

Improvement Analysis Greenpeace International April 2018

Mechanisms for feedback and complaints (NGO2)

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?



Coordination with other actors (NGO6)

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.

Procedures for local hiring (EC7)

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.

Impact on local communities (SO1)

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 stake 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?

