

Amnesty International 2010 Report to INGO Accountability Charter using GRI NGO Level C reporting template

Name of organization:



Filled in by:

Name:

George Macfarlane

Position:

Senior Director, Organisational Services

Email:

George.Macfarlane@amnesty.org

Phone number:

+44 20-7413-5200

AI Index Number: IOR 80/005/201

After you complete this, send a copy to GRI at:

Global Reporting Initiative

P.O. Box 10039

1001 EA Amsterdam

Email: guidelines@globalreporting.org

Fax: +31 20 531 0031

Information on numbering: All sections in the boxes are taken directly from the original English version of the NGO Sector Supplement and the original reference numbers and page number appear in parenthesis. The NGO Sector Supplement is available for free downloading at www.globalreporting.org

1 Strategy and Analysis

1.1 Statement from the most senior decision-maker of the organization. [GRI NGOSS: p. 25]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is a membership based international movement working together for human rights as set out publicly in our Statute. We are committed to meeting good practice standards in operational excellence, confidentiality, public reporting and transparency. We seek to comply fully, for example, with public standards for financial reporting and with the International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO) Accountability Charter. Our six-year Integrated Strategic Plan 2010-2016 (see 2.2 below) and the corresponding prioritisation document for each of our operational planning cycle provide guidance to our work. Our vision, goals and objectives as well as the six-year strategic plan are all presented on our website (<http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/accountability>).

Our economic sustainability is based on continuing public support for the goals of the movement. With in the region of 3 million individual members and supporters, the funding base of the movement is relatively secure as our performance in the face of recent global economic challenges has attested. Some decreases were experienced in a few markets, however, and this slowed our overall income growth rate. We remain focused on retaining our members and supporters and diversifying our sources of income. We are committed to building a more diverse and active member/supporter base reflecting our priorities for human rights campaigning in different parts of the world.

As would be expected of a human rights organisation we respect all relevant laws and legislation applying to social conditions and undertake assessments of the suitability of partner organisations and suppliers before entering into relationships with them. We do not yet have in place comprehensive environmental impact measurement systems or policies and are conscious that we need to do more in this area. However we do measure emissions and are looking at ways to reduce these including through the increased use of communications technology to reduce international travel.

Work for and with individuals whose rights are at risk lie at the heart of our mission and so it is to them that we are most directly accountable. Through research and campaigning work, we actively listen to individuals at risk and human rights defenders all around the world. We also work in partnerships with other organisations in a consultative manner to ensure we use our limited resources to work most effectively on an international basis.

2. Organizational Profile

2.1 Name of the organization. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

2.2 Primary activities (e.g., advocacy, social marketing, research, service provision, capacity building, humanitarian assistance, etc.). Indicate how these activities relate to the organization's mission and primary strategic goals (e.g., on poverty reduction, environment, human rights, etc.). [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's vision is of a world in which every person enjoys all of the human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments. In pursuit of this vision, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's mission is to undertake research and action focused on preventing and ending grave abuses of these rights. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL addresses governments, intergovernmental organizations, armed political groups, companies and other non-state actors. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL seeks to disclose human rights abuses accurately, quickly and persistently. It systematically and impartially researches the facts of individual cases and patterns of human rights abuses. These findings are publicized, and members, supporters and staff mobilize public pressure on governments and others to stop the abuses.

In addition to its work on specific abuses of human rights, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL urges all governments to observe the rule of law, and to ratify and implement human rights standards; it carries out a wide range of human rights educational activities; and it encourages intergovernmental organizations, individuals, and all organs of society to support and respect human rights. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's strategic human rights priorities in 2010-2016 are: (1) Empowering people living in poverty; (2) Defending unprotected people on the move; (3) Defending people from violence committed by state and non-state actors; and (4) Protecting people's freedom of expression and freedom from discrimination. Details on these and other organizational priorities are described in our "AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL INTEGRATED STRATEGIC PLAN 2010 TO 2016" (<http://www.amnesty.org/en/integrated-strategic-plan>), which aims to empower rights-holders whose rights are challenged and strengthen the human rights movement.

2.3 Operational structure of the organization, including national offices, sections, branches, field offices, main divisions, operating companies, subsidiaries, and joint ventures. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

The AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL movement comprises of national sections and structures and the International Secretariat. Sections and structures carry out work to promote human rights in their own countries/territories in accordance with AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's Statute (<http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/accountability/statute-of-amnesty-international>). The International Secretariat provides key research and action functions and coordinates AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's day-to-day work at the global level.

2.4 Location of organization's headquarters. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's International Secretariat (IS) is located at 1 Easton Street, London, WC1X 0DW, UK (main office of the IS). There are eight other IS offices worldwide (Dakar, Kampala, Beirut, Hong Kong, Moscow, Geneva, Paris, New York) in addition to country project offices.

2.5 Number of countries where the organization operates. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL currently has 69 legal entities present in 66 countries/territories:

Global South (43 entities in 43 countries/territories): Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Bermuda, Burkina Faso, Chile, Cote D'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Faroe Islands, Ghana, Hong Kong, Hungary, Israel, Kenya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Global North (26 entities in 23 countries/territories): Australia, Austria, Belgium (2 entities with one Flemish speaking and one French speaking), Canada (2 entities with one English speaking and one French speaking), Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK (2 entities with one section and the International Secretariat), USA

2.6 Nature of ownership and legal form. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is a worldwide movement based on voluntary membership and composed of independent legal entities being national sections and structures and the International Secretariat. The work carried out through the International Secretariat is organised into two legal entities, in compliance with United Kingdom law. These are Amnesty International Limited ("Amnesty International L") and Amnesty International Charity Limited ("Amnesty International CL"). Amnesty International Limited undertakes charitable activities on behalf of Amnesty International Charity Limited, a registered charity (UK Charity Registration Number: 294230). For charity statuses of sections and structures, contact information can be found at <http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/amnesty-international-in-your-country>.

2.7 Target audience and affected stakeholders. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is a worldwide movement of people who campaign for internationally recognized human rights to be respected and protected for everyone. We believe human rights abuses anywhere are the concern of people everywhere. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL works to improve people's lives through campaigning and international solidarity. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL conducts research and generate action to prevent and end grave abuses of human rights and to demand justice for those whose rights have been violated. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's members and supporters exert influence on governments, political bodies, companies and intergovernmental groups. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's activists take up human rights issues by mobilizing public pressure through mass demonstrations, vigils and direct lobbying as well as online and offline campaigning.

2.8 Scale of the reporting organization. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

As of Dec 2009, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL had about 3 million members and supporters (about 88% from the Global North and about half were women). And we estimate at least 1 million individual activists around the world took part in actions (traditional methods such as letter writing, signing petitions, demonstrations, lobbying, and other innovative methods such as blogging, social networking, street theatre and road shows) sponsored by AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL in 2009. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's 2009 global income was €200 million and expenditure was €193 million. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's net assets at the end of 2009 was €108 million (€156 million of assets, €48 million liabilities) with €55 million in cash.

In 2009 AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL sent 163 research missions into the field covering 87 countries/territories and logging 4333 person-days.

Please note some countries (e.g., China, Cuba, Iran, Laos, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan, Vietnam) prohibit our entry to investigate human rights violations; others make entry for research purpose either rare or extremely difficult (e.g., India, Libya, Syria); and, in respect to some countries our research methodologies mean it is simply too unsafe to enter, both for our contacts in those countries and for our staff.

2009	Missions	Person-Days	Countries/Territories
Africa (Sub-Saharan and Southern)	44	1508	23
Americas	23	589	13
Asia-Pacific and South Asia	51	1310	20
Europe and Central Asia	30	467	23
Middle East and North Africa	15	459	8
Total	163	4333	87

To publicize human rights abuses around the world AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL published 130 reports (10 pages or longer) and 399 shorter documents (country updates, campaign digests, case sheets and leaflets) documenting human rights violations in 112 countries/territories in 2009.

2009	Reports	Other Shorter Documents	Countries/Territories
Africa (Sub-Saharan and Southern)	21	85	24
Americas	24	93	17
Asia-Pacific and South Asia	26	97	24
Europe and Central Asia	37	56	33
Middle East and North Africa	22	68	14
Total	130	399	112

Issued when a person is in imminent danger of human rights abuse and the bringing of public attention through letter writing is likely to make a difference, urgent actions are a longstanding means of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL calling for activist action. In 2009 AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL issued 600 urgent actions and related updates covering 77 countries/territories.

2009	New Urgent Actions	Urgent Action Updates	Countries/Territories
Africa (Sub-Saharan and Southern)	30	15	13
Americas	119	63	21
Asia-Pacific and South Asia	55	43	14
Europe and Central Asia	31	32	15
Middle East and North Africa	108	104	14
Total	343	257	77

2.9 Significant changes during the reporting period regarding size, structure, or ownership. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

None

2.10 Awards received in the reporting period. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

None

3. Report Parameters

Report Profile

3.1 Reporting period (e.g., fiscal/calendar year) for information provided. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

Calendar year of 2009.

3.2 Date of most recent previous report (if any). [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

March 2010 (2009 Report covering compliance with the INGO Accountability Charter in 2008 using the interim Reporting Framework of the INGO Accountability Charter).

3.3 Reporting cycle (annual, biennial, etc.). [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

Annual

3.4 Contact point for questions regarding the report or its contents. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

George Macfarlane (Senior Director, Organisational Services)

Report Scope and Boundary

3.5 Process for defining report content. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

The content we chose to report on is based on the following considerations: (1) INGO Accountability Charter Board's instructions (Oct 2010 workshop and "Board Meeting Paper ACC 10/21 a") requiring all Charter signatories to report compliance with the Charter using GRI Level C template for NGOs with 18 indicators (9 are NGO-specific); and (2) key elements of our 2010-2016 Integrated Strategic Plan (see 2.2 above).

3.6 Boundary of the report (e.g., countries, divisions, subsidiaries, leased facilities, joint ventures, suppliers). See GRI Boundary Protocol for further guidance. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

Unless stated otherwise, this report covers the entire movement of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL, including all legal entities globally (sections, structures, the International Secretariat).

3.7 State any specific limitations on the scope or boundary of the report. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

None

3.8 Basis for reporting on joint ventures, subsidiaries, leased facilities, outsourced operations, and other entities that can significantly affect comparability from period to period and/or between organizations. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

All AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's legal entities are expected to adhere to local generally accepted accounting principles in preparing their financial reports to the movement and their own governments. Due to resource and time constraints, it has not been possible to gather sufficient information to determine the adjustments required to ensure that the global financial statements are compliant with International Financial Reporting Standards ("IFRS"). The content and format of the primary statements (balance sheet and cash flow statement) and supporting notes have been designed to ensure compliance with IFRS disclosure requirements where possible. However the content and format of the income statement and fund notes have been based upon the disclosure requirements of Accounting and Reporting by Charities: Statement of Recommended Practice ("SORP 2005").

3.10 Explanation of the effect of any re-statements of information provided in earlier reports, and the reasons for such re-statement (e.g., mergers/acquisitions, change of base years/periods, nature of business, measurement methods). [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

The most significant prior year (2008) restatements are as follows:

1. Restatement due to a change in accounting policy on adoption of the changes to the requirements found in Section 1000 Financial Statements Concepts of the Handbook of Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (AI Canada) - Decrease in opening funds of €229,041
2. Restatement due to the inclusion of the results and financial position of AI Ireland Foundation in the 2009 aggregated accounts (AI Ireland) - Increase in opening funds of €1,028,886

3.11 Significant changes from previous reporting periods in the scope, boundary, or measurement methods applied in the report. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

None

3.12 Table identifying the location of the Standard Disclosures in the report. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

4. Governance, Commitments, and Engagement Governance

4.1 Governance structure of the organization, including committees under the highest governance body responsible for specific tasks, such as setting strategy or organizational oversight. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's highest decision-making body is the International Council, which convenes every other year and is made up of representatives of sections and structures and members of the International Executive Committee. The primary functions of the International Council are:

- (i) to focus on strategy;
- (ii) to set AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's vision, mission and core values;
- (iii) to determine AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's Integrated Strategic Plan including its financial strategy;
- (iv) to establish systems and bodies of governance and delegation for the movement, to elect members to those bodies, and to hold those bodies and their members accountable;
- (v) to evaluate the movement's performance against its agreed strategies and plans;
- (vi) to hold sections, structures and other bodies accountable.

The primary role of the International Executive Committee is to provide leadership and stewardship for the whole of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL worldwide. The functions of the International Executive Committee are:

- (i) to take international decisions on behalf of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL;
- (ii) to ensure that there is a sound financial policy for AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL and that the financial policy consistently implemented across the international organization;
- (iii) to ensure implementation of the Integrated Strategic Plan;
- (iv) to make any necessary adjustments to the Integrated Strategic Plan and other decisions of the International Council;
- (v) to ensure compliance with the Statute;
- (vi) to ensure human resources development;
- (vii) to hold sections, structures and other bodies of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL accountable for their functioning by presenting reports to the International Council;
- (viii) to perform the other functions conferred on it by the Statute.

4.2 Indicate whether the Chair of the highest governance body is also an executive officer (and, if so, their function within the organization's management and the reasons for this arrangement). Describe the division of responsibility between the highest governance body and the management and/or executives. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

The Chair of the International Council is non-executive and appointed by the previous International Council Meeting. Members of the International Executive Committee are non-executive and elected at International Council Meetings. The day-to-day affairs of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is conducted by the International Secretariat headed by a Secretary General under the direction of the International Executive Committee.

4.3 For organizations that have a unitary board structure, state the number of members of the and/or non-executive members highest governance body that are independent and/or non-executive members. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

The current International Executive Committee has 10 unpaid non-executive members (9 elected and 1 coptee). Details of these 10 International Executive Committee members can be found: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/our-people/international-executive-committee>.

4.4 Mechanisms for internal stakeholders (e.g., members), shareholders and employees to provide recommendations or direction to the highest governance body. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

Members and staff can provide recommendations and feedback directly to the International Executive Committee at IEC@amnesty.org. Members' recommendations are also channelled through their section/structure's representatives to the International Council Meeting. The movement routinely consults members and staff on key policies and strategies between bi-annual International Council Meetings using a wide range of channels from formal submissions to face-to-face forums.

Stakeholder Engagement

4.14 List of stakeholder groups engaged by the organization. [GRI NGOSS: p. 29]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's key stakeholders are individuals at risk, human rights defenders, non-governmental and community organisations and coalitions, members and supporters, activists, volunteers, governments, international organizations such as United Nations.

Individuals, defenders, groups or communities that we work with arising from human rights violations or threats that they have experienced are identified through our research, contacts and partners at national level, usually in the first instance by the country team of the International Secretariat, or by our section/structure colleagues.

Country level strategic partners are identified and supported by the country team and the strategic partnerships team. The criteria for relationships are based on our shared human rights priorities and agreed plans for joint work that is mutually reinforcing and of real added value to the partners and the human rights goals we share.

We target key governments and intergovernmental organizations to either put pressure on them to promote human rights or to expose how their actions undermine respect for human rights. We work with key international and regional human rights bodies and mechanisms such as the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council, UN treaty bodies and special procedures and the regional human rights courts and mechanisms. Additionally we work with political and legal bodies such as the UN Security Council and the International Criminal Court as well as the European Union, Council of Europe, ASEAN and Arab League. Our engagement with each of these institutions is based on our priorities and assessment of the impact these institutions can have in the promotion of human rights.

Data on Performance

Indicator 1: (NGO1) Involvement of affected stakeholder groups in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs.

As a founding member of the INGO Accountability Charter and a contributor to the development of the GRI NGO Sector supplement, we recognize the continuous need to improve and promote our accountability mechanisms to all of our stakeholders. But more specifically, we would identify primary stakeholders as those individuals at risk of grave human rights violations anywhere in the world and strive to include them at every stage of our work and across every part of the organization.

Several steps have been taken towards this. For example, our six-year Integrated Strategic Plan ("ISP", see 2.2 above) is the result of extensive consultations with our members, partners and independent experts. A general public online survey was also developed as a way to encourage views from the general public. At the heart of the ISP is our aim to empowerment of right holders whose rights are challenged and strengthen the human rights movement. Moreover, one the ISP's main priority is to develop 'active participation' and participatory methods for research and action to ensure wider inclusion of stakeholders as well as improved effectiveness and impact.

From our global strategy down to an individual project level, we try to involve stakeholders at every stage of the project cycle, from situation analysis to setting indicators to reporting on results. The International Secretariat project management methodology encourages all staff to conduct participatory exercises with affected stakeholder groups, at the planning stage of a project, during periodic organisational review times and during evaluation exercises. Partners, and communities we work with are consulted on plans, and involved in reviews and evaluations we carry out. This can vary from consultation to participative processes. During the "Stop Violence Against Women" Campaign, which was completed in 2010 we found it difficult to bring partners and stakeholders together to give time to reflect on our work with us despite concerted efforts. This and other organisational directions have given rise to a project on active participation, which is developing more inclusive and effective approaches and tools for engagement with stakeholders.

We have also developed qualitative methods for assessing impact placing constituency voices at the centre of such assessment. There are many different research methods by which to assess impact. Given our core values and our vision and mission, which value people's experience and the change we deliver for individuals, our key method is 'stakeholder engagement'. This research method involves the gathering of stakeholders' perspectives. For this method to produce reliable results, we always try to include the widest possible range of affected stakeholders. As a matter of principle, evaluation and impact assessment findings are shared with those who took part, and are affected by the issue concerned. Additionally, where possible, feedback is sought from stakeholders to strengthen the learning exercise. This process also helps us articulate concrete and grounded lessons from multiple dimensions of a project. Action plans based on the findings and recommendations are developed so that the learning derived can influence future projects. All the information enables us to make improvements to its projects and programmes of work on a regular basis and in the longer-term helps guide the organization's priorities and use of resources. We strive to share the findings and extensively disseminate evaluations of major global campaigns to key stakeholders, partners, and those we individuals and communities involved in the projects, we also post evaluation reports on the international website. The results of the evaluation of the "Stop Violence Against Women" Campaign can be found at <http://www.amnesty.org/en/review-stop-violence-against-women-campaign>.

Indicator 2: (NGO2) Mechanisms for feedback and complaints in relation to programs and policies and for determining actions to take in response to breaches of policies.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL recognizes that those with and for whom it works may be given cause to raise a complaint about the organisation and that they have the rights to do so, to receive a formal response and to have their concerns addressed where these are shown to be well founded. Complaints may be addressed to AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's Secretary General in writing by email or mail (<http://www.amnesty.org/en/contact>). We endeavour to respond to complaints in writing as quickly as possible (preferably within two weeks) and then to assess the basis for the complaint within 30 working days. If appropriate the matter will be referred to an Amnesty International national section or structure for their investigation and formal response. Complainants will be informed about any delays in this process (e.g., due to unavailability of relevant staff or the matter's referral to the national entity).

At the International Secretariat, there is a whistle-blowing policy to encourage staff to report practices not in compliance with standard policies and the INGO Accountability Charter . The movement does not have a global whistle-blowing policy for all sections and structures.

Indicator 3: (NGO3) System for program monitoring, evaluation and learning, (including measuring program effectiveness and impact), resulting changes to programs, and how they are communicated.

It is part of our mission to continuously improve our effectiveness and positive impact on human rights. To this end, the International Secretariat operational planning and reporting includes the setting of indicators at the planning stages of the projects and programmes of work. All projects have to be planned, reviewed and improved at six monthly intervals and involve stakeholders as much as possible. The approach proposes critical reflection as a way of focusing on learning and the six monthly reviews are an opportunity to maximise and share learning from different projects. All this information is held in a database accessible to all staff and volunteers, ensuring complete transparency and openness across the organization. Although significant progress has been made on this front, the practice is not fully institutionalized in the organization. Recently, the 'Theory of Change' approach has been introduced in the organization as a method for developing campaigns and programmes of work.

The Learning and Impact Unit (LIU) at the International Secretariat also conducts regular evaluative activities to examine progress towards projects' and the organization's goals and mission. Additionally, the Unit undertakes a series of in-depth impact assessment every year to complement the on-going project level evaluations. As part of this methodology, the Unit has developed the first impact assessment framework for the movement, called the "Dimensions of Change". They derive from the organization's vision and mission and are designed to assist the systematic analysis of positive and negative impacts for those affected by our work, particularly the affected stakeholders. They are intended to enable the analysis of cumulative and aggregated change within and across themes, countries, stakeholder groups or time. These impact evaluations aim to determine the relevance and fulfilment of programme objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. They help the organization learn and correct actions as a result - not just proving the effectiveness of our work but also improving it. This happens at different levels: lessons learnt from impact evaluations are used to modify what we're doing on a specific campaign or project - i.e. changing the way we're engaging with the media or modifying our messages to governments. Learning can also happen more broadly within an area of work around what does and doesn't work. Cumulative knowledge of what makes a campaigning method effective or what works in a certain context helps us build more successful strategies in the future.

Across the movement as a whole, a standardized planning and reporting system for activities of all entities was piloted in 2008/2009 and was further developed to include information about outcomes 2010/12 as a way to strengthen monitoring and evaluation. This global system seeks to enable the movement to translate its global priorities into concrete work plans. The resulting information is contributing to our understanding of the movement's overall performance against our six-year Integrated Strategic Plan using Key Performance Indicators. While lessons are still being learnt and improvements to the process are on-going; the information that is being uncovered has already helped shape the organisation's priorities and use of resources across the movement.

Indicator 4: (NGO4) Measures to integrate gender and diversity into program design, implementation, and the monitoring, evaluation, and learning cycle.

We are committed to creating a respectful and welcoming environment that promotes inclusiveness. We have employment policies at the International Secretariat and in our sections and structures to prohibit all forms of discrimination in hiring. We launched a gender action plan in 2003 and are planning a second edition for release in 2011. Additionally we are currently working on a road map that will enable all entities to ensure that we are competent in addressing diversity and our practices model inclusiveness. For both the revised gender action plan and for the roadmap for diversity, we engaged in a gender and diversity audit of our sections and structures as well as the International Secretariat.

Being a global organization with national sections and structures means that we must address diversity – not just from the perspective of our International Secretariat – but also in a national context. Substantively, we have long addressed discrimination and persecution in our work. We also are committed to working on gender and undertook as our first global campaign, a campaign on stopping violence against women. At the end of the campaign, we had an evaluation conducted by two independent consultants and plan to integrate the findings into our ongoing work on gender. The consultants spoke with staff, members, partners, advocacy targets and rights holders to evaluate the campaign. In the current Integrated Strategic Plan (see 2.2 above) we have named gender and diversity as cross cutting issues in all our work.

Indicator 5: (NGO5) Processes to formulate, communicate, implement, and change advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns.

Our campaign plans, including the human rights change objectives, advocacy strategies, identification of targets, mobilisation and education activities, are formulated in close consultation between the International Secretariat, our sections, structures and partners. They are communicated through internal campaign strategy and planning documents, backed up by regular newsletters, weekly updates, and wiki tools that are made available both internally and to partners. Implementation is coordinated by teams at the International Secretariat, with the majority of campaign, advocacy, education and media work linked to campaigns being delivered by the sections and structures. Regular review and reflection processes are carried out to change and update campaign objectives.

Indicator 6: (NGO6) Processes to take into account and coordinate with the activities of other actors.

We proactively work with partners on all of our campaign initiatives. The development of campaign strategies, and plans are facilitated in a way that involves the organisations and groups working on similar issues. This includes consultations to identify overlaps and gaps in the work. We often embark on joint initiatives with other NGOs, and participate actively in the global and national coalitions that are focussing on our priority areas of human rights work.

Indicator 7: (NGO7) Resource allocation.

All entities allocate resources according to budgets developed through entities' internal planning processes. All entities follow a set of commonly agreed global operational priorities (based on the Integrated Strategic Plan, see 2.2 above) to guide the annual planning process and resulting budgets. Internal financial controls are in place to ensure that expenditure is made in accordance with relevant legal requirements, as well as with internal operating policies. All material operations are subject to full independent external audit as required by national laws and these statements together with independent auditors statements are all published in the relevant jurisdictions. A combined international set of figures are prepared, as shown in indicator 8 below, to provide transparency on the full scale of operations of the movement internationally. As national legislation varies, national reports are not directly comparable. For the purpose of combined financial reporting, however, the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) are used as the reference standards. We are currently in the process of implementing a common financial reporting framework which will enable improved reporting of internationally combined figures, through implementation of common reporting standards and definitions.

Indicator 8: (NGO8) Sources of funding by category and five largest donors and monetary value of their contribution.

Of the €200 million global income in 2009, 96% were un-restricted. The 4% restricted income came mostly from governments (human rights education only), trusts and foundations. Below are the breakdowns by income source of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's 2009 global income.

2009 Income Source	EUR (million)	%
Donations from the public	80.0	40%
Membership fees	52.8	26%
Members' additional donations	17.9	9%
Legacies	18.0	9%
Events and merchandise	8.4	4%
Trusts and foundations	2.9	1%
Governments (human rights education only)	2.5	1%
Corporations (un-restricted only)	0.5	0%
Other institutions	6.3	3%
Gifts in kind	3.0	1%
Investment	1.5	1%
Others	6.4	3%
TOTAL	200	100%

The five largest donors in 2009 accounted for 4% (€8 million) of our 2009 global income.

2009 Top 5 Donors	EUR (million)
National Zip Code Lottery (Netherlands)	4.8
Postcode Lottery (Sweden)	0.9
Department for International Development (UK Government, human rights education in Africa)	0.8
Oak Foundation (USA)	0.7
Education Foundation of America (USA)	0.5
TOTAL	8

Of the €193 million global expenditure in 2009, 57% were spent on human rights programming (research and campaigns) and communicating/publicizing human rights violations. And 13% were spent on general management, administration and governance. The remaining 30% were spent on fundraising to recruit new members and supporters.

2009 Expenditure	EUR (million)	%
Programmes (research and campaigns)	93	48%
Communications and Publications	18	9%
Fundraising	57	30%
General Management and Administration	20	10%
Governance	5	3%
TOTAL	193	100%

Indicator 9: (EC7) Procedures for local hiring and proportion of senior management hired from the local community at locations of significant operation.

We don't have a local hiring policy as such but the majority (over 90%) of staff are recruited locally or regionally. All of our sections and structures are almost fully staffed by locals. These sections and structures account for about 1400 staff (or 75% of the movement's total of 1850). The International Secretariat in London is the exception to this pattern as it is considered important that this office has a diversity of staff to reflect the diversity of the movement. While around half of the over 400 International Secretariat staff are of UK origin there are staff from over 60 countries, covering all continents.

Indicator 10: (EN16) Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight.

Our 2009 carbon emissions tracking focused on office energy use (electricity and gas) and business travel. As we had just started tracking carbon emissions, only 14 sections and the International Secretariat provided 2009 emissions data. These 15 entities represented about 70% of our global resources in 2009 and their total emissions in 2009 are shown below:

Office energy carbon emissions (15 entities' total): 2859 metric tonnes
Business travel carbon emissions (15 entities' total): 4041 metric tonnes

Indicator 11: (EN18) Initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reductions achieved.

In addition to promoting to all entities to track carbon emissions, we are also planning to launch in 2011 a global environmental sustainability policy and corresponding guidelines for carbon reduction initiatives and targets. We will focus first on the largest 25 entities, which account for over 90% of our global resources and carbon emissions.

Indicator 12: (LA1) Total workforce, including volunteers, by type, contract, and region.

In 2009 we had a global workforce of about 1850 staff with the about 90% being permanent. As we will start collecting detailed staff and volunteer information from all of our sections and structures in 2011, we are aiming to provide breakdowns by type, contract and region in our next GRI report.

Indicator 13: (LA10) Average hours of training per year per employee by employee category.

Although we do not track this globally, a staff member at the International Secretariat on average received about 18 hours of training in 2009. The International Secretariat offers a variety of training and learning events for its staff. Learning events are scheduled around core competencies, such as research methodologies, campaigning, human rights thematic issues, travel safety, soft skills (writing, communicating, influencing, etc) and languages. A calendar of events is in place at the International Secretariat with trainings lasting a few hours to several days. Relevant and necessary individual learning is also encouraged with needs identified through annual appraisals or on an ad hoc basis. With attempts to move learning away from purely classroom based, facilitator led training, the International Secretariat has also invested in e-learning, coaching and mentoring and shared learning. A team is dedicated to advise and assist learning at all levels of the organisation, and a budget to reflect the priority we place on staff development and organisational learning.

Indicator 14: (LA12) Percentage of employees receiving regular performance and career development reviews.

All International Secretariat staff received performance reviews in 2009. As we will start collecting this information from sections and structures in 2011, we are aiming to provide this information in our next GRI report.

Indicator 15: (LA13) Composition of governance bodies and breakdown of employees per category according to gender, age group, minority group membership, and other indicators of diversity.

Our highest decision making body, the International Council, is made up of representatives from sections and structures. The bi-annual International Council Meetings are typically attended by 250-300 section and structure representatives and members of the International Executive Committee. The current International Executive Committee is made up of 10 members: 3 females and 7 males from 10 countries (Belgium, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Senegal, South Korea, Sweden, UK)

The gender and age breakdowns of our board members and staff in 2009 are based on data from 21 entities (20 sections and the International Secretariat), which accounted for about 80% of the movement's resources. In 2009 these entities had a total of:

195 board members (21 entities' total): 51% women; 6% aged <25, 48% aged 25-44, 43% aged 45-64, 3% aged 65+

1491 staff (21 entities' total): 64% women; 2% aged <25, 68% aged 25-44, 29% aged 45-65, 1% aged 65+

As we will begin collecting these data from all entities in 2011 our GRI report in 2012 will include fuller information to cover all entities of the movement.

Indicator 16: (SO1) Nature, scope, and effectiveness of any programs and practices that assess and manage the impacts of operations on communities, including entering, operating, and exiting.

We understand impact as being about the consequences of our work on the external world. These are often cumulative and aggregated, planned and unplanned, intended and unintended. We define impact as the extent to which any activity or intervention produces lasting or significant changes - positive or negative, intended or not - in the lives of people and communities. We see impact assessment as an on-going process which can be done in real time in order to assist decision making processes at all levels. It is important that an assessment is done even before a project starts - the planning phase. When planning a campaign or project, it is key to outline a change model, which can be shared and improved as a result of consultations with key stakeholders. During implementation stages or at the end of the campaign or project, the change model is useful for learning purposes as it allows a comparison between the original assumptions and what actually happened. Change models are not constant and therefore they need to be adapted in light of lessons learned through evaluations.

Equally, we see the process of assessing impact as being concerned not just with outcomes and results but also with the process getting to these outcomes/results - i.e. not just focussing on the "what" has changed but also on how change was brought about. We know by experience that all those involved in the evaluation process can acquire new skills, knowledge and perspectives. This is true for all stakeholders involved and the more participatory assessments can be the more meaningful and relevant will be the emerging results. In assessing the impact of our work, we look at what sort of contribution we have made or can make to a certain situation rather than solely looking at whether the change can be attributed to us.

The establishment of the Learning and Impact Unit (LIU) is one of the significant steps taken to institutionalise impact assessment within the movement. The Unit develops policy, procedures, guidelines and tools for monitoring, evaluation, impact assessment and learning. It also supports key initiatives in line with the movement's priorities from the development of monitoring and evaluation frameworks to leading on specific impact evaluations. The Unit has been key in ensuring that more and more projects are engaging in a planned way with stakeholders at every stage of the project cycle. Increasingly, projects are building local contacts with grass-roots organisations, communities or representatives of individuals / groups and interacting with them in a participatory manner. However we still have work to do to ensure that all projects are systematically planned, implemented and evaluated in a fully participatory manner.

Indicator 17: (SO3) Percentage of employees trained in organization's anti-corruption policies and procedures.

Based on 2009 data of 21 entities, which accounted for about 80% of the movement's resources, only 1% of staff had been trained on anti-corruption policies and/or procedures. As we will begin collecting these data from all entities in 2011 our GRI report in 2012 will include fuller information to cover all 69 entities.

Indicator 18: (PR6) Programs for adherence to laws, standards, and voluntary codes related to ethical fundraising and marketing communications, including advertising, promotion, and sponsorship.

We have a global fundraising strategy, which commits our entities to strive for the highest standards of accountability and transparency in our funding arrangements. We do not accept funding for which we are not prepared to be fully and publicly accountable to our members, donors, supporters and those on whose behalf we work. We do not undertake fundraising and marketing activities, which we are unable to fully and clearly justify in terms of outputs and outcomes. Entities are strongly encouraged to join local professional fundraising regulatory bodies and adhere to standards those bodies promote. We do not sell or distribute merchandise that is banned in any markets. We are not aware of any complaints for breaches of standards in relation to rights of affected stakeholders.

GRI Self-Assessment Application Level

Report Application Level		C	C+	B	B+	A	A+
Standard Disclosures	G3 Profile Disclosures OUTPUT	Report on: 1.1 2.1 - 2.10 3.1 - 3.8, 3.10 - 3.12 4.1 - 4.4, 4.14 - 4.15		Report on all criteria listed for Level C plus: 1.2 3.9, 3.13 4.5 - 4.13, 4.16 - 4.17		Same as requirement for Level B	
	G3 Management Approach Disclosures OUTPUT	Not Required	Report Externally Assured	Management Approach Disclosures for each Indicator Category	Report Externally Assured	Management Approach Disclosures for each Indicator Category	Report Externally Assured
	G3 Performance Indicators & Sector Supplement Performance Indicators OUTPUT	Report on a minimum of 10 Performance Indicators, including at least one from each of: Economic, Social and Environmental.		Report on a minimum of 20 Performance Indicators, at least one from each of Economic, Environmental, Human rights, Labor, Society, Product Responsibility.		Report on each core G3 and Sector Supplement* Indicator with due regard to the Materiality Principle by either: a) reporting on the Indicator or b) explaining the reason for its omission.	
				*Sector supplement in final version			
		GRI Application Level C					

I hereby declare that to the best of my understanding this report fulfils the requirements for a GRI G3 Application Level C.

Name: George Macfarlane
 Position: Senior Director, Organisational Services
 Date: 15 Feb 2011

‘Copyright and Trademark Notice

This document is copyright-protected by Stitching Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). The reproduction and distribution of this document for information is permitted without prior permission from GRI. However, neither this document nor any extract from it may be reproduced, stored, translated, or transferred in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopied, recorded, or otherwise) for any other purpose without prior written permission from GRI.’