

**RESOLUTIONS REPORT
FROM 2012 RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE**

**AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL**



**Vancouver 2012
AGM/Human Rights Conference**

Amnesty International
Canadian Section (*English-speaking*)

A: STRATEGY AND ACTION
B: ORGANIZATION
C: FINANCE

June 15 to 17
University of British Columbia
Vancouver BC

AICS(ES) AGM 2012 Final Resolution Committee Report

Members: Marcel Lennon (Chair), Andy Buxton, Aengus Bridgman

Preamble:

The 2012 Resolutions Committee includes Aengus Bridgman, Andrew Buxton, and Marcel Lennon (chair). We met by telephone conference twice (March 24 and April 1st), discussed the resolutions then divided them according to committee members and resolution submitters. Aengus took lead on Resolution B-5, consulted on B-3 and put together the final report, Andrew took lead on Resolutions A-1 and A-2 (and A-3), and Marcel took lead on Resolutions B-3, B-4, and B-6. There were no changes required for resolutions C-7 and C-8. All major decisions were unanimously agreed upon by the committee, and the final report was finalized with input from each member.

RESOLUTION A-1

- We corrected the report title in the resolution to exactly match the March 2011 report.
- We asked the resolution sponsor (Action Circle A62) to ensure that they found the required full complement of 6 AI members to support the resolution.
- We clarified with Alex Neve that AI Canada plans to issue an update to the report in or around December 2012 (Alex clarified that in fact AI Canada has issued an update human rights agenda for Canada document roughly every 12 to 18 months since 2000).
- Since the initial resolution asked that AI identify 'additional ways that Canada has strayed from the human rights track' we raised the question (per the resolutions guidelines) as to whether this resolution is problematic per the 'Country Resolutions' (guidelines section 3) guidelines, but ultimately agreed that we were not concerned that this was an issue, and note that the sponsor removed this clause upon review.
- We asked the proposers whether they had any specific 'additional ways...' in mind that they expected the report might uncover (one item they suggested was the issue of solitary confinement in Canada – addressed by a separate resolution).

RESOLUTION A-2/A-3

- We suggested that the current AI policy on solitary confinement (per the AI Handbook) be included as a 'whereas' statement or an explanatory note.
- We suggested that if the Juan Méndez statement on solitary confinement was to be used as a 'whereas' it should be clarified that he concluded that the use of solitary confinement over 15 days should represent the limit between solitary confinement and prolonged solitary confinement and that he proposed a worldwide ban on prolonged solitary confinement.

- We considered the concern that this resolution as proposed might violate the country resolutions guidelines (and concluded this was not an issue).
- We asked the resolution sponsors to clarify whether their objective was an assessment of the use of solitary confinement in Canada, followed by some sort of action, or was inherently a proposal for AI to change its current policy on the use of solitary confinement internationally, in which case it might be argued that this is really two separate resolutions (and in fact the resolutions were ultimately split into resolutions A-2 and A-3).
- We concluded that resolution A-3 would require approval from the AGM to proceed to discussion since it is a 'new' resolution built from resolution A-2 and asks AI Canada to take a recommendation to the next ICM.
- We asked the sponsors to clarify the sort of action they had in mind (the traditional letter writing campaign was mentioned)

RESOLUTION B-3 (now B-4)

Preamble: One concern with this resolution was the title, as we felt it didn't accurately match the resolution's changes. We also realized that one of the expectations of this resolution was that the section adopt an electronic voting system, though the adoption of it was a tenant of resolution B-6. David corrected us in saying that it is a consideration regardless of whether B-6 is passed, and thus the correction reflects this as well. As not all members may be aware of what preferential voting is, we recommended adding an explanatory section to define it. We also suggested the correction of awkward wording in the 'be it resolved', and corrected some minor formatting. All suggestions were accepted and implemented.

The changes are as follows:

- Change of the title from "Fair Voting Methods" to "Preferential Voting Method".
- Changing from "that *when* AICS (ES)..." to "...that *if/when* AICS(ES)..." in the 'be it resolved'.
- Addition of the explanatory section on preferential voting.
- Editing of the wording in the 'be it resolved' to clearly indicate the use of the voting method.
- Various minor formatting changes were implemented.

RESOLUTION B-4 (now B-5)

Preamble: One concern we had was regarding the term 'senior salaried post' as mentioned in the 'be it further resolved', as it wasn't given a direct definition. David required confirmation on the exact positions considered, and revised the wording as needed. We also needed clarification on the intention and wording of part b, as we weren't sure it was intended as another addition to article 5.03 of the by-laws. David

replied saying that it would have been somewhat redundant, and some leeway would be required to allow for possible exceptions, but for clarity David added the explanatory section to clear this up. All suggestions were accepted (or altered for correction) and implemented.

The changes are as follows:

- Editing the 'be it further resolved' to include an exact definition of 'senior salaried posts'.
- An explanatory section was added to properly define the intentions of part b, and to better reflect what was considered “contrary to the interests of the branch”.
- Various minor formatting changes were implemented.

RESOLUTION B-5 (now B-6)

Preamble: The resolutions committee is particularly happy to see a resolution that seeks to clean up the very out-dated Branch Policy Manual. The committee recommended a number of primarily semantic concerns in order to improve the readability of the resolution. All suggestions were implemented.

The changes are as follows:

- We suggested adding the removal of the AGM references in sections of the Branch Policy Manual totally purged by the resolution.
- We suggested several minor formatting changes to ensure that the resolution was clear and accessible. - We checked to ensure the language drawn from the Branch Policy Manual was accurate to the latest version of the Branch Policy Manual.
- We suggested the policies be placed in proper ascending order.
- We suggested one minor adjustment in the language of the explanatory note which appears in the final resolution submitted to the AGM.

RESOLUTION B-6 (now B-7)

Preamble: As we were all aware this is a resolution with years of work behind it, there appeared to be only minor changes required, especially considering all required by-law changes would be submitted in the following year. One point we made was in the wording of the general meetings, as the main one was termed the BGM, and the off-year one was termed the AGM. Ian suggested using the terms BGM and “Off-Year General Meeting” to represent the two meetings. We also noted that a sentence mentioning who would be subsidized to the off-year meeting was repeated in the 'be it resolved', which we felt was unnecessary. We also noted some minor corrections on wording and formatting. All suggestions were accepted and implemented.

The changes are as follows:

- All mention of the off-year meeting as an “AGM” has been changed to “Off-Year

- General Meeting” or “Off-Year Meeting”, as appropriate to the original wording.
- Deletion of a redundant sentence in the 'be it resolved'.
 - Editing from “...will be more available...” to “...will have more availability...” in the end notes.
 - Various minor formatting changes were implemented.

RESOLUTION C-7 (now C-8)

- No changes required.

RESOLUTION C-8 (now C-9)

- No changes required.

Resolutions AICS(ES) AGM 2012

Resolutions Committee contact information:

Andy Buxton [abuxton254@aol.com]
Marcel Lennon [mlennon00@gmail.com]
Aengus Bridgman [aengusbridgman@gmail.com]

A: STRATEGY AND ACTION

A-1 Follow-up document GETTING BACK ON THE 'RIGHTS' TRACK: A Human Rights Agenda for Canada (March 2011)

Submitted by Barrie Amnesty International Action Circle A62:

Nancy Lee Allison, 705-353-0145, nancyallison79@yahoo.com;
Mariane Cancilla, mbcancilla@hotmail.com;
Heather Laurie Cook, 705-368-2205, hlauriecook@yahoo.ca;
Doreen Fernandes, 705-728-5815, dtef@yahoo.com;
Elaine Gareau, elaine.gareau@rogers.com;
Marilyn McKnight, 705-726-5175, marilyn.shadowlab@gmail.com)

WHEREAS in GETTING BACK ON THE 'RIGHTS' TRACK: A Human Rights Agenda for Canada (March 2011), Amnesty International notes that the status of Canada as a world leader in human rights has diminished, summarizes the issues that Canadians needed to address nationally and globally, and calls on Canadian political parties to address the issues raised, particularly as there was an opportunity to make their stances clear at the outset of the 2011 federal election.

AND WHEREAS Amnesty International asserted that the human rights agenda itemized in GETTING BACK ON THE 'RIGHTS' TRACK “must be implemented by those who win the election” (from “Overview” of Reclaiming Canada’s role as leader on human rights, March 31, 2011).

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Canadian Section (English-Speaking) of Amnesty International work with the International Secretariat to publish a sequel document to GETTING BACK ON THE 'RIGHTS' TRACK: A Human Rights Agenda for Canada (March 2011) identifying Canada’s current stand on human rights

issues nationally and globally.

Explanatory note

Members are interested in assistance from Amnesty International concerning Canadian issues. Although the Branch posts material concerning Canadian issues on our website (www.amnesty.ca) and Amnesty International includes a section about Canada in the annual report (for example, 2011, pp. 96–97), the March 2011 report highlights a trend in which Canadian policies have strayed away from the human rights track and, more importantly, clearly states what our government needs to do to address these human rights violations. The resolution seeks further assessment of Canada's record since the federal election in May 2011 and clear guidance for the membership in addressing Canada's current human rights record.

A-2 Solitary Confinement in Canada

Submitted by Barrie Amnesty International Action Circle A62:

Nancy Lee Allison, 705-353-0145, nancyallison79@yahoo.com;

Mariane Cancilla, mbcancilla@hotmail.com;

Heather Laurie Cook, 705-368-2205, hlauriecook@yahoo.ca;

Doreen Fernandes, 705-728-5815, dtef@yahoo.com;

Elaine Gareau, elaine.gareau@rogers.com;

Marilyn McKnight, 705-726-5175, marilyn.shadowlab@gmail.com)

WHEREAS the Amnesty International Handbook states:

Solitary confinement

Isolation of a prisoner or detainee. In some cases, long-term solitary confinement, or the reduced sensory stimulation which can result from solitary confinement, may amount to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. It can also have serious effects on the physical and mental health of prisoners and may facilitate torture.

Solitary confinement is not the same as incommunicado detention. A prisoner held in solitary confinement on their own in a cell may still have access to, for example, lawyers, family and independent medical care.

AI believes no prisoner should be confined long-term in conditions of isolation and reduced sensory stimulation, and that conditions of detention should conform with the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and other international human rights standards.

Solitary confinement should be completely prohibited for imprisoned children.

AND WHEREAS, in October 2011, Juan E. Méndez, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture and Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment, identified prolonged (in excess of 15 days) solitary confinement as a form of torture that is used globally and called for a global ban on the practice of prolonged solitary confinement in excess of 15 days.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Canadian Section (English-Speaking) of Amnesty International (i) identify the extent of the use of solitary confinement in both the Canadian penal system and the Canadian immigration detention system, (ii) where solitary confinement is found to be used, name those instances in which its

use does amount to cruel, unusual or degrading treatment, and (iii) publish a statement and suggest an action regarding its finding about solitary confinement.

Explanatory note

Juan Méndez defined solitary confinement as “the physical and social isolation of individuals who are confined to their cells for 22 to 24 hours a day” (UN General Assembly GA/SHC/4014 <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/gashc4014.doc.htm>) and that “confinement in excess of 15 days” be “subject to an absolute prohibition” (“Solitary confinement should be banned in most cases, UN expert says,” *UN News Service*, <http://www.un.org/apps/news/printnewsAr.asp?nid=40097>).

A-3 Solitary Confinement

(note this is a new resolution and will require AGM approval to proceed)

Submitted by Barrie Amnesty International Action Circle A62:

Nancy Lee Allison, 705-353-0145, nancyallison79@yahoo.com;

Mariane Cancilla, mbcancilla@hotmail.com;

Heather Laurie Cook, 705-368-2205, hlauriecook@yahoo.ca;

Doreen Fernandes, 705-728-5815, dtef@yahoo.com;

Elaine Gareau, elaine.gareau@rogers.com;

Marilyn McKnight, 705-726-5175, marilyn.shadowlab@gmail.com)

WHEREAS the Amnesty International Handbook states:

Solitary confinement

Isolation of a prisoner or detainee. In some cases, long-term solitary confinement, or the reduced sensory stimulation which can result from solitary confinement, may amount to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. It can also have serious effects on the physical and mental health of prisoners and may facilitate torture.

Solitary confinement is not the same as incommunicado detention. A prisoner held in solitary confinement on their own in a cell may still have access to, for example, lawyers, family and independent medical care.

AI believes no prisoner should be confined long-term in conditions of isolation and reduced sensory stimulation, and that conditions of detention should conform with the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and other international human rights standards.

Solitary confinement should be completely prohibited for imprisoned children.

AND WHEREAS, in October 2011, Juan E. Méndez, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture and Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment, identified prolonged (in excess of 15 days) solitary confinement as a form of torture that is used globally and called for a global ban on the practice of prolonged solitary confinement in excess of 15 days.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Canadian Section (English-Speaking) of Amnesty International raise these concerns about solitary confinement at the next ICM and urge the movement to name solitary confinement as a human rights abuse.

Explanatory note

Juan Méndez defined solitary confinement as “the physical and social isolation of individuals who are confined to their cells for 22 to 24 hours a day” (UN General Assembly GA/SHC/4014 <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/gashc4014.doc.htm>) and that “confinement in excess of 15 days” be “subject to an absolute prohibition” (“Solitary confinement should be banned in most cases, UN expert says,” *UN News Service*, <http://www.un.org/apps/news/printnewsAr.asp?nid=40097>).

B: ORGANIZATION

B-4 Preferential Voting Method

Submitted by the Executive Committee – contact person:
David Smith drsmithsoftware@gmail.com 450-247-2185

WHEREAS elections using the first-past-the-post method are potentially unfair to candidates and may produce results that do not reflect the will of the majority of AICS(ES) members,

WHEREAS preferential voting methods allow voters to rank their choices of the candidates standing for election,

WHEREAS electronic voting makes it easy and reliable to use a preferential voting method,

BE IT RESOLVED that if/when AICS(ES) adopts an electronic voting system for elections, preferential voting be used in AICS(ES) Executive Committee elections, as well in those of International Council Meeting (ICM) delegates and other elected positions.

Explanatory Notes

Preferential Voting (also known as instant runoff voting) is a type of election where voters rank the candidates in order of preference, with "1" being the highest (most preferred) ranking. The first preference on each ballot counts as a vote for that particular candidate, and the votes are tallied. If no candidate receives a majority (greater than 50% of the total valid ballots), the candidate with the fewest number of votes is eliminated and the ballots for that candidate are redistributed to each ballot's second preference. The process continues until a majority is reached by one of the candidates. The Wikipedia article on [Instant Runoff Voting](#) is a good reference.

B-5 Conflict of Interest

Submitted by the Executive Committee – contact person:
David Smith drsmithsoftware@gmail.com 450-247-2185

Conflict of Interest Resolution - a

WHEREAS the International Council Meeting (ICM) of August 2011 made a number of requests to sections to bring their by-laws and practices in line with measures designed to ensure that Amnesty board members and staff avoid conflicts of interest,

BE IT RESOLVED that the following text be inserted after the first paragraph of article 5.03 of the by-laws of AICS(ES):

No person who has served on the staff of AICS(ES) may be eligible to present his or her candidacy for the Executive Committee until two years have elapsed since leaving the staff.

Conflict of Interest Resolution - b

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

No person having served on the Executive Committee of AICS(ES) shall be appointed to the post of Executive Director or that of Secretary-General of the branch for two years following the end of their elective mandate.

If it appears that this provision appears contrary to the interests of the branch, AICS(ES) will request a decision from the international movement via the mechanism set out in decision 15 of the 2011 ICM (an ad hoc commission composed of the International Executive Committee Chair, the Chair of the International Council Meeting and the Secretary General).

Explanatory Notes

As the resolution notes, these changes to our by-laws and branch policies are designed to bring us into line with governance standards set by the international movement. The first part of the resolution (moving directly from a staff position to the board) is quite clear and no exceptions are envisaged. The second scenario of moving from the board onto staff allows for some exceptions. It is both difficult and critical to find just the right person for senior staff positions. While we are concerned about possible conflicts of interest we do not want to completely tie our hands either. We feel that the mechanism suggested of consultation with the rest of the movement in such a circumstance both protects us from making a bad decision while at the same time giving us the flexibility that we might one day require. This possible scenario is understood by the international movement too as indicated by the existence of a mechanism to deal with such cases.

B-6 Branch Policy Manual

Submitted by the Executive Committee – contact person:
George Harding george_a_harding@hotmail.com 250-964-0350

Explanatory Notes

The Branch Policy Manual (BPM) is a compendium of policies adopted by the English-speaking branch of AI Canada (hereinafter AIC) over a period of many years. The policies arise from decision made either at an Annual General Meeting (AGM) or by the Executive Committee (EC).

While reading through the BPM affords one a history of the Branch's evolution, the primary purpose of the Manual is to reflect existing Branch Policy. Ideally, the Manual serves as a resource for anyone wishing to know what *current* policy or position the Branch holds regarding a variety of issues. However, seen with that purpose in mind, the BPM is sorely out of date, containing many policies that are no longer applicable – and no longer applied.

The purpose of this resolution is to remedy that situation by either deleting or, where applicable, amending policies contained in the BPM that no longer reflect current Branch practice and, in that way, bring the Manual up to date.

Because the policies addressed in this resolution derive from decisions taken at past AGMs, an AGM

decision is required to change them.¹

The “BE IT RESOLVED” section of the resolution refers to policies, or parts thereof, that the EC recommends be expunged from the BPM and not replaced.

The first two “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED” sections of the resolution refer to section of the BPM that the EC recommends be replaced by other policy.

The third “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED” refers to a change to one of the Standing Orders.

The sections of the BPM that the EC proposes be deleted from the BPM are highlighted. Following each highlighted section is an explanation for the proposed change.

BE IT RESOLVED that the following highlighted sections of the AIC Branch Policy Manual be deleted:

3.05 Responsibilities of Committees

Resolutions Committee

The AGM Planning Committee shall appoint a sub-committee called the Resolutions Committee by February 15 of each year, for a period of one year.

In considering whom to appoint to the Resolutions Committee, the AGM Planning Committee shall use the following criteria for selection of Committee members:

- a) All members will have attended a minimum of two Branch Annual General Meetings
- b) The membership of the Committee will reflect a range of relevant leadership experience in the Branch (e.g. fieldworker, coordinator, EC member, experienced member of the executive of an Area Support Team, community or youth group or action circle, participation in an International Council Meeting)
- c) To allow newer members of the Branch to learn from and participate in national-level responsibilities, one member will not yet have served in a national leadership capacity.

The Resolutions Committee shall:

- consist of four members of AICS(ES), one of whom shall be a representative of the AGM Planning Committee
- choose a chairperson from amongst its members
- report to the AGM Planning Committee
- be provided with AGM resolutions upon receipt by the Secretariat
- consult by phone and/or mail

The Resolutions Committee shall have responsibility for:

- reviewing and submitting resolutions intended for the ICM in accordance with accepted guidelines

¹
decisions.

The EC is undergoing its own internal process to review and update EC policies that derive from EC decisions, as opposed to AGM

- consulting with and advising those proposing resolutions to the AGM in accordance with accepted guidelines
- suggesting to the Secretariat relevant background information which might be provided to members in order to assist with the assessment of the impact of particular resolutions
- deciding that where, in the view of the Resolutions Committee, a proposed resolution is in conflict with the mission of Amnesty International, national or international policy, or proposes action that is not within the power of the AGM to take, the resolution shall not be considered; and
- preparing a report to be included in the AGM mailing on actions taken by the Resolutions Committee and decisions reached.

(from AGM Standing Orders, revised AGM 04)

Note: Guidelines for resolutions are appended to the AGM Standing Orders found elsewhere in this Manual.

Whereas in ICM years, the AGM may be held after the submission deadline for ICM resolutions;

Be it resolved that when this is so, the Resolutions Committee will review the resolutions and submit any appropriate ones to the IS and that after the AGM, necessary revisions or withdrawals will be arranged by the Executive Committee.

(AGM 88)

[This is not current practice. It is the EC – or members - that submit ICM resolutions to the AGM for approval, not the Resolutions Committee. In the year preceding an ICM, a resolution intended to be submitted to the ICM may be submitted to the AGM for approval. Alternatively, a resolution drafted after this AGM is submitted first to the ICM (in order to meet the ICM resolution filing deadline, generally in January of the year of the ICM) and then submitted to the AGM held in the year of the ICM for ratification. See BPM 12.06]

5.12 Financial Statements and Projections

Financial statements will be appended to the minutes of the Executive Committee meetings.

(AGM 83, rev. EC 03/88)

Statements of revenue and expenses will be supplemented by a summary in graphic or percentage form.

(AGM 86)

In every edition of The Activist (or any equivalent publication to the membership) there be a clear report to the membership about the current financial status of AICS(ES) including a summary of income to date against expenditures, and of the financial performance of AICS(ES) for the current fiscal year against the objectives of the budget as approved by the previous AGM.

(AGM 95)

The EC requests that management include in each Management Group Report to the Executive Committee a statement indicating whether or not all remittances (salary and GST, for example) have been made on time.

(EC 04/98)

[The highlighted policies have not been followed for many years. Currently, financial statements are distributed to EC members and kept in the central files of EC meetings. They are not appended to the EC Minutes. Management provides up-to-date financial statements and reports at every EC meeting. This information has always been made available to any AIC member upon request. Moreover, a detailed financial report is presented at every AGM.]

5.13. Consultation with Treasurer

The Treasurer of AICS(ES) will be consulted in regard to all financial matters of the Branch.

(AGM 83)

[This 29 year old decision was made when the Branch did not have a professional Director of Finance an Administration, nor a senior management structure that involved both an Executive Director and a Secretary General. While the Treasurer has many specified duties,² he/she has not been consulted on all financial matters for many years.]

5.19 Fundraising Council

Be it resolved that the 1995 AGM calls for the immediate establishment of a Fundraising Council as recommended in the final report of the Program Funding Taskforce,

² The Treasurer's duties are set out at section 2.05 of the BPM and include: monitoring the Branch's financial situation by reviewing monthly financial statements of the Corporation; ensuring that the EC is kept informed regarding Branch finance matters; providing the financial analysis necessary to assist the EC in making decisions on financial matters; approving EC expense claims; participating in budget preparation; ensuring that the budget presentation is made and that an auditor is appointed at each AGM; meeting with the auditors following each annual audit of the Branch; and exercising, where necessary, the Treasurer's signing authority.

Be it further resolved that the Fundraising Council's mandate include strategies incorporating non-traditional sources³ (as defined above). The strategy would make an analysis of the potential benefits, costs, issues and risks to these sources. The analysis would review past practices and reference guidelines of AICS(ES) and other sections. The EC will report back on the progress of the fundraising strategy at the next AGM.

(AGM 95)

[There was an active Fundraising Council for a number of years but as the Fundraising Staff became more and more professional and our programs became more diverse there was no work for such a Council and it has not been constituted for a number of years.]

7.09 Geo-political Balance - Special Actions

Since participation in special actions is optional, geo-political balance should be the prime consideration in the groups' choice.

(AGM 83)

[As AI has discontinued "special actions", this policy is no longer relevant.]

8.01 Planning for Regional Development

That AICS(ES) move in a planned way toward a greater balance between central and regional levels of the organization, and that the Executive Committee be mandated to develop an action plan, including guidelines for determining target areas for the development of more regional offices, more regional staff and regional decision making structures.

(AGM 92)

[This decision called for the EC to "develop an action plan" regarding regional development. The decision does not require the EC to do this on an annual or regular basis. It has been many years since the EC has developed such an action plan. Questions regarding regional development of AIC's membership are now addressed by other EC bodies, such as the current Membership Renewal Committee.]

8.03 Regional Development Funding

1. Objective

³ Examples in the 1995 resolution included soliciting and accepting from non-traditional sources such as charitable foundations, wills and estates, major public events (i.e. concerts, fundraising dinners, speakers etc.) and some commercial enterprises, subject to relevant AICS(ES) and international guidelines.

To make available funding in a systematic manner so that membership development will be fostered in all regions and areas of AICS(ES).

2. Eligibility

Members in an area or region and/or national staff working with regional membership may apply for funding under this policy. The proposal for funding will be strengthened if there is a demonstration of membership consultation in the region or area.

3. Selection Criteria

Projects will be eligible for funding if:

- α. they enhance the effectiveness of the membership within the region or area
- β. they promote increased membership within the region or area
- γ. they otherwise enhance the effectiveness of AI work within the region or area
- δ. they promote the goals and implementation of the Branch plan.

4. Types of Funding.

Funding will be flexible depending upon the type of project, or event, and the existing ability of the people making the proposal to contribute partially to the total costs of the project being proposed. In some cases therefore matching funds may be available while in others the total costs of the proposal may be met by the fund available under this policy.

With the exception of travel subsidization to regional meetings, it is not intended that funding will be of a core (i.e. on-going) nature, but rather that it will give the impetus for creative development in a region or area that might otherwise be impossible without outside financial assistance.

5. Branch Obligation

The Branch is not obliged to approve funding of any projects if it is determined that none meet the selection criteria.

Regions are encouraged to apply early in the fiscal year for funding they require. Although every attempt will be made to ensure that national funding under this policy is allocated in an equitable way, funds will be dispersed as requests are received.

6. Exclusion.

Funding will not be considered for:

(a) financing of services already provided by Branch offices

(b) financing of fund raising events. These will continue to be eligible for funding as separate proposals to the Executive Committee

(c) financing of salaries, fees for service or honoraria except where reviewed and approved by the Management Group (MG).

7. Selection Process.

Proposals shall be submitted (for immediate consideration) to the relevant National Office Director who will consult with the appropriate area support people in making a decision.

If the proposal is rejected, members may appeal to the Executive Committee at the next EC Meeting.

8. Reporting Requirements.

Requests for travel subsidies must be substantiated by copies of receipts and/or details of kilometers traveled.

In all other cases a written detailed report with accompanying financial statements must be submitted to the relevant staff person within 2 months of the end of an event or project. This written report shall include details of implementation compared to those contained in the original proposal.

(AGM 90, rev. AGM 94)

[The Branch now has a Membership Cooperation Fund and a Campaign and Action Fund and processes for accessing each of these. The projects envisioned above are now primarily dealt with through the Membership Cooperation Fund. See BPM 5.20]

9.04 Regional Action Networks (RANs)

1. AICS(ES) is prepared to work on all RANs. When invited by the IS to participate in a RAN, AICS(ES) accepts, once a Coordinator has been appointed for the RAN.

2. The Groups and Membership Officer allocates RANs to AI groups in accordance with international policy "that all AI groups undertake individual prisoner work through the technique of adoption/investigation and/or RANs". The allocation of prisoners of conscience/RANs will also be in accordance with the principle of geo-political balance.

3. AICS(ES) expects always to have at least five groups working on each RAN. After groups have been chosen by the Ottawa Secretariat to participate in a RAN, the relevant Coordinator/Co-group member will distribute RAN materials coming from the IS and handle all necessary correspondence.

4. Coordinators receive copies of all RAN materials related to their concerns, and they are kept informed of which groups are participating in the RAN. All Coordinators establish and update the basic country file - relevant external and internal AI material under cover sheets - so that new groups can be informed quickly.

5. While no time limit will be placed on the number of years that a group will work on a RAN, groups will be given the option of relinquishing work on a RAN after two years. If after consultation with the Ottawa Secretariat and the Coordinator responsible, it is agreed that a group should not continue with a RAN, then the RAN should be returned to the Ottawa Secretariat.

6. Groups may work on more than one RAN provided they fulfill other obligations (e.g., prisoner dossiers (Action Files), fund raising, publicity, death penalty abolition work, campaigns).

7. Groups should appoint a person as a contact for each RAN they work on.

8. All groups are encouraged to work on at least one RAN.

9. RAN work is monitored by both the Coordination Officer in relation to Coordinators and the Groups and Membership Officer in relation to groups and by the Executive Member responsible for the world region of the RAN.

10. Groups report at least every six months, but complete for each action a practical one-page report with an activities log and an actions checklist. These reports are returned to Coordinators when actions end.

Note: Following a change in practice at the International Secretariat, reporting on RANs within the Branch was changed to annually in 1994.

11. After a group has worked for two (three) years on a RAN, they can request information about subsequent RAN actions and remain available to the Branch in a consulting role.

(AGM 1986)

[AI no longer utilizes Regional Action Networks as a strategy and, as a consequence, AIC no longer works with RANs.]

13.07 AGM Matters

Where feasible and unobtrusive, video recordings be made of the speeches given by featured speakers at all future AGMs, provided that the speakers consent in advance to making such recordings; and

These video recordings of featured speakers at AGMs be made available to members of AICS(ES) through the publications list.

(AGM 90)

[This 22 year-old policy has not been followed for many years.]

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the section of the Branch Policy Manual regarding the Approvals Committee be deleted and that the responsibilities of this Committee be undertaken by the Finance and Audit Committee of the Executive Committee.

5.04 Approvals Committee

An Approvals Committee be established with the following terms of reference:

A) The Approvals Committee will decide on whether or not to accept corporate sponsorship or designated gifts under the following circumstances:

- I. Where it is not clear whether the gift is outside of current priorities;
- II. Where the possibility exists that accepting the gift would be detrimental to AI's public image/credibility;
- III. Where the amount of the gift requires the Branch to seek approval from the international movement.

B) The Approvals Committee will be composed of one Executive Committee member, either the Executive Director or Secretary General, one member of the Fund Raising Council (appointed by the Fundraising Council and not an Executive Committee member) and one member of AICS(ES) elected annually at the AGM.

C) The criteria used by the Committee shall be relevant Branch Guidelines and the International Guidelines for the Acceptance of Funds and Fund Raising for AI and based on research as outlined in the Branch guidelines Acceptance of Gifts or Sponsorships.

(AGM 98)

[Since its establishment in 1998, the Approvals Committee has never met. The Fundraising Council, which is to appoint one of the Approvals Committee members, no longer exists. Currently, it consists of only one member, who has held the position for many years. It is recommended that the functions of the Approvals

Committee could be undertaken by the EC through its Finance and Audit Committee. In that way, these same issues would be addressed by an active, functioning Committee composed of elected AIC members, with ultimate responsibility for its implementation falling to the EC]

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the section of the Branch Policy Manual regarding International Committees (highlighted) be deleted and replaced by the policy adopted by the Executive Committee in May 2011, set out below.

12.01 International Committees

Nominations

1. The Chairperson of an Annual General Meeting during the opening Plenary session shall briefly explain to those in attendance the International Committees in existence and their mandate.
2. Following the Chairperson's explanation, he or she shall invite any interested person to submit to the Secretary General no later than 15 August of that year a curriculum vitae outlining all AI and non-AI experience with a clear indication for which International Committee or committees one wishes to be considered.
3. The Press and Information Officer [Communications Officer] shall ensure that the June The Activist contains a notice advising the membership of the existence of the International Committees, their respective mandates, the fact that all expenses of the committee members are borne by the international level, the frequency of meetings when possible and requesting all interested persons to submit an application form outlining their AI and non-AI experience as well as the committee or committees in which they are interested and that all applications should be submitted to the Secretary General no later than 15 August of that year. Note: this would now be the responsibility of the Activist Editor.
4. On or after 16 August of the year in question, the Secretary General shall circulate to all members of the Executive, photocopies of all submissions.
5. At the summer/fall meeting of the Executive, the Executive shall consider all applications and choose suitable candidates, if any, whose names will be forwarded by the Secretary, after consultation with AISC(F), to the International Executive Committee for consideration. The Secretary shall request the International Executive Committee to respond at its earliest convenience.
6. The Secretary of the Executive shall inform all applicants whose names, if any, have been selected to be forwarded to the International Executive Committee for consideration.

7. Upon receipt of a response from the International Executive Committee, the Secretary shall notify accordingly those persons, whose names have been forwarded, of the decision taken by the International Executive Committee.

(AGM 84)

[Since being passed in 1984, this decision regarding appointments to international AI committees has never been implemented or followed. In May 2011, the EC addressed this issue and passed the policy set out below:]

Nominations Process for International Non-Operational, “Gray Area” Opportunities and Committees

The following assumes:

- that nominees for international operational opportunities are chosen by senior management in consultation with other managers and staff
- that some requests for nominees stipulate a particular office holder or a particular person
- that the non-operational and gray area opportunities are extremely limited in number
- that the latter opportunities usually require specific skills and experience, and in many cases broadcasting these opportunities widely would raise false expectations among the membership
- that occasionally opportunities may allow members to apply directly without a section nomination, in which case the opportunity will be distributed as appropriate
- and that our branch already has selection procedures for certain opportunities, such as International Council Meeting delegates

Nomination Processes:

The President should take primary responsibility for determining the most appropriate nominations process for international opportunities as they arise. Nominations processes should be guided by principles of transparency, consultation, inclusion and diversity, while recognizing that different limits may be placed on each process by the specific skills, restrictions, capacities or experiences outlined in each call for nominations.

There are several nominations processes that may be appropriate depending on the nature of the opportunity and the deadline for nomination:

1. The EC representatives on the International Strategy Committee (including the President) should circulate information on the opportunity to key membership groups (eg. fieldworkers, staff, coordinators, relevant committees, group contact people and the youth/student network) or consult appropriate groups to come up with a list of potential candidates to approach. They should then review the applications and forward those that meet the criteria to the EC for a final decision, with a recommendation if they so wish.
2. The EC directly selects and nominates members (this may be the best option for delegates to other sections' AGMs, positions to be filled by an EC member, or IEC candidates, for example).
3. The President, in consultation with key people such as staff, EC or senior management as necessary, selects a nominee on his/her own. This option should be reserved for when a deadline for nomination is very tight or when a position is of particular strategic importance to the branch.

Note that in all of these options, elected EC members are responsible for the final nomination decision.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Standing Order 10.4 concerning the establishment of a Nominations Committee be updated by deleting the highlighted section, below, in order to make the Standing Order consistent with By-law 5.10.

10.4 The Executive Committee, through the AGM Planning Committee, shall appoint a Nominations Committee who will actively seek candidates for all positions on the Executive Committee and for the International Council Meeting. (5.10)

[By-law 5.10 states that it is the Executive Committee that appoints a Nominations Committee, without any participation of the AGM Planning Committee. This is current practice.]

B-7 Moving from AGM to BGM

Submitted by the Executive Committee – contact people:

David Smith drsmithsoftware@gmail.com 450-247-2185 and
Ian Heide ianheide@yahoo.com

BE IT RESOLVED that Amnesty International Canada (AICS(ES)) move from holding large membership General Meetings on an annual basis to holding such meetings every two years, which will be referred to as Biennial General Meetings (BGMs). In the year when there is no BGM (referred to as the “off-year”), an “Off-Year General Meeting” will be held to meet the Bylaws of AICS and laws of Canada. That Off-Year Meeting will approve the budget, appoint auditors and conduct any other business that is mandatory for the year and cannot wait until the following BGM. Only members of the Executive Committee and Management Staff of AICS will be subsidized to attend this Off-Year Meeting.

The proposed schedule for the change to BGMs is as follows:

- 2012 – Annual General Meeting
- 2013 – Annual General Meeting
- 2015 – Biennial General Meeting
- 2017 – Biennial General Meeting

In the years 2014, 2016, etc. there will be an Off-Year General Meeting to meet mandatory legal requirements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this transition to BGMs includes the following directions and components:

1. Biennial General Meetings:

The goals of the BGM will include:

- ⤴ Bring more members together than normally attend an AGM
- ⤴ Bring other human rights activists from outside of AI to the BGM
- ⤴ Reduce costs for members to attend the BGM (in relation to current AGM costs)
- ⤴ Create a Human Rights Conference feeling to the BGM that allows participants to gain inspiration in a variety of ways by scheduling their time to focus on education, networking, or the decision making and business aspects of AICS.

2. Meeting Members Needs:

AICS is committed to providing human, financial and technical support to AICS members in order to meet their needs, and also meet the needs of AICS in the “off-year”. The criteria for the Membership Cooperation Fund (MCF) will be reviewed to ensure the focus on membership needs includes “off-year” requests. The MCF will also be significantly increased to provide financial support for “off-year” membership activities.

3. Elections Process:

AICS will move to an electronic voting system for the elections of Executive Committee members and International Council Meeting delegates. The current voting rights will not be changed (every member of AICS is entitled to one vote). This electronic voting system will be applicable every year, regardless of whether or not there is a BGM.

4. Decision-Making in the “Off-Year”:

On an on-going basis, AICS will provide information, conduct consultations and engage in dialogue to ensure members are aware of issues within the “off-year”. This will allow AICS to move towards more inclusive decision making processes that are also more flexible than deciding on resolutions at an AGM.

5. Environmental Impact:

By moving to BGMs, AICS will continue to reduce our overall impact on the environment. Any activities that take place in the “off-year” that can be measured for environmental impact will be measured to ensure AICS continues in this direction.

6. Financial Impact:

The financial cost of moving to BGMs, with increased “off-year” membership activism needs, will be less than or equal to the current financial expenditure of AGMs every year. In the “off-year” the Membership Cooperation Fund (MCF) will be used to provide financial support for organizing Regional and other meetings, as well as to help finance other creative initiatives that support membership growth and activism.

7. Human Rights College (HRC), Fieldworkers (FWs) and Coordinators (COs) Meetings:

Historically, the HRC, FWs and COs have chosen to meet prior to the AGM so that they could then participate in the AGM after their annual meetings. All three of these important “structures” have been discussing how they would change their current processes if AICS moves to BGMs. Therefore, the resolution does not address the solution to this issue because the solution will be decided in consultation with those three structures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an Implementation Plan be prepared in the next year and presented to the 2013 AGM for approval. That Implementation Plan will resolve the details of moving from an AGM to a BGM. For example, this Implementation Plan will provide details on how electronic voting/elections will be managed, etc.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the 2015 BGM be provided with an evaluation of the move from AGM to BGM. A process will be put in place for members to review the evaluation and assess whether any adjustments are required.

Explanatory Notes

Introduction:

The Executive Committee is enthusiastic and excited about this resolution because it opens up space to explore creative ways to strengthen AI Canada. It creates time and provides support for local members in Regions to build a stronger presence in their communities. This resolution is not about saving money, nor is it about centralizing decision making or reducing membership input into the directions of AICS. Quite the opposite. We envision large, lively, energetic BGMs one year followed by creative new projects, events and forms of participation in human rights work the next year.

By law, Amnesty International Canada (AICS(ES)) is required to hold an Annual Meeting, to approve the budget, appoint auditors and ensure the Executive Committee is elected. Historically, AICS has held large membership meetings annually, referred to as the Annual General Meeting (AGM). This Resolution proposes that these large membership meetings take place every two years, and be referred to as Biennial General Meetings (BGMs). In the year when there is no BGM, there would still be an Off-Year General Meeting, but only members of the Executive Committee and Management Staff of AICS will be subsidized to attend this Off-Year Meeting. Attendance at this Off-Year Meeting would still be open to any member of AICS.

Meeting the Needs of the Membership:

The key purposes of our current AGM, as identified by members, are roughly as follows:

- ✦ Relationships/networking
- ✦ Motivation/inspiration/celebration
- ✦ Exchange of ideas/learning what others are doing
- ✦ Learning about organization/Branch issues/Seeing Branch in action/campaigns/accountability
- ✦ Education/tools building/information on HRs
- ✦ Exercising democracy (decision-making/sharing views on issues being discussed)

We believe those will be met if we move to BGMs. We realize that there is a very strong need for human rights activists to connect personally to others involved in our work, especially inside of AI’s membership. Face-to-face conversations are best, with technology opening up many ways to build relationships with others also. We hope that new ideas and creativity will result in new methods of connecting, including Regional Meetings, campaigning events, youth gatherings, etc. Generally, AI members coming together

around any issue or theme that we feel is beneficial to move our important work forward.

We believe we can be more effective in our communication in future. We can share stories, successes, techniques. We can communicate within communities, across regions, at the national or local level. Much of it will be based on technology. There will be increased support for using technology and for sharing of information so that we all can learn together throughout the year, not just at the BGM.

To support our educational needs, we will see increased travel from staff campaigners and other experts. Common workshops can be used across AI, at a Regional Meeting or simply within a local AI Community or Youth-Student Program Group. Rather than bring a limited number of people together at an AGM, we hope that we can reach more people by encouraging and supporting networking, education and discussion of issues at all levels across the membership.

After consulting with members, we don't feel there is a strong need to specifically define "regions". In some parts of the country, AI members do identify with a specific region. And, of course, that may continue, with Regional Meetings occurring on a regular basis. In other parts of the country, AI members may feel closer to those who campaign on the same issues. That will also be recognized and promoted as part of the opportunity we have if we move to BGMs.

Elections:

The elections process will be the same in BGM-Years and Non-BGM-Years. The process will be a "technology-based" system, but will accommodate participation via non-electronic means also. Members will be made aware of their right to vote and the method of voting via the same mailings we use today (Group Chair lists, Monthly mailings, etc.). The exact timing of the elections remains to be determined but it will be designed to ensure continuity as the new members of the Executive Committee are elected.

The technology is not determined yet, but it will resolve issues of registration, security, access to candidates, etc. because we will use a proven system that has been used successfully by other organizations. For example, a voting web site will allow candidates to provide information about themselves. A blog space on the site could allow members to ask questions of candidates and have them answered there. A live on-line Q&A with candidates is another possibility. The elections process would set a nomination deadline, allow for a campaign period and then a two-week voting period. The details of the elections system will be determined as part of the 2013 Implementation Plan.

Environment:

Delegates at the 2009 AGM passed a motion to reduce our environmental impact at General Meetings through a series of recommendations regarding different aspects of the meetings. AICS has continually made efforts to reduce our environmental impact via approaches such as reducing the use of paper, turning our offices into "green building spaces", reducing the consumption of meat at AGMs, etc. Moving to a BGM will continue that trend of reducing our impact on the environment.

An analysis of our estimated carbon footprint shows that an AGM held in Toronto costs approximately 67.13 metric tons of CO₂. However, recent Regional Meetings are estimated on average at approximately 1.25 metric tons of CO₂. Also, a projection of a Regional Meeting that includes 100 participants would still only be in the range of 3.00 to 4.00 metric tons of CO₂, which is about 5-7% of the carbon footprint of an AGM. This AGM Resolution will significantly reduce our impact on the environment while not reducing our ability to come together and share the challenges of our important human rights work.

Financial Impact:

At a very high level, the financial impact of moving to BGMs could be as follows:

Two-Year Cost with Current AGM Model:

· AGM Costs:	\$ 190,000	(\$ 95,000 per year)
· AGM Subsidy Costs:	\$ 10,000	(\$ 5,000 per year)
· Membership Cooperation Fund (MCF):	\$ 20,000	(\$ 10,000 per year)

Total Cost based on 2 years: \$ 220,000

Two-Year Cost with Proposed BGM Model:

8. BGM Average Cost:	\$ 115,000	(expanded BGM)
9. BGM Subsidy Cost: participation)	\$ 25,000	(increased
10. MCF (BGM Year)	\$ 10,000	(current amount)
11. MCF (Off-Year):	\$ 70,000	(supports activism)

Total Cost based on 2 years: \$ 220,000

Notes:

1. The AGM and BGM costs indicated above do not include costs for the HRC, FW or COs. Those costs have been removed from the analysis as they will be attributed to the “structures” themselves to determine how to allocate in future. Further discussion is required with the FWs and COs to determine the budget guidelines and proposed budget amounts for the future if AICS moves to a BGM approach.
2. The Membership Cooperation Fund (MCF) will be used to provide support for membership events and activities in both the BGM year and the Off-Year. The MCF will not be used to fund staff costs for travel or support to membership activities. Those costs will come from existing budget lines.
3. There is an impact on human resource costs (both financial and work hours) to move to a BGM approach. It is not possible to provide a reasonable estimate of staff savings if there is a BGM and no AGM. If AICS moves to BGMs, it is proposed that staff will have more availability to support membership revitalization work as proposed in the Branch Plan. It is also proposed that staff logistical support that used to be allocated to AGMs can now help support membership meetings and events in the “off-year”. Again, there has been no detailed estimate done of the impact financial or in regards to work hours. Instead, the assumption and commitment is that staff will have more availability to support “off-year” activities in a variety of ways, as capacity allows.

C: FINANCE

C-8 Audited Financial Statements – Fiscal period 2011

Submitted by the Executive Committee – contact person:

Brenda Dashney bdashney@sympatico.ca. 613-821-7469

BE IT RESOLVED that the audited financial statements for the fiscal period 1 January 2011 to 31

December 2011 be accepted.

C-9 Approval of Auditors

Submitted by the Executive Committee – contact person:

Brenda Dashney bdashney@sympatico.ca. 613-821-7469

BE IT RESOLVED that Deloitte be appointed auditors for the fiscal year 1 January 2012 – 31 December 2012.