

Improvement Analysis Amnesty International 2020 Report

Main likes/dislikes from stakeholders and organisation's response (E3)

The primary collection feedback process was the consultation for the strategic framework already mentioned in the report (C2). As positive feedback is highlighted the expertise, global network, evidence-based approach, and credibility that AI brings. In terms of feedback for improvement, the need of enhancing work with partners was highlighted. The report explains that this feedback has been incorporated in the strategic framework development process.

In future reports, the Panel recommends to explore here feedback from other stakeholders groups listed in D1, and also internal stakeholders such as staff and activists. A suggestion to keep the report concise, could be to focus on a particular stakeholder group in each reporting year.

Pay scale, gender pay gap and top salaries (G2)

The *Equal Opportunities and Diversity Policy* (shared with the Panel) mentions the commitment to equal pay, and more information on how this commitment is put in practice is available in this [webpage](#), which also contains data on top salaries, gender pay gap, and ratio of the highest salary to the lowest. The latest update of the data was 2018, which is justified by the UK government delaying this obligation for organisations to report due to the pandemic.

The Panel emphasises the importance of keeping this information and data updated as an exercise of transparency and accountability to key stakeholders beyond legal requirements.

In 2019, AI has started to report to Fairshare on women in leadership positions. Has the reporting been discontinued? The Panel would be interested to know whether the exercise has been beneficial.

Staff development (H2)

The Employee Experience Programme (EEP) is described. Through it, IS staff have been offered development opportunities on stress and resilience, mental health awareness, management and leadership development. The report recognises



there is a gap between efforts and results, and points to “deep seated dynamic” as the cause for the gap.

Staff development budget has been decentralised and teams control a set amount to invest in job-specific development.

The Panel is not clear on what was the take-up of the training sessions. Also, a more elaborated response and reflection would have helped the Panel to understand what the “deep seated dynamic” means, ie. What are these dynamics - gendered, racial, both, something else entirely? Furthermore, given the powerful opening statement by the Secretary General acknowledging institutionalised racism, and the need to stamp it out, the Panel would have expected some related training (eg. race and unconscious bias) to be addressed here. [Greenpeace accountability report \(pp. 31\)](#) might provide some examples on how these kinds of training can be integrated into the overall staff development offering.