

# 2017 Accountability Report



---

**GREENPEACE**

# Contents

Statement from the International Executive Directors and Board Chair

Impact on local communities (SO1)

Coordination with other actors (NGO6)

Procedures for local hiring (EC7)

Mechanisms for feedback and complaints (NGO2)



## Statement from the International Executive Directors and Board Chair

International Executive Directors Bunny McDiarmid and Jennifer Morgan, together with Ayesha Imam, Greenpeace International Board Chair, have written the [opening statement](#) for the 2017 annual report .



Jennifer Morgan and Bunny McDiarmid,  
Executive Directors of Greenpeace International

Two handwritten signatures in blue ink. The first signature is 'jmorgan' and the second is 'Bunny'.



Ayesha Imam,  
Greenpeace International Board Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Ayesha'.

The 4 sections below are the responses to the [improvement analysis](#) provided by the independent review panel in April 2018.

## Impact on local communities (SO1)

### Feedback by the independent review panel:

There is a risk analysis process in place for all Global Projects, which includes a risk analysis tool that prompts Project Leads to identify potential impacts of Greenpeace's activities on the wider community. There are also principles and protocols in place outlining how to take risk smartly and non-violently. These are captured in an agreement which is extended to all those with whom Greenpeace works. Examples are provided of how Greenpeace Africa and Greenpeace East Asia engaged with communities during project design and implementation. Some more specifics on how this engagement actually shaped the projects, as well as the kind of feedback received from communities, would be appreciated in the next report. However, the Panel would still like to see more information about how Greenpeace assesses risks and impacts on societies more broadly, beyond a project-by-project basis. How are broader trends and larger risks that might pose strategic or governance risks identified? Are exit strategies in place, and are post-intervention evaluations undertaken? The Panel acknowledges the example of continuous engagement including after a campaign ended in the case of Greenpeace East Asia – are evaluations undertaken for all major campaigns?

Greenpeace National and Regional Organisations (NROs) work with and co-power communities “to expose global environmental problems, and develop solutions for a green and peaceful future” in some particular instances. Careful consideration is always given to ensure our engagement is done right, this may include risks assessments and planning for exit strategies, however global Greenpeace does not have a systematic way to approach work with local communities globally. These policies, engagement strategies and plans are developed at the local level. Greenpeace takes a people powered approach by engaging citizens on a voluntary basis. Greenpeace's global projects undergo monitoring and evaluation to varying degrees, which may allow the NROs participating in global projects to reflect on the engagement with local communities.

In our previous report we had provided an examples of how Greenpeace NROs engaged with local communities during project design and implementation. As requested by the independent review panel we are providing an example on how a campaign involving local communities is designed and implemented.

Communities are the strategic backbone of the Climate Justice and Liability project. In a practical sense, this means that communities in the Philippines, including those living on the frontlines of climate change, are leading the legal and campaign efforts for climate justice. Filipino disaster survivors and other brave individuals, along with 11 NGOs including Greenpeace Southeast Asia in the Philippines, triggered a first-ever national investigation into the responsibility of fossil fuel companies for human rights impacts, or threats thereof, resulting from climate change. Greenpeace continuously seeks feedback from the communities in the Philippines on whether our shared efforts of securing and defending environmental and human rights are helping them achieve their goals and contribute to securing democratic spaces at these challenging times in the Philippines.

## Coordination with other actors (NGO6)

### Feedback by the independent review panel:

The response states that a commitment to work with allies in a cooperative and humble way is one of the cornerstones of Greenpeace's Framework, and provides some examples of collaborative efforts at the regional and national levels. However, evidence of a systematic approach is still missing. How does Greenpeace detect and avoid duplication, and identify which other actors to engage with? Sightsavers' partnership framework is a good example to refer to.

Greenpeace has made significant improvements in working with others and has made progress in establishing an internal culture of information sharing around who is working with whom. We have had feedback from a number of allies in several countries over the last year that "working with Greenpeace has become easier".

We do not yet have a formal system in place to ensure a systemic approach to coordinating with other actors globally. We think such a system is desirable but have yet to explore how it could be implemented and take account of global diversity.

As reported previously, most of our interactions with other actors are at the national level as Greenpeace NROs coordinate with other actors in their local contexts. NROs have more or less formal systems to coordinate work with other actors in a meaningful and coherent manner, ensuring the right actors are identified and duplication of efforts is avoided. Some NROs are part of local and/or regional alliances, coalitions and networks to advance common causes and, at a minimum, ensure awareness about each other work.

## Procedures for local hiring (EC7)

### Feedback by the independent review panel:

Greenpeace endorsed a set of Compensation and Benefits Principles in 2015 and began implementing them in 2016. A quote from the Principles states that all staff based in a given country will be subject to the same compensation and benefits policy, to ensure equity amongst staff in the same NRO. A tool was commissioned in 2016 to align grading systems and allow for benchmarking between NROs. No mention was made of any policies for hiring local staff, including for senior levels. As such the Panel continues to consider this question only partially addressed, and urges Greenpeace to address these issues in future.

Local hiring is the norm across the Greenpeace network. At the end of 2017, 12% of staff in 21 NROs and GPI<sup>1</sup> were non-local. Compensation & Benefits Principles (section 5.1.2, xi) "All staff--national or non-national, and whether working within the local organisation's structure or for Greenpeace International (GPI) or another NRO--based in a given country will be subject to the same (local) compensation and benefits policy."

<sup>1</sup> 7 NROs didn't collect data on this theme.



All national and regional organisations have their own recruitment protocols and policies, which are applied to hiring staff at all levels, whether they hold a local position or a global 'distributed' role<sup>2</sup>, with the exception of the Executive Director in some cases. The global Principles document provides a minimum standard with which each NRO aims to comply, however, local legal and budgetary restraints may impact the speed at which they are able to adopt some of the principle agreements.

Staff recruited from outside a country may be granted an additional relocation allowance but their rewards package (salary & benefits) as well as all other employment terms and conditions will be agreed according to local terms and conditions in the NRO through which they are formally employed. All positions will be graded according to the local grading structure. The 2016 grading mapping tool is designed to align as best as possible the grading of similar jobs throughout the global network.

This statement applies to all staff, with the exception of those on limited-duration (< 3 years) assignment arranged through the global staff mobility policy as a secondment. In these cases, staff will remain on home office terms and conditions with local adjustments as appropriate.

## Mechanisms for feedback and complaints (NGO2)

### **Feedback by the independent review panel:**

Greenpeace International implemented an External Complaints Policy in 2015 (the Panel repeats its request for a link) but is yet to develop practical procedures to support the objectives of the policy. This was first expected in 2016 and was then pushed to 2017. The same applies to a Global External Complaints Policy – clarification on how this differs from the regular External Complaints Policy mentioned above would be welcome. An initial search of Greenpeace International's website suggests that the policies/processes still have not been finalised as of April 2018, and no information is given to stakeholders about how they might lodge a complaint. The Panel requests an update on this including a concrete timeframe for completion of the policies/mechanisms, rollout to NROs, as well as how Greenpeace intends to make the complaints policies broadly known and accessible. It is reported that 10 NROs have their own complaints policies in place, and data from these is provided. It is explained that Greenpeace is working on improving the consistency of the questions it poses to NROs when gathering data for this accountability report, as 15 NROs provided complaints data in 2015, and it is not anticipated that NROs have dropped their complaints policies in the meantime. This makes it difficult to gauge to what degree the number of complaints has changed year on year. In 2016, most public complaints (38%) related to Greenpeace's strategy, methods or tactics and advocacy positions. The majority of supporter complaints (45%) were about fundraising methods or tactics. The Panel would be interested in knowing whether Greenpeace's efforts to involve stakeholders in strategy and campaign design processes has any impact on the number or proportion of complaints relating to these issues. The Panel also requests information on what proportion of the complaints received were resolved and whether these resolutions were also satisfactory to the complainants. Does Greenpeace have an independent arbitration mechanism in the event that complainants are not satisfied with Greenpeace's response?

<sup>2</sup> The responsibility to lead campaigns on global issues – climate change, deforestation, oceans, toxics and sustainable agriculture - will be moved, or distributed, from the centre, Greenpeace International, towards Greenpeace's national and regional organisations under the concept of Distributed Campaigning. This means that many Greenpeace International staff are located in national offices, where they are employed according to local terms and conditions, whilst holding a global role.

The development of the practical procedures to satisfactorily implement both, the Greenpeace International (GPI) External Complaints Policy and, the Global External Complaints Policy have been further delayed due to capacity constraints<sup>3</sup>. In order to improve our data collection to strengthen our decision making, there will be a consultation with NROs, led by GPI, to agree how to report policy compliance and what data on external complaints would need to be captured.

Next steps include putting in place practical procedures, externally publishing the process of making a complaint and confirming compliance criteria.

We have noted feedback and questions from the independent review panel on the nature and content of the complaints received. This is very important for Greenpeace and it is one of the main purposes of developing external feedback and complaints mechanisms. Greenpeace has local mechanisms in place but we require improvements to our global mechanism to assess trends from complaints.

---

<sup>3</sup> The difference between the Global and the GPI policy is the scope. The Global policy will be a model policy that will apply to all Greenpeace NROs and GPI international, too. Each NRO and GPI will need to adapt the global model policy to its local realities and legal requirements, and adopt it and implement it, developing their own practical procedures to achieve the objectives of the policy.



Greenpeace is an independent global campaigning organisation that acts to change attitudes and behaviour, to protect and conserve the environment and to promote peace.

---

For more information contact:  
[hector.payo@greenpeace.org](mailto:hector.payo@greenpeace.org)  
Published October 2018 by  
Performance, Accountability & Learning Unit (PAL)

Written by: Hector Payo. Thanks to everyone who contributed to this Accountability Report.

Edited and produced by: Hector Payo

Cover image © Jason Blair / Greenpeace

Greenpeace International  
Ottho Heldringstraat 5  
1066AZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands