

**AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL
UNITED KINGDOM SECTION**

**NOTICE AND
RESOLUTIONS OF THE
2026 ANNUAL
GENERAL MEETING**

Saturday 27 - Sunday 28 June 2026

**AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL**



AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

UNITED KINGDOM SECTION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING (AGM) OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL UNITED KINGDOM SECTION (AIUK SECTION) to be held as a hybrid meeting from 3.45pm on Saturday 27 June 2026 to 4pm on Sunday 28 June at the Jubilee Building, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton, BN1 9SL. Members will also be able to access the meeting online.

Participating in the meeting

The AGM will be held at the Jubilee Building, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton, BN1 9SL. Members may attend in person or online.

Information on how to join the meeting electronically can be found in the Chair's letter and at www.amnesty.org.uk/about/accountability/governance/annual-general-meeting-of-amnesty-international-united-kingdom-section.

The AGM will be held over two days as part of the Amplify Summit. Members planning to attend in person are requested to register their attendance so we can contact you in the event of any last-minute changes and to ensure we have adequate space at the venue. Links to AGM registration and further information about activities at the Amplify Summit can be found at www.amnesty.org.uk/get-involved/events/amplify-summit-agm-national-conference/

AGM business

The business of the AGM will be to:

1. Receive and, if thought fit, adopt the report of the Standing Orders Committee
2. Receive the report of the Returning Officer
3. Receive the report of the Nominations Sub-Committee
4. Receive the report of the Directors
5. Receive the audited accounts for the year ended 31 December 2025;
6. Ratify the budgetary estimates for the current and ensuing financial periods
7. Approve the appointment of BDO LLP as external auditors and authorise the Directors to approve their remuneration
8. If an election is required, to elect the AGM Chair for 2027 and members of the Members and Directors Appeal Committee
9. Consider and, if thought fit, pass the resolutions printed below, which shall be proposed as Special and Ordinary Resolutions

Appointing a proxy

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

A form to nominate a proxy and to vote on the AGM resolutions is, for members that are receiving this notice by post, enclosed. For members receiving this notice electronically, the form is available to download from www.amnesty.org.uk/about/accountability/governance/annual-general-meeting-of-amnesty-international-united-kingdom-section, or you can email AmnestyAGM@Computershare.co.uk for a copy, or otherwise by post from the Company Secretary, AIUK Section, 2nd floor, Peter Benenson House, 1 Easton Street, London WC1X 0DW. If you prefer to submit your proxy form and vote online, please go to www.amnesty.org.uk/vote. You will need to enter your Voter Reference Number and PIN. Completed forms must be returned by the means set out in the proxy form, and arrive no later than **9am on Thursday 25 June 2026**.

By order of the Board

Tim Hancock

Tim Hancock,
Company Secretary,
12 May 2026

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

2nd floor, Peter Benenson House
1 Easton Street
London WC1X 0DW

RESOLUTIONS TO THE AIUK SECTION ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

F1: Financial Statements

Summary: A resolution to receive the financial statements and reports.

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves to receive the Report of the Directors and the audited accounts of AIUK Section for the year ended 31 December 2025.

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

F2: Financial Estimates

Summary: A routine resolution to ratify the budget estimates for the years 2026-2028.

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves to ratify the budget estimates for the years 2026-2028.

Proposer's background note: The budget estimates are included in the Treasurer's report to the AGM and will also be available on AIUK's website

alongside the financial statements, approximately 3-4 weeks before the start of the AGM. Please visit www.amnesty.org.uk/about/accountability/governance/annual-general-meeting-of-amnesty-international-united-kingdom-section

F3: Re-appointment of Auditors

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

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

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

Proposer's background note: AIUK Section is required by law to appoint auditors at each AGM. The Board recommends that BDO LLP be re-appointed, with the audit fee at an amount to be agreed by the Board.

O1: A Call for an Independent External Review into the Current Financial Crisis at AIUK

Summary: This resolution calls for an independent external review into the current financial crisis at AIUK.

Proposer: Hornsey and Wood Green Group

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves that the AIUK Section Board commission an independent external

review into the causes of the current financial crisis at AIUK, and in particular the roles of and relationships between the Section's Board, Section Board leadership team, the outgoing CEO, senior management and the Charitable Trust.

Implementation of this review is to start immediately after the 2026 AGM, to be completed and a report published by the 2027 AIUK AGM.

Proposer's background note: In a letter to lead activists on 28 November 2025, the chair of the AIUK Section Board advised the following points:

'Even if we sell the HRAC we would still need to reduce our costs significantly (including a reduction in the number of AIUK staff) to bring our budget into balance. In effect, the lack of HRAC sale in 2025 has brought this forward. Our financial problems cannot be solved by selling the HRAC alone because our income levels are not at the scale we had anticipated to be able to sustain our increase in costs. For that reason, we have had to make cuts to our spending plans both for the remainder of 2025 and will need to make a significant cut in our planned spending for 2026 and beyond. I am very sorry to say that we will not be able to achieve those savings without cutting back on staff roles.'

This has now indeed led to significant cutbacks in staffing at AIUK, cutbacks in capacity, as well as cutbacks in training budgets, with most training moving online. AIUK Country Coordinator and Activism Representative budgets have been frozen for 2026, as have budgets for networks and the hosting of Regional Gatherings. In addition, lead activists have been

asked to keep costs as low as possible, including moving meetings online where feasible and limiting travel that requires reimbursement. Another consequence is a delay in AIUK's annual payment to the Amnesty International Secretariat.

Amnesty UK suffered a similar financial crisis in May 2012, needing to reduce annual running costs by £2.5M. As a result, a review was commissioned and the report, entitled Learning for the Future – Evaluation of AIUK Costs and Priorities Programme (CAPP), was published on 7 October 2014.

The speed at which the current financial crisis unfolded was surprising, and raises serious questions about forecasting and financial management by the Section's Board, leadership team, the outgoing CEO, senior management and the Charitable Trust Board. The purpose of the proposed independent review is to learn from and to avoid another financial crisis from occurring in the future.

This resolution is co-sponsored by the Glasgow West, Croydon, Sutton, York and Bournville local Amnesty groups.

Board background note:
The Board supports this resolution

At their October 2025 Board meeting, the Senior Management Team advised the AIUK Section Board and AIUK Charitable Trust Board of Amnesty International UK that urgent action would be required to address a significant financial challenge facing the organisation. The need for significant savings arose because our income was not growing at the rate required to fund our growth in costs. The delay in the sale of the HRAC (Human Rights Action Centre, also referred to as the New Inn Yard building) exacerbated

this issue and meant that savings had to be delivered quickly at the end of 2025 and in the first quarter of 2026.

The sale of the New Inn Yard building was ultimately completed in February 2026. A programme of staff reductions and structural reorganisation is expected to conclude in April 2026. Significant reductions in non-staff expenditure have also been made and it is planned to make further efficiency savings, as appropriate, going forward.

The Board is undertaking an independent review to understand how the organisation reached this position and what lessons can be learned.

The Board has taken this resolution into consideration in drafting the terms of reference for the review.

There are no equalities impacts arising from this resolution.

S1: Special Resolution to Amend the Articles of Association by Establishing a Voting Record Date

Summary: A resolution to more clearly establish a cut-off date for new members to exercise full participation rights at the AGM.

Proposer: AIUK Section Board

Text of resolution: The AGM Decides to amend the Articles of Association by:
(a) Inserting a new Article 21.1.4, as follows:
 “21.1.4 the Voting Record Date”
(b) Inserting a new Article 23, immediately after Article 22 (“Service of Notice”), as follows:

“23 Voting Record Date

23.1 The Directors may determine a date (the “Voting Record Date”) by which a Member must be entered on the Register of Members in order to attend, speak and vote at a General Meeting.

23.2 The Voting Record Date shall not be more than seven clear days prior to the date of the relevant General Meeting.”

(c) renumbering the Articles and all internal cross-references appropriately to reflect the insertion of the new Article.

Proposer background note: A Voting Record Date is the date on which a person must be entered onto a company’s membership register in order to have the rights to attend, speak and vote at a General Meeting.

At present, no provision expressly exists in AIUK Section’s Articles of Association for a voting record date. In principle, this means that a person could join the Section immediately prior to the start of a General Meeting and expect the right to vote. In practice, it is administratively extremely challenging to give effect to this. This discrepancy has the potential to cause confusion and frustration for new members.

It should be noted that Article 10.3 of the Articles already gives the Board the power to determine the criteria and process for admission to membership, which can be interpreted as including timing of admission. However, making this explicit through a dedicated Article is intended to ensure clarity, transparency, and reduces risk of dispute.

Establishing a Voting Record Date is intended to provide certainty for both

members and governance administrators by establishing a cut-off date. Anyone joining the UK Section after this date would not have the right to attend and vote at the upcoming General Meeting.

If adopted, the Board will establish the Voting Record Date prior to each General Meeting and this will be stated in the meeting notice.

The seven-day maximum period strikes a balance between enabling recent joiners to exercise their rights and ensuring administrative clarity.

The special resolution therefore establishes that the Board may not agree a Voting Record date more than seven clear days prior to the start of a General Meeting. For an AGM that begins on 27 June, for example, the Voting Record Date could not be earlier than 19 June.

O2: Governance and Financial Integrity in Children’s Social Care

Summary: This resolution requests that Amnesty International UK Section advocate for independent structural and case review of children’s social care in England and Wales to ensure compliance with Article 8 ECHR and to address potential funding and market distortions affecting family separation decisions.

Proposer: Amnesty International UK – Woking Group

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves that Amnesty International UK, in line with its refreshed Everyday Rights strategy and Children’s Human Rights campaign:

1. Advocate for the establishment of an independent structural review of children’s social care in England and Wales, examining intervention thresholds, funding allocation, market provision, kinship care access, and reunification practices, in light of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.
2. Support the development of an independent case review mechanism for current and historic child removal decisions, with formal participation of birth families, children in care, and care leavers.
3. Examine and report on whether current child protection and placement practices operate consistently with the United Kingdom’s obligations under Article 8 ECHR, including the principles of necessity and proportionality, as well as the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and other instruments.
4. Report progress to members by the 2027 AGM, including any recommendations for further policy advocacy.

Any advocacy undertaken should emphasise that separation of children from their families must be exceptional, evidence-based, proportionate, and maintained where clear and evidenced serious harm is established.

Proposer’s background note: In England, over 600,000 children are referred annually to children’s services, while more than 50,000 children are on child protection plans each year (Department for Education, Characteristics of Children in Need, 2025). Children’s social care represents a substantial and growing proportion of local authority expenditure, with councils in England spending over £10 billion annually

on children's services, much of it on placements and late-stage intervention (Local Government Association; National Audit Office reports on children's social care funding pressures).

The sector has undergone significant structural change over the past decade. A substantial proportion of foster and residential placements is now delivered by private providers. The Competition and Markets Authority's Children's Social Care Market Study (2022) reported high levels of market concentration in parts of the residential care sector and rising placement costs, which risk becoming unsustainable.

Independent academic analysis has examined trends in child protection intervention and outcomes for family. Research from the University of Leeds School of Law and the charity Cerebra has noted that increased levels of child protection investigation are disproportionately impacting families of disabled children, causing severe trauma for this already vulnerable group. Other groups at risk of over-reactive child protection investigations include families on low incomes, and survivors of domestic abuse.

Research and official inquiries have also documented safeguarding risks within residential and out-of-home care settings (Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse; Office of the Children's Commissioner reports on vulnerability of children in care).

Under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, any interference with family life must be lawful, necessary and proportionate. Removal of a child from their family constitutes a significant interference and

therefore requires rigorous evidential justification to prevent serious negative life outcomes.

Questions have been raised in policy, academic and parliamentary discussions about intervention thresholds, the balance between early family support and late-stage placement spending, access to kinship care, and reunification practices.

This resolution proposes that Amnesty International UK Section consider engaging with these issues from a human rights perspective, including examination of whether current structures operate consistently with Article 8 ECHR.

Key references

High-cost children's social care placements survey, Local Government Association, 2023 www.local.gov.uk/publications/high-cost-childrens-social-care-placements-survey

Pressures on Children's Social Care, National Audit Office, 2019 www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Pressures-on-Childrens-Social-Care.pdf

Children's Social Care Market Study, Competition and Markets Authority, 2022 www.gov.uk/government/publications/childrens-social-care-market-study-final-report

Systems Generated Trauma: How disabled children and their families are traumatised by dysfunctional public services when they ask for support, University of Leeds Law School and Cerebra charity, 2025 <https://cerebra.org.uk/latest-news/new-report-reveals-widespread-systems-generated-trauma/>

How can a child in care cost £281,000 a year? Ask the wealth funds that have councils over a barrel. George Monbiot, The Guardian, 18 May 2024 www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/article/2024/may/18/child-care-cost-year-wealth-funds-councils-britain-residential

Private equity owns lion's share of children's foster services and is 'bleeding the sector of money'. Jon Ungood-Thomas, The Observer, 1 February 2026 <https://observer.co.uk/news/national/article/private-equity-owns-lions-share-of-childrens-foster-services-and-is-bleeding-the-sector-of-money>

Board background note:
The Board opposes this resolution

This Board background note applies to both resolution O2 and O3.

Whilst the Section Board understands the seriousness of the issues raised in the resolution, neither AIUK nor the International Secretariat (IS) have policy or research on these issues. Neither AIUK nor the IS have the expertise or experience to provide even an initial analysis of the content of the motions or what the human rights analysis and recommendations would be. Even with an AIUK AGM Decision, we cannot instruct the IS to conduct the work that is required by these resolutions.

At both a UK and international level, we have not been engaged in child protection issues beyond work on the Convention on the Rights of the Child and broadly on children's rights. We have no detail on Family Tribunals or their equivalent, or on international standards in these areas in any other country. No work on these issues is currently planned.

AIUK is aware of some of these issues as they have come up in our work on AIUK's *Broken Britain* and *Social Insecurity* reports, in the context of people having their children removed on the basis of neglect because they simply don't have the money to make ends meet or provide food and decent housing. However, to properly assess the content of this motion we would need to cover multiple aspects of child protection and interacting systems which we are currently not working on, such as; the adoption system, role of Ofsted as a regulator of social work departments, role of police in multi-agencies child protection processes, child safeguarding boards, access to justice via family court proceedings, positions of relevant organisations working in this sector, etc.

AIUK has recently undertaken a strategy refresh and has implemented a financial recovery plan to bring expenditure into line with income. Undertaking the required work would mean not progressing plans currently in our organisational strategy, and would require AIUK to broaden its focus well beyond our strategic priorities and existing areas of expertise. This would have significant financial implications, as well as a detrimental impact on our ability to deliver our strategy.

We believe the following organisations would be better placed to engage with on these issues:

ATD 4th World, who have conducted research and have a campaign on many of these issues: <https://atd-uk.org/2023/07/27/new-report-published-i-have-walked-this-journey-alone-my-soul-is-tired/>.

Coram Children’s Legal Centre:
<https://childrenslegalcentre.com/>

Resolution: <https://resolution.org.uk/campaigning-for-change/vision/>

Further work would be required to assess this resolution’s equalities impacts.

O3: Family Justice and Human Rights

Summary: This resolution asks Amnesty International UK to assess and advocate for independent review of family court practices in England and Wales to ensure compliance with children’s rights and human rights obligations.

Proposer: Amnesty International UK – Woking Group

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves that Amnesty International UK, in line with its refreshed Everyday Rights strategy and Children’s Human Rights campaign:

1. Assess and report on the extent to which current family court processes in England and Wales operate consistently with the United Kingdom’s obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and other relevant international human rights standards.
2. Advocate for the establishment of an independent review of family court

practices affecting child residence, contact and removal decisions, with formal participation of affected families and relevant experts.

3. Support the development of an independent case review mechanism for families who allege serious human rights violations arising from family court proceedings.
4. Examine the role of expert evidence, funding structures and access to appeal within family proceedings, and report recommendations to members by the 2027 AGM.

Proposer’s background note: Family courts in England and Wales make determinations concerning child residence, contact and removal from birth families. Such decisions engage Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (right to respect for family life) and, where serious risk is alleged, Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment). The United Kingdom is also bound by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Academic research in developmental psychology has examined the importance of early attachment relationships in children’s emotional and social development (Bowlby, Attachment and Loss, 1969; Ainsworth, 1978), and the costs to human development of severing those bonds.

International reporting has drawn attention to concerns about child protection systems in various jurisdictions. In Denmark, for example, the government has announced a review of historic child removal cases involving Greenlandic families following concerns about assessment practices.

At United Nations level, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women and girls has examined the treatment of domestic abuse allegations in custody contexts. Her 2025 report on the United Kingdom noted that ‘the lack of justice has forced many mothers to leave the United Kingdom’, putting them at risk of being accused of child abduction. GREVIO’s 2025 evaluation of the United Kingdom under the Istanbul Convention also addressed the handling of domestic abuse allegations within family proceedings.

These injustices lead to severe long-term suffering for children, their parents and wider families and communities.

Questions have been raised in public discourse and academic commentary regarding the use of expert evidence, access to appeal, and transparency in family proceedings, including in recent reported judgments.

The Victims’ Commissioner has publicly called for an urgent review of cases involving the work of a psychologist whose expert evidence has been subject to increasing scrutiny. In public statements, the Commissioner expressed concern about the removal of children on the basis of such expert evidence and urged systemic examination. In 2025, the Government responded that a further review would not be a proportionate response at that stage.

Given the human rights implications of decisions on child custody, independent assessment of the system’s compliance with binding legal obligations may assist informed policy discussion.

References

UN Human Rights Council, Special Rapporteur on violence against women and girls, A/HRC/53/36 (2023). www.ohchr.org/en/documents/thematic-reports/ahrc5336-custody-violence-against-women-and-violence-against-children

UN Human Rights Council, Special Rapporteur on violence against women and girls, Country Report on the United Kingdom, A/HRC/56/48 (2025). www.ohchr.org/en/documents/country-reports/ahrc5947add1-visit-united-kingdom-great-britain-and-northern-ireland

GREVIO, Baseline Evaluation Report: United Kingdom, Council of Europe (2022). <https://rm.coe.int/grevio-s-baseline-evaluation-report-on-legislative-and-other-measures-/1680b66579>

BBC World Service, ‘Greenlandic parents seek review of child removals’, 19 February 2025. www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/p0n1v1kq

Y (Experts and Alienating Behaviour: The Modern Approach), High Court (Family Division), [2026] EWFC 38. <https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewfc/2026/38>

National media reporting concerning expert evidence and family court practices (2025–2026). www.mysocialworknews.com/article/landmark-ruling-throws-family-courts-into-crisis-over-unregulated-parental-alienation-experts

Bowlby, J. (1969), Attachment and Loss; Ainsworth, M. (1978), childhood attachment research.

Board background note:
The Board opposes this resolution

Please refer to the board background note to resolution O2.

O4: International Child Abduction and Treaty Coherence

Summary: This resolution calls for an urgent, participatory review of the handling of international child abduction cases in England and Wales to assess alignment with domestic criminal law, safeguarding standards and binding human rights obligations.

Proposer: Amnesty International UK – Woking Group

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves that Amnesty International UK, in line with its refreshed Everyday Rights strategy and Children’s Human Rights campaign:

1. Advocate for the establishment of an independent review of the operation of international child abduction cases in England and Wales under the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, with formal participation of affected families and relevant experts.
2. Assess and report on whether current Hague return mechanisms operate consistently with the United Kingdom’s obligations under international human rights law, including the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the European Convention on Human Rights, and the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence.

3. Advocate for the publication of disaggregated data on Hague return applications, including on safeguarding issues and post-return outcomes, to enable transparent evaluation of systemic patterns.
4. Support the development of an independent case review mechanism to examine current and historic cross-border child return decisions.
5. Report progress to members by the 2027 AGM, including recommendations on whether further policy advocacy is required to ensure coherence between treaty obligations, domestic criminal law and child safeguarding standards.

Proposer’s background note: In England and Wales, incoming requests for the return of children in international parental child abduction cases are handled under the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. These cases are processed in the High Court as urgent civil matters focused on whether a child should be returned to another country. Outgoing requests are transmitted via the UK Central Authority.

Concerns have been raised by affected families, practitioners and some legal scholars about the alignment of this framework with binding human rights obligations, including the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. In particular, cases involving allegations of domestic abuse, coercive control or other criminal conduct are generally addressed within civil return mechanisms rather than through criminal investigation pathways. This can create tensions around evidential standards and risk assessment, potentially delaying recovery where a child has been unlawfully taken, or

conversely resulting in expedited return where serious risk is alleged, leading to severe violations of the rights of children, leading to risk of immediate or long term irreparable physical and psychological harm.

Questions have also been raised about the interaction between Hague return decisions and the UK's obligations under Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 8 (respect for family life), and principles of non-refoulement. Academic analysis, including Robinson (2023), has examined potential tensions between Hague return decisions and the absolute prohibition on ill-treatment under international law.

The UN Special Procedures in 2023 highlighted what they described as 'egregious miscarriages of justice that regularly occur in both family courts and courts that adjudicate Hague abduction cases'. The 2025 report of the Council of Europe's Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO) on the United Kingdom's implementation of the Istanbul Convention similarly raised concerns about the treatment of domestic abuse allegations in family courts. There is limited publicly available disaggregated data on Hague outcomes, including the sex of the taking parent, safeguarding issues and post-return consequences. It is proposed that increased data collection and transparency would support informed evaluation of the operation of the Hague agreements.

Amendments relating to the Hague Convention are currently under consideration in the House of Lords

as part of the Crime and Policing Bill. Given the human rights implications of proposals concerning criminalisation in cross-border cases, it is intended that independent analysis of compatibility with international treaty obligations would assist informed parliamentary scrutiny.

References:

Evasive Manoeuvres: Strasbourg, the Hague Child Abduction Convention and the Absolute Prohibition on Ill-Treatment, Oxford University Press, Human Rights Law Review, Volume 23, Issue 2, June 2023 <https://academic.oup.com/hrlr/article/23/2/ngad011/7169146>

Letter of the Mandates of the UN Special Procedures to the Hague Conference on Private International Law, September 2023 www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/issues/women/sr/activities/20230919-Joint-Letter-Hague-Conference-Private-International-Law.pdf

GREVIO Baseline Evaluation Report on the United Kingdom, 2025 <https://rm.coe.int/grevio-s-baseline-evaluation-report-on-legislative-and-other-measures-/1680b66579>

Board background note:

The Board opposes this resolution

Whilst the Section Board understands the seriousness of the issues raised in the resolution, neither AIUK nor the International Secretariat (IS) have policy or research on these issues. Neither AIUK nor the IS have the expertise or experience to provide even an initial analysis of the content of the motions or what the human rights analysis and recommendations would be.

At both a UK and international level, we have not been engaged in child protection issues beyond work on the Convention on the Rights of the Child and broadly on children's rights.

To properly assess the content of this motion we would need to cover multiple aspects of child protection and interacting systems, which we are currently working on and have no planned work.

The proposer's note on this motion refers to a key problem, the lack of officially held data on these cases, including the sex of the taking parent, which is particularly important when looking at cases involving domestic abuse, as well as post-return consequences. This again would require not only substantial policy analysis in an area where we have no experience or expertise, but also evidential research to establish a primary research base, which is currently absent. Research is very expensive and takes a long time. If AIUK were to embark on this issue, the scoping and research phase alone may take several years before we are able to engage with the substance of the resolution.

AIUK has recently undertaken a strategy refresh and has implemented a financial recovery plan to bring expenditure into line with income. Undertaking the required work would mean not progressing plans currently in our organisational strategy, and would require AIUK to broaden its focus well beyond our strategic priorities and existing areas of expertise. This would have a significant financial implication, as well as a detrimental impact on our ability to deliver our strategy.

We believe the following organisations would be better placed to engage with on these issues:

ATD 4th World, who have conducted research and have a campaign on many of these issues: <https://atd-uk.org/2023/07/27/new-report-published-i-have-walked-this-journey-alone-my-soul-is-tired/>.

Coram Children's Legal Centre: <https://childrenslegalcentre.com/>

Resolution: <https://resolution.org.uk/campaigning-for-change/vision/>

Further work required to assess the equalities impacts of this resolution.

O5: Support for AIUK Resolution on UN Veto at the 2026 Global Assembly

Summary: AIUK is putting forward at the 2026 Global Assembly the activist-led UN Network's resolution calling on the ICJ initiative on legal limits to the UN Security Council veto to be adopted as an official campaign by Amnesty. This resolution aims to demonstrate grassroots support for the resolution prior to the meeting of the Global Assembly later this summer.

Proposer: Janet Phillips

Supporters: Ian Myson; Dr Marci Green; Astrid Laich; Jeremy Cunningham; Cherry Bird

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves that the AIUK Board vigorously pursues its resolution to the Global Assembly on the ICJ initiative regarding the UN Security Council veto and campaigns for its adoption.

Proposer's background note: The primary responsibility of the UN Security Council is to maintain international peace and security. It is failing to do this in large part because action to address mass atrocities (genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression) is repeatedly blocked by vetoes from one or more of the five permanent members of the Council.

Prof Jennifer Trahan (Professor & Director of the Concentration in International Law and Human Rights, NYU Center for Global Affairs) argues that there are legal limits to the use of the veto in the face of mass atrocities:

- the Principles and Purposes of the UN Charter
- international treaties such as the Genocide Convention and Geneva Conventions
- peremptory norms / jus cogens (See Prof Trahan's book on the subject can be found here: www.cambridge.org/core/books/existing-legal-limits-to-security-council-veto-power-in-the-face-of-atrocity-crimes.)

A veto should never be in violation of any of the above; a veto should never result in enabling mass atrocities or allowing them to continue. For example, repeated vetoes by the US of resolutions calling for ceasefires in Gaza contributed to the prolongation of the war there and further loss of Palestinian lives; Russian and Chinese vetoes blocked humanitarian aid for Syrians in 2020; and a Russian veto in 2024 blocked humanitarian assistance to civilians in Sudan.

Also, in accordance with Article 27.3 of the UN Charter, a party to a dispute should abstain from voting on resolutions (within Chapter VI and

Article 52. 3 of the Charter). This restriction has repeatedly been ignored (e.g. Russia should have abstained from the resolution concerning the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, and more recently all resolutions concerning the war in Ukraine; the US should have abstained from the resolution concerning its invasion of Panama in 1989).

Prof Trahan is campaigning, with the support of several NGOs and eminent legal experts and diplomats from around the world, to get the International Court of Justice (ICJ) to issue an advisory opinion as to the legal limits of the veto. To this end, the campaign is lobbying member states to put forward a resolution in the UN General Assembly requesting an ICJ opinion.

The UN Network proposed a resolution concerning the ICJ initiative to the AIUK Board, which accepted it and submitted it to the Global Assembly. The final stage of the Global Assembly resolution process is later this summer. To view the draft resolution, please go to www.amnesty.org.uk/about/accountability/governance/annual-general-meeting-of-amnesty-international-united-kingdom-section/

Board background note:

The Board supports this resolution

The AIUK Board is very supportive of, and grateful for, the work on UN reform conducted by the AIUK UN Network, alongside others in the movement. AIUK works within a global AI framework, and work at UN level must comply with policy positions set by the International Secretariat of AI. The International Secretariat is not developing work on the ICJ initiative because of the capacity required to deliver this work, and their assessment (so far) of its likely impact.

The AIUK Section Board has put forward the motion to the AI 2026 Global Assembly that was proposed by the AIUK UN Network. The Global Assembly is due to take place in August 2026. Before the AI Global Assembly takes place, the movement will undertake a prioritisation process to vote for the motions that will be discussed at the Global Assembly, based on the Global Assembly voting convention of 'one section one vote' (by Standing Representatives of Sections). This process is due to take place in April 2026. If this motion is not prioritised, it will not go forward to the Global Assembly for discussion, workshops or a vote. The International Board of AI has advised that it does not support the Global Assembly motion, on the grounds that it focuses on a tactic rather than a position or policy.

If the motion is prioritised for debate at the Global Assembly, the AIUK delegate will of course advocate strongly for it.

There are no equalities impacts arising from this resolution.

O6: Refugees Welcome Network

Summary: A resolution proposing that Amnesty UK set up and support a Refugees Welcome Network in order to challenge anti-refugee and migrant prejudice and help create a welcoming environment for refugees.

Proposer: Ulrike Schmidt

Supporters: Christopher Ramsey; Jovana Bosnjak; Helen Ball; Alison Whelan; Graham Leslie Minter

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves that AIUK establishes a Refugees

Welcome Network to enable, support and empower AIUK activists and supporters to challenge anti-refugee and migrant prejudice and help create a welcoming environment for refugees.

Proposer's background note: In recent years Amnesty UK has set up a number of new Networks based around the lived experience of various rights holders eg Disabled people's network, Anti-racism network. A Refugees Welcome network would be in line with that strategy. It is also intended to build on the I-Welcome Refugees campaign a few years ago that was very popular with Amnesty activists and helped create a positive welcoming environment for refugees in many parts of the country.

In the UK, the toxic anti-migrant and refugee narrative has taken root in mainstream political parties with refugees and migrants being used as scapegoats to explain or divert from housing shortages, cuts to NHS services and falling living standards. The concept of 'Remigration' the forced deportation of refugees, immigrants and even citizens of colour is being normalised. Nigel Farage has pledged that, if Reform comes to power, he would deport 600000 people seeking asylum as well as many of those who have been granted leave to remain.

As Human Rights activists, supporting international human rights law such as the 1951 United Nations Refugee Convention on the right to asylum is central to our work. Most refugees are fleeing the serious human rights violations that we are tirelessly campaigning about.

A Refugees Welcome network is intended to enable Amnesty members

to collectively organise locally and nationally to defend and support refugees and asylum-seekers, reclaim the narrative and replace the hostile environment with a welcoming and caring one.

Board background note:

The Board supports this resolution

The Board welcomes this resolution, as this is an activist network that we are notably missing.

Amnesty has been developing activist thematic and professional networks for over 40 years.

Amnesty has been working on refugee rights for decades and has a long history of solidarity, campaigning and activism both globally and in the UK. Working on the rights of refugees and reclaiming the narrative to replace the hostile environment with a welcoming and caring one, fits very well with our refreshed strategy and has the potential to make a great contribution to it.

Currently, we have the following rights holder networks, all of which are constituted and formally recognised as part of AIUK:

- Trade Union Network Committee
- Disabled People’s Human Rights Network
- Children’s Human Rights Network
- Anti-Racism Network
- Amnesty Feminists
- Queer Network (formerly known as the Rainbow Network)

The development of a Refugee Network will require additional resourcing, staff support and budget, particularly for accessibility and support purposes which the nature of this type of work

will require. If this resolution is passed we will initiate a plan to develop this work in line with our available budgets and in line with the thematic network development process.

There are no equalities impacts arising from this resolution.

O7: Improvement of the Activist-led Campaign (ALC) Framework and Related Processes

Summary: A resolution to review and enhance the ALC process in order to address significant problems and barriers experienced by activists in securing approval for an ALC and in running approved campaigns.

Proposer: Ian Myson

Supporters: Janet Phillips; Astrid Laich; Cherry Bird; Jerry Allen; Dr Marci Green

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves that AIUK improve the Activist-led Campaign framework and related processes (‘the Activist-led Campaign process’), particularly in the following areas:

- Campaign approval. Clarify responsibility for approval, the degree to which Amnesty research is a pre-requisite, and the time period for an approval decision.
- Campaign issues. Clarify the rules for what it’s possible for an Activist-led Campaign to campaign on.
- Freedom of action. Clarify what an Activist-led Campaign can and can’t do in running a campaign without additional permission (including use of Amnesty positioning and branding).

- AIUK/IS coordination. Improve triangulation between AIUK, the IS and the relevant Activist-led Campaign where an Activist-led Campaign relates to an international issue.
- Staff responsiveness. Provide staff decisions and responses on a timely basis, including on approval.
- Staff resource to support Activist-led Campaigns. Revisit the principle in the Activist-led Campaign process of minimal staff involvement and consider how involvement can be most effective.
- Country Coordinators. Better define the limits of the Country Coordinator role in conducting campaigns on topics relevant to their country/region and their interaction with the Activist-led Campaign process.

Proposer's background note: ALCs give activists the opportunity to campaign on issues beyond the organisation's priorities. They are also a valuable opportunity for activists to use their skills and knowledge to devise and shape campaigns on issues they are passionate about and on which Amnesty does not have the capacity to work. The current ALC framework can be found at www.amnesty.org.uk/documents/5395/Activist-led20Campaign20Framework20Updated20August202023.docx

The staff team advise that there are 17 current ALCs. Eight of these are led by Country Coordinators on international topics; five are being worked on by thematic networks (some UK-focused, some international); three are led by local activists (all international); and one sits with the STAN network (freedom of expression in universities and colleges). The individual member supporters of this resolution between them are involved in leading work on ten ALCs. It is in keeping with governance best

practices to review frameworks on a periodic basis to ensure they remain effective in delivering campaign objectives. The framework has been operating now for 4+ years and review and improvement are timely, not least because the new Activism and Education Strategy puts more emphasis on campaigning focus, and the various parts of the movement all pulling in the same direction, than was the case when the framework was devised. A range of learnings and practical issues have arisen from the operation of ALCs to date which this resolution seeks to respond to and address in order to ensure that the impact of ALCs is maximised.

**Board background note:
The Section Board supports this resolution**

AIUK welcomes this resolution as an opportunity to review and improve the activist led framework and process.

The Activist Led Campaigning (ALC) framework was developed and launched in 2021 in order to allow for more agency in aligned human rights campaigns, which are not central AIUK campaigns and which run without staff resourcing. Over the last 5 years we have seen ALCs being led from our local groups, thematic networks, Country Coordinators and youth activism. The work has bought breadth and diversity.

This will require a nominal amount of further staff support for a short period - and AIUK wishes to include exploration of using the online community platform to support, promote and make the ALC process more efficient.

There are no equalities impacts arising from this resolution.

O8: Improving Activists' Access to AIUK Board Meeting Agendas and Minutes

Summary: This resolution asks the Section Board to make their meeting agendas and draft minutes available to members.

Proposer: Exeter Local Group

Text of resolution: This AGM resolves that the Board of Amnesty International UK shall:

1. in advance of each AIUK Section Board meeting, give the date and agenda to the membership via the AIUK website, on the monthly email to local groups and/or by other suitable means.
2. promptly after the meeting, issue draft minutes to the membership via similar channels.
3. Publish a summary of AIUK board meeting decisions on the website and magazine each quarter.

Proposer background note: Over the last few years, major decisions have been made by the Section Board about the future of AIUK- such as the sale of the HRAC, new IT systems, possible bookshop closures, removing Real Lives and changing the format of the National AGM/conference to mention a few. Consultations were sometimes promised but did not take place, very little information was made available to members before it was too late to object, and what questions were raised were dismissed or ignored. As examples, in an online meeting about AIUK activism on 16th May 2023, three alternative

formats were proposed for National Gatherings, but no further consultation was offered before significant changes were made to the way these events were arranged. At the 2023 AGM (24th June), four alternatives were given for the future of the HRAC with the implication that activists would have a say in the decision-making; this never materialized. The Exeter group emailed the board and trust chairs regarding the HRAC sale on 19th February 2025 but received no reply.

Discussion of these issues at board meetings has effectively happened behind closed doors and decisions presented to the membership as a fait accompli.

The board are voted in by the membership and are mandated to make decisions on their behalf without needing to consult on every issue. However, the intention of this resolution is that major decisions are explained to members in advance, so that their opinions, and any arguments for and against, can be heard and used to inform board decisions.

Any availability of agendas and minutes at present is not well-known and needs to be made easier and more accessible. Even as an active group, the Exeter group have never been told that agendas or minutes could be made available. In the last year, only one person has asked (via Tim Hancock) to see a copy of board meeting minutes.

This resolution would require agendas to be made available with enough time for comments on issues to be made by members via their area or network Board representative. As minutes are not agreed until the following board meeting,

draft minutes will need to be available in order that further comments can be made in time for the next board meeting.

Board background note:
The Board supports this resolution

The Section Board wishes to note that the initial decisions referred to in the Proposer’s Note, regarding the bookshops, Real Lives, and the combined National Conference and AGM (in 2024) were taken by the previous Chief Executive as ‘operational’ and the Section Board was not consulted beforehand.

A review of AIUK’s governance is due to take place in 2026 and will consider how, whilst ensuring the Boards don’t become involved in operational decisions, sufficient consultation can take place to ensure the views of the Section Board are considered for significant issues.

Until approximately ten years ago, minutes of the Section Board meetings were published on the website. The practice was discontinued as very few people were accessing these pages and there was risk that confidential or sensitive material could be disclosed in the public domain. Section Board Minutes are available to AIUK members on request.

There are no significant barriers to publishing dates of meetings and agendas in advance. There are occasions when Section Board meetings are called at short notice and, depending on the circumstances, advance notice of such meetings may not be possible.

The most significant challenge to publishing minutes on the website is to ensure that sensitive and confidential

items are not inappropriately disclosed in a public space. The Section Board expects this to be resolvable with some changes to procedure in the setting of agendas and production of minutes.

Implementation of this resolution is unlikely to cost additional money but will require increased time to develop and implement revised procedures in the short term, and this may displace other governance support activity. In the medium term, the resource implications are likely to be marginal.

There are no equalities impacts arising from this resolution.

