



**Accountable
Now**

GLOBAL STANDARDS LOCAL TRUST



Greenpeace
Independent Review Panel Feedback
Accountability Report 2017
Review Round October 2018



Greenpeace

Feedback from the Independent Review Panel

Review Round October 2018

16 November 2018

Dear Jennifer Morgan and Bunny McDiarmid,

Thank you for submitting your accountability report. We, the Independent Review Panel of Accountable Now, appreciate your efforts to continuously strengthen accountability to communities, local partners, supporters, staff, donors, or other key constituencies. Our key focus is on accountability to those you serve. It is against this background that we critically discussed your report and came to the individual assessment below.

Greenpeace International's tenth accountability report is a brief interim report responding to the Independent Review Panel's most recent [improvement analysis](#).

Whereas a dedicated opening statement from International Executive Directors Jennifer Morgan and Bunny McDiarmid had been provided in the past, this time a link to their introduction to the 2017 Annual Report was provided. Subsequently, the focus on institutional commitment to accountability was not as strong in previous years, though the Panel does note positively Greenpeace's commitment to change organisational culture in response to the #metoo movement.

However, particularly in light of this commitment, the Panel is concerned about the fact that Greenpeace still does not have a functioning complaints mechanism in place; the capacity challenges Greenpeace cited in this respect are noted, and the Panel would like to better understand these challenges. This remains a serious area of weakness which the Panel urges Greenpeace to rectify as soon as possible

In the other areas the Panel had identified for improvement, the information provided was rather broad and it was difficult to understand if/what improvements had been made. Specific examples are requested to illustrate, for example, what improvements have been made in working with other actors or how Greenpeace has responded to feedback from local communities to appropriately manage its impact.

Overall it appears that policies and processes relating to the areas covered in this interim report remain largely at the national level, without a systematic approach across the organisation. The Panel encourages Greenpeace to provide some guidance which can be adapted to local contexts (as is planned with the complaints mechanism) and to make key documents available online to increase transparency.

Our intention is that this feedback letter, and any response you may wish to provide, is made publicly available on the Accountable Now website along with your report – as it is the case with all previously reviewed reports. However, should there be errors of fact in the feedback above or in the note below; we would of course wish to correct



these before publication. Please share any comments or amendments by 14 December 2018. If you have any other feedback or comments on our work, please share them with us by sending them to the Accountable Now Secretariat.

Yours sincerely,

Mihir Bhatt

Jane Kiragu

Danilo Songco



Greenpeace's Accountability Report 2017

Review Round October 2018

PROFILE DISCLOSURES

I. Strategy and Analysis

1.1	<p>Statement from the most senior decision-maker</p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>The report provides a link to the opening statement of Greenpeace's 2017 accountability report, written by co-Executive Directors Jennifer Morgan and Bunny McDiarmid.</p> <p>The statement covers the difficulties Greenpeace faced in 2017 with two lawsuits being brought against them and how Greenpeace continued its work nonetheless, highlighting key successes.</p> <p>It is stated that "investigating and exposing destructive and corrupt practices is a crucial part" of Greenpeace's work and an example is given of how Greenpeace highlighted a lack of accountability and consultation behind several global trade deals. The #metoo movement is also mentioned, with Greenpeace working to ensure it becomes rooted in its organisational DNA.</p> <p>Perhaps due to the fact that this opening statement was not specifically for the accountability report, it did not contain much more information on Greenpeace's accountability. In future reports, the Panel hopes to see more on why accountability is important for the organisation and how it is integrated into Greenpeace's work and processes.</p>
-----	---

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

I. Programme Effectiveness

NGO2	<p>Mechanisms for feedback and complaints</p> <p><i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>While Greenpeace International implemented an External Complaints Policy in 2015, the development of practical procedures to implement the policy has been delayed year on year and was again delayed in 2017 "due to capacity constraints".</p> <p>A Global External Complaints Policy has also been developed as a model policy for all NROs and Greenpeace International to adapt to their local</p>
------	---



	<p>contexts, but this also has yet to be implemented, with capacity challenges cited.</p> <p>It is stated that next steps include putting in place practical procedures and externally publishing information about complaints processes, but no timeline was provided for this. The Panel stresses the importance of having a functioning complaints mechanism as a basic expectation of Accountable Now members. It urges Greenpeace to at a minimum have its complaints policies published online as soon as possible, and to point stakeholders to an email address by which they can submit complaints until a more robust process is implemented. Until then, this remains a serious area of weakness.</p> <p>The report also states that there will be a consultation with NROs to agree on how to report on compliance with the policy and what complaints data needs to be captured. The Panel looks forward to an update on progress in this regard in the next report, and an overview of the number and nature of complaints received as well as whether complainants were satisfied with their resolution (if consolidated statistics are not yet available, information on complaints received by Greenpeace International is requested, as has been provided in previous reports).</p> <p>Accountable Now is launching a Peer Advice Group in which members will work together to improve their complaints and feedback mechanisms, and the Panel strongly encourages Greenpeace to join this group.</p>
NGO6	<p><i>Coordination with other actors</i></p> <p><i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>The Panel had asked whether Greenpeace has a systematic approach to engaging with other actors, how relevant actors are identified, and how duplication is avoided. The report states that Greenpeace thinks a formal system to ensure a systematic approach to coordinating with other actors is desirable, but is yet to explore how to implement this.</p> <p>It is mentioned that NROs have “more or less formal systems” to coordinate work with other actors, ensuring the right actors are identified and duplication of efforts is avoided – specific examples of how this is done would have been helpful and are requested in the next report.</p> <p>Finally, the Panel notes that Greenpeace claims to have made significant improvements in working with others and in establishing an internal culture of information sharing. Positive feedback from partners points to working with Greenpeace having become easier. Again, the</p>



	<p>Panel would have liked to hear how exactly Greenpeace has improved its processes.</p> <p>The Panel had previously pointed to Sightsavers' partnership framework as a good example, and would like to highlight relevant information on this topic in their most recent report (pg. 12).</p>
--	--

IV. Human Resource Management

EC7	<p>Procedures for local hiring</p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>The previous report had adequately covered how Greenpeace ensures equal compensation and benefits across the organisation, and between local and non-local hires (through a global Compensation and Benefits Principles document and a salary grading mapping tool).</p> <p>The Panel had requested information on hiring of local staff, including for senior levels. The response states that local hiring is the norm across the Greenpeace network and that only 12% of staff in 21 NROs and in Greenpeace International were non-local. The Panel would also like to know what proportion of leadership/management positions are held by local staff.</p>
-----	---

V. Responsible Management of Impacts on Society

SO1	<p>Managing your impact on local communities</p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>Greenpeace's previous report referred to the risk analyses in place for all global projects Greenpeace undertakes, and how these include potential impacts on the wider community. Examples of how Greenpeace engages with communities during project design and implementation were provided, but the Panel had requested more specific information on how this engagement has shaped projects and what kind of feedback has been received from communities. Unfortunately these specifics were not provided. The report points to a success from a campaign for climate justice in the Philippines and mentions that Greenpeace continuously seeks feedback from the communities on whether shared efforts are helping them achieve their goals – however, the results of this feedback are not mentioned. It is notable however that empowering language around stakeholder engagement is captured in terms of “co-powering” communities through entry and exit strategies in place.</p> <p>The Panel had also asked how Greenpeace assesses risks and impacts on societies beyond a project-by-project basis. The response explains</p>
-----	--



that Greenpeace does not have a systematic approach to working with local communities globally, but that policies and engagement strategies are developed at the local level. These “may include risks assessments and planning for exit strategies” and monitoring and evaluation of projects “may allow the National and Regional Organisations (NROs) participating... to reflect on the engagement with local communities”.

Even if there are no hard requirements of NROs, the Panel recommends that Greenpeace develop some guidance to share globally, outlining best practices in this area.