



REF: OSG.2014.001

27 January 2014

**AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL**  
INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT  
Peter Benenson House, 1 Easton Street  
London WC1X 0DW, United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)20 7413 5500  
F: +44 (0)20 7956 1157  
E: [amnestyis@amnesty.org](mailto:amnestyis@amnesty.org) W: [www.amnesty.org](http://www.amnesty.org)

Dear Panel Review members,

Thank you for the extensive comments that you have provided on Amnesty International's 2013 report. These have been useful to assess our progress as we continue to improve our accountability mechanisms and use these to deliver positive strategic outcomes.

In your feedback, you highlighted some areas for improvement. Some of these relate to ongoing processes. For example, you mention the lack of a comprehensive partnership approach. We acknowledge that we have a distance to travel, but we are mainstreaming approaches to active participation which have, for instance, seen improvements to our global planning processes. Monitoring the effectiveness of these and other processes, including aspects of our participatory research work, is paramount and relevant systems, processes and reporting mechanisms will enable us to provide the panel with information on progress in our report next year. The panel also raised some issues where we felt a more immediate reply would be helpful – please find these below.

*Challenges of being in the midst of fundamental organisational change at global level*

Our strategies and plans relating to our global transition programme seek to increase our accountability to a range of stakeholders, including the communities with whom we work. As noted by the panel, this is a continuing effort which will continue to roll out over the next few years. However, while the rationale for this transition, including principles of increased accountability, is both widely acknowledged and provides the basis for our roadmap, there are hypotheses to be tested as we go along. The challenge is to capture increases in AI's accountability during this transition, to understand it and to replicate it - are we, for instance, quicker in our responses to evidence of human rights violations? Is our research more influential in improving policy content, as a result of increased credibility and visibility at national level? Are we more quickly and deeply empowering communities with greater and extended interaction? Capturing how and why this takes place will help us shape and adjust forms of organizing ourselves in a process of continuous improvement. Our monitoring and evaluation framework for the organisational change we are undertaking will enable us to identify and measure improvements in these areas and we will report key findings in subsequent reports to the Charter.

*Explanation of the great variance in numbers of complaints reported in 2011 and in 2012*

In 2010-11, Amnesty International received a large number of complaints related to severance payments made in December 2009 to its former Secretary General and deputy. We have come a long way since then, addressing and implementing all the recommendations of a fully-independent and comprehensive review. Much of the implementation work has already been reported in previous AI reports, including mechanisms to increase the expertise and effectiveness of the International Board (e.g. under 4.10 in the most recent report), reviews to AI's committee structure and a stronger set of controls (e.g. under 4.1 and 4.5, again in the most recent report). These improvements are represented

in the dramatic fall in numbers of complaints back to levels of 2009-2010. This is not, and nor has it ever been, a reason for complacency. Future reports will detail the ways that we are improving our learnings from complaints overall.

*Anti-corruption and bribery – rates of training*

The panel has noted that global rates for staff trained on anti-corruption policies and bribery is low – when comparing the number of people trained with the total number of staff in Amnesty International. While we understand the requirements to report on a percentage rate of employees trained on these processes, internally we do not consider this the most useful measure of the effectiveness of our approach in this area. Our methods to combat anti-corruption and bribery do include training on our anti-bribery policy, but also: targeted support to stakeholders most at risk and the implementation of financial policies in particular risk areas (such as procurement and expenses). This means that the training numbers in relation to our anti-bribery policy will likely remain low as a result of resources spent on these other types of support. Training will be monitored to assess whether the right group of stakeholders have been targeted.

*Gender mainstreaming and diversity*

We acknowledge there is still progress to be made here. The preparatory work in 2012 is already bearing fruit in 2013, including; building Amnesty International's International Women's Human Rights Network to fulfil its key monitoring role and its strategic capacity to identify and support innovative human rights work; the provision of training, toolkit development to mainstream gender into our human rights work and; guidelines which operationalize the action plan and roadmap in terms of organizational development. Updates on these and our progress against the Plan and Roadmap will feature in our next submission to the charter.

We look forward to continue to work productively with the INGO Accountability Charter and its host organisation, the International Civil Society Centre, and to providing further information later in the year on progress made during 2013.

Best wishes,



Salil Shetty

Secretary General