ICM REPORT

31ST INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

BERLIN, GERMANY

18-22 AUGUST 2013

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Amnesty International members only / À l'attention exclusive des membres d'Amnesty International / Solo para la membresía de Amnistía Internacional

As with previous years, The ICM Report 2013 will only be available in English. The 4 Working Party Reports, however, are available in English, French and Spanish at the wiki address below.

For further information, background papers, circulars and on-site presentations, please see the ICM wiki at: https://intranet.amnesty.org/wiki/display/GHPP/ICM+2013

Photos, videos and non-PowerPoint presentations from the ICM are on ADAM on the IS Intranet at: https://adam.amnesty.org/asset-bank/action/viewHome
[Please note, this requires you log in to ADAM first]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

_Toc367099275

OPENING CEREMONY

Janet MacLean, Chair of the International Council Meeting (ICM), welcomed participants to the meeting and hoped the agenda would encourage stimulating conversations amongst delegates on the following key issues: Human Rights Priorities, Amnesty International's growth strategy, improving organizational strength through the Global Transition Programme (GTP) and global governance.

Oliver Hendrich, Chair of AI Germany, welcomed the movement to Germany and Berlin on behalf of AI Germany and mentioned that the last ICM in Germany was 43 years ago in 1970. He outlined his hope that the ICM would send a strong message to the Egyptian government opposing their use of violence against protesters and also highlighted the need for the ICM to continue changing as the world rapidly changes around it.

Pietro Antonioli, Chair of the International Executive Committee (International Board)[1], welcomed delegates to the ICM on behalf of the International Board. He showed delegates three pictures: firstly, one of Kasha Nabagesera who had asked the 2011 ICM "What is Amnesty practically going to do for the external world?" Pietro believes that this is an essential question that should be asked at every ICM to assess what impact the movement is having on the external world. The second picture was of Amnesty International's office in Turkey which served as a temporary medical centre during the Istanbul protests in 2013. For Pietro, this example illustrates the breadth of talented and committed individuals who make up the Amnesty International movement and encouraged participants at the 2013 ICM to meet as many other delegates as possible. The third picture was of Stephan Hessel, one of the leading architects of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights who passed away in 2013.

Pietro met him in 2008 and recalled a statement he made in an interview in 2013 in which Hessel declared "Being outraged is not enough. Outrage must transform into a true commitment. Change requires an effort". Pietro used these words to remind delegates of the reason why they were gathered, and to strengthen their commitment to change on behalf of the organization's 4.6 million members, supporters and activists.

Salil Shetty, Secretary General (SG) welcomed all volunteers and activists to the ICM. He described his role of speaking to global leaders across the world and emphasized that Amnesty International's independence and impartiality coupled with its large and passionate activist base gave the movement a legitimacy which government and corporate leaders respect and take seriously. He recalled a recent visit to Brazil, where leaders of the Maré *favela* in Rio de Janeiro thanked Amnesty International for protecting them in the face of violence from police and drug gangs to highlight the reason why Amnesty International exists and remains relevant today.

---

[1] **Following decision 10 of the 2013 ICM, the International Executive Committee (IEC) was renamed International Board (Board). As this report is being issued after the ICM the term International Board will be used in place of IEC.**

VIDEO MESSAGE: NAVI PILLAY

"Dear colleagues and friends

It gives me great pleasure to send this message to you today, addressing you as human rights defenders and as representatives of Amnesty International throughout the world. I regret that I cannot attend your ICM in person. The expression of solidarity between individuals often continents apart and global campaigning based on international human rights standards has been a hallmark of your work since the organization came into being in 1961. I myself sought the assistance of nascent Amnesty International groups in London, Paris and Stockholm in 1973 on behalf of prisoners of conscience in South Africa and recall how much you were needed in my country. Your record of authoritative reporting on human rights violations wherever they occur irrespective of the perpetrator has brought to light the hidden human rights situations. And you have brought your campaigning strength to bear in countries or circumstances where others were reluctant or fearful to tread. I should also like to pay tribute to Amnesty's work in strengthening the global human rights protection systems. Amnesty has often been at the forefront in identifying protection gaps. Through its advocacy, it has contributed to the creation of new mandates and to the strengthening of existing mechanisms and bodies. Amnesty played a key role in advocating for the establishment of the International Criminal Court and the creation of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. It is my honour to occupy that post today and I believe my office has come a long way in the first two decades of its existence. It is increasingly an authoritative and strong advocate for victims across the world.

We and you can point to successes:

- the underlying principles that human rights are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated are strongly reinforced even if still challenged by a minority;
- the artificial hierarchy under which social, economic and cultural rights were viewed by some as less important than civil and political rights, and vice versa, has been breached;
- there has also been major advances in women's rights and international legislation has continued to develop in the area of conflict-related sexual violence, although women are still subject to discrimination and violence to a shocking degree across all geographic regions.

Since the Vienna Declaration and programme of action, human rights defenders have been recognized as playing an increasingly important role both on the ground and advancing the global human rights agenda, infusing it with fresh ideas and energy. And so, when we know that human rights defenders are at risk, it is a joint responsibility to support them and speak out for them at times when their voices are silenced. New challenges are constantly emerging whether it is climate change, or global terrorist movements, issues related to migration, threats to freedom of expression and invasion of privacy in cyberspace, or unforeseen economic and financial crises affecting many countries across the planet.

Sometimes the responses to these challenges raise as many problems and challenges as the problems they are trying to address, counter terrorism and austerity measures being two obvious examples. It is vital that rights remain central to all such processes. We are at a point when the human rights framework is well established, human rights mechanisms are in place including treaty bodies, the Human Rights Council and its Universal Periodic Review and special procedures. The problems are more to do with implementation, political will, commitment of all stakeholders, and the deployment of sufficient human and financial resources. Human rights work is taking place in world of new and evolving technology, continuing globalization, and new social behaviours. It is important that we have strong organizations working on the ground, where it matters most. That implies increased flexibility in adapting our working methods to a world where change is happening faster and in more complex ways than ever, with consequences that are often hard to predict. But universal human rights laws and standards must continue to be central to our work. Human rights can and should be the bedrock of moral and legal stability.

Finally in concluding this brief message I send you my best wishes for your deliberations and look forward to our continued cooperation. Thank you."

KEYNOTE SPEAKER: NARIMAN TAMIMI

"I use my camera as a weapon to show you what is happening".

Steve Crawshaw, Director of the Office of the SG at the International Secretariat (IS) introduced **Nariman Tamimi** from the Popular Resistance Committee (PRC), based in the West Bank of Palestine and her daughter Ahd.

Nariman began by explaining that her brother had been killed by Israeli brothers and that his death had strengthened her belief in non-violent struggle. She described the events leading up to his death in her village Nabi Salah, which is inhabited by 600 people. In 2009, the villagers began to hold peaceful protests against land seized by Israeli settlers. As a result of these demonstrations, the villagers' water supply was confiscated, many people were imprisoned and wounded and housing in areas under Israeli control was destroyed displacing many of the villagers. Nariman denounced this displacement policy as discriminatory against Palestinians and reported that rubber bullets and water cannon spraying dirty water were used against protestors.

She introduced a video showing her husband and brother involved in a peaceful demonstration in Nabi Salah. She reported that while her husband has been arrested several times, her brother was shot at by Israeli soldiers who forbade Nariman from approaching him

as he lay dying in front of her. Following the film, Nariman asked Amnesty International to help her obtain justice for her brother, through a fair trial and holding the soldiers to account for their actions. Nariman herself has been arrested numerous times and had to pay a fine to attend the ICM.

She reaffirmed her commitment to non-violent principles and bears no grudge against Israelis, describing Yonatan from AI Israel as 'my brother', but is opposed to the illegal settlement of Palestinian land. She passionately defends non-violent resistance as a means of helping to counter negative perceptions of the current situation in the occupied Palestinian territories.

Nariman used the symbolic examples of Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi to illustrate that peaceful resistance is the most efficient and effective method of societal change. She believe that peaceful resistance movements have to utilize different tools to ensure their survival, such as gaining media support to further their cause and fundraising to shoulder the financial burden of expenditure such as fines or bail payments. Nariman repeated her wish for a State where people can live together in peace and appealed for displaced refugees to be able to come back home and simply stated: "The ideas are simple but I want to achieve them".

In closing, she reiterated her wish for a fair trial to bring justice for peaceful protestors such as her brother and asked for Amnesty International's expert advice on cases like this. She encouraged a deepening of the relationship so that villagers can say, because of Amnesty's presence in Nabi Salah "The world is helping us regain our rights".

ICM CLOSING CEREMONY

Catherine Baber, Director of Asia-Pacific at the IS introduced **Shin Dong-Hyuk**, the first person to ever escape from the infamous Camp 14 prison in North Korea who has since set up his own human rights-based non-governmental organization (NGO).

KEYNOTE SPEAKER: SHIN DONG-HYUK

"In 2005, I escaped from the prison camp and settled in South Korea in 2006 and have been a human rights activist ever since. As human beings we are all the same but some people are born into liberty and freedom and others go through lives of suffering and disadvantage. Many countries have human rights issues but North Korea is extraordinary because if you are born in a prison like me, you are a prisoner for life and if you are son of a dictator you will also live as a dictator. This makes me afraid of the current situation and what could happen in North Korea.

I hope that the UN's Commission of Inquiry (COI) will be effective and a great success. I am hopeful because this is an international organization establishing an inquiry into North Korean human rights abuses. I am also hesitant because although the COI is crucial and important, it cannot legally change the situation in North Korea.

Two days ago, l talked to commissioners and lots of media organizations. I am the first witness to talk about my background and experience before the members of the COI. I talked about the torture I suffered and how my father and mother were executed at the camp, the COI commissioners were shocked and disturbed to hear these stories.

There is no video footage or photographs to show you. I can only share the scars on my body and the testimonies of other former prisoners. When asked about my 24 years in the camp, the beatings, the indescribable humiliation that women suffered, the torture, these were things I thought were normal before leaving the camp. I can only give my word and show my scars. For all of you in civil society it is difficult for you to take everything in and understand it.

We see other cases of genocide throughout history which have not been focussed on, in Cambodia and in Sudan. What I am afraid of is the fact that the world has seen even less of the situation in North Korea than anywhere else and that the clock is ticking.

In the camp, I lived without emotion at the treatment I received from the prison guards. I see now that I was treated worse than a dog and with less respect than even mice. What makes me shudder to this day is that the fact that it is continuing and inmates in the camp think that this treatment is normal.

I have met many heads of state during my travels but I am not sure I can tell them what to do to change things. I have been researching how to make change and what the solution should be. What I can say is that regarding the solution for how we can help, it lies with all of you gathered at this event, all of you coming together with your efforts to come up with ideas, that's the best thing you can do to help human rights in our country

We can look at what has happened with Egypt, Syria and Libya, where people have mobilized and taken up arms to challenge their authorities as an example of what to do, but this cannot happen in North Korea yet because people are afraid."

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL

PART 1: HUMAN RIGHTS

PREPCOM'S VISION FOR THE 2013 ICM: HUMAN RIGHTS

The ICM Preparatory Committee's (PrepCom) vision for the 2013 ICM was that: "First and foremost, it is essential that we maintain a sharp focus on the major human rights challenges facing the world and how Amnesty International can most effectively anticipate and respond to them.[2]"

The ICM agenda was structured so that each day began with a session focussed on substantive human rights work.

HUMAN RIGHTS: MIGRATION

"I want all the world to know about us"

This session was facilitated by **Karen Moeskops**, Director of AI Belgium, Flemish-speaking and covered Amnesty International's work tackling human rights abuses throughout the migration chain through the connectivity between all Amnesty International entities as well as personal testimonies from Human Rights Defenders (HRD's) affected by migration across the world.

Kusha Bahrami, an activist from AI Greece, fled from Iran in 2006 after refusing military service and converting from Islam to Christianity. He became a member of AI Greece in 2009 and joined their board in 2012 after receiving refugee status. Kusha spoke of the long and complicated process of applying for asylum in Greece, a process which led him to go on hunger strike and even attempt suicide. He evocatively described the fear and alienation he felt in his host country but also how lucky he was compared to other refugees, like the case of a Syrian refugee who was abandoned by smugglers in the Greek Islands and left his wife and children in search of water. He was arrested, put in jail, has no paperwork proving his nationality or any idea what happened to his family. Kusha highlighted the importance of giving people like him and all refugees a voice and thanked all Amnesty International activists, campaigners and leaders for standing together on this important issue.

Carmen Dupont, European Campaign Coordinator on migration at the European Institutions Office (EIO), spoke of the appalling conditions faced by migrants either on their way to, or at European borders and the need for Amnesty International to publicize these conditions. She highlighted the campaign which began a year ago under the slogan "SOS" and showed ICM delegates a video: www.whenyoudontexist.eu. This campaign also covers what Carmen described as "the other side of the story": the impact on families and communities in the countries where refugees flee from. She passionately advocated further mobilization on this issue so that migration can become part of the EU agenda as well as other international bodies.

Sherif Elsayed-Ali, Head of Refugee and Migrant Rights at the IS, emphasized the need to highlight the plight of migrants using two illustrative case studies of strawberries and football. When most people buy strawberries and watch Wimbledon, they do not ask whether the fruit is picked by people who have been trafficked, smuggled or work in unfair and unsafe conditions. Sherif highlighted the

---

[2] ORG 50 003 2012

inefficiencies of current agricultural legislation which covers 40% of the EU's budget but does not contain any human rights protections. In the same way, fans travelling to Qatar for the 2022 World Cup, one of the richest countries on Earth, are unaware of the real migrant story behind the construction of stadiums where many people in search of a better future often end up in forced labour and detention. Sherif sees it as Amnesty International's job to speak out on such issues and concluded by saying "We will be stronger. This is why we can make a huge change to their lives".

Rameshwar Nepal, Director of AI Nepal, spoke of the research on migrant rights his section is undertaking and how on a recent Amnesty International mission to Qatar he found shocking evidence of worker exploitation and mistreatment. Some workers for example, agreed to forfeit five months of wages in order to have their passports returned to them and exit permits granted. He explained that the justice system in countries like Qatar is not designed to protect migrant workers, and that the responsibilities of employers are not regularly enforced which allows coercion, discrimination and the exploitation of workers to take place. AI Nepal and the IS are strongly lobbying the government and civil society leaders to address unsafe migration practises by running nationwide campaigns and "safe migration clinics". These ongoing campaigns have led to a mainstreaming of the debate on migrant rights in Nepal along with other successes.

Migration is a huge global phenomenon that has always existed in history enhancing diversity and mutual understanding. By definition, migration connects people, but it also connects Amnesty International sections, structures and activists all over the world. The session reiterated that the movement can make a real difference by tackling human rights abuses against people on the move.

HUMAN RIGHTS: CRISIS WORK

"Sexual violence in conflict is not a women's problem; it is a matter of human rights and it concerns all of us"

The second human rights panel, facilitated by **Nicola Duckworth**, Senior Director for Research at the IS, helped ICM delegates to get a clearer understanding of Amnesty International's approach to crises and explored the movement's strengths and weaknesses in this area, with a view to improving our response in the immediate future.

Gilles Yabi, Project Director of the West Africa Programme at the International Crisis Group, outlined the research work being done by his organization in West Africa and the conflict in Mali. He described the three main factors which triggered the crisis. Firstly, the armed liberation movement in Northern Mali who attacked army barracks demanding independence. Secondly, the Islamist group connected with Al Qaeda who was fighting for Sharia law to be applied to all of Mali. Thirdly, the toppling of the Malian president by the army in 2012. The combination of these internal factors coupled with an influx of fighters from neighbouring countries such as Algeria and Libya and an increase in drug trafficking and corruption, has led the Malian stable model of democracy which has been in place since the 1990s rapidly collapse.

Gaetan Mootoo, Regional Researcher at the IS, talked about Amnesty International's response to the situation in Mali. Since the crisis began in early 2012, five missions have been sent for between three and four weeks each time. AI Mali has played a critical role in these missions which has enhanced its visibility in Mali. Amnesty International has widely communicated its human rights concerns about the use of sexual violence by armed groups, torture by security forces, the recruitment and detention of child soldiers, and other violations of International Humanitarian Law. Amnesty International's rapid response to this on-going crisis has also had a wider regional impact for example, in countries like Côte d'Ivoire. Amnesty International's timely presence in Mali has also had a positive effect over the opening of judicial inquiries and its research has been used by the International Criminal Court (ICC) in its preliminary investigations..

Hassiba Hadj Sahraoui, Deputy Director of the MENA Programme at the IS, discussed Amnesty International's response to the human rights situation in Egypt. Amnesty International has been

documenting human rights abuses in the clashes between security forces (police and army) and supporters of the deposed President, Mohammed Morsi. Violence against women in Tahrir Square and elsewhere and the lack of reparation for victims of human rights violations are two of the main concerns raised by Amnesty International in its research and campaign work. Amnesty International has been permanently present in the country since the end of June 2013. Hassiba stated that the Egyptian experience may spill over into neighbouring countries, which confirms the relevance and importance of the movement's cross-border human rights and crisis work.

FUNDRAISING: BUILDING A CULTURE OF HUMAN RIGHTS PHILANTHROPY

"Fundraising: From the "f" word to the billion dollar dream"

Rune Arctander, International Board member introduced the session on fundraising and human rights philanthropy by stating that Amnesty International must secure integration between fundraising, campaigning and advocacy. Fundraising should be viewed by the movement as a tool which secures and increases our work against human rights abuses.

Christoffer Holm from the Fundraising Management Team, **Kerry Moscogiuri,** Marketing Director of AI UK and **Genèvieve Garrigos**, Chair of AI France gave an insightful and informative panel presentation on fundraising for human rights. The panel reminded ICM delegates of the importance of prioritizing fundraising as a fundamental component of Amnesty International's work. In the context of the current economic crisis, Amnesty International is seen as underperforming compared to other international NGOs (INGOs) and at its present rate, will not achieve the growth required to deliver on its strategic goals and achieve a positive impact on human rights. A decline in fundraising leads to a decline in human rights work and in order to grow in members and resources, the panel suggested the organization must improve the way it relays positive outcomes.

Genèvieve Garrigos explained AI France's progress with their growth strategy since 2011. The section experienced a large loss of members so they invested time and resources in a fundraising strategy where all campaigns and planning conducted had to have a fundraising element. At first, the section's membership and external audience were nervous as there were fears that emphasising fundraising could damage their human rights programmes. However, they were eventually convinced to back the section's leadership plans for increased fundraising activities through a reiteration of the belief that increased money through fundraising means an increase in human rights work itself.

Lawrence Amesu, Director of AI Ghana shared his sections' experience of fundraising. AI Ghana identified three key issues affecting its income: over-dependence on the IS, a concentration of the section's work in Ghanaian cities and a public perception that Amnesty International was an elitist organization. To tackle these issues, the section changed its strategy and moved into community activism where volunteers in rural regions of Ghana could mobilise activists. Addressing local issues and traditions was a central element of this new strategy which helped convince Ghanaians that Amnesty International is relevant to them. Following this new strategy has helped to stabilize the section and its income growth has come from successfully applying for funding from external donors.

ICM delegates were then shown a video message from fundraising expert and Amnesty International activist, **Ken Burnett** who wanted to make four key points to the ICM.

Firstly, he described how his son, Charlie became a human rights lawyer following stories Ken had told of meeting other human rights lawyers standing up to the brutal regime in Guatemala. The power and passion of these stories had inspired him to become a human rights lawyer and ICM delegates were reminded of its role in motivating people like Charlie to become prominent activists.

Secondly, delegates were asked why some international not-for-profit organizations are thriving in troubled economic times and Amnesty International is not? The answer given by Ken Burnett was that other NGO's have chosen to invest in fundraising rather than to cutback their activities in difficult economic times. Fundraising is a sound, secure and practical investment which produces a greater return on investment. ICM delegates were challenged to think about what Amnesty International could do with a million more members and a billion dollars of income year after year.

Thirdly, the advertising strategies employed by Amnesty International in the 1980's and 1990's were described as powerful, angry and the best possible means of generating income through fundraising. These included the Amnesty International "pen pack" which told the story of a young man who had his eyes removed through the use of a plastic biro which changed the face of campaigning in the UK, particularly from non-profit organizations. ICM delegates were asked why Amnesty International does not tell these powerful stories anymore.

Finally, Ken Burnett described how Amnesty International should put fundraising at its very core because the movement has the best stories to tell potential supporters, keep current supporters and reactivate former supporters. Amnesty International needs to sharpen the attitudes to the external world by being outspoken, angry, audacious, bold and brave and to have the courage of its convictions. "If it does, a million new members will come to Amnesty International because you have the best stories to tell and you have the best reasons for telling them."[3]

HUMAN RIGHTS: DIGITAL FREEDOMS

"The challenge of using technology for human rights and protecting the right to privacy at the same time"

Owen Pringle, Director of the Digital Communications Programme at the IS, facilitated this session on digital freedoms in the context of Amnesty International's overarching digital vision for 2016.

Owen presented "Panic Button", a mobile app for HRD's who face dangerous situations. By pressing the Panic Button, they can broadcast their situation to a preselected group of contacts or through social media (ICM delegates were directed to www.foronedayonly.com for more information).

Eric King, from Privacy International, talked about the negative side of technology and specifically the threats to the right to privacy. Currently, there is almost no defence against technological threats because governments refuse to set limits and controls. As the Edward Snowden case has shown, Western countries do not want to talk about surveillance or even accept its existence. Eric advocated the need for legislation to prevent a situation where the use of technology does not translate into a breach of the right to privacy. He concluded by stating "we can no longer accept that surveillance can be above the law."

Marcelo Daher, from the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), spoke about the work carried out by the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression, Frank la Rue, in relation to human rights and surveillance. This work covered the protections needed for journalists, bloggers and other free speech advocates as well as the drive to hold intelligence agencies accountable for their behaviour in the digital arena.

The session showed that in a time of rapid and simple technological communications, the global human rights community must look closely at the right to privacy. Amnesty International should explore how to engage people in the defence and promotion of this right. Furthermore, access to the internet is now a basic human right. Amnesty International must find out how to add value to the debate on human rights in the technology space.

HUMAN RIGHTS: SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

"Ensure that men and women can exercise their sexual and reproductive rights without coercion, discrimination or violence"

Béatrice Vaugrante, Director of AI Canada, French-speaking, chaired the session and began by reminding ICM delegates of the positive effect Amnesty International can have on campaigning for sexual and reproductive rights (SRR) by mentioning her namesake Beatriz, a young woman from El Salvador who was denied an abortion in her country despite her pregnancy being potentially life-

---

[3] To see this video message online and other ICM audio and video related content visit the ICM intranet at: https://intranet.amnesty.org/wiki/display/GHPP/ICM+2013

threatening.

Widney Brown, Senior Director for International Law and Policy at the IS, set the scene for ICM delegates on Amnesty International's work and positions on SRR. Widney explained that Amnesty International's policy is framed around the premise that we want to live in a world where women do not have unwanted pregnancies, people have access to information and contraception services and understand the impact of their actions. This will ensure that a woman chooses to be pregnant and is not a victim of coercion or sexual violence. This premise led to research into sexual violence inside and outside conflict situations which in turn led to the "Stop Violence Against Women" campaign and the adoption of a policy advocating that abortion needs to be decriminalized across the world. Where a pregnancy is a result of sexual violence, the state must ensure there is access to sexual health services under the right to health. If a pregnancy is a threat to the life or health of the mother, the state has an obligation to ensure access to timely and safe abortion services. Widney concluded by stating that "forcing women to continue with an unsafe pregnancy is considered torture – we must empower women."

Colm O Gorman, Director of AI Ireland, highlighted the difficulties facing his section in a country where the Constitution contains the right to life for unborn children and abortion is only allowed when the life of the mother is at risk. His section decided not to campaign on the issue when it became Amnesty International policy and outlined the scale of the challenge. To be successful, his section will need to build a large groundswell of support for their position because they are advocating constitutional change in Ireland..

Mariela Belski, Director of AI Argentina, explained some of the challenges faced by sections in countries where the legal and societal approach to SRR can be different to the policies and campaigns of Amnesty International. Mariela explained that the section wanted to campaign on the issue of guaranteeing accessible, legal and safe abortion but they also had to work within the legal framework of their country. Some women's organizations in Argentina called on the local section to go even further with their campaigns on abortion and other SRR issues and Mariela mentioned how difficult it is to strike a balance between international and local level issues.

Aurora Parong, Director of AI Philippines described the work that has occurred in her section on SRR. She discussed the political situation in her country in relation to a reproductive health bill that was presented to congress. The bill would improve maternal health in cities but the local section faced accusations from religious groups that their position demonstrated an "anti-life" stance. Aurora outlined the position of AI Philippines which is based on the right to life of the mother, freedom from discrimination and support for access to post-abortion services in order to reduce maternal mortality rates. This has led to a mainstreaming of the debate on maternal health and SRR in the Philippines and other southeast Asian nations where women's rights have previously been on the sidelines. Aurora posed a question to ICM delegates: how does Amnesty International balance short-term gains like those achieved in the Philippines against long-term movement-wide campaigns to decriminalize abortion?

A number of delegates expressed a deep interest in discussing the scope, focus and desired human rights impact through developing the work on SRR further.

PART 2: ACCOUNTABILITY

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

Salil Shetty spoke about the successes achieved by the Amnesty International movement in the past two years.

Using the human rights change goals in the current Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP) as his framework of reference, Salil began by talking about how Amnesty International has empowered people living in poverty through making corporations accountable.

The Ruggie Principles are starting to take hold in the corporate world and although Amnesty International has pushed for the standards to be mandatory parts of corporations' due diligence practices rather than voluntary guidelines, the movement's evident influence on these principles is very strong. Salil emphasized the importance of changes at the macro-institutional level where extractive industries are concerned. For example, Amnesty International has focused on Nigeria as a core country in this area and a ground-breaking judgment from the Economic Community of West African States Court of Justice (ECOWAS) which ordered the Nigerian government to punish oil companies over pollution shows the movement's successes on this issue. Other examples of progress are Shell publishing their oil spill data for the first time and the joint Amnesty International / Greenpeace report[4] of the Trafigura case in the Ivory Coast where criminal prosecutions are now in train. Salil hailed Amnesty International's work supporting indigenous communities in India in their battle against the UK mining company Vedanta as a clear example of the movement's international solidarity with rights-holders.

In terms of SRR and maternal health, Amnesty International has established these issues more firmly as human rights in the last two years. Key successes included increased access to maternal health services in Sierra Leone and the Beatriz case in El Salvador where the movement came together to support the plight of a young woman denied a life-saving abortion because of the stringent laws in the country.

Regarding forced evictions and the right to housing, 25 campaign alerts have been issued to the movement in the last two years and 10 of these have led to Amnesty International averting or delaying forced evictions in Romania, Italy and elsewhere whilst calling for a provision of alternative housing for those displaced. Innovation in Africa was highlighted through the movement's Slum Radio projects to assist publicising the situations of people who face eviction on a regular basis.
Amnesty International's work pushing for the Optional Protocol to International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was key to this Protocol coming into force and adding an international mechanism for the defence of ESCR.

The second human rights change goal, "Defending unprotected people on the move" was described as the toughest to implement by the SG. Successes included a European Court ruling placing strong legal restrictions on interception operations and strong research and campaigning on individual case studies of migrants' rights.

The major achievement under the human rights change goal of "Defending people from violence committed by state and non state actors" was the adoption in April 2013 of the Arms Trade Treaty after 20 years of campaigning by Amnesty International. Salil hailed the work of all sections and structures across the movement who mobilized their activists to write almost half a million letters to the UN Secretary General advocating the adoption of the treaty. ICM delegates gave a loud round of

---

[4] AFR 31 002 2012

applause to the delegations from AI France, AI Spain, AI Germany and AI Netherlands who each produced 50,000 of these letters. AI Mali and AI Philippines were also congratulated for producing over 20,000.

Regarding the movement's work on the abolition of the death penalty, the SG congratulated AI USA for their continued commitment. Two further states in the US have ended executions along with Latvia, Mongolia and Benin. There have also been changes in policy on the death penalty in India, Pakistan, Nigeria and Indonesia which Amnesty International can take a lot of credit for. However, ICM delegates were reminded that there remains a stubborn smaller group of countries who remain anti-abolitionist: China, Iran and other Middle Eastern countries as well as the USA. A change of strategy to is required to address this group of nations.

Progress and challenges on international justice over the previous cycle were also highlighted. The first war crime conviction at the ICC is evidence of the Court's longevity which will continue with the referral of Malian, Ivorian and Kenyan governments. Sri Lanka however, seems to evade justice for crimes against their population. We also now have an Amnesty International Centre for International Justice, thanks to work carried out by AI Netherlands.

The successes and frustrations of documenting human rights violations were highlighted by the SG. Documentation of horrific abuses in Syria and Egypt by IS researchers have had little impact on international policy but a key success has been the ending of virginity testing in Egypt.

Salil congratulated the whole movement for efforts defending freedom of expression through the record-breaking letter writing marathon (2 million letters drafted) and excellent campaign calling for the release of the Pussy Riot singers in Russia. On the efforts to protect freedom from discrimination, landmark rulings on indigenous peoples in Latin America, progress on Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) gender identity and sexual orientation issues at the Human Rights Council, new Pride marches in Ukraine and elsewhere and holding European states to account for their shocking treatment of the Roma people were all held up as examples of Amnesty International's passionate commitment against human rights discrimination.

The SG then gave ICM delegates an overview of the internal change agenda since the 2011 ICM. Integrating and prioritising strategies has resulted in two Global Campaigns being agreed after consultation with the movement: Stop Governments Torturing and My Body, My Rights. Further sharpening of national and regional priorities is required in OP3 which will be strongly assisted by progress in resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Mechanism (RAM) processes. These improvements, directly requested by the 2011 ICM cover previously under-resourced areas at the IS: Human Resources, Finance, Legal and IT which are now much better placed to serve and support the movement. Regarding the decentralisation of the IS, Salil highlighted the Amnesty International offices in Brazil and India showing excellent early progress and that Wave 1 of the Hubs in Africa and Hong Kong will be launched by the end of 2013.

In terms of learnings from the last two years, Salil recognised that women's rights, despite the aforementioned progress, remain a neglected aspect of Amnesty International's overall portfolio. The challenge of sharpening the movement's focus on specific campaigns, countries and thematic areas is also still prevalent. ICM delegates were challenged to help define and improve Amnesty International's added value and impact on human rights issues as well as the need to celebrate our successes. The invaluable fundraising and campaigning work of AI Norway was celebrated by the ICM which has given the movement a much needed cash injection in difficult financial times. Salil concluded his presentation by saying that all of these things happened during a period of major internal organisational change, so it's a great testimony to our staff, members, activists, leaders and management that we achieved so much.

At the end of his report, Sections and Structures posed questions to the SG.

AI Senegal: Will Amnesty International call on the UN Security Council to say something about the situation in Egypt and Syria and take it to the ICC?

SG: Nicola Duckworth, Senior Director for Research responded on behalf of the SG. We've had a lot of intensive conversations about what our call would be on the national and international level. A call on the Security Council is a possibility. We have been exploring with colleagues in the Geneva office if there was appetite from states to have a discussion on Syria at the Human Rights Council.

AI Morocco: The MENA region has been going through some era-defining events and we feel there should be a greater Amnesty International presence there. We would like to see a regional hub in MENA set up as soon as possible.

SG: Salil responded that in a period of great change, questions will be asked about what does a strategy mean, should we respond to these events and shouldn't we have greater local presence on the ground? The answer to all these questions is yes, and that's the way we want to go. The pace at which we want to move is another question. We would have liked to do all these things at the same time but it wasn't possible for resource reasons. So we prioritised hubs in Africa in 2013. After the Arab Spring, we increased the capacity for support for the MENA region that we had at the IS, but even that is stretched. We can't really change the speed of response in the short term.

Nicola Duckworth emphasised that the points raised by AI Morocco were in our minds when planning the regional strategies in 2013. Two positive developments in this round of planning have been to involve sections and structures much earlier and to focus on having an integrated strategy for Human Rights and growth. For example, Sally Sami from the AI Egypt Growth Project was present in the country at a time of great upheaval investigating abuses but also seeking to establish a permanent Amnesty International presence in Egypt.

In a separate session, the SG answered questions from sections and structures which were sent to ICM@amnesty.org prior to the ICM. Questions and answers can be found on the ICM wiki at: https://intranet.amnesty.org/wiki/display/GHPP/ICM+2013.

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BOARD (FORMERLY CALLED INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE[5])

Pietro Antonioli and **Guadalupe Rivas** reported on behalf of the International Board. **Bernard Sintobin** gave a report as International Treasurer. Pietro introduced all other International Board members present: Nicole Bieske, Julio Torales, Mwikali Muthiani, Zuzunna Kulinska and Rune Arctander and encouraged ICM delegates to book time with them at the meeting to discuss any relevant issues.

Pietro Antonioli reported on the implementation of Decision 1 of the 2011 ICM[6], the preparation of the Core Standards as well as reflecting on the governance function in the movement. Recognising the anger and concern across the movement in 2011 and afterwards on the payments to the former SG, the International Board commissioned Dame Anne Owers to write an independent report on the movement's governance. Her report[7] challenged Amnesty International to improve their approach to governance. This has led to the creation of a Governance Programme at the IS for the first time, whose workplan for the next governance cycle has now been circulated to the movement[8]. The report also questioned failures within human resources and other systems at the IS. This led the International Board and the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) at the IS to implement strategies to fix the situation. As the events of the last year have shown, not all of the issues have been resolved but the great progress made will now be clearer to all of the movement's constituencies.

---

[5] Decision 10 of the 2013 ICM renamed the International Executive Committee to the International Board. Although these sessions occurred before the decision was passed by the ICM, the new term is included in this report for consistency and clarity.
[6] ORG 52 002 2011, Pages 5-7.
[7] ORG 10 026 2011
[8] ORG 20 055 2013

Regarding the Core Standards, the 2011 ICM requested the International Board bring a package of measures to the 2013 ICM for approval. The International Board is satisfied with the wide-ranging consultations on the Core Standards and emphasised the importance of striving for a higher level of mutual accountability through this key tool of improving the governance functions across the movement. ICM delegates were reminded that a huge amount of time has been invested in governance reviews, reports and reform in the last two years yet trust remains the key issue for Amnesty International. The International Board would like to see a cultural transformation where independent reviews are not the default position of the movement and we move towards trusting our leadership and empowering them to take decisions, even the tough ones. ICM delegates were also reminded that the various governance reports and reviews which have occurred since 2011 are a golden opportunity to implement the changes at a section and structure level. Pietro asked delegates if this is happening.

In conclusion on the governance topic, the International Board was pleased to see resolutions from sections on proposing improvements to Amnesty International's accountability mechanisms. The belief held amongst the leadership is that accountability shouldn't solely be in the form of internal reports but through impact evaluation and external reporting to donors and beneficiaries and that this should be part of the overall discussion.

Guadalupe Rivas reported on the GTP, with an emphasis on the challenge of both leading and overseeing the movement at a time of great change. Repeated reviews over the last 20 years have highlighted the need for Amnesty International and the IS in particular to improve the integration and coordination of their operations. However, all ICM delegates are aware that there is a widely-held reluctance across the movement to "change". The International Board has reacted to criticism over the lack of communication around the GTP by making this a governance priority since the ICM in 2011. There is however, still an issue of managing the change process at a national level and this ICM should seek to improve the mechanisms that section leaders use to communicate the meeting's decisions, directions and their consequences to their local constituencies.

Regarding section engagement, ICM delegates were given information on the significant number of sections who have responded to GTP-related consultations since the 2011 ICM. One of the learnings from these processes is that despite the level of feedback received, explanations of how this feedback is utilised and communicated back to the movement needed to be improved. The Reference Group report[9] pointed this out and the Board praised the SLT and Global Management Team (GMT) for improvements made in the recent consultation on hubs and sections[10].

Regarding International Board engagement in the recent tensions at the IS, the International Board members do not see the reaction given to these tensions as "Board-only answers" as the entire movement has come together (sections, structures, IS staff, the SG, SLT, GMT and in turn the Reference Group) to publish a collective vision of a way forward out of the difficulties faced in recent times. ICM delegates should be proud of the way the movement reacted to these problems with the collective vision that is now driving the movement forward.

Bernard Sintobin, reported on the status of the movement's finances, also considering the resources and the systems Amnesty International needs to accomplish its mission. ICM delegates were informed of improvements in the process around the statutory accounts; they are now approved through a standard time schedule (the previous calendar year is approved in June of the following year). The accounts are now published on our website but the International Board have asked the SG to develop a tool to explain these documents to non-experts. There is now an efficient and balanced relationship with the external auditor which provides for independent scrutiny of our key processes and risks. The Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) and the auditors have acknowledged the major improvements within the Finance Department at the IS, resulting in an audit cost that is 40% below its 2009 peak.

---

[9] ORG 30 002 2013
[10] ORG 30 005 2013

The International Board now annually approves the high-level IS budget and monitors the quarterly forecasting now carried out across the IS. Despite the progress made, there is still a long way to go to develop a budget culture at the IS, especially at middle management level, through improved training systems.

The International Treasurer then explained progress on the implementation of Decision 18, One Financial Amnesty from the 2011 ICM[11]. The Common Accounting Framework (CoCoA) now covers 95% of the movement's income. This framework has led to the Global Management Accounts which has allowed a consolidation of our income and our allocation of global funds to our strategic priorities. The Global Reserves Guidelines have been issued to the movement to ensure we identify areas of risk but also identify room for investment. And in terms of training and capacity-building, the IS has worked hard to develop a Global Finance Community of finance managers with regional skillshares in order to jointly develop improved systems and policies.

Prioritisation of projects aimed at maximising our human rights impact and distribution of our global resources have been key issues for Amnesty International. ICM delegates were reminded of two critical organisational tools which have been implemented to assist: the Critical Pathways (CP) and the RAM. More work is required on allocation of expenditure to CPs, finalising RAM flows on fundraising loans and Centres of Expertise and communicating how these will work to all Amnesty International entities. However, these are new tools which will greatly help the movement's strategic planning and financial reporting.

Regarding income, ICM delegates were informed that the movement's income growth is broadly on track with forecasts but partly due to favourable Euro exchange rates. Issues at certain sections, for example AI USA are reasons for concern but many sections and structures continue to perform well. The movement is also broadly on track to reach our target of 34% of global income redistributed to the Global South by 2016. The economic crisis which has occurred in recent years has caused some sections serious fundraising issues which mean that the movement's work in this area should be increasingly selective and coordinated to target untapped potential markets.

Concluding with the growth strategy and fundraising, the International Treasurer highlighted successes through the Big 5 project particularly in AI France. Growth opportunities in the global South should also be investigated, building on the early successes of AI India and AI Brazil. Face-to-face fundraising remains Amnesty International's key technique but there must be more investment in major donors, foundations and legacies. The International Board supports the SG's new initiative of a Global Council to approach high net worth individuals. Despite concerns, watching reserve levels, monitoring budget processes and working together to adjust financial systems and mechanisms, will prepare the movement to meet any challenges in the future.

At the end of the report, Sections and Structures posed questions to the International Board.

AI France: There have been many consultations on a range of issues, but the rate of participation is still quite low. Have you thought about why it's so low and how you would change this to increase participation?

International Board: Pietro Antonioli responded on behalf of the International Board. The section engagement numbers on GTP-related consultations in the last two years have been good, as any response from over 30 section and structures is higher than normal. On a broader point, although consultation and communication are good things, the movement often has the anxiety that we have to consult everyone about everything. The net result is that key people who should contribute miss the key consultations. We have made progress on some issues moving towards narrower consultations e.g. the finance community. Instead of calling for more consultations, we should call for more selective and tailored consultations.

---

[11] ORG 52 002 2011, Pages 25-32

AI Turkey: The movement's strategy needs revision for a fast changing world. We receive criticism in political circles for being behind on emerging issues such as crisis response in the MENA region. We require regional and global strategies which are regularly updated.

International Board: Pietro Antonioli responded that we feel the challenge of the fast changing world around us and as a consequence, we put forward a resolution on strategic goals to this ICM. Regarding the tension between regional and global strategies, we are One Amnesty and we need to keep in mind that we may have regional strategies but we need a global framework.

AI Israel: Regarding RAM, one year after its implementation, the International Board will undertake an interim evaluation. Will this report be part of the Board's presentation, and what are the key findings?

International Board: Bernard Sintobin responded on behalf of the International Board. We are satisfied with the implementation of the RAM but progress has been slower than hoped. At this stage, we feel it would be premature to evaluate something that we are still developing. When it's in full gear, we could undertake an evaluation, but that would be at the 2014 Chairs Assembly.

In a separate session, the International Board answered questions from sections and structures which were sent to ICM@amnesty.org prior to the ICM. Questions and answers can be found on the ICM wiki at: https://intranet.amnesty.org/wiki/display/GHPP/ICM+2013.

GLOBAL TRANSITION PROGRAMME REPORT

Pietro Antonioli introduced the session by explaining to ICM delegates "what we said we would do" on the GTP and what has been achieved so far. As reference points, delegates were directed to the Roadmap[12] to view the planned phasing of the GTP and the International Board wiki to view specific progress indicators against the Roadmap. The recommendations from the Reference Group were taken very seriously by the International Board and there has been progress against 74% of the indicators contained in the Delivery Plan[13]. Following a suggestion from AI Canada, the international budget now has separate coding to document GTP expenditure which is now included in the quarterly management accounts circulated to all treasurers.

Salil Shetty spoke about lessons learned so far during the GTP firstly by covering staff-related issues. Staff are our biggest asset and we should have done better with staff at all levels. The reorganisation of the composition of the SLT took longer than it should have, but once in place the unity, clarity and collective action worked very well. The next level was the management at the IS and the key learning from the GTP is that time should have been invested much earlier to ensure the necessary buy-in and support. Once this was carried out systematically, it worked very well. Regarding other IS staff, the SLT have reflected on how their actions of consultation and discussion could have been improved to restore the faith and trust of staff. The staff who have been with Amnesty the longest felt they had not been valued or respected in the consultations. This will be improved in future waves of the GTP.

Regarding systems, processes and internal infrastructure, It is clear that the systems, processes and internal infrastructure at the IS were not ready to handle a project as large as the GTP. The Accenture process was problematic because of the lack of oversight and leadership given to them by the SLT at the start of the project. On ODHR (Organisational Development and Human Resources), we knew that there were major issues in the areas of IT and Finance and more effort should have been put in to improve them before the GTP started. ODHR has come a very long way in a short time but further improvements are needed, the Pathfinder evaluations clearly show that our IT systems need further improvement and most of our finances are now in order: we have clear expenditure reporting and management accounting has improved. However, we are still not where we need to be in these areas.

---

[12] ORG 30 001 2013
[13] ORG 30 006 2013

The final area of learning identified by Salil was engagement with sections and structures and their members. The SLT focused primarily on the IS when launching the GTP and left it too late to bring the Amnesty International membership along the journey. This is a key learning for Salil and the SLT. The "Northern" sections felt their contribution to, and role in the movement had not been sufficiently recognised and considered and on reflection, this should have been planned better.

Nokuthula Magudulela, Director of AI South Africa, explained to ICM delegates the experiences she and her colleagues have had of the Johannesburg Pathfinder project and how these experiences can benefit the regional hubs to be launched in 2013. The importance of staff communication and teamwork was highlighted; topics such as boundaries and expectations, roles and responsibilities, accountability and support were openly discussed. Campaign successes in South Africa were also shared: including the justice for Noxolo Nogwaza campaign, the launch of the My Body, My Rights campaign, activism workshops and the regional report launch. Delegates were shown images and video from the new AI South Africa office and staff joining the new hubs in Nairobi, Hong Kong and Dakar were encouraged to be bold as they are going to be successes!!

Richard Eastmond, Senior Director of ODHR at the IS, outlined next steps on the GTP firstly focussing on events in London. The 2013 IS staff consultation was explained to ICM delegates which included an exhaustive process of answering over 1,000 questions from sections, union members, staff and management. Regarding the 100 IS Staff who are directly affected, 45 have been re-deployed to hubs and the others will be leaving the IS by the end of 2013. Staff in Kampala are also affected and the phased closure will be concluded in February 2014. In terms of learnings, the IS has established 11 working groups covering impact, quality assurance, project management, induction and training, reporting, communication and engagement, content and information management, digital security, risk management and quality control.

Addressing questions from ICM delegations on IS participation, Richard referenced a letter from the Unite union to the ICM which has been shared with delegates. The SLT consider that the topics contained in the letter are addressed by the progress against the 43 recommendations in the Reference Group report and particularly the comprehensive consultation process intertwined with systematic activities with the IS management team.

Next steps are recruiting further staff for the operational Hong Kong and South Africa hubs and preparing the Nairobi office for launch by the end of 2013. Planning is now starting on Wave 2 with likely hub locations in Mexico City, Bangkok, Delhi or Kathmandu. A similar consultation process with IS staff, sections and structures is planned for Wave 2 with the addition of Regional Advisory Groups to advise on the process.

At the end of the report, Sections and Structures posed questions on the GTP to the SG and the International Board. Questions and answers sent prior to the meeting to ICM@amnesty.org can be found in full on the ICM wiki: https://intranet.amnesty.org/wiki/display/GHPP/ICM+2013. Questions were also posed from the floor in plenary.

AI Canada, English-speaking asked a question on the participation of IS Staff at the ICM and other international meetings.

Pietro Antonioli responded on behalf of the International Board. The consultation with IS Staff on the Reference Group delivery plan was reiterated and the International Board, the SG all agreed that it is not appropriate for IS Staff to share their views at governance meetings as they are represented by the SG. Governance meetings are opportunities for members to air their views on the direction of the IS and the wider movement so unless staff are part of section delegations or appointed by the SG to attend, it is not the correct forum for IS staff to express their views.

AI Spain asked questions on the future of research within the GTP and the leadership of the International Board during recent difficult times.

Pietro Antonioli responded on behalf of the International Board. There is an interim GTP review at

the end of 2014 and then a full review at the end of 2016. These reviews will assess the research operations of the hubs in connection with the GTP framework including Regional Advisory Groups and the relationship between hubs and sections. This review will be shared in full with the movement. Regarding the leadership of the International Board, the increased response and communication following the publication of the Reference Group report showed that the International Board showed clear leadership and oversight of the GTP processes at the IS and elsewhere. The International Board has clear lessons to learn and the opportunity to discuss these further was offered to the section and others.

AI Canada, English-speaking and AI Spain requested an evaluation of the impact of the African hubs.

Nicola Duckworth responded on behalf of the SG. This would not be appropriate as the African hubs are not yet operational. For the 30 or so African projects planned and budgeted for 2013, around 80% are on track. 13 published reports on the region include priority countries and 22 African missions have taken place. There is ring-fenced capacity for reactive work such as on the Marikana mine shootings in South Africa and the crisis in Mali. However, there have been serious delays in work on the DRC and Central African Republic.

AI Taiwan asked about the transitional impact of the Hong Kong hub.

Nicola Duckworth responded by stating that the delivery of projects planned for 2013 has not been negatively impacted but there are recruitment challenges. No research staff currently based in London are moving to Hong Kong so there are plans to extend contracts to ensure thorough handovers to mitigate risks.

AI Canada, English-speaking asked for an answer to their opinion that the challenges and opportunities for research had not been tested in the Pathfinder projects.

Nicola Duckworth explained that the focus of the Pathfinders was to test new roles but the research function and how it integrates was tested. Some learnings matched previous knowledge gleaned from IS operations in Moscow and Kampala in that being closer to the human rights violations means that demands for reactive work often outweigh proactive work. However, being closer to the ground means sustained contact with victims and greater impact on advocacy targets. All of these issues are captured in the GTP risk register evaluated at SLT and International Board level.

AI Netherlands asked how Moving closer to the Ground will impact research and quality control.

Nicola Duckworth explained that enhancing Amnesty International's research quality is a major reason for the GTP, the Human Rights component paper goes into more detail[14]. Strong quality assurance mechanisms are in place to mitigate risks and the role of continental research officers and advisors will bring more consistency in this area across all time zones.

Thomas Schultz-Jagow, Senior Director for Campaigns and Communications, continued with the campaigning aspects of the question. This is an exciting opportunity and there has already been engagement with sections through regional strategies and global campaign development. Having research expertise closer to the sections will bring increased support.

AI Netherlands asked does the International Board believe the pace of this process is appropriate given the risks?

Pietro Antonioli responded on behalf of the International Board that the required procedures to implement the GTP as planned are ready and available. Budget constraints require regular review but

---

[14] ORG 30 015 2013

the SG has been tasked by the International Board to implement the GTP as originally planned. The phased or Wave approach includes a risk register which is reported to the Board through the GTP dashboard.

AI Sweden suggested the development of a best practise toolkit to communicate the GTP changes to Amnesty International members. Pietro explained that the GTP Oversight Taskforce is strongly focussed on delivering these materials to sections for internal and external audiences.

AI Japan asked what the hubs would be called.

Salil Shetty responded that outside Amnesty International, hubs would be called regional offices.

AI UK explained that although their members are passionate about the GTP, they urgently need to see the human rights impact of the changes to offset fears about cuts at their section to staff, specifically campaigning capacity.

Nicola Duckworth responded by reiterating the existing materials, the Roadmap and Human Rights component documents which show the planned impact of the GTP.

Salil Shetty added that success stories would help with the demonstration of the impact of the GTP. The section should speak to Thomas Schultz-Jagow and his team about examples from Brazil, India and elsewhere to show the positive impact of the GTP.

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE (INC)

Stuart Webb, Chair of the INC, discussed the findings of the Committee on candidates for internationally elected positions. He thanked members of the SLT and the International Board for their honest assessments of the current strengths and weaknesses of the International Board as individuals and as a group. The clear strengths of the current International Board are strong governance, financial and legal capabilities and human rights expertise. The weaknesses of the current International Board include gender mainstreaming, fundraising and human resources/organisational skills. The INC recommended that when ICM delegates speak to prospective International Board candidates they broach the subject of these weaknesses. Though the movement agreed at the Chairs Assembly / Directors Forum in February 2013 to allow them to do so, the INC would not be recommending specific candidates but have made an assessment of the core competencies in the matrix completed by all International Board candidates to date.

The second major task of the INC was to find as wide and diverse field of candidates for the International Board as possible. The candidates to date include two current Board members and three members of other Governance Committees. The INC had approached sections and structures to encourage the nomination of candidates but this was unsuccessful, partly because the INC does not have the required detailed knowledge of the movement. In the future, the INC would look for other candidates outside the movement, seeking guidance from headhunting agencies.

Sections and Structures then posed questions to the INC.

AI Switzerland expressed their disappointment at the lack of International Board candidates.

AI Austria thanked the INC for their honest assessment and asked what steps would be taken to improve the situation.

AI Canada, English-speaking asked for more information on why people were not running for the International Board and what lessons could be learned.

Stuart Webb responded that the INC recognises the situation is not ideal and that further work would be conducted on the skills matrix and searching for candidates outside of the movement. Sections

and structures were strongly encouraged to put forward candidates for the International Board at future ICM's. Being an International Board member is a significant time commitment which requires personal sacrifices and this could be a reason for the lack of candidates.

SECTION AND STRUCTURE ACCOUNTABILITY SESSION

This session, facilitated by **Janet MacLean**, ICM Chair and **Laurent Deutsch**, ICM Alternate Chair began with "questions from a hat" where sections and structures were asked questions which had been sent to the movement prior to the ICM[15].

Bernard Sintobin asked AI Belgium, Flemish-speaking: How is your section bringing members through the transition?

AI Belgium, Flemish-speaking responded that they take every opportunity to have internal communication with members. They try to communicate the good news stories, as well as recognising the problems.

Julio Torales asked AI Argentina: What are some best practises that your section has implemented to encourage diversity and gender equity in your elected positions and on your staff?

AI Argentina responded that the section works to non-discrimination principles and although the membership and staff is dominated by women, they have tried to improve gender balance. These principles include accounting for childcare needs and no board meetings at weekends or unsociable hours. There is still progress to be made, improving disabled access to their office for example.

Rune Arctander asked AI Sierra Leone: What impact has your section achieved for human rights? How has your section engaged the global human rights priorities and what has been the local outcome of this work?

AI Sierra Leone responded that the section is the leading human rights organisation in the country and the government has identified the section as a representative to the constitutional review process. They also provide significant capacity-building for other human rights and civil society organisations. Their campaign on maternal mortality led to a government initiative granting free access to maternal health facilities. The government has agreed a moratorium on the death penalty through the section's campaigning and the section has built up their membership and overall constituency through their Human Rights Education (HRE) work.

Bernard Sintobin asked AI Taiwan: How is your section building the movement to increase human rights impact? Have you made any changes in structure, planning and evaluation processes, investment and resourcing?

AI Taiwan responded that the section is diversifying their Board structure to gain more insight from different generations. The section's office, statute and communication methods with members have all been modernised.

Julio Torales asked AI New Zealand: How is your section working to improve their governance and accountability?

AI New Zealand responded that this has been a key area of focus in the last 2 years. Recruitment methods of Board members have been improved with skills gaps identified and job descriptions

---

[15] ORG 50 017 2013

created accordingly which are advertised inside and outside the movement. All Board members have to share Amnesty International's values and positions and these are checked at interview and through reference checks. This has led to a good gender and diversity balance on the section's Board. Board group reviews are conducted looking at KPIs and overall accountability. The Chair of the Board has weekly catch-ups with the section Director and monthly catch-ups are held with the Vice-Chair and treasurer. The outcomes of these meetings are shared with the Board and questions are invited from the membership.

Laurent Deutsch then introduced a panel of three Amnesty International entities covering the growth processes and human rights impact strategies that have been employed across the movement.

Julio César Bermúdez, Chair of AI Venezuela, outlined the progress the section has made and the challenges they have faced on growth and impact in recent years. The monitoring of the local political and economic situation has made growth difficult to predict, for example the Venezuelan economy has recently suffered 40% inflation and a 300% devaluing of their currency. Urgent assessment of the situation is required and the section is committed to improving channels of internal communication and continuing to grow their activism work by working hand in hand with their membership base. Human resources is a key focus for the section as they need to build their leadership and train new spokespersons to come forward to increase the healthy working environment currently present.

Ananth Guruswamy, Director of AI India, explained the strategy of building up Amnesty International's presence in the country. Learnings from previous movement presence in India were that the work needs to be both deeply rooted in civil society but also financially sustainable. An integrated operating model was key to this: all staff were trained that all functions (research, campaigning, fundraising etc.) were part of the same effort to build awareness of Amnesty International's work in India. The work was focused on urgent national and local issues but also a long-term educational programme aiming at cultural change on human rights issues. Partnerships with other organisations were leveraged for their access to networks in India in exchange for technical support from the new office.

On the membership and campaigning side of AI India's work, mobile phones are the preferred way of contacting people, there are 600 million mobile phones in India and this is often a good way of bypassing any literacy issues. The office is investing a lot of effort in contacting an estimated 2.5 million activists through their network. AI India have around 20,000 activists taking regular actions and around 4,000 paying members. As they have exceeded their expectations of activist and member generation, the office's membership services systems need improvement.

Antonio Marchesi, Chair of AI Italy, described the long-standing tradition that Amnesty International has in Italy. In 2011, the section signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with AI Spain which covered structural change, a human rights impact focus on local relevance, and membership growth. On structural change, the section has achieved governance changes at their recent AGM reducing the number of governance bodies to one from at least three. AI Spain have recommended further changes on budgeting and other procedures following a management audit which AI Italy is now implementing.

On human rights impact, a ten point agenda was launched by the section to coincide with the last round of Italian national elections, 5 out of 7 party leaders and 120 Members of Parliament have formally accepted and signed up to this agenda leading to draft parliamentary bills and legislation passed on violence against women. Regarding economic and membership growth, the section's AGM agreed to the use of external fundraising agencies which is a positive step. Antonio reported that the section has released all the reserves they can to try and meet the growth targets they have been given and that they now require further financial support and resources from the movement to move forward with the strategy.

Laurent Deutsch summarised the growth panel for ICM delegates by saying that: "growth is something that happens through action." It is the role of the movement's leaders to push their

membership in the right direction even if resistance is faced. Our strategies must be adapted to get close to the local population; we must be a movement that is close to people, that is how we will be able to grow. We are also One Amnesty, a movement of international solidarity which supports those in difficulty.

Janet MacLean introduced a panel of three Amnesty International sections covering the GTP and the successes and challenges they had faced in their own countries and regions.

Lulu Barrera, Chair of AI Mexico, explained to ICM delegates the challenges their section had faced when communicating the changes in the GTP process to their membership who have asked the section leaders for improved communication. Successes include creating a Working Group of 20 or so members who have been Chairs or on Committees to carry out consultations. The response to this new process was positive. On the bigger issues such as the Reference Group report and the Roadmap, the wider membership was consulted but with targeted questions such as: Did the review of the Pathfinder projects contain enough information? Did the membership approve of the KPIs and do you share the concerns highlighted by the Reference Group? Are their proposals sufficient to overcome the challenges? The members' responses were helpful and helped the section's overall strategy on the GTP.

On the regional front, there have been regular meetings on the GTP with Latin American, US and Canadian sections as well. Regional strategies have been developed to identify major human rights priorities in our region. The regional sections do have disagreements but the level of communication has increased in recent times and the need for regional organisation mechanisms has been highlighted by all as key learnings from the GTP.

Stephen Tsui, Director of AI Hong Kong, emphasised the positive view of the GTP within his section. The presence of the Pathfinder office in Hong Kong has led to a MoU being signed with their section which clarified the roles of the two offices. There was a spirit of mutual trust and more widely a sense of regional solidarity. Through the GTP process, there is a more regular exchange of information and meetings between sections and structures. He emphasized the need to clarify the decision-making process further regarding hubs and sections and how the hubs will be governed. Regarding the membership, it is sometimes difficult to engage members on governance and structural issues but we do need to do this with the GTP to ensure that all members are aware of the changes, what they mean and why they are positive.

Laurette von Mandach, Chair of AI Switzerland, began by saying her section has waited, impatiently, a long time for the reforms in the GTP. The section has been critical and questioning of the movement's leadership but they support the overall process and hope the criticism has been taken constructively. The section has engaged with their membership on the GTP by adapting their current strategy to cover growth and One Financial Amnesty. This new strategy was submitted to the AGM as a resolution explaining that the new assessment system is aimed at increasing human rights impact. The resolution was passed on the condition that no redundancies were implemented at the section. Other forms of engagement used by the section included a role play around the relationship between the sections and the hubs which successfully gathered good feedback. This can offset the at times dry GTP materials. On overall movement communications, Laurette called for a simplification of International Board communication, using fewer acronyms when communicating with members. The challenge of members receiving information from IS Staff that the section leadership does not receive was also highlighted. The section agrees with the overall strategy of not responding to anonymous letters but will continue to ask tough questions to help to drive the GTP forward.

Janet MacLean summarised the GTP panel by saying sections and structures are using increasingly positive tones and attitudes to bring their members with them on the GTP journey. Also, feedback from sections shows that the GTP materials are not yet fully effective tools for membership engagement.

PART 3: WORKSHOP SUMMARIES

PREPCOM'S VISION FOR THE 2013 ICM: WORKSHOPS

The ICM Preparatory Committee's vision for the 2013 ICM contained the following question: "In light of our human rights priorities and given what we anticipate needing to confront during the next few years, what would you like to see us discuss?" Following a wide range of responses to this question from sections, structures, the IS and the International Board, 11 topics for workshop sessions were chosen which were woven into the overall ICM agenda. Below are the summaries from these sessions.

ONE FINANCIAL AMNESTY

This session was facilitated by Bernard Sintobin, International Treasurer and George Macfarlane, Senior Director for Organisational Services at the IS.

Bernard Sintobin provided a recap of Decision 18 from the 2011 ICM on One Financial Amnesty. which committed the movement to aim for 35% growth in nominal terms (including inflation) by 2015 and delayed the 40% global spend target to 2021 with the shortfall being made up by Additional Voluntary Contributions (AVC's) from sections. The new assessment bands implemented have reduced the number of sections paying assessments from 50 to 28. Other developments have been the phasing out of fundraising deductions from assessment calculations as well as modelling and sensitivity analyses performed on budgetary forecasts from the IS.

George Macfarlane described progress and challenges on the movement's finances since the 2011 ICM. The income growth targets have not been achieved, current movement currency growth is 20.4% against a pre-2011 target of 26% currency growth. Many sections who have either reduced or increased their growth projections have reported fundraising success or challenges as the reason for the change in projection. The transitional arrangements for the new assessment system agreed in 2011 have caused issues and specific agreements have been agreed with three sections to allow increased transition time: AI Ireland, AI UK and AI USA.

Progress was reported on impact reporting through the new Strategy and Evaluation Unit at the IS; an increase in grants income for 2014 (£7 million up from £6.5 million in 2013) and fundraising potential in new forms of Amnesty International presence (for example India). Stakeholder involvement has significantly improved through initiatives such as the RAM sub-group of the GMT and data sharing on free reserves from sections to the IS. It is clear that excess reserves are in short supply across the movement.

An interim analysis of the implementation of Decision 18 shows that there are affordability concerns for 2017 and the following years. This would challenge the current assumption that increased assessment contributions would be met by income growth. Sections are therefore challenged to find alternative sources of income. It was confirmed that there are no planned changes to the assessment system but the IS International Finance team are on hand to support and assist with any issues, concerns or suggestions from the movement finance community.

Workshop attendees were then separated into groups and asked to answer three questions:

1. What are the fundraising approaches in your section to achieve sustainable growth?
2. Are cost-saving or efficiency strategies being considered?
3. What are the key issues in the assessment system? (especially with affordability)

Key issues and recommendations gathered from the group exercise were as follows:

Fundraising

- Recommend that the IS develop an international fundraising strategy in relation to sections that are high priority and with the highest potential return.

- Recommend international investment in new forms of fundraising that may replace, in the medium-term, face-to-face and other traditional channels that are in decline.

- Recommend reconstituting the Fundraising Investment Fund to give sections access to investment in fundraising.

- Recommend consideration be given to a broader specialist investment team, consistent with competitors.

- Notes that traditional and larger sections are becoming increasingly risk averse, which poses a risk relating to high income growth.

Assessment

- Recommend review of the assessment system given concerns regarding the sustainability of the current system when assessment growth exceeds section income growth, and the lack of confidence that the system instils in sections regarding financial sustainability.

- Recommend that the One Financial Amnesty system be modified immediately to allow for a reduction in costs given its impact on the sustainability of the assessment, as well as discouraging investment in fundraising.

- Note that the payment of assessment may constrain investment in fundraising and/or Information Technology which would drive income growth; with the full impact in reduced investment to be felt in subsequent years.

- Sections have reduced their fixed cost base and there is limited scope to make further reductions in fixed costs.

GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

This session was facilitated by **Nicole Bieske,** International Board member and she encouraged an interactive session where movement leaders were encouraged to share their experiences of successes and challenges in the governance field.

Tygve Nordby, Chair of AI Norway, shared his experiences of governance from inside and outside the Amnesty International movement. Governance in the NGO world is full of dilemmas, it is both practical and theoretical, its search for structure often leaves organisations open to internal manipulation and a narrow pool of governance leaders can lead to sectarianism within some NGO's. Governance can also lead to great successes, if fresh thoughts are favoured over continuity, if the ability and willingness to change are present, the make up and background of an organisation's governors is sufficiently diverse and if organisations have frameworks allowing for evaluation and transparency, then governance can be a huge driver of an organisation's success.

Stephen Tsui, Chair of AI Hong Kong, shared his experiences of governance outside of Amnesty International. Staff at his organisation (also an NGO) created procedures and guidelines for their day-to-day work which have been developed over a long period of time and were a source of internal pride. A recently appointed Director General who came from a government background and introduced further guidelines which although supported by the Board, did not involve the staff. Many staff members resigned. Stephen pointed out that governance is not just a set of guidelines but a culture which has to be shared by everyone at an organisation in order for it to be truly integrated.

Jimena Cuadrado, Chair of AI Argentina, described challenges her section had faced recruiting a permanent Board of governors. They sought advice from the IS and International Board on how to implement this. The IS provided help with recruitment, selection and induction processes and the International Board assisted with capacity building workshops for new and existing governors at the section. They also consulted with other sections in the region for assistance. The importance of open and honest dialogue between management and the Board on roles and responsibilities was crucial for the section as was taking advantage of the time of change that Amnesty International is currently experiencing: sharing standards and good practises for the ultimate good of the One Amnesty movement.

Vincent Adzahlie-Mensah, Chair of AI Ghana outlined the progress and changes his section has gone through. Starting from a base of a chaotic and confused structure based on regional representation where Board members worked as staff in the section's office, AGM's yielded little in terms of agreement and decision and the section was placed into international administration. A new Board was elected and a recovery strategy was agreed where governance, capacity building, the recruitment of quality staff, financial management and increasing the visibility of the section within Ghana were focused on.

The Board introduced major changes in the section's governance, members were elected on competencies rather than regional balance, numbers were reduced from 13 to 5 and each member was given a specific area of the section's operations to oversee. This has led to structured Board meetings where evaluation, monitoring and self-assessment are commonplace.

Usha Sabanayagam, Chair of AI Malaysia, shared current governance issues within her section. There are issues in finance and conflict management with some Board members acting like activists. The section has not had a Director for a year and the Board is carrying out the financial management of the section in the interim. An inquiry is going to be conducted and there is a long road ahead to get the section out of their current situation.

Ali Yemloul, Chair of AI Algeria, highlighted the unique circumstances his section has faced following the Civil War in his country. The section had no staff for a period of 6 to 7 years during which the Board took operational responsibility. Following a protocol agreed with the IS, a new Director was recruited and a new Board appointed. The remaining problem is that the Board members urgently need training on governance issues in order to advise the management on leadership and other issues.

Sandy Jones, Governance Director at the IS presented an outline of the Governance Work Programme for the next biennium. Two key areas that were highlighted to workshop participants were the axes of accountability where accountability lines are often confused and a reform of the ICM itself. Sandy explained that there are no aspects of the ICM which are off-limits for this review which should cover the meeting's frequency and the current process of proposing and passing resolutions amongst other issues.

Nicole Bieske closed the session by highlighting the importance of the Core Standards, which are proposed to this year's ICM for approval. The governance support now available at the IS along with the phased nature of the Core Standards were emphasised to sections and structures. Delegates were reminded that without effective governance, Amnesty International will not have the human rights impact we want or need.

PLANNING OUR NEXT STRATEGY

This session was facilitated by **Clare Doube**, Director of Strategy and Evaluation at the IS and **Zuzanna Kulinska**, International Board member.

Clare Doube began the session by presenting the current framework of the ISP and other strategies

and plans that Amnesty International has before looking at potential ways to structure our strategies in the future. Although the current ISP will conclude at the end of 2015, it is not too early to consider how we plan for a new strategy. The complexity of the current ISP was highlighted along with the range of documentation contributing to it: CPs, regional strategies, growth strategy, Global Priority Statement and list of priority countries. Workshop participants were asked how many of them had read all of these documents: only 50% had. It is hard for the movement to currently align and integrate if there is confusion as to what sections and structures should align and integrate with. Workshop participants were encouraged to think about how we improve this in the future?

Zuzanna Kulinska outlined the resolution proposed by the International Board to this year's ICM to change the name of the ISP to Strategic Goals. She emphasised that the International Board seek to change the wording and structure but not the approval process which will remain the ICM's prerogative. We should also look at the length of time a strategy covers, is 6 years too long considering emerging events which have occurred since the start of the current ISP?

Workshop participants were asked to discuss what characteristics for Amnesty International do we want to encourage through our strategy and planning?

Following the group discussions, **Clare Doube** mentioned that clarity and balance are key themes. She asked participants how do we ensure these characteristics are contained in the new strategy document? For example, could flexibility come from a rolling plan with prescribed check points for amendments or could the strategy contain fewer documents? Participants were asked to build on earlier feedback and think about how a new strategy could bring out the aforementioned characteristics.

Zuzanna Kulinska closed the session by outlining the next steps which will be to take feedback from this workshop and the progress of the Strategic Goals resolution through the ICM to the next International Board meeting. The process for the development of Amnesty International's next strategy will be shared with the movement through consultation in 2014, with the view to presenting a draft to the 2015 ICM.

GLOBAL TRANSITION PROGRAMME

This session was introduced by **Mwikali Muthiani**, International Board member, who encouraged an interactive session where movement leaders were encouraged to discuss the GTP, focusing on the section perspective of local relevance, international solidarity, strengthening One Amnesty and other GTP-related issues.

Esteban Beltran, Director of AI Spain, gave workshop participants an overview of the local relevance consultation in which 23 sections participated. The consultation aimed to achieve a definition of local relevance as well as principles, KPIs and decision making around the issue and has broadly been successful. Next steps will include the definition of local relevance along with other consultation feedback being discussed by the SLT, the feedback will then be sent to the movement. SLT will then prepare an implementation plan on local relevance linked to OP3 planning.

Nicola Duckworth spoke about the cooperation between sections and the forthcoming regional hubs strengthening local relevance. She reiterated the strong belief that the GTP will mobilise and build the movement's constituency in the global South. Toolkits will be developed for sections to engage with a range of issues such as freedom of expression, without actually undertaking full research projects. Increasing the movement's international solidarity is a key principle of the GTP and this will be ensured through coordinated global campaigns, consistent policy positions and regional planning processes.

Colm O Cuanachain, Senior Director of Movement Building at the IS, described the recent

consultation on the relationship between the sections and the hubs where the IS replied to over 400 specific questions from 32 sections[16]. The Principles and Assumptions contained in the GTP Roadmap were amended following the consultation feedback which is a significant development as the role of sections, regional hubs and the IS were clarified for the first time[17].

Answering questions from AI Mexico, AI France and AI Ghana, Colm explained that the IS wanted to have practical conversations with any section close to a planned hub location on the roles, responsibilities and relationships with hubs. Also, MoU's would be used between offices where required but should not be universal. He clarified that decision-making with entities within the New Forms of Presence (NFOP) umbrella would depend on the relationship with the IS: for example the Egypt Growth Project is heavily structured and integrated whereas Mozaika is more of a partnership.

Mabel Au, Director of AI Hong Kong, summarised the relationship between her section and the expanded IS office in Hong Kong which was one of the Pathfinder projects. Defining roles and responsibilities was initially difficult but after signing a MoU, this has led to improvements between the two offices. From a regional perspective, most Asian sections are pleased with the increase in the speed of responses especially on issues of law, policy and media queries since the IS now has a presence in the region.

GLOBAL CAMPAIGN: STOP GOVERNMENTS TORTURING

This session was facilitated by **Emily Nevins**, Director of Campaigns at the IS and **Sara MacNiece,** Deputy Programme Director, Security and Human Rights at the IS.

Guadalupe Rivas, Vice-Chair of the International Board, reported to participants that an analysis of Amnesty International's global campaigns has revealed that the movement has conducted too much campaigning without assigning clear priorities; meaning the desired result was not always achieved. Our aim should be to get closer to civil society and to create greater impact through fewer campaigns. The IS will take an interdisciplinary approach to campaigns with various departments getting involved.

Emily Nevins described the journey which has led to two global campaigns which allows for Individuals at Risk work and sections and structures conducting their own regional campaigning work. Global campaigns will now be sharper, more focused and more "winnable". An extensive consultation was conducted where 56 sections and structures responded and two clear front runners were identified.

Sara MacNiece gave a detailed account of the Stop Governments Torturing campaign explaining that the topic was chosen as there had been little positive change in government responses to torture over recent years; in certain respects, the situation had deteriorated since governments were committing acts of torture and then denying having committed them. In the past, Amnesty International has carried out excellent campaigns but with no identification of the impact they have had. The key features for this campaign include providing victims of torture with access to a lawyer, their family members and independent examinations. We are seeking these safeguards to ensure that our campaign holds governments accountable. It is also imperative to inspire activists with individual cases as well as enabling sections and structures to carry out local campaigning on the issue.

Aurora Panang, Director of AI Philippines provided several shocking examples of the use of torture in her country, including a victim who was burnt three times, electrocuted and exposed to extreme temperatures until he made a false confession to police. Amnesty International can break this cycle of torture and other sections and structures were encouraged to ensure perpetrators are brought to justice. She concluded that an Asian country has not been a campaign priority for a long time and any

---

[16] ORG 30 017 2013
[17] ORG 30 018 2013

impact in the Philippines would have a knock-on effect on the rest of the South Asian sections.

Lulu Barrera, Chair of AI Mexico, described the legal situation on torture in her country where the government has signed up to various protocols but these have not included legislation to enshrine them in Mexican law. This links in with the problem that Mexican officials consider some forms of torture normal methods of interrogation. Emblematic cases were outlined such as the rape of indigenous women and the unlawful detention of citizens. Workshop participants were reminded that Mexico is a country that responds to international pressure and lobbying.

GLOBAL CAMPAIGN: MY BODY, MY RIGHTS

This session was facilitated by **Noeleen Hartigan**, Programme Director at AI Ireland, **Savio Carvalho**, Director of the Demand Dignity Campaign at the IS and **Sherif Elsayed-Ali**, Campaign Strategy Development Manager for the My Body, My Rights Campaign at the IS.

Guadalupe Rivas, Vice Chair of the International Board highlighted that this campaign should be closely linked with the International Board's workplan and CP timelines. It will also be important to support the rights of stakeholders in the campaign and that fundraising is integrated with the plans.

Savio Carvalho, ran through some of the feedback from sections and structures that the Demand Dignity campaign was too convoluted. The IS has created a sharper and more focussed campaign, linked to the CPs as a result of this feedback.

Sherif Elsayed-Ali, gave a detailed overview of the My Body, My Rights campaign. The main objective was to promote universal human rights for all, ensuring individuals have the right to choose how they live their lives regardless of their appearance, sexual orientation or the societal norms of the country they live in. The campaign could be controversial because it will focus on decriminalising abortion, same sex relationships and individuals taking control of their own reproductive rights.

Burkina Faso, El Salvador, Ireland, the Maghreb and Nepal have been chosen as the 5 priority areas for the core of the campaign which would be layered with Individuals at Risk cases and HRE components to complete the campaign strategy. In Nepal, the focus would be uterine prolapse, often caused by young girls forced early into marriage and sexual intercourse. The condition is preventable and treatable but poor access to healthcare and discrimination against women in Nepal exacerbates the problem. In El Salvador, the criminalization of abortion would be the focus; in the Maghreb the focus would be inadequate legal protections against rape.

Mariela Belski, Director of AI Argentina spoke about successes in the section's campaign on abortion. The national congress recently discussed the issue but it has since dropped down the political agenda. The section addressed this by working closely with their activists and the National Youth Council which yielded a positive response from the government. Mariela stated that Amnesty International had a role to play linking international with national campaigns.

Yves Traore, Director of AI Burkina Faso, described his section's work on the existing My Body, My Rights campaign in a conservative society where women are often treated as chattels of men. Collaborating with Marie Stopes International, the section campaigned with women's groups empowering them to change things themselves. A march was held delivering an Amnesty International report on women's rights to a senior politician which demonstrated the growing awareness of the issue in the country. On the issue of forced marriage, section activists in the north of the country spoke to school children to explain Amnesty International's message and that they could be the winners from this campaign.

Noeleen Hartigan, explained the importance of Ireland being chosen as a priority country for this campaign. Ireland has the most restrictive abortion laws in Europe and the recent case of an Indian woman who died after being refused an abortion is changing hearts and minds in the country.

Coupled with a ruling from the European Courts that the Irish government must improve access for women to maternal rights services and associated materials, it is an ideal time for the section to build the political will to change the Irish constitution.

Answering a range of questions from participants, the panel reiterated the importance of regional section and structure support for the countries prioritised in the campaign. Amnesty International's focus on control and criminalization was reconfirmed and that the campaigns would have to start slowly and carefully considering the sensitive nature of these issues. The operational plan for the campaign will be forwarded to sections in the next few weeks which will include global objectives for the priority areas and an opportunity for sections and structures to provide feedback on how they would like to approach the abortion issue in their country.

NEW FORMS OF PRESENCE (NFOP)

Julio Torales, International Board member introduced the session which aimed to provide participants with a greater understanding of, and support for NFoP being developed to grow the movement and to share views on how these "presences" should be represented in Amnesty International's governance structures.

Nicole Bieske, International Board member explained the 5 NFoP models currently present in the movement: deferred self-governance, affiliation, strategic partners, international members and virtual sections and introduced representatives from some of these groups and organizations to participants.

Putri Kanesia from KontraS described their relationship with Amnesty International as a strategic partnership. Whilst there is no Amnesty office in Indonesia, there are a large number of human rights NGOs so it makes sense to build on what is already there before starting a new independent Amnesty presence. KontraS' relationship with Amnesty International is time-bound where complementing thematic issues are worked on; this has focused on policing for the last few years. Support from Amnesty International has included training for police on how to protect people in custody.

Kristine Garina from Mozaika explained that they are affiliated to Amnesty International which gives them a lot of credibility in Latvia, they have been able to move from solely working on LGBTI gender identity and sexual orientation issues to a wider human rights remit.

Gemma Cartwright from the Growth Programme at the IS explained that NFoP will be increasingly located in line with priority countries and will contribute to the delivery of the growth strategy, regional strategies and CPs. **Nicole Bieske** added there are also strategic decisions by the movement to move into new countries. **Ananth Guruswamy**, Director of AI India stated that they needed to build a network of activists and supporters to build a base before they could address the challenge of internal democratic structures.

Nicole Bieske informed participants that impact indicators and KPIs are being used to evaluate NFOP as well as the models of interaction because the relationships themselves are new. **Kristine Garina** stated that Mozaika was happy to be a pilot project and conduct constant reviews to change things where necessary. **Souleymane Sow**, International Member shared his experience of working in Guinea with the IS and AI France. The French section has assisted with campaign materials and some financial support and the IS has assisted on HRE projects. The Amnesty International community in Guinea was very proud when the Arms Trade Treaty was signed as it demonstrated the impact of the activists' contribution but also the importance of support from the wider movement. **Kaspars Zalitas** from Mozaika added that in addition to working with the IS, they have collaborated with AI Sweden and AI Denmark on developing their youth group as well as with the European Institutions Office (EIO) on pride marches.

Nicole Bieske concluded the session by stating there will be further consultations with the movement on how to develop the NFoP model further in terms of locations, structures, linkages with

international governance and so on.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LAND

Claire Mallinson, Director of AI Australia, began this session by introducing the panel which consisted of **Rosalia Vega**, Director of AI Paraguay, **Alex Neve**, Secretary General of AI Canada, English-speaking and **Karine Gentelet**, Chair of AI Canada, French-speaking. The session involved discussion of indigenous land rights and the shared and common experiences of Indigenous Peoples; identifying sustainable development challenges and opportunities.

Alex Neve gave participants a history of Amnesty International's work with Indigenous People, a group which represents around 5% of the world's population. Indigenous communities frequently appear amongst the most marginalized and dispossessed in the world. Work on their rights greatly increased since Decision 4 of the 2007 ICM decision to work on the full spectrum of economic, social and cultural human rights[18].

Claire Mallinson presented her section's "Homelands" campaign which is designed to raise awareness of the plight of Aboriginal people in Australia and is based on informed participation by empowering rights-holders. Aboriginals were only given the vote in Australia in 1962, they have a life expectancy 11 years lower than other Australians and they are 28 times more likely to go to jail. The section started working with a group of Aboriginal communities (or mob in local dialect) in a place named Utopia in the Northern Territory where 15 communities across 10,000 square miles share one shop and one medical facility. There is no electricity, running water or rubbish collection. Participants were read a quote from Elsie, an Aborigine in her 80's: "Lady, I pay rent to the government to sleep on a mattress in the desert. I don't have a voice, no one is listening to me or my family. No one hears us, we have no voice and if you don't comply you don't get help".

Four years after beginning their work with people in Utopia, Amnesty International launched a campaign with high level missions made to the region with SG, Salil Shetty. The Australian government responded by acknowledging the rights of indigenous people to live on their lands. The section helped two Utopian residents to travel to the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Peoples and it was clear that Aboriginal rights holders were energised by the movement's support. Further campaign successes included a government commitment to a ten year funding programme worth AUS\$ 250 million for indigenous communities including infrastructure and housing upgrades. Although the campaign took a long time, it has made the section stronger and the great experience of Utopian residents being at Parliament House to hear the extra funding being granted was clear evidence that the campaign had been successful.

Alex Neve and **Karine Gentelet** gave an overview of the joint indigenous peoples project in Canada where issues are very similar to Australia. Beginning with land rights, Alex described the vast mining, forestry and gas projects which have been approved by the Canadian government. These are negatively affecting indigenous peoples due to inadequate consultation with residents and the government's lack of recognition of land rights. The section has heavily campaigned on this issue, releasing several reports and engaging in a number of legal proceedings on behalf of indigenous partners at the Inter-American Human Rights tribunal and the Canadian Supreme Court. There is little public awareness and no political will but the section will keep the campaign going.

Karine described violence against indigenous women in Canada. Both sections have worked with women's organisations to document disappearances, racism, violence and misogyny which are unfortunately prevalent amongst and against indigenous women in Canada. Indigenous children are often taken from their parents and placed in boarding schools huge distances from their communities. Alcoholism, drug addiction and prostitution are common amongst young indigenous

---

[18] ORG 52 001 2007, Page 11

women but the response from the authorities and wider society is inadequate and indifferent. The sections are pursuing solutions such as furthering their work with women's organisations to create programmes tailored to the needs of indigenous women; campaigning on the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples which Canada ratified in 2010 and calling for a national commission of inquiry on the "disappeared".

Rosalie Vega outlined a four-year campaign conducted by the section and the Yakye Axa and Sawhoyamaxa people, two indigenous communities in Paraguay who have been removed from their ancestral homelands. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights ruled in favour of the communities but the Paraguay government did not respond. The section has now made the case emblematic for Amnesty International through a national, regional and international campaign. The communities have been empowered to take part in social forums and stand up for their own rights, young people were targeted in the campaign through visual representations of the discrimination suffered.

The Yakye Axa people accepted alternative lands offered by the state but they have been unable to move because there is no road access. The Sawhoyamaxa people have been offered a small proportion of their original land at an exorbitant price but the new government in Paraguay is planning an expropriation law to obtain the lands and give them back to the indigenous people. There have been clear successes in Paraguay but more work is needed.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION

This session was facilitated by the Conflict Management Assistance Group (CMAG) comprising **Ginny Morrison, Roger Clark** (CMAG Chair), **Charlotte Renard, Sabine Gieger and Qaqamba Vellem.** The session aimed to assist the movement to prevent and resolve conflict through sharing skills and practises.

Workshop participants were given a range of tips to prevent conflict, including: controlling your reactions, being open to other people's views, limiting your assumptions, not labelling people with whom we have a history, being committed to fixing any problem, talking to the person we have an issue with and recognising that the impact of actions may not always be intentional.

Ginny Morrison went into more detail on two specific tactics associated with conflict resolution, firstly "Listen first, explain later". This tactic involves adapting your reactions in a conflict situation to show that you are listening to the other person's point of view before making assumptions on whether they are correct or not. Once good faith has been demonstrated through listening, the root causes of anger or confusion can be located and common ground can then be sought. The second tactic is "Speak for yourself" and is a fairly simple idea: explaining how someone's actions affected you personally can often be a very effective way of defusing conflict and holding colleagues accountable at the same time.

The remainder of the session involved participants discussing case studies on situations of conflict and then deciding how best to utilise the skills and practises provided by CMAG. All participants and their colleagues across the movement were encouraged to contact CMAG@amnesty.org for any future advice on conflict resolution.

GROWTH

This session discussed progress on the growth strategy along with key success stories and how the movement can overcome growth challenges. It was facilitated by **Anil Pant**, Director of the International Mobilisation Programme (IMP) at the IS.

Pietro Antonioli, Chair of the International Board briefly ran through the history of the growth strategy. Decision 14 of the 2009 ICM approved the concept[19] and a final strategy was approved by the International Board in December 2010[20].

Claire Mallinson, Director of AI Australia, explained the growth strategy in her section. Through effective campaigning on indigenous peoples and other issues coupled with a more aggressive fundraising strategy, the section has moved from a position of flat growth in the 1990s to 2013 where they will have achieved 550% income growth since 2000. She advocated a strong and continuing fundraising strategy for the whole movement as with more income growth, the movement can do more things.

Marcos Gomez, Director of AI Venezuela, described the challenges of achieving growth in a country going through economic and political upheaval. For example, activists cannot safely wear yellow Amnesty International T-Shirts as the colour is identified with a particular political party. Young people are often made into political targets and therefore participation in NGO's is quite low in the country. Despite all of the challenges his section faces, they are still delivering growth of 30% per year.

Anil Pant outlined progress and challenges to date in delivering the growth strategy and although there have been problems, many sections have seen strong growth in the number of paid members and activists with some funded sections having developed plans to be self-sufficient by 2018.

GLOBAL BRAND POSITIONING

This session was facilitated by **Markus Beeko,** Director of Campaigns and Communications at AI Germany and **Sara Wilbourne**, Director of Strategic Communications at the IS and served to present the new Amnesty International Global Brand Manifesto to ICM delegates as well as sharing lessons learnt and insights gathered during the process and to discuss next steps.

Markus Beeko explained the journey towards a truly global identity for Amnesty International. It started with Decision 36 of the 2001 ICM which called for the management of the Amnesty International brand at a global level[21]. The candle in barbed wire logo combined with use of the colour yellow was first presented at the 2007 ICM and by the following year, 45 sections and the IS had begun using this visual brand identity. This was followed by global discussion on the movement's key values which led to the "Little Yellow Book" being launched at the 2011 ICM. In the last two years, this has been built on further with the movement commissioning the global communications network Ogilvy, who were tasked with helping the movement express its shared beliefs and vision in a simple manner. The outcome is the Manifesto which contains the statement: "By inspiring people to take injustice personally, and by mobilizing the humanity in everyone, together we bring the world closer to human rights enjoyed universally".

Sara Wilbourne explained some of the learnings and insights gathered through the development process of the Global Brand Manifesto and she outlined planned next steps. The charity marketing sector is very crowded and it is crucial for Amnesty International to make its communications more efficient both in the South to reach new audiences and the North to broaden the movement's appeal. To help define what is great about Amnesty International, a three-day "Big Ideal Workshop" was held in Berlin with 40 stakeholders from across the movement. This yielded 60 "big ideal statements" which were categorised into three distinct themes describing the movement: the human (Amnesty International takes injustice personally), persistence (Amnesty International never forgets and always takes on difficult causes) and the collective (Amnesty International is a great movement of ordinary people).

---

[19] ORG 52 003 2009, Page 14
[20] ORG 30 001 2011
[21] ORG 52 001 2001, Page 70

The Berlin workshop was followed by focus group research conducted by Globescan, the public opinion research consultancy, in a mixture of Amnesty International markets. In the North, the collective ideals were favoured and in the South, the human ideals were more popular. The challenge was to bring all these factors together in a manifesto which told positive stories, celebrated successes and took supporters on a journey to drive the movement forward.

In terms of next steps, the IS working on a range of new materials to back up the new Global Brand Manifesto including a global architecture for campaign messaging, a new version of the Little Yellow Book, a digital brand book and a brand management sharing space. A full roll-out schedule will be available to the movement by the end of 2013.

PART 4: WORKING PARTIES

The Working Party reports were published on the ICM wiki in English, French and Spanish, in September 2013. The original texts of resolutions and final decisions referred to in these reports can be found in full in Circular 13 – Second Batch of Resolutions[22] and Circular 29 – ICM 2013 Decisions.[23]

WORKING PARTY 1 – FINANCE

CHAIR   Dawna Wright

RAPPORTEUR   Angela Gill

SECRETARY   Owen McKinstry

General overview of the Working Group sessions

Introduction
The Chair welcomed the delegates and the Working Party team; outlined the meeting etiquette; referred to conference policies and Standing Orders; and outlined the items for the first session of the Working Party, being the Treasurer and FAC presentations, as well as a brief introduction to the resolutions. The Chair noted the compressed nature of the sessions over the coming days, noted that it was likely a drafting committee would be formed, and reminded delegates of the One Financial Amnesty and RAM workshops.

Consideration of Resolutions
AI Australia and AI Puerto Rico confirmed that Resolutions 1.03 and 1.09 respectively have been withdrawn. The Working Party held an introductory session with respect to the remaining proposed Resolutions in order to gauge preliminary views and the extent of potential amendments. The indicative plan for addressing resolutions in the following sessions was outlined as follows:

- Session 8:
  - 1.01: Finance One Financial Amnesty (OFA)
  - 1.04: Restricted Giving
  - 1.08: Strategic and Sustainable Investments
- Session 9:
  - 1.02: Assessment Calculation
  - 1.05: Evaluation of One Financial Amnesty process and its impact on reserves
  - 1.06: Accountability of International Assessment to Stakeholders
  - 1.07: International Functions carried out by Sections and Structures

---

[22] ORG 50 007 2013
[23] ORG 53 006 2013

Outside the Working Party, a drafting group discussed Resolutions 1.01, 1.04 and 1.08 prior to the final session. The drafting group comprised delegates from AI Sweden, AI Greece, AI USA, AI UK, AI Netherlands, AI Mexico, AI Canada, AI Spain, AI Germany, AI France, AI Denmark, AI Finland, AI Ireland, and AI Mexico, as well as the International Board and the IS. In addition, the International Board and IS presented workshops on OFA and RAM.

Summary Statement
In the final session of the Finance Working Party, delegates discussed a summary message to be presented to the plenary. AI France proposed draft text based on consultation with various sections. In the Working Party, the text was discussed by delegates (including AI Taiwan, AI France, AI Mexico, AI UK and the International Board) and the summary statement was adopted by consensus.

Conclusion
The recommendations of the Finance Working Party set out below:

Resolutions adopted by consensus in the Working Party, and recommended for approval in the plenary:

1.01: Finance
1.04: Restricted Giving
1.06: Accountability of International Assessment to Stakeholders
1.07: International Functions carried out by Sections and Structures

Resolutions withdrawn following amalgamation into Resolution 1.01:
1.03: Exchange Rates
1.05: Evaluation of One Financial Amnesty and its impact on reserves
1.08: Strategic and Sustainable Investments

Resolution voted upon, not recommended to the plenary:
1.02: Assessment Calculation

Resolutions withdrawn at the commencement of the ICM:
1.03: Exchange Rates
1.09: Evaluating the Mechanism for Compensating International Board Members.

The Chair closed the Finance Working Party, acknowledging the efforts of the interpreters, volunteers and Working Party delegates. The International Board acknowledged the efforts of the Working Party Chair for her stewardship of the Working Party Sessions and efforts in the Drafting Committee.

In the plenary, all resolutions that were adopted by the Working Party and recommended for approval (1.01, 1.04, 1.06 and 1.07) were passed by consensus.

Financial Accountability Report

Treasurer's Report: Bernard Sintobin
The International Treasurer, Bernard Sintobin, spoke to a PowerPoint presentation which summarises the Treasurer's Report provided to the movement in Circular 16[24].

The Treasurer outlined the structural difference between the Amnesty International Limited and Amnesty International. The Statutory Accounts have been approved, being compliant with UK law.

During 2012 (year ended 31 December 2012), Amnesty International Limited generated income of £54.9 million and incurred operating expenditure, excluding provisions for campaign and

---

[24] ORG 50 010 2013

communications and pension valuation (£2.2 million), of £54.2 million, with a statutory deficit of £2.6 million. The International Board accepted this result on the proviso that a surplus be generated in 2013. The report was audited by Crowe Clark Whitehill.

Management accounts as at 30 June 2013 were presented, noting that these accounts are a more valuable tool for the Board and management than the statutory accounts. Noted that they are prepared quarterly and had previously been made available via the 'wiki' site.

For the half year ended 30 June 2013, income and expenditure was broadly in line with the budget. However, actual GTP expenditure exceeded the budget primarily due to the treatment of provisioning for the announced redundancies; under UK accounting standards the full provision was incurred in the first quarter, versus the budget which distributed the costs over the year. The reserve balance at 30 June 2013 is relatively low.

During 2013, it is imperative that the planned surplus be achieved. Year to date expenditure exceeds the budget primarily due to union negotiations, redundancy provisioning and higher staff costs. However, the full year expenditure should not significantly exceed the budget. Decisions made under Wave 2 of the GTP will allow for more precise forecasting of expenditure going forward. The 'Common Chart of Accounts' was a big step forward in global accountability; with the aggregation by sections using the Common Accounting Framework, representing 95% of global income.

During 2012, AI generated revenue of €239 million, representing revenue growth of 8.7%; 75% of total revenue came from individual donors. Globally, the Movement spent 44% on human rights activities, 30% on fundraising and 26% on organizational support. Total expenditure increased roughly in line with revenue, increasing by 7.8%. Overall, the Movement's expenditure exceeded funds raised by €4.1 million, however, the global reserves position remained sufficient. The IS is monitoring the level of global reserves and has previously circulated the Global Reserve Guidelines.

Sections and Structure
AI USA is a material topic, important from both an accountability and transparency perspective. The IS and AI USA signed a MoU in February 2013. This MoU addressed: AI USA's assessment level during 2013-15 and noted the contingent liability incurred in prior years of £14 million. There has not been a decision regarding the governance review or trademark agreement. Other assessment dues that are outstanding include: AI Ireland (£1.6 million, the majority of which will be deferred under Decision 18 of the 2011 ICM); AI UK (£0.9 million) and AI Greece (£0.2 million).

As at 30 June 2013, Amnesty International Limited had £2.4 million loans outstanding of which £1 million is deemed to be at risk. AI Switzerland and AI Austria have provided loans to the IS, totalling £1.8 million.

2014 Budget
Reserves guidance is available showing lower and upper bounds of reserves. The International Board noted that the matter of reserves is captured in Resolution 1.01. Whilst Wave 2 is yet to be formally announced, it has been incorporated into the budget.

Income growth remains challenging with the GTP continuing to have a significant impact, as well as the impact of the compromise with the union resulting in the need to carefully prioritise projects and activities given the limited cash available.

The FAC target, proposed in Resolution 1.01, for AVC's for the period 2014-15 is set at €3,500,000. This is based on the high level income budget discussed at the FAC and reflecting discussions with many sections regarding the new assessment system.

Finance and Audit Committee: Greg Marsh
A member of the FAC, Greg Marsh, noted that the FAC comprises five members of which three members are appointed by the International Board and two members are directly elected by the ICM.

The FAC noted that its key tasks include risk monitoring; improving financial policies and compliance; global oversight of the now developed framework; financial control; risk and reserves; oversight of the audit of all Amnesty International entities. The role of the directly elected members also extends to ensuring that the Treasurer discloses all significant matters.

The FAC acknowledged the lack of diversity on the committee and advised it would be addressed going forward. The FAC outlined that, consistent with the Statute approved in 2009, directly elected members of the FAC are required to report to ICM delegates on any matters as they see fit. The FAC noted that it is comfortable that the Treasurer's report provides a fair picture of the financial position of the movement.

The FAC advised that the International Board has made continued progress in improving financial management and accountability. The quality of reporting and risk management over the last six years has improved significantly, though there remains scope for further improvement. Visibility into oversight, financial governance and risk control at the section level has also improved, although again, there is further scope for improvement. The FAC is in the process of reviewing management letters, reserve levels and audit status of sections.

The FAC emphasised the importance of sections providing timely and complete information to the IS. The FAC noted that an International Board Payments Committee had been established to oversee any requirement for compensation of income lost due to International Board commitments. The FAC advised that the International Board Payments Committee had not received any requests from International Board members for compensation payment.

The FAC acknowledged the contributions of the IS staff, notably the IS Finance Team, for their efforts over the last two years.

Resolutions
Prior to the ICM, Circulars 14[25] and 20[26] outlined the International Board's preliminary views on the resolutions, and the estimated budgetary impact of the resolutions, respectively.

Finance (Resolution 1.01 - International Board)
The International Board provided an overview of the resolution. Given that Resolution 1.01 is relatively lengthy, it was decided to deal with it section-by-section.

Financial Reporting - Part A: There were no points of clarification and this part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Financial Reporting - Part B: As a result of discussion, the International Board noted that: the notification is intended as a courtesy notice to assist the International Board in supporting sections with the formal appointment of auditors; sections are not required to wait for a response from the IS; and, while it is not the intention of the resolution, best practice is to rotate auditors.

Section comments included: advice that AI Moldova requests tenders from several auditors; AI Mexico highlighted its concern regarding the lack of clarity on the process; and AI Austria noted its support for the concept. Amendments were proposed by AI France, AI Taiwan and AI USA, all of which were deemed unfriendly amendments by the International Board, and were not adopted by the Working Party. This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Financial Reporting - Part C: Discussion captured the issue of guidelines as opposed to compulsory requirements and the distinction between holding versus utilising the reserves.

Following comments from AI Turkey and AI Mali relating to the difficulties encountered by small

---

[25] ORG 50 008 2013
[26] ORG 50 014 2013

growth sections, the International Board advised that the International Finance Team would endeavour to provide technical support where possible to smaller sections and acknowledged that small sections may not be able to achieve this target within the next 12 months. AI Czech Republic noted that risk assessments are prepared in a highly variable manner, and sought support from the International Board in ensuring consistency. This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Assessment – Part A (Local group income): AI France suggested that additional information from Circular 14 be included in the resolution to clarify "net" amount. The International Board accepted as a friendly amendment the footnote "net figure between total group income and the total local group expenditure". This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Assessment – Calculation of restricted income: This part of the resolution was discussed in conjunction with Resolution 1.04 (Restricted income). AI Greece queried how donor relation building costs or maintenance costs would be calculated. This part of the resolution was referred to the drafting committee. Following discussions in the drafting committee and in conjunction with the amended Resolution 1.04, the International Board deleted this part of the resolution.

Assessment – Part B (Deductibility of funds granted to another AI entity): This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Assessment – Part C (Currency translation): This part of the resolution was amended by the International Board prior to the ICM and resulted in the withdrawal of Resolution 1.03 by AI Australia. This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Assessment – Part D (Decision making authority): AI France queried how materiality will be determined. The International Board advised that it would define materiality. This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Assessment – Part E (Review of the assessment system): In conjunction with the withdrawal of Resolution 1.05 by AI France, the International Board introduced an amendment inserting this part of the resolution.

AI Germany, AI UK, AI Australia and AI Spain raised queries regarding the matter of timing. The International Board advised that the intention of the Working Group is to build consensus and would seek to implement the consensus view prior to the 2015 ICM.

Following discussions in the drafting committee, the International Board proposed a further amendment to this part of the Resolution, and AI Taiwan submitted a grammatical amendment, which the International Board accepted as friendly. Following a query from AI France, the International Board advised that if there was consensus of the movement, changes may be implemented before the 2015 ICM and following the 2015 ICM, at future ICMs as appropriate. This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Transitional arrangements: This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Investments – Part A: Following a meeting of the drafting committee, in conjunction with the withdrawal of Resolution 1.08, AI Denmark proposed an amendment which was accepted by the International Board as friendly. Following a query from AI Slovenia, the International Board advised that the Fundraising Investment Guidelines have been developed, but not yet finalised for distribution. This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus.

Investments – Part B: This part of the resolution was adopted by the Working Party by consensus without discussion.

Resolution 1.01 was adopted, in its entirety, by the Working Party by consensus, and passed by

consensus in the plenary.

Assessment Calculation (Resolution 1.02 – AI Australia)
AI Australia provided an overview of the resolution.

AI Germany, AI Greece and AI Denmark raised queries and concerns relating to the Resolution. In particular, concerns regarding the additional work required by IS and sections; potential budgeting difficulties; adjustments following the final IS calculation; and the potential for a significant one-off payment capturing payments for assessments already incurred. The IS advised that relevant systems are not yet in place and an adjustment may be required based on the relevant section's audited financial report.

AI New Zealand proposed an amendment extending the timing in the resolution from the preceding quarter to the preceding year, which was accepted by AI Australia as a friendly amendment. AI Israel indicated its support for a one year differential.

The Resolution could not be adopted by the Working Party by consensus so was put to a vote. Nine sections voted in favour, 18 abstained, and 23 voted against, and as such the resolution was not recommended to the plenary.

The Chair encouraged any delegate who abstained from the vote because they did not have sufficient information to approach her.

Exchange Rates (Resolution 1.03 – AI Australia)
AI Australia withdrew the resolution on the basis of amalgamation into 1.01 International Board Resolution on Finance.

Restricted Giving (Resolution 1.04 – AI UK)
AI UK provided an overview of the resolution.

AI Greece requested the resolution be discussed in conjunction with 1.01 Part (b) and commented that several sections have capacity to bring in institutional or major donor income and that the IS should expect something in return. Eystein Myking of the FAC spoke in a personal capacity, querying treatment of income and costs involved and was concerned that wording may incentivise poor practice. Noted that he prefers the International Board's text in 1.01 Part (b). AI Switzerland spoke in favour of the resolution due to the perverse behaviour that may result from differential treatment between restricted and unrestricted funds.

AI Austria noted that the will of the donor must be considered, no "kick back" should be allowed, and that the measurement of income for benchmarking purposes (specifically with respect to income growth targets), should include restricted income. AI Germany commented that they are of the view that the resolution is in contrast to the principles of the new assessment system, being that it be simple, transparent and fair. AI USA supported the resolution on the basis that it supports income growth where if a major donor is identified, the cost to pay the assessment needs to be found from unrestricted funds.

AI Canada suggested a provisional approach that could be tested, modelled and evaluated in 2014 and reconsidered in 2015. AI Mexico requested the Treasurer's view on the impact on restricting liquidity in the international budget. AI Peru noted that many major donors fund global concerns. The International Board opposes the resolution, as while it is in agreement with the goal is disagrees with the approach. The International Board is of the view that restricted giving should not be linked with the assessment system given the unknown impact on section finances and the potential bias in section fundraising strategy.

The IS noted that the financial impact of this resolution has not been determined, having limited experience with the reliability and repeatability of restricted income. The two year lag in payment of the assessment may create a significant liability.

AI Austria sought clarification on funding. AI UK advised that funds would still be directed 100% to the relevant project. The resolution was referred to a drafting committee and further discussions were facilitated.

AI UK stated that as a result of the drafting session and discussions with the International Board and IS, AI UK submitted a substantially redrafted resolution pertaining to a pilot program, which would provide information that can be utilised and reviewed at the 2015 ICM. AI UK noted that the intent behind the resolution allows for the quantum of the funds to be agreed in good faith between the International Board and the relevant section.

AI Austria noted their support, however, being concerned about any impact on unrestricted funds and proposed an amendment to allow for monitoring this impact. AI UK accepted the resolution as a friendly amendment. AI NZ, AI Australia and AI Taiwan commended all parties for their efforts in drafting the resolution and noted their support. AI Switzerland noted its support for the resolution. AI Australia queried if the resolution was (because of the pilot program) in effect giving differential treatment to various sections. The International Board noted that this resolution does result in differential treatment, but that it is not expedited to be a significant issue given it is a relatively short pilot program. The IS noted that a review of the full assessment will run in parallel.

AI Mexico queried the impact of the drafting session on other resolutions. The International Board noted that the International Board would amend Resolution 1.01. AI Spain commended the wide-reaching consensus on the resolution and efforts of the drafting committee and requested clarification from the IS or International Board on the definition of "Foundations". The International Board referred to the relevant policy. AI UK clarified that the resolution is intended to capture charities and not only high net worth individuals.

AI Taiwan proposed an amendment, accepted by AI UK as a friendly amendment.

Resolution 1.04 was adopted by the Working Party by consensus, and in the plenary, passed by consensus.

Evaluation of One Financial Amnesty and its impact on reserves (Resolution 1.05 – AI France)
AI France provided an overview of the resolution and the International Board noted that financial analysis regarding impact of OFA and the impact on reserves is underway and will capture reserves. AI France withdrew the resolution on the basis of the amendment to Resolution 1.01.

Accountability of International Assessment to Stakeholders (Resolution 1.06 – AI Australia)
AI Australia provided an overview of the resolution. The International Board advised that, prior to the ICM, it had requested the SG to develop an Annual Accountability Report. The International Board endorsed the resolution and noted that the International Board had tasked the SG to focus on accountability.

Resolution 1.06 was adopted by the Working Party by consensus, and in the plenary, passed by consensus.

International Functions carried out by Sections / Structures (Resolution 1.07 – AI Denmark)
AI Denmark provided an overview of the resolution. The International Board acknowledged the issue, though it is seeking a less prescriptive resolution and had engaged with AI Denmark in this regard prior to the ICM. The International Board proposed an amendment which AI Denmark accepted as a friendly amendment.

Resolution 1.07 was adopted by the Working Party by consensus, and in the plenary, passed by consensus.

Strategic and Sustainable Investments (Resolution 1.08 – AI Denmark)
AI Denmark provided an overview of the resolution. At the start of the ICM, the International Board

had inserted an amendment to Resolution 1.01 to address the intentions of this resolution by reflecting the requirement that people with fundraising expertise be closely involved in overall resource allocation decisions.

AI Canada and AI Denmark queried the scope, powers and composition of the Global Fundraising Taskforce. AI Morocco queried how their contribution to fundraised strategy could be more structured. The International Board noted it does not believe that the resolution is necessary given the integrated system under the RAM and the Fundraising Guidelines that will be released imminently, and noted that it does not support fundraising deductions. The IS reiterated the need for a single integrated system, allowing for only one fund flow.

Following a query from AI Czech Republic, the IS advised that there is an organisational mechanism to share and develop resources in a coordinated manner under the Fundraising Management Team, and noted that the IS is considering establishing a Centre of Expertise in this area. Following comments and queries from AI Greece and AI Denmark regarding innovation, specifically regarding funds to establish methods and tools for capturing innovation, the International Board advised RAM Flow 6 Innovation has not been developed as it has received minimal funding since it was established.

Following a query from AI Taiwan, the International Board advised RAM Flow 5 Loans has worked in practice to solve short-term cash flow shortages. AI UK noted its support of the resolution and queried how the IS is encouraging fundraising. The IS advised that the current mechanism for fundraising investment addresses the intentions of the resolution and the IS reiterated concern about establishment of a second fund allocation system. AI Mexico queried the difference between a loan and a conditional grant. AI Denmark noted that a grant, versus a loan, may be more attractive for a small section.

The resolution was referred to a drafting committee. Following discussions in the drafting committee, AI Denmark withdrew the resolution on the basis of an International Board amendment to Resolution 1.01 which captures loans, grants and assessment waivers to support new fundraising initiatives. The Chair acknowledged the efforts of delegates involved in negotiations regarding this resolution.

Evaluate the Mechanism for Compensating International Board Members (Resolution 1.09 – AI Puerto Rico)
AI Puerto Rico withdrew Resolution 1.09 on the basis of discussions with the International Board, whereby the International Board advised it will develop the terms of reference on the payment committee to clarify process and criteria.

Summary Statement
The Working Party assessed the key messages arising from the sessions as follows.

Working party spirit:
- Efficiency of the approach: satisfying solutions were found.
- Pragmatic approach at a time where key issues are identified and solved.
- Collaborative spirit: consideration of the various realities of different sections around the movement.

On the substance:
- Major concern regarding the financial situation because of the gap between what is needed   and expected, versus what is to be delivered, as well as the risks associated (for sections as well as for the movement). The affordability and sustainability issue will be at the heart of the 2015 ICM.
- Absolute need to increase the focus on investing in innovative and integrated fundraising, globally and nationally, without losing our independence or our impartiality.
- Whilst recognizing the opportunity that restricted giving could offer to help increase our global income, there is a wish to ensure an appropriate balance between the respective percentages of restricted versus unrestricted income.
- Focus on political and strategic issues rather than on technicalities (no figures were discussed).

Participation:
Encourage shared responsibility to provide support to the developing sections and structures that would like to strengthen their skills, to enable their broader participation.

WORKING PARTY 2 – GOVERNANCE

CHAIR Christine Weise

RAPPORTEUR Remzi Cej

SECRETARY Rasha Abdul Rahim

General overview of the Working Party sessions

The session began as the Chair introduced the Working Party team and set out some discussion guidelines. She then led a general, introductory exercise to gather delegates' views and general remarks on the resolutions. This allowed the Working Party team to decide the order in which the resolutions would be discussed during the week.

In the second Working Party session, the Chair invited volunteers with governance experience to serve as drafting consultants on standby. These drafting consultants could be reached for advice on wording changes, assist sections in making amendments, and so on. Delegates from UK, Canada (English-speaking), Spain, France, and Venezuela volunteered to help provide drafting support in all three languages throughout the week.

The sessions were well-attended, and generally drew a lively debate.

Democratic Participation (Resolution 2.04 - AI Germany)
This resolution sought to strengthen democratic participation in the movement calling on the International Board to ensure that sections and structures have sufficient time to review proposals, to have the necessary information that would allow them to make informed response drafting, to look for better ways of sharing consultation feedback within the movement, and to ensure that recommendations are implemented and reported.

Following the initial discussion, a proposed amendment by the International Board deemed friendly by the proponents was incorporated into the resolution. The amendment called for the recognition that there may be instances in which consultations may not be possible, for example due to confidentiality concerns etc.

The general comments made by a number of sections referred to the importance of the need to improve consultation mechanisms within the movement. AI Belgium (Flemish-speaking) proposed an amendment to the resolution to call for the International Board to develop a plan of action to strengthen consultation mechanisms. This was viewed as a friendly amendment. The amended resolution was put to a vote in the working party and was passed with an overwhelming majority.

In the plenary, the resolution was passed by an overwhelming majority.

Core Standards (Resolution 2.05 – International Board)
This resolution was brought forward in response to Decision 7 of the 2011 ICM, which called for the development of core standards in the areas of governance, organization, management, and human resources, to be approved by the ICM.
The discussion began after an introduction of the resolution by the International Board representative. The introduction referred to the International Board's extensive consultations with sections since the process began. Responding to potential concerns that the core standards may be seen as a strict compliance mechanism, the International Board member clarified that sections would not be expected to comply by the end of 2015, but that compliance would be a progressive process.

The core standards are intended to be a support mechanism for sections. A few sections expressed concern regarding core standards in instances where the standards may conflict with local laws. The International Board agreed to discuss this concern with interested sections to seek a middle ground on the matter.

During the discussion, a number of sections (New Zealand, Cote d'Ivoire, Switzerland, Mexico, Australia, the Netherlands) proposed amendments to the core standards, based on governance best practices in those sections and structures. The International Board reminded the Working Party that it was important to create a universally applicable and a numerically manageable list of core standards, and that delegates needed to keep that in mind when proposing changes. The core standards apply to the whole movement, not just a section – they have been drafted in a manner specific enough to be meaningful, but also to be general, in order to allow for some flexibility for sections and structures.

AI Switzerland proposed amendments regarding the inclusion of gender considerations in the core standards, as suggested by the International Women's Network, so as to ensure that equality and diversity become engrained in the core standards. The International Board agreed to meet with the proponents to discuss the wording of the amendment.

Some sections had concerns regarding the provisions on compliance, asking for clarification on what the consequences of the failure to comply would be. The International Board responded by stating that there will be some flexibility with regards to sections that would fail to comply, clarifying that failure to comply referred to instances of continuous failure to comply. Even then, sanctions would depend on the context and circumstances under which there has been continuous failure to comply. The International Board amended the introductory paragraph of its own resolution to explicitly state that both management and governance are supported by the movement.

The Working Party passed an amendment to core standard 1 to the effect that members with a conflict of interest might possibly be excluded from voting at a section's AGM. As a result of some extensive proposed amendments, the International Board agreed to make changes to the resolution – they agreed to take amendments from different sections and to try to incorporate them into the resolution for the second working party meeting, since the working party was out of time.

At the second Working Party session, the International Board presented the amended resolution. The resolution included the proposed amendment that garnered general support in the first working party session. AI Sweden expressed concerns regarding provisions in Core Standard 1 that restricted some members from voting. International Board proposed wording changes that would allow some flexibility in the core standard. The amendment was adopted. The resolution was then put to a vote and passed by an overwhelming majority.

In the plenary, the resolution was passed by consensus. AI Luxemburg and AI Hong Kong declared their abstention.

Frequency of the ICM (Resolution and Statute Amendment) 2.01
This resolution was merged with resolutions 2.06, 2.09, and 2.10.

Renamed to "Governance Reform" in the Plenary
2.01 - AI Canada Francophone Resolution and Statute Amendment: Frequency of the ICM
2.06 - AI Spain and AI France Resolution: Comprehensive International Accountability System
2.09 - International Board Resolution: Next steps in improving Global Governance: Review of the Statute of Amnesty International
2.10 - AI Netherlands Resolution: Accountability and Governance System

Merged 2.01, 2.06, 2.09 and 2.10 (AI Canada (Fr), International Board, AI Spain, AI France and AI Netherlands)
The International Board introduced this resolution by stating that the International Board wishes to do a broader review to enable the movement to consider different options and different possibilities

for improving our governance, which was also part of the Dame Anne Owers report. International Board has therefore undertaken a holistic approach to the Statute review over focusing on different sections of the Statute.

AI Sweden proposed an amendment to the resolution by adding a sentence to the merged resolution, calling for endorsing and strengthening AI's internal democracy and identity as a membership-based organization. The amendment was adopted.

The resolution was then passed with an overwhelming majority.

During the second meeting of the Working Party, the Chair suggested re-opening the resolution, since AI Spain and AI France wished to include the spirit of resolution 2.06 in the merged resolution, which would call for the voting of reports at International Council Meetings. Noting that there were no objections to this suggestion from the proponents and the floor, the Chair then asked the delegates for views on the new addition. To questions regarding the purpose of voting reports at the ICM, AI Spain explained that the purpose was to instil a greater sense of responsibility to ICM participants, so that all delegates can vote on reports, decide together, and share in the positive impact for the future of the movement. Following some clarification of questions, the resolution was put to a vote and passed with an overwhelming majority.

In the plenary, the resolution was adopted by consensus.

Deadline for Nominations of International Board Candidates (Resolution 2.02 – International Board)
The International Board introduced the resolution by explaining that it was seeking to place a deadline for a time when the candidate nominations for elections could be proposed – the resolution called for a 3-month limit, so as to ensure that the INC could prepare for the ICM.

AI Sweden and AI Germany jointly proposed an amendment to the resolution to ensure that ICM nominations were accepted up until 24 hours prior to the election, after receiving advice from the INC, if necessary to ensure an adequately balanced field of nominees. The amendment was considered friendly. Based on this amendment, the INC's candidate recommendations will be approved by the ICM at the opening plenary, similar to the way in which some sections are approved for voting at the ICM.

The International Board reiterated that the option of having the ICM approve the candidate nominations was not the preferred solution, but it conceded that the general feeling among delegates and sections led them to agree to this change. The resolution was passed by an overwhelming majority.

In the plenary, the resolution was adopted by consensus.

Direct Election of the International Board Chair (Resolution and Statute Amendment 2.03 – AI Norway)
The AI Norway Chair introduced the resolution and made an argument for direct democracy and greater accountability through direct elections of the Chair. The resolution had been amended by the proponent prior to the Working Party meeting. The amendment included more detail on the direct election of the Chair, International Board members running for the Chair's position etc. The proponent shared concerns about the current system, suggesting that the International Board may be comprised of experienced and skilled committee members, but who may lack Chair leadership qualities.

A number of sections expressed concerns with regards to the purpose and practical benefits of directly electing a Chair. International Board expressed concerns regarding the creation of potentially different mandates among International Board members and the Chair, which could create tension in the International Board. Following an extensive discussion on the merits of directly electing a chair, the resolution was put to a vote and was defeated by an overwhelming majority.

Comprehensive International Accountability System (Resolution 2.06 – AI Spain and AI France)
This resolution was withdrawn, and the spirit of the resolution was included in an amendment to the merged 2.01/2.09/2.10 resolution, and was subsequently approved by the working party.

Protection of the image of independence and impartiality (Resolution 2.07 – AI Venezuela)
This resolution was withdrawn from the working party. AI Venezuela made a statement reiterating the importance of AI impartiality and safeguarding our credibility.

Procedures for applying measures relating to International Administration, Suspension, Termination of Membership or Closure under the Statute of Amnesty International (Resolution 2.08 – International Board)
This resolution, proposed by the International Board clarifies procedures adopted previously in the 2011 ICM.

Following the initial presentation, the working party Chair opened the floor up for discussion. AI USA suggested a number of amendments, as it wished to extend the deadlines. The amendment was considered friendly. AI USA proposed adding an amendment to the resolution on behalf of AI Ghana, who were not present, to seek clarification for sections that are sanctioned. After some negotiations with the International Board and some wording change to include instances when a section can undertake action to remedy a situation, the amendment was considered friendly. The resolution was then put to a vote and passed with an overwhelming majority.

In the plenary, the resolution was adopted by consensus.

Governance of Hubs (Resolution 2.11 – AI Israel)
This resolution was withdrawn from the working party.

International Board Resolution and Statute Amendment: Statute Changes arising from Independent Review of the International Board - Renamed to "Renaming the International Executive Committee" in the Plenary
The International Board introduced this resolution by reminding the delegates of the context that prompted its development: Decision 1 of the 2011 ICM, the Dame Anne Owers report, and the IROG (Independent Review Oversight Group) report. The International Board also pointed out the need to build capacity in the International Board through skill-building and expertise-sharing, which are gaps that are not always filled through election processes. The resolution comprised two parts that focused on renaming the "International Executive Committee" to 'International Board', and on several new rules regarding co-opted members. One section asked for clarification on the proposed changes regarding co-opted members, questioning how the co-opted members would be accountable. The International Board clarified that the International Board is accountable as a team, and has collective responsibility, since decisions are made as a team.

There were some questions about the direct translation of "International Board" to French and Spanish, since a literal translation of "International Board" is not possible. It was agreed that two temporary translations would be used for Spanish: "Junta Directiva Internacional" and "Directiva Internacional"[27]. For French, the translation will be "Bureau exécutif international".

Some sections had concerns regarding the potentially high number of co-opted members in the International Board. The International Board clarified that only up to 25% of the International Board would comprise of co-opted members, and noted that the International Board would only appoint up to 3 co-opted members if necessary, depending on the circumstances. The provision was made to allow the International Board the flexibility to appoint individuals with expertise that the International

---

[27] Following the ICM, Spanish-speaking sections and structures were consulted on their preferred translation to Spanish of International Board. It was subsequently agreed that The International Board will be known as "La Junta Directiva Internacional" in Spanish.

Board needs. It was also stated that once co-opted members would join the International Board, they would have to become an Amnesty International member. Related to this, one section asked why a co-opted member would be eligible for a second term of co-opted membership on the Board, if they have become an Amnesty International member and can stand for election at the ICM. Some other sections asked whether co-opted members could be eligible for two 4-year terms. The International Board clarified that this was correct, and that there would be no difference between a co-opted member and an elected member on this matter.

Recognizing delegates' concerns about different parts of the resolution, the International Board withdrew part B of the resolution, which referred to increasing the number of co-opted members in the International Board, as well as the length of their term, and eligibility for re-appointment. The shortened resolution, comprised of part A of the original resolution (a call to rename the International Executive Committee to 'International Board') was then put to a vote and passed by consensus.

In the plenary, the resolution was adopted by consensus.

2.13 - International Board Resolution and Statute Amendment: Statute Update
Renamed to "Updates to the Statute" in the Plenary
The resolution was introduced to the floor by the International Board as a Statute update, primarily composed of updates related to legal references to Amnesty International. The resolution contained a change of wording referring to Amnesty International from 'organization' to 'movement'.

The IS legal counsel assured the delegates that while these articles are deleted because they are obsolete, similar provisions existent in these articles are applied to the structures for which they are valid, such as the IS. The Working Party Chair called for a vote on the resolution as proposed by the International Board: the resolution was passed by an overwhelming majority.

In the plenary, the resolution was adopted by consensus.

Reference in the Statute to the Core Standards (Resolution 2.14 – International Board)
This resolution was introduced as complementing the Core Standards resolution. The resolution would make it clear that the Core Standards would apply to Amnesty International sections, structures, and the International Board. After some general discussion and clarification of questions, the Chair called for a vote on the resolution. The resolution was passed with consensus.

In the plenary, the resolution was adopted by consensus.

WORKING PARTY 3 – HUMAN RIGHTS STRATEGY

CHAIR	César Marín
RAPPORTEUR	Koldo Casla
SECRETARY	Giuliana Doloriert Silueta

Introductory session and reflection on the role of the Human Rights Strategy Working Party.
The purpose of the introductory session of the Working Party was for the representatives of the delegations to have an opportunity to get to know each other personally. Two informal exercises were conducted at the session to help identify which resolutions might provoke most discussion at the three sessions. Based on the outcome of the introductory session, the Preparatory Committee drew up an agenda for discussion of the resolutions, which was sent out by email to the delegations and presented at the next session.

Some sections invited the participating delegations to think critically, throughout the working sessions of the Working Party, about the role an ICM can play in the area of human rights strategy when there are other parallel forums for evaluating and planning strategic goals. This approach gave the discussions a different perspective which many of the delegations found very interesting. In this

connection, AI New Zealand, AI Finland, AI Austria, AI Switzerland, AI Poland, AI Uruguay, AI Australia, AI Bermuda, AI Czech Republic, AI Hungary, AI Iceland, AI Mexico, AI Mongolia, AI Norway, AI Philippines, AI Thailand, AI United Kingdom, AI United States, AI Denmark and AI Hong Kong (20 sections) agreed the following statement:

A number of Sections and structures would like the role of the Human Rights Strategy Working Party (HRS WP) to be examined and clarified. For example, the WP currently considers resolutions that recommend action on topics that are not in the existing ISP, the OP nor the priorities, and/or they require IS budget allocation that conflicts with existing allocations. Such matters may be better left to the strategic planning process. In contrast, and perhaps as a result, the WP has not had time for proper discussion of other human rights issues when the WP is presumably the best forum for such discussion.

These Sections/structures call for discussion on the role of the HRS WP, and the possible creation of Terms of Reference. This could be done within the proposed review of the role of the ICM, in light of the proposed changes to the strategic planning process. Questions which could be considered include:

1.   What should be the role and scope of an ICM human rights resolution?

2.   Should ICM human rights resolutions have a global rather than sectional focus?

3.   Should ICMs consider non-emergency human rights resolutions that sit outside the ISP (or strategic goals)?

4.   How can we better develop strategic or policy conversations on emerging and likely future human rights issues?

Resolutions not supported by the Working Party.
There were a series of resolutions which, despite not receiving the Working Party's support, prompted a fruitful exchange of ideas which enriched the debate:

AI Greece presented their resolution on the use of "less lethal" weapons in rallies and demonstrations. The resolution asked the International Board to develop a policy based on opposing the use of indiscriminate weapons at demonstrations and rallies. The resolution also asked Amnesty International to be alert to the use of weapons that might endanger people's lives or physical integrity. A total of 15 sections spoke in the debate. Among the questions raised were: What does this resolution add to Amnesty International's current policy? Should the resolution specifically mention certain weapons or, instead, should that level of detail be left to the International Board/IS? How does this resolution fit in with the principles of proportionality and necessity in the use of force by police? Following a lengthy exchange of views, the resolution was put to a vote and received 22 votes in favour and 27 against. It was therefore rejected.

AI Greece also presented a resolution on attacks on humanitarian aid missions. AI Greece asked Amnesty International to condemn all attacks on humanitarian aid missions, regardless of the ideology of the organization providing such aid. Seven sections participated in the discussion and spoke about the implications of the resolution, bearing in mind international humanitarian law standards. A straw vote found that there was not enough support in the Working Party for the resolution and AI Greece therefore decided to withdraw it.

AI Puerto Rico presented a resolution on the death penalty in non-autonomous or non-sovereign territories or on members of indigenous peoples. Both the International Board and the six delegations participating in the discussion pointed out that Amnesty International's total opposition to the death penalty in all circumstances already allowed the organization to work on the circumstances set out in the resolution and suggested that there was a need to discuss how the particular situation of Puerto Rico should be addressed in Amnesty International's work against the death penalty. The resolution was put to a vote in its original version and was rejected by a majority.

Concerned that Amnesty International's overall work on Europe might be cut back or left in the hands of sections from that continent, AI France presented a resolution to ensure sufficient research on Europe. The International Board asked about the relevance of the resolution given the adoption of the recently agreed regional strategies. A total of eight sections spoke in the debate, asking questions or giving their views about the possibilities of working on one's own country, the strengthening of minimum adequate global coverage, and the strategic and operational nature of AI France's proposal. The resolution was rejected by a majority of the Working Party.

Before the two AI Greece resolutions and the one from AI Puerto Rico were voted on, the International Board offered the sections concerned the opportunity to incorporate the essential points contained in them into a statement from the Working Party. However, neither section accepted the offer.

Key outcomes: Human rights strategy for business and mining activities.
AI Ghana gave a presentation about the need to have a human rights strategy for business and mining activities. It is an increasingly important problem in many countries of the Global South. In recent years gradual progress has been made in analyzing business and mining activities from the human rights perspective (for example, the development of the so-called "Ruggie Principles", among others). Amnesty International is also beginning to conduct research in this area and this is having a global impact, not just in Africa. AI Ghana is therefore urging the movement to give active consideration to the way in which Amnesty International can become a more important actor when it comes to researching and taking action on the human rights obligations incumbent on businesses from the mining sector.

AI Ghana sent a series of questions to the IS. Answers were provided and AI Ghana was happy with them. These can be found on Page 4 of the ICM Decisions Circular[28].

AI Ghana expressed their annoyance because they felt that they had not received the information they needed during the Working Party sessions on the organization's current policies and the impact of the resolutions on them. AI Ghana also complained that they had not been given sufficient help with designing the "workshop" format for discussing these key outcomes, and that there was no opportunity to present them in the Working Party.

Key outcomes: Statement on peasant rights.
AI Mexico explained why they had decided to present a resolution to this ICM concerning peasant rights. Peasants make up almost half of the world's population. They are the source of humanity's food. However, their rights are often eroded because of the concentration of land in few hands, forced evictions, lack of empowerment for women, the criminalization of social movements, corporate practices that are seriously prejudicial to the right to health, failure to protect the right for them to participate in processes that concern them, and economic policies that force them to produce for export and not for consumption in their own communities. As a result of this set of circumstances, living conditions for peasants are gradually deteriorating. Against this background discussion is taking place at the United Nations of a Declaration on the rights of peasants. The role of civil society will be crucial for adopting a Declaration that recognizes peasants as the holders of certain specific rights.

With the help of other delegations, AI Mexico drew up and presented to the Working Party key outcomes which can be found on Page 6 of the ICM Decisions Circular[29]:

AI Mexico told the Working Party that they were disappointed at the failure to provide specific details about the methodology to be used in the workshop prior to the ICM. If the ICM wishes to have fruitful discussions about issues related to human rights, the format in which such discussions are to take place must be much more clearly defined, a task in which it is essential that the International Board

---

[28] ORG 53 006 2013
[29] ORG 53 006 2013

and the IS are involved.

The Human Rights To Food, Water And Sanitation

AI Switzerland and AI Peru presented this resolution as an amalgamation of their original respective resolutions. Both sections emphasized the relationship between the human rights to food, water and sanitation. Given that there are plenty of opportunities for mobilizing in this area, in particular in the context of the global Demand Dignity campaign, AI Switzerland and AI Peru asked the International Board to explore action and research opportunities with regard to water, food and sanitation. Four sections spoke in favour of the resolution or to ask about the added value Amnesty International might bring to the work being done by other organizations. AI Togo, in particular, stressed the need to be clear about the operational implications, and AI Australia asked if the International Board would be willing to incorporate these rights into the proposed strategic goals in 2015. The resolution was eventually adopted by a majority of the Working Party.

The resolution was adopted by consensus in the plenary.

Human Rights Violations Caused By Large-Scale Disaster

AI Japan presented a resolution that was initially focused on the impact of nuclear accidents on human rights and government responses to such accidents. AI Japan said that, as a result of the terrible accident in Fukushima in March 2011, the Japanese Government was not properly ensuring the right to health, displacement of people had taken place, those affected had not been properly compensated and the right of access to information was not being protected. In response to the interventions of some of the eight delegations participating in the discussion, AI Japan said that it was not an issue that solely affected their country since nuclear accidents can occur in many other places and, in any event, their effects transcend borders. Following the first session, the International Board, AI Japan and other sections met and agreed a text that goes beyond nuclear accidents to include other kinds of catastrophes also. The resolution was eventually adopted by consensus.

The resolution was also adopted by consensus in the plenary.

Strategic Coverage To Prevent The Retrogression Of Rights

After making an amendment to the text originally distributed, AI Venezuela presented their resolution to the Working Party, their view being that the question of the retrogression in human rights in the context of the fight against terrorism or the economic crisis is not included in the guidelines on strategic coverage or crisis response. Six sections spoke, some expressing support while others expressed doubts on the grounds that the text was not specific enough and could be open to broad interpretation. The International Board responded by saying that Amnesty International was already taking action on the question of the retrogression in human rights, and that more intensive work on it would require increased resources, something which AI Venezuela challenged on the understanding that what it would involve would be a criterion or guideline for the design of future work strategies. The resolution was adopted by a majority of the Working Party.

The resolution was adopted by a majority in the plenary with 110 votes in favour, 66 votes against and 12 abstentions.

Human Rights, Counter-Terrorism And The "War On Terror"

AI Germany presented their resolution on Amnesty International's work in the context of the so-called "War on Terror". AI Germany said that in their view Amnesty International's work had been merely reactive. They also expressed concern at the apparent lack of a robust response to specific incidents, such as the killing of Osama Bin Laden or the recent leaks about surveillance operations carried out by the United States National Security Agency and intelligence agencies from other countries. Following interventions from three sections and the International Board, AI Germany presented an amendment to their own resolution in order to clarify the language in the third paragraph. The resolution was eventually adopted by a majority.

The resolution was adopted by a majority in the plenary.

Sporting Organizations

AI United Kingdom explained why they had decided to present a resolution calling for Amnesty International to step up its work on human rights abuses (population displacement, abuses of the rights of immigrants, etc.) committed in the context of major international sporting events. Some sections expressed support for the content of the resolution but also raised doubts as to whether Amnesty International really needs a new policy to address this issue effectively. In any event, the text submitted by AI United Kingdom was put to a vote and received the support of a majority of the Working Party.

The resolution was adopted by a clear majority in the plenary.

Resolution rejected in the plenary: Conscientious Objectors.

AI Israel presented a resolution calling for a change in Amnesty International's policy on conscientious objection. AI Israel argued that it was time that the organization stopped making distinctions between different types of or grounds for conscientious objection. Several of the eight delegations who took the floor expressed support for the text. During the discussion there was an interesting exchange of views about the scope of what a government can legitimately require of its citizens. The International Board and the IS pointed to the two studies carried out as a follow-up to Decision 2 of the 2011 ICM[30] and expressed their doubts about the resolution given that it did not appear to have legal backing under international human rights law. Some sections criticized the general nature of the first document and the delay in sending out the second one. Other sections expressed concern about the possible extension of this resolution to other areas, such as tax resistance. The Chair of the Working Party invited the sections to set up a drafting committee to help draft a text that would command the support of a majority in the room. AI Uruguay, AI United States, AI Greece, AI Turkey, AI Korea, AI Peru and the International Board joined AI Israel in this task. The outcome of the work of the drafting committee was presented at the third Working Party session. Despite having participated in the drafting committee, the International Board opposed the resulting text. Voting on the resolution was deferred to the plenary because of lack of time.

In the plenary, AI Israel reiterated the reasons why they had submitted this resolution to the ICM. The International Board opposed the resolution and gave the floor to the IS, who pointed out that, in light of international human rights standards, Amnesty International's current policy does not consider someone imprisoned for refusing to undertake non-punitive alternative civil service to be a prisoner of conscience. The IS argued that, if adopted, the resolution could pose a risk for Amnesty International's work on countries that do not envisage civil service as an alternative to military service. AI Turkey and AI Greece expressed their support for the resolution and AI Korea put forward an amendment that was deemed friendly by the proposing section. In their second intervention, AI Israel pointed out that Amnesty International would have to take on the challenge of leading the international human rights community by going beyond existing international law if that was necessary. The resolution from AI Israel received 45 votes in favour, 97 votes against and 48 abstentions, and it was therefore rejected in the plenary.

WORKING PARTY 4 – ORGANIZATION

CHAIR   **Laurent Deutsch**

RAPPORTEUR   **Maïmouna Dioncounda Dembele**

SECRETARY   **Jean-Christophe Bailbe**

Presentation of all the Working Party sessions

---

[30] POL 31/001/2013, POL 31/002/2013

The Working Party met four times, on Sunday 18 August from 18h00 to 19h00, Monday 19 August from 13h30 to 15h00 and again from 15h30 to 17h00 and finally on Tuesday 20 August from 13h30 to 15h00.

No headcount was made of the number of people attending these sessions but there were around 60 participants each time.

4.01 AI Austria Resolution: Support for Sections and Structures

The proposing section explained that, based on information gathered before and during the ICM, it was now aware that the concerns expressed in the resolution are indeed being taken into account in the movement's plans.

AI Austria therefore withdrew its resolution.

At the plenary AI Austria specified that it had withdrawn the resolution because it felt that the content had been integrated into the resolution on Core Standards.

4.02 AI Belgium Francophone Resolution: Amnesty International, a Movement to Embody International Solidarity

In view of the proposal put forward by the AI Sweden, AI France, AI Iceland and AI Austria in Resolution 4.08, the Belgium Francophone Section withdrew its resolution.

4.03 AI Belgium Francophone Resolution: Evaluation of the Global Transition Programme

The delegate from AI Belgium Francophone explained that the section had held in-depth discussions with the International Board before and during the ICM on this issue and that the International Board had confirmed its intentions as expressed in the circular published in July updating the progress of the GTP. In particular, a procedure will be implemented which will draw on the work of the Reference Group and increase the confidence of stakeholders. This will be done through an extensive system of permanent monitoring which will include quarterly reports, a provisional assessment at the halfway mark and a final assessment. The results of these assessments will be shared with the movement. In view of these commitments, which will be included in the ICM Summary Statement, AI Belgium Francophone withdrew its resolution. Once a resolution is withdrawn it no longer exists, so the Chair did not open a discussion by the working party.

AI Spain, however, was disappointed as it had prepared carefully for this discussion and wished to express its views. Discussions subsequently took place between this section and the International Board which were held outside the working party and cannot therefore be covered in this report.

4.04 - AI Belgium Francophone Resolution: The Quality of Research and Positions Taken by the Movement

The proposing section explained that since submitting this resolution it had become aware of documents setting parameters for research by the hubs. The section had confidence in these guarantees and had therefore decided to withdraw its resolution.

4.05 AI France Resolution: Accepting funding from States and Foundations

AI France recalled that a study on funding by government entities requested by AI Austria was carried out during the previous cycle. Foundations were not covered by this study and making use of their resources thus posed a risk to Amnesty International's independence, impartiality and reputation.

Furthermore, in the section's opinion the above study did not result in sufficient guidelines. It is therefore the section's belief that a study based on experience already gained together with an analysis of the risk to our image of independence and impartiality will enable us to make progress in this direction.

This resolution is thus made up of two separate parts. The first focuses on analysing the risks involved in funding by foundations and the second on defining a procedure and criteria enabling us to distinguish which foundations and other partners the movement should or should not work with.

AI Iceland commented that it was glad the number of its members made it possible to avoid having recourse to foundations of this kind, public or otherwise.

AI Hong Kong described its experience in this area. There are numerous foundations in the local environment. Drawing on the resources these foundations make available is a general practice and the section follows this practice within the existing rules. When necessary it consults the IS for guidance on taking the right decision. The section queried whether there was any need to define new rules. This view was shared by AI Switzerland, AI USA and AI Austria, who asked that the relative flexibility of the system should be maintained and that the movement be better informed on the existing rules.

AI Netherlands supported the idea of strengthening the guidelines. AI Korea shared this view, taking into account the number of cases to be examined. AI Spain felt that the movement's growth depends in part on being able to draw on resources of this kind and that it is necessary to set parameters for this with clear criteria. AI Ireland and AI Canada, English-speaking also supported this resolution. AI Senegal felt that greater consideration should be given to local contexts, as foundations may offer privileged access to resources in countries where the population's spending power is very low. AI France agreed with this analysis and stated that its aim was not to prevent the movement working with partners of this kind, only to ensure that there were common rules.

The International Board proposed, as an amendment of form, that the first paragraph be completed to specify what the issue was. This was accepted immediately.

The International Board also recalled that an existing decision authorizes Amnesty International to accept state funding if, and only if, it is used to finance HRE activities. The study carried out during the past two years had concluded that this rule should be confirmed. With regard to foundations, the current principle was that of due diligence. Perhaps this rule needed to be made better known to the sections and structures.

Regarding the first part of the resolution, the decision had already been made but not yet implemented. Sections and structures would be informed about this before the end of the year. The SLT confirmed that there is an ongoing debate on fundraising in general and especially on the relationship between fundraising and ethics. It took the position that a report on this issue is not needed since the principle of due diligence covers any questions which may arise and ensures all necessary safeguards for the movement's reputation and independence. AI Belgium Francophone emphasized that rules already exist and proposed that these be summarized in an easily accessible document.

The SLT informed Working Party participants that colleagues active in the fundraising area had held a meeting in May and had embarked on the task of defining three categories of potential partners. The first category consists of partners with whom Amnesty International refuses to work while the second consists of those who are fully acceptable. The third, intermediate, category consists of partners who must be closely scrutinized using clear criteria before a decision is made as to whether Amnesty International should work with them.

The International Board commented that the discussion had allowed a better understanding of the aim of the resolution. It proposed making a distinction between the two parts. The project currently underway at the IS could respond to the concerns in the first part while the second part could be deleted.

Following these constructive exchanges, the AI France delegation put forward an amended text of its resolution. This was accepted unanimously by the Working Party which decided to submit it to the International Council for adoption.

The resolution as thus amended was adopted by consensus at the plenary session.

4.06 AI France Resolution: Evaluation of the language policy

AI France welcomed the important work which had been completed, in a very difficult budgetary context, to reorganize the movement's language policy. However, it observed that no assessment of the project had been provided for and proposed that this omission be remedied.

The International Board supported this resolution and expressed its appreciation for the work done by the SG on this issue. The Working Party recommended unanimously that the International Council adopt this resolution.

At the plenary session one section drew attention to the importance of Amnesty International being able to transmit its message directly to people at local level and asked the movement to increase the resources allocated to the language programme.

The resolution was adopted by consensus by the International Council.

4.07 AI Ireland Resolution: A Vision for Sections and Structures

AI Ireland made it clear that it was not calling into question decisions previously made and implemented by the movement. On the contrary, it is important to assess the effects those decisions have had on different parts of the movement in order to mitigate them if need be. The aim is thus to strengthen sections and structures with a view to improving our collective capacity to fight for human rights.

The International Board was willing to support this resolution which it perceived as fitting into the ongoing work it has carried out over the past two years and responding to the identity crisis experienced by some sections following the changes which have taken place in the movement.

However, the International Board suggested that the paragraph relating to the effect of these changes on the financial viability of sections be discussed in the Working Party on finance, which is more used to dealing with such questions and better placed to relate them to other relevant resolutions if necessary. AI Switzerland supported this last point.

AI Burkina Faso and AI Senegal asked for the French translation to be corrected. The term "funding sections" had been translated as "contributing sections" which was not fair to the many types of contributions made by other sections within the movement. The Working Party agreed to add the adverb "financially" to the French version in order to make it clear that the sections concerned are those which contribute to the movement's funding. The Working Party recommended that the International Council adopt the resolution with this amendment plus the deletion of the paragraph on financial viability.

At the plenary session it was discovered that the questions on financial viability had not been deleted from the documents distributed to participants. Once this correction was made, the International Council adopted the resolution by consensus.

4.08 AI Sweden Resolution: Safeguarding our Core Values

The Swedish Section stated that Amnesty International is based on a certain number of core values and that the resolution was focused on three of these: international solidarity, impartiality and independence. These three values were, in their opinion, those most likely to be affected by the movement's current evolution. However, the movement is constantly changing without its core values and their concrete implications for the different aspects of its work being reassessed.

For example, the increased emphasis on working at local level raises questions on how Amnesty International will continue to embody the value of independence. The section was adamant that its resolution was absolutely not intending to bring into question the important work currently being done to enable the movement to respond better to current and future challenges with regard to the respect of human rights.

AI Senegal stressed the importance of assessing how our practices comply with our core values. However, it regretted that the resolution made no mention of indicators which would enable us to ensure such compliance. AI Sweden explained that it felt the first step should be to reach agreement on the meaning of these values before considering how to assess compliance.

AI Argentina was concerned by what it felt was the intention of the resolution, which gave the impression that its authors lacked confidence in the countries of the South. It was those countries which would benefit from a new degree of autonomy. The countries of the North, thanks to the financial means at their disposal have long been able to carry out actions without any need being perceived to lay down guidelines with regard to respecting core values. AI Sweden denied that this was its intention. It pointed out that one of the examples it had put forward was the action taken on Julian Assange, which concerned the IS, not a section from the South.

AI Belgium, French-speaking pointed out that because of the resources available to them, sections from the North do indeed carry out more actions than their colleagues from the South. It may therefore be considered that they are all the more affected by the need to comply with our core values. Several sections felt it was a pity that three values had been selected and pointed out the risk of creating, even inadvertently, a hierarchy among the core values. All six core values mentioned in the statutes should be included in the resolution. AI Algeria emphasized that the movement's democratic nature is also a value.

AI Philippines stated that although it was a section from the South, it supported this resolution. It did not see the resolution as a threat to sections from the South but on the contrary as an opportunity for the whole movement to agree what it is based on. Other international organisations had experienced serious problems because they lacked a clear definition of the values to be respected by their various representatives. AI Denmark was concerned about being overly bureaucratic and expressed its support for the current ISP.

The International Board pointed out that Amnesty International's core values already define a large part of the organization's work. While it felt that impartiality and independence were values which did not lend themselves to a wide range of interpretation, it was a good idea to take the time to reach agreement on a collective understanding of international solidarity.

Based on these discussions, AI Sweden drafted a proposal which put more emphasis on the need to take into consideration all Amnesty International's core values, without any hierarchy among them. The new draft also aimed to avoid any misunderstanding which might lead people to think that the purpose was to establish a strict control on compliance through an overly drastic definition of these values. This version was accepted by consensus and the Working Party recommended that the International Council adopt the resolution thus amended.

The resolution was adopted by consensus at the plenary session.

4.09 AI Switzerland and AI Sweden Resolution: The Potential of Human Rights Relief
The Working Party discussed resolution 4.09, jointly presented by AI Switzerland and AI Sweden, regarding the potential of Amnesty International's Human Rights Relief (HRR) programme.

Amnesty International's HRR programme has existed for some time but remains often little-known. It enables the movement to provide relief to human rights defenders and is organized by the IS within the Campaigns programme. A coordinator is responsible for evaluating each request based on specific guidelines and approvals from bodies within the IS at are required before any action can be taken. Actions may take the form of financial assistance to individuals in danger, legal or medical aid or protection for witnesses to acts of torture. They may also involve support to organizations with which the movement works. The proposing sections want to give this practice a more prominent place within the movement's work and gain more recognition for its importance.

AI Ireland, AI Czech Republic and AI Finland questioned the relevance of such a programme. The International Board supported the resolution and proposed three amendments which were

considered as friendly. The Working Party recommended that the International Council adopt the resolution with these amendments.

The resolution was adopted by consensus at the plenary session.

4.10 International Board Resolution: New Forms of Presence

The International Board clarified several aspects of the resolution in order to alleviate certain concerns. AI France described to the Working Party how it had agreed to invest a great deal of energy in order to offer 300 individual members in Guinea a physically operational network so that they could carry out Amnesty International campaigns. The section hoped that initiatives of this kind would be taken into consideration. It also felt that the resolution should state explicitly that the section remains the preferred model within the movement and that other forms of presence must aim at achieving section status whenever possible and appropriate. The section proposed that the resolution text be modified accordingly.

The International Board was in favour of this idea, as was the Working Party, which approved the amendment and instructed the International Board, AI France and the Working Party Chair to incorporate this concept into the resolution text. The working party decided to recommend that the International Council adopt the resolution once it had been thus amended.

At the plenary session AI USA expressed its surprise that the document distributed did not include this amendment, which the International Board had considered as friendly.

The Working Party Chair apologized for this oversight and once the text had been corrected the International Council adopted the resolution by consensus.

4.11 International Board Resolution and Statute Amendment: Strategic Goals

This International Board resolution was supported by AI Spain, AI Chile, AI Algeria, AI Taiwan and AI Burkina Faso. The International Board's purpose in proposing this statute amendment is to replace the term «Integrated Strategic Plan» with «Strategic Goals». It is aware of the concerns raised by this resolution, in particular with regard to the movement's standards of competence slipping. It rejected this interpretation and stated clearly that this is a technical resolution to introduce a simple change of terminology which is more in line with reality. In the International Board's view the key document approved by the International Council every six years is not strictly speaking a plan and a correction is therefore required for purely semantic reasons.

The International Board would not be able to change the strategic goals except under very special circumstances. For example, the World Trade Centre towers were destroyed barely twenty days after an ISP was adopted. The movement was about to embark on a six year plan but the world changed radically before that period even began. This illustrates that it is necessary to be flexible and be able to update or adjust strategic goals without re-discussing everything.

AI Sweden understood the International Board's aim but felt it was not expressed sufficiently clearly in the resolution. AI Denmark, AI Netherlands, AI Australia and AI Germany also felt that the resolution as submitted did not give an exact idea of the International Board's intentions, particularly with regard to the legitimate requirement for flexibility.

The International Board agreed that as yet not all questions have received a definitive response. For example AI Denmark's question on the future existence of Critical Pathways which would not concern human rights had not been answered. It added that in theory it would be possible to submit adaptations of a strategic plan to the International Council but that in view of time constraints this solution did not guarantee sufficient flexibility. The idea was to fix four year goals and that these could be adjusted after two years, but only based on very serious arguments. AI Netherlands was concerned that the role of the International Council could become marginalized.

AI France proposed that the Working Party record the agreement of participants on the idea that the term "Integrated Strategic Plan" was not appropriate and on the International Board's intention to

revise the period of 6 years the movement currently uses to set its goals. However, since the method was not very clear, it suggested that the International Board produce a proposal for discussion at the Chairs Assembly.

A drafting committee was formed including representatives from the International Board, AI Australia, AI Denmark, AI Sweden and AI Netherlands. The committee produced a text to which the International Board, original author of the resolution, then made several amendments. The International Board submitted the new version of the document to the Working Party which adopted it by consensus.

At the plenary session, since this resolution would result in a statute amendment one section asked the Chair of the International Council to put it to a formal vote. This was done and the resolution was adopted unanimously.

DECISIONS & STATUTE

Full texts of ICM 2013 Decisions, Key Outcomes and Summary Statement may be found in Circular 29[31]. The AI Statute has been amended to reflect the decisions made at the ICM.

PART 5: ICM OFFICIAL BUSINESS

ELECTION RESULTS FOR INTERNATIONALLY ELECTED POSITIONS

All candidates for international positions had the opportunity to introduce themselves and give a one minute speech in support of their candidacy. Those candidates who were not physically present either submitted a short video for their candidacy which was shown to delegates in plenary, or they were represented by a delegate from their nominating Section or Structure who spoke on their behalf. International Board candidates also had the opportunity to speak in more detail during the 'speed dating' session.

INTERNATIONAL BOARD

Vincent Adzahlie-Mensah (AI Ghana)	*170 votes ELECTED (4 year term)*
Guadalupe Rivas (AI Mexico)	*164 votes ELECTED (4 year term)*
Sarah Beamish (AI Canada – English-speaking)	*110 votes ELECTED (4 year term)*
Paul Divakar Namala (India – nominated by AI Australia)	*86 votes ELECTED (4 year term)*
Jussi Forbom (AI Finland)	75 votes NOT ELECTED
Zuzanna Kulinska (AI Poland)	60 votes NOT ELECTED
Stefan Kessler (AI Germany)	55 votes NOT ELECTED

INTERNATIONAL NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Hanna Roberts (AI Sweden)	*76 votes ELECTED (4 year term)*
Kristin Hogdahl (AI Norway	*74 votes ELECTED (4 year term)*
Susan Waltz (AI USA)	71 votes NOT ELECTED
Stephanie Rixecker (AI New Zealand)	59 votes NOT ELECTED
Robin Rickard (AI UK)	45 votes NOT ELECTED
Alexander Huelle (AI Germany)	29 votes NOT ELECTED

FINANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE - Appointed for 4 year term (uncontested)
Greg Marsh (AI UK)

MEMBERSHIP APPEALS COMMITTEE – Appointments for 2 year terms (uncontested)
Maria Acosta (AI Uruguay)
Donald Bierer (AI USA)

---

[31] ORG 53 006 2013

Ian Gibson (AI Australia)
Marian Pink (AI Austria)
Daniel Weishut (AI Israel)

ICM CHAIR – Appointed for 2 year term (uncontested)
Janet MacLean (AI USA)

ICM ALTERNATE CHAIR – Appointed for 2 year term (uncontested)
Laurent Deutsch (AI Belgium French-speaking)

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA & STANDING ORDERS

The ICM confirmed the meeting agenda as stated in Circular 27[32] with no comment. The Standing Orders, as stated in Circular 7[33] were agreed without comment.

CONFIRMATION OF TELLER & ELECTION OFFICERS

Usha Sabanayagam (AI Malaysia) was confirmed as the Election Officer, and Jacoba Kruse (AI Faroe Islands) and Jamel Miladi (AI Tunisia) as Tellers.

VOTING RIGHTS

As stated in Circular 15[34] a number of Sections and Structures had failed to meet the statutory requirements for receipt of voting rights. The International Board recommended in the Circular that these requirements be waived for AI Ireland, AI UK and AI USA because repayment plans for overdue assessment payments have been agreed and are covered by individual Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) or agreements. At the ICM itself, the International Board recommended to delegates that the requirements also be waived for AI Greece following a meeting between the section and the International Board where reforms at the section were agreed. The ICM accepted the International Board's recommendations.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The outgoing Chair of the International Board, Pietro Antonioli was warmly thanked for his extraordinary commitment and successful stewardship of the Board and outgoing International Board member, Zuzanna Kulinska was thanked for her contribution over the last two years.

Thanks were offered to the volunteers and the volunteer coordinators Liz Espert (AI USA) and Cetana Das (AI Australia), and to all of the volunteer interpreters for their commitment to making the ICM a truly multilingual event. Julie Wright, the Organisation Liaison Unit and IT at the IS were thanked for their hard work organizing the ICM and the Media and Audio Visual teams at the IS were thanked for their technical support during the meeting. The ICM Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) were thanked for ensuring the smooth running of the Working Parties and finally, Janet MacLean was thanked for her hard work in preparing and Chairing the meeting.

The ICM paid tribute to two stalwarts of the Amnesty International movement: Christopher Hall and Alicia Zama who both sadly passed away in 2013. Alicia founded AI Mexico in 1971 and fought tirelessly for the release of Mexican prisoners of conscience. Christopher joined the IS in 1990 and was named senior legal adviser in charge of the International Justice Programme in 2004. His dedication to legal justice, seeking accountability for crimes under international law including genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity, was a key component of the successful campaign to create an International Criminal Court (ICC) in 1998.

---

[32] ORG 51 002 2013
[33] ORG 50 004 2013
[34] ORG 50 009 2013

ICM PARTICIPANTS

AI Algeria

Ali Belghit

Louiza Benyahia

Hassina Oussedik Giraud

Ali Yemloul

AI Aotearoa New Zealand

Grant Bayldon

Catherine Iorns

Helen Shorthouse

AI Argentina

Mariela Belski

Jimena Cuadrado

Nahuel Del Favero

Juan Adolfo Maida

AI Australia

Sarah Holloway

Gabe Kavanagh

Claire Mallinson

James Milsom

Anthony Mitchell

Sen Raj

AI Austria

Anton Lorenz

Bernhard Morawetz

Heinz Patzelt

Linda Sepulveda

Sabine Vogler

Barbara Weber

AI Belgium Fl

Karen Moeskops

Ilona Plichart

Hilde Stals

Karine Vandenberghe

AI Belgium Fr

François Graas

Philippe Hensmans

Marie Noël

Cécile Van Parijs

AI Benin

Pierre Akomédi

Clement Capo-chichi

AI Bermuda

Lucy Attride-Stirling

Nelleke Hollis

Jennie Whiting

Suzanne Wilson

AI Brazil

Atila Roque

AI Burkina Faso

Grace-Kevine Batiana

Yves Da

Roger David Minoungou

Yves Boukari Traoré

AI Canada En

Sarah Beamish

Aengus Bridgman

Alex Neve

Liz Wightman

AI Canada FR

Kristina Maud Bergeron

Charles Berthelet

Karine Gentelet

Béatrice Vaugrante

AI Chile

Felipe Labra

Macarena Machín

Roberto Morales

Ana Piquer

AI Cote d'Ivoire

Ahmed Coulibaly

Tia Diomande

Hervé Kokou

Nathalie Kouakou

AI Czech Republic

Martin Balcar

Libor Marek

Mark Martin

David Risser

AI Denmark

Nina Boel

Trine Christensen

Dan Hindsgaul

Lasse Hvid

Mads Hyuk Jørgensen

Fatima Madsen

AI Egypt Growth Project

Sally Sami

AI Faroe Islands

Katrin á Neystabø

Bergur A. Dalsgarð

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL

	Erling Isholm	AI Ireland	Richard Bourke
	Jacoba Kruse		Jacinta Kelly
AI Finland	Jussi Förbom		Colm O'Gorman
	Frank Johansson		Mary Quinn
	Niina Laajapuro	AI Israel	
	Tuomas Laine		Yonatan Gher
			Ishai Menuchin
AI France			Noa Redelman
	Geneviève Garrigos		Yael Weisz-Rind
	Arnaud Geze		
	Alain Korenblitt	AI Italy	
	Nsengimana Mahoro		Dario Del Giudice
	Stephan Oberreit		Ammar Kharrat
	Claire Paponneau		Antonio Marchesi
AI Germany			Pasquale Quitadamo
	Selmin Caliskan		Carlotta Sami
	Oliver Hendrich	AI Japan	
	Adriana Hennawi		Shirotaka Ishida
	Lea Richtmann		Sonoko Kawakami
	Martin Roger		Kaori Shoji
	Roland Vogel		Hideki Wakabayashi
AI Ghana		AI Kenya	
	Vincent Adzahlie-Mensah		Justus Nyang'aya
	Jennifer Kafui Akubia		Risper Olick
	Lawrence Amesu	AI Korea (Rep)	
	Thomas Dabriboyen-Ziem		Kyung Ock Chun
AI Greece			Demian M. Park
	Elias Anagnostopoulos		Jay Yeon
	Katerina Kalogera		Sylvia Yoon
	George Karatzas	AI Luxembourg	
	Alexia Tsouni		Stan Brabant
AI Hong Kong			David Pereira
	Mabel Au	AI Malaysia	
	Venus Cheng		Rafeeza Hamdan
	Hang Tung Chow		Zulaika Hamidi
	Stephen Tsui		Shamini Kaliemuthu
AI Hungary			Usha Sabanayagam
	Adele Eisenstein	AI Mali	
	Ági Fülöp		Sitan Diakité
	Flora Hevesi		Keita Mariam Toure
	Orsi Jeney		Saloum Traoré
AI Iceland		AI Mexico	
	Sólveig Haraldsdóttir		Lulu V. Barrera
	Hörður Helgi Helgason		Manuel Herrera
	Kristin Kristjansdottir		Sanae Hinojosa
	Anna Dóra Valsdóttir		Karen Luna
AI India		AI Moldova	
	Ananth Guruswamy		Veronica Mihailov-Moraru
	Manoj Mitta		Victor Pantiru
			Cristina Pereteatcu

Slava Tofan

AI Mongolia

Altantuya Batdorj
Enkhbayar Batzul
Nergui Lombo
Ganchimeg Sodnomdoo

AI Morocco

Salah Abdellaoui
Fatiha Darif
Fadoua El Bouamraoui
Driss Haidar

AI Nepal

Deek Prasad Ghimire
Rameshwar Nepal
Pratap Paudel
Shambhu Thakur

AI Netherlands

Wilco de Jonge
Ila Kasem
Eduard Nazarski
René Peters
Brigit Schumacher
Maria Verhoeven

AI Norway

Veslemøy Aga
Helle Biornstad
John Peder Egenaes
Inga Laupstad
Mina Hennum Mohseni
Trygve Nordby

AI Paraguay

Maria Teresa Añazco
Fabián Forestieri
Giovanna Scappini
Rosalia Vega

AI Peru

Juan Carlos La Puente
Alonso Ortiz
Liz Paucar
Diana Zapata

AI Philippines

Badhong Lorenzana
Jepie Papa
Aurora Parong
Ritz Lee III Santos
Agnieszka Galka
Mateusz Hladki
Draginja Nadaždin
Ula Skonecka

AI Poland

AI Portugal

José Bernardino
Joana Cardoso
Victor Nogueira
Teresa Pina

AI Puerto Rico

Mozart Dávila
Irma Lugo-Nazario
Pedro Santiago
Marjorie Vázquez

AI Senegal

Fatou Bintou Dione
Seydi Gassama
Diène Ndiaye
Naphy Samba

AI Sierra Leone

Sylvia Bangura
Sahr James
Vandie Nabie
Solomon Sogbandi

AI Slovakia

Rado Sloboda

AI Slovenia

Janez Kozamernik
Nataša Posel
Dragana Trivundza
Sabina Živec

AI South Africa

Nokuthula Magudulela
Samkelo Mokhine

AI Spain

Jordi Baltà
Esteban Beltrán
Helmut Kalthoff
Alfonso López Borgoñoz
Itziar Ruiz-Gimenez Arrieta

AI Sweden

Lise Bergh
Maria Eklund
Sofia Halth
Natasja Persson
Par Skold
Tora Törnquist

AI Switzerland

Victoria Gronwald
Hans Markus Herren
Stella Jegher
Xenia Rivkin
Manon Schick

	Laurette von Mandach		Judith Pacheco
AI Taiwan			Renee Ponce
	Freddy Lim	**AI Zimbabwe**	
	Sho Lin		Teresia Musago
	Bo Tedards		Takesure Musiiwa
	Ya-Chi Yang		Amos Phiri
AI Thailand			Cousin Zilala
	Ann Boonridrerthaikul	**International Membership Representatives**	
	Chamnan Chanruang		Hussain Abro
	Somchai Homlaor		Tosin Francis
	Kwan Saleephol		Grégoire Kauli Moket
AI Togo			Souleymane Sow
	Aimé Tchamie Adi	**European Institutions Office**	
	Ella Akoegnon		Nicolas Beger
	Kodjo Atho		Lars Normann Jørgensen
AI Tunisia			
	Lotfi Azzouz	**Conflict Management Assistance Group**	
	Nidhal Hlaiem	Chair	Roger Clark
	Safaeddine Maatallah		Sabine Geiger
	Jamel Miladi		Ginny Morrison
AI Turkey			Charlotte Cécile Renard
	Murat Çekiç		Qaqamba Vellem
	Emek Eren	**Finance & Audit Committee**	
	Levent Korkut		Greg Marsh
	Murat Köylü		Eystein Myking
AI UK		**International Nominations Committee**	
	Kate Allen		Aïcha Kabore Zoungrana
	Cris Burson-Thomas		Stuart Webb
	Tom Hedley	**International Women's Human Rights Network**	
	Hannah Perry		Marcelline Letou
	Kerry Moscogiuri		
	Sarah O'Grady	**KontraS**	
AI Ukraine			Putri Kanesia
	Tanya Mazur	**MOZAIKA**	
AI Uruguay			Kristine Garina
	Mariana Labastie		Kaspars Zalitis
	Facu Santos	**Guest Speakers**	
	Alejandra Umpiérrez Link	AI Denmark	Christoffer Holm
	Eugenio Varela	AI Greece	Kusha Bahrami
AI USA		International Crisis Group	Gilles Yabi
	Jeffrey Bachman		
	Kristina Brady	Popular Resistance Committee	Nariman Tamimi
	Shahram Hashemi		Ahd Tamimi
	Helen Jack	Privacy International	Eric King
	Frank Jannuzi	United Nations - OHCHR	Marcelo Daher
	Beth Ann Toupin	AI Ireland	
AI Venezuela		**International Board Chair**	Noeleen Hartigan
	Julio César Bermúdez		
	Marcos Gomez		

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

	Pietro Antonioli		Susana Flood
International Board Vice Chair			John Gillespie
	Guadalupe Rivas		Erika Guevara
International Board Members			Hassiba Hadj Sahraoui
			Saleh Hijazi
	Rune Arctander		Sandy Jones
	Nicole Bieske		Sergio Laurenti
	Zuzka Kulinska		George Macfarlane
	Mwikali Muthiani		Sara Macniece
	Julio Torales		Madhu Malhotra
International Treasurer			Guadalupe Marengo
	Bernard Sintobin		Gaëtan Mootoo
			Emily Nevins
International Board Candidates (not on delegations)			Colm O Cuanachain
AI Germany	Stefan Kessler		Anil Pant
AI India	Paul Divakar		Minar Pimple
INC Candidate			Owen Pringle
	Kristin Høgdahl		Thomas Schultz-Jagow
ICM Chair			Ellen Waters
	Janet MacLean		Sara Wilbourne
ICM Alternate Chair			Nick Williams
	Laurent Deutsch		Brian Wood
Working Party Chairs			
	César Marín	**Secretary General**	
	Christine Weise		Salil Shetty
	Dawna Wright	**Programme Staff - EIO**	
Working Party Rapporteurs			Dasa Van der Horst
	Koldo Casla		Carmen Dupont
	Remzi Cej	**Programme Staff - AILRC**	
Maïmouna Dioncounda Dembele			Begoña Águeda
	Angela Gill	**Organization Staff - IS**	
Programme Staff - IS			Rasha Abdul-Rahim
	Sarah Atkinson		Julia Armero
	Catherine Baber		Sarah Buszard
	Netsanet Belay		Gemma Cartwright
	Widney Brown		Anthony Cole
	Savio Carvalho		Giuliana Doloriert Silueta
	Steve Crawshaw		Michael Fellows
	John Dalhuisen		Ikila Grant
	Gnanam Devadass		Edward Herbert
	Clare Doube		Marie-Odile Leber Haller
	Nicola Duckworth		Amber Macintyre
	Richard Eastmond		Selina Nelte
	Sherif Elsayed-Ali		Ariel Plotkin
	Alberto Estevez		Huw Prior

Sebastien Rabas	Inger-Lise Ostrem
Jene Redmead	Monica Pares
Sophia Scherer	Christel Pierson
Jane Sessenwein	Emmanuelle Rivière
Bhavika Solanki-Silva	Jonathan Sanders
Jim Ward	Phil Smith
David Whitbourn	Marita Thomsen
Jules Wright	Madeleine Walter

Organizational Staff - AI LRC

JC Bailbe

Patricia Combeaud Bonallack

Anna Zak-Davies

Organizational Staff - AI Belgium Flemish

Georges Coomans

Organizational Staff - AI Netherlands

Edgar Mulié

Organizational Staff - IS Geneva

Franziska Christen

Interpreters

Sarah Adlington

Tom Afton

Cheo Arconada

Magda Assem

Mireia Bas

Marion Bouvier

Francois Butticker

Inés Caravia

Mercedes Conde

Alison Corney

Roxana Dazin

Gachi de Luis

Aymeric de Poyen

Emad Elnaggar

Jérémy Engel

Adrià Franch

Cécile Galy

Barbara Grut

Isabelle Guinebault

Claudio Guthmann

Michael Hill

Phillip Hill

Anne Lepreux

Valeria Luna

Edwina Mumbru

Becky Naidis

Félix Ordeig

Head Interpreter

Zoe Hewetson

ICM Volunteers

AI Algeria	Lacen Mehennaoui
AI Algeria	Yasmina Bellounar
AI Cote d'Ivoire	Ismaila Kangoye
AI Czech Republic	Adéla Válková
AI Denmark	Sara Katrine Brandt
AI Finland	Markus Viljasalo
AI Germany	Florian Altmann
AI Germany	Yu-Shan Chang
AI Germany	Friederike Hellner
AI Germany	Ute Jugert
AI Germany	Else Engel
AI Germany	Florian Zeidler
AI Ghana	Joseph Ankamah
AI Japan	Kayo Fujikawa
AI Korea (Rep)	JieHoon Chung
AI Mexico	Gabriela Sánchez Aranda
AI Mexico	Lucero Ramos
AI Netherlands	Cyriel de Jonge
AI Norway	Sara Linn L. Hansen
AI Portugal	Ângela Ferreira
AI Puerto Rico	Paola Marie Mangual Arbelo
AI Senegal	Fatou Sall
AI Spain	Blanca Hernández Martín
AI Togo	Enyonam Gadagbui
AI Tunisia	Marwa Mansouri
AI UK	Lucy Barnett
AI Ukraine	Nadiia Ivanova
AI Venezuela	Gabriela Escalona

ICM Volunteer Coordinator (AI USA) Liz Espert

ICM Deputy Volunteer Coordinator (AI Australia)   Cetana Das

63

AGENDA & CIRCULARS LIST

2013 ICM AGENDA, 18-22 August

* = No interpretation

Saturday 17		Day 1 - Sunday 18		Day 2 - Monday 19		Day 3 - Tuesday 20		Day 4 - Wednesday 21		Day 5 - Thursday 22
New Chairs Induction (09:00-13:00)	Youth Day (10:00-18:00)	09:00-10:15	1. Opening ceremony and opening business	09:00-10:15	6. Human Rights: Crisis Work	09:00-10:15	11. Fundraising: Building a culture of human rights philanthropy	09:00-10:15	16. Human Rights: Digital Freedoms	Election results announced / 21. Human Rights: Sexual & Reproductive Rights
COFFEE BREAK		10:15-10:45 COFFEE BREAK		10:15-10:45 COFFEE BREAK		10:15-10:45 (nominations close?) COFFEE BREAK		10:15-10:45 Ballots distributed COFFEE BREAK		COFFEE BREAK
New Chairs Induction	Youth Day	10:45-12:00	2. Human Rights: Migration	10:45-12:00	7. Workshops — a) One Financial Amnesty; b) Global Governance and Leadership; c) Planning our next Strategy	10:45-12:00	12. Accountability - Global Transition Programme	10:45-12:00	17. Working Party / Workshops — a) Indigenous Peoples and Land – Workshop; b) Conflict Resolution – Workshop; 2. Governance – Working Party	22. Decision Making 1
LUNCH		12:00-13:30 LUNCH		12:00-13:30 Campaign Action - AI Germany LUNCH		12:00-13:30 LUNCH		12:00-13:30 Voting area in dining room LUNCH		LUNCH
First time attendee orientation (14:00-18:30)	Youth Day	13:30-15:30	3. Accountability IEC / SG Reports	13:30-15:00	8. Working Party sessions — 1: Finance; 2: Governance; 3: Human Rights Strategy; 4: Organisation	13:30-15:00	13. Working Party sessions — 1: Finance; 2: Governance; 3: Human Rights Strategy; 4: Organisation	13:30-15:00	18. Workshops — a) Global Campaign: My Body, My Rights; b) Growth; c) Global Brand Positioning	23. Decision Making 2
COFFEE BREAK		15:30-16:00 COFFEE BREAK		15:00-15:30 COFFEE BREAK		COFFEE BREAK		COFFEE BREAK		COFFEE BREAK
First time attendee orientation	Youth Day	16:00-17:30	4. Elections; International Nominations Committee report; introduction of candidates	15:30-17:00	9. Working Party sessions — 1: Finance; 2: Governance; 3: Human Rights Strategy; 4: Organisation	15:30-17:00	14. Workshops — a) Global Transition Programme; b) Global Campaign: Stop Governments Torturing; c) New Forms of Presence	15:30-17:00	19. Accountability: Sections & Structures	24. Closing
BREAK		17:30-18:00 BREAK		17:00-17:30 BREAK		17:00-17:30 BREAK		17:00-17:30 BREAK		BREAK
First time attendee orientation	Youth Day	18:00-19:00	5. Working Party Introductory Session — 1: Finance; 2: Governance; 3: Human Rights Strategy; 4: Organisation	17:30-19:00	10. Election: Meet the candidates	17:30-19:00	15. Accountability: IEC and SG Questions & Answers	17:30-19:00	20. Regional Meetings — Africa; Asia Pacific*; Americas*; Europe*; Middle East and North Africa	
DINNER		From 19:00 Informal BBQ Dinner; hotel Beer Garden		19:00-20:30 DINNER		19:15 Coach transfer to Informal BBQ hosted by AI Germany / Start of return transfers back to the hotel		19:30 onwards ATT Celebration dinner		
						From 22:00				

1	Welcome letter and nominations call	ORG/50/002/2012
2	A vision for the ICM	ORG/50/003/2012
3	ICM preparation pack	ORG/50/005/2012
4	Volunteer program - call for nominations	ORG/50/004/2012
5	Call for people: Internationally elected positions	ORG/50/006/2012
6	Resolutions - first batch (due back from WPCs 24 Feb)	ORG/50/001/2013
7	Standing Orders	ORG/50/004/2013
8	Registration instructions	ORG/50/02/2013
9	Core Standards	ORG/50/003/2013
10	IEC's Vision for the next Biennium	ORG/50/005/2013
11	Fundraising: Building a Culture of Human Rights Philanthropy	ORG/50/006/2013
12	ICM agenda & Letter 2 from the ICM Chair	ORG/51/001/2013
13	Second Batch of Resolutions and Statute Amendments	ORG 50/007/2013
14	One Financial Amnesty	ORG 50/008/2013
15	ICM voting rights	ORG 50/009/2013
16	IEC and International Treasurer's report	ORG 50/010/2013
17	Secretary General's report to the ICM	ORG 50/011/2013
18	IS Substantive advice on resolutions	ORG 50/012/2013
19	Human Rights Landscape	ORG 50/013/2013
20	2013 ICM Resolutions: Preliminary budget costings	ORG 50/014/2013
21	GTP Assessment Report	ORG 50/015/2013
22	Update on Implementation of 2011 ICM decisions	ORG 53/002/2013
23	State of the Movement report	ORG 50/016/2013
24	Final update report on the implementation of ICM 2011 Decision 1	ORG 53/003/2013
25	ICM Logistics - joining instructions	ORG 50/019/2013
26	Glossary	ORG 50/020/2013
27	ICM Agenda - July 2013	ORG 51/002/2013
28	Nominations to internationally elected positions	ORG 50/024/2013
29	Decisions of the ICM 2013	ORG 53/006/2013

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL