risk team, communications
- At the level of S/s: campaigners, policy experts, fundraisers, marketers. They interface regularly with victims and their families, in-country and global NGOs and networks, the media, legal representatives, funders, and influence targets such as governments and international institutions. In addition, AI engages with these stakeholders on a wide range of activities for a variety of purposes including: data gathering and information exchange, analysis and dissemination of research, capacity-building, fundraising, advocacy, and campaigning. Examples of this range of activity are given below.

Strategic Partnerships: In 2007–08, AI explored new models of partnerships with other NGOs. The main purpose was to build HR constituencies where AI has no sections or structures, but where AI has established relationships and a record of trust with local groups. With these strategic partnerships AI aims to create a local platform for AI's issues and learn from local groups. In 2008 Strategic Partnerships were initiated in Botswana (on the issue of death penalty), Liberia (survivors of sexual violence), Indonesia (policing and impunity), and Latvia (LGBT rights). More recently AI has entered into partnership in Cambodia (human rights defenders and land rights), Timor Leste (impunity) and Romania (discrimination in education). All of the partnerships have a MoU outlining planned activities, timelines, complaint procedures and the use of AI's brand.

Partnerships on International Justice: AI is part of a coalition of more than 2000 organisations promoting the Rome Statute at the national level. All coalition members sign up to key principles supporting the Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court (ICC). Some form of vetting process is undertaken by the coalition prior to admitting members. In relation to international justice, AI is also a member of a separate Working Group on Victims' Rights that brings together 300 national and international victim organisations. The Working Group advocates with the ICC to implement its mandate in relation to victims.

Human Rights Defenders in Africa: AI partners with numerous HR organisations and individuals in the African region. The partnerships are not formalized except when conducting joint projects, such as in the case of the DFID-funded Africa Human Rights Education project. Partners offer support to AI's research, campaigns and lend an African voice to AI's messages.

Death Penalty Network: AI is a founding member of World Coalition Against the Death Penalty (WCADP) that presently includes more than 100 abolitionist NGOs and professional associations. WCADPs General Assembly formulates its strategy and this is carried out by its own secretariat, directed by a Steering Committee of which AI is an elected member. At the level of the Asian region, AI has initiated the Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network (ADPAN)

which is a network (without a formal legal identity) of organisations and individuals committed to the abolition of the death penalty in the Asian region.

'Control Arms' Campaign: The campaign is jointly run by AI, OXFAM International and International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA) and is provided with policy and strategic advice by a Steering Committee which includes other organizations. It was launched in 2003 and marked the first time AI joined with other organisations in a global campaign. The campaign to control arms includes work towards adoption of a UN 'Arms Trade Treaty'. No formal agreement has been made between AI, Oxfam International and IANSA. However, all members of the campaign's Steering Committee must sign up to a set of core values and "Global Principles". AI has proposed draft Organisational Principles and Rules for NGO Partnership to the Steering Committee, including provision for protecting the independence and impartiality of members, and consistency with agreed policy for joint external documents/statements.

Partnerships with women's groups: During the SVAW campaign AI formed a range of relationships and networks with organisations working on violence against women which were seen as critical for the campaign. An evaluation of the SVAW campaign has noted that AI has not systematically collected, analysed and shared across the movement what it learned from these partnerships. The evaluation report has also noted that due to ending of the SVAW campaign there is a concern about whether and how the partnerships established during the campaign will be maintained.

Demand Dignity Campaign: The Demand Dignity campaign involves working with local groups including CBOs. Under the broad umbrella of the Campaign, AI is involved in several networks, coalitions and joint projects, including:

- Right to Education Project with Action Aid International and Global Campaign for Education
- A coalition of more than 300 organisations for the promotion and ratification of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
- A consortium of some 50 HR-related NGOs working on the obligations of states towards persons outside their countries or extraterritorial obligations
- Membership in ESCR-Net (the International Network for Economic, Social & Cultural Rights), and CIVICUS.

National thematic campaigns: AI Sections in various countries have partnerships with local organisations and associations. For example, the Swedish section has engaged with local groups on issues related to asylum and migration, and the UK section has finalized a MoU with the UK Trades Union Congress (TUC) to work on AI's urgent actions related to trade unionists and/ or violations of labour rights. Even within individual S/s there is often no standard documentation to accompany any given form of joint working.

Fundraising: In the case of partnerships with corporates, all AI entities are subject to the *Policy Governing Corporate Relationships that Benefit AI* (2008) (where benefits can be valued and recorded in financial terms). The policy requires a screening process at the national Section level, and at higher values of benefits, screening and approval by the SG and IEC. It also mandates record keeping and reporting to the movement of relationships over £50,000 in value. S/s form a number of relationships with corporate entities to aid in fundraising. Some sections have established additional processes at the national level to meet the further requirements of stakeholders and local regulation. AI UK has established a rigorous process of due diligence scaled to the level of resources donated. The deliberations of the due diligence process are recorded and take into account the track record of the corporate entity against AI's aims and values. The risks and trade-offs are made explicit and the identity of those making the final call is noted.