

Accountable Now

GLOBAL STANDARDS LOCAL TRUST



Greenpeace International Independent Review Panel Feedback

**Interim Accountability Report 2015
Review Round November 2016**



Greenpeace International

Feedback from the Independent Review Panel

Review Round November 2016

22 December 2016

Dear Bunny McDiarmid and Jennifer Morgan,

Thank you for submitting your Accountability Report. We, the Independent Review Panel of Accountable Now, appreciate your efforts to continuously strengthen your 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. Before we share this with you, however, we want to highlight a few issues of concern that we found throughout most of the nine reports assessed in the last review round.

Closing the feedback loop with stakeholders (NGO2, NGO9)

A [recent study](#) on 40 international civil society organisations' (CSOs') accountability practices - conducted by the *direct impact group* on behalf of Accountable Now - revealed that only three out of these 40 CSOs responded with an appropriate answer to a complaint test within three weeks.

This is alarming. All Members of Accountable Now should have a fully functioning feedback mechanisms in place. However, when checking your reports we found a consistent lack of reporting filed complaints per type, quantity, and region as well as a total lack of information on how they were resolved. We believe this is not an acceptable level of accountability. CSOs should not only have a mechanism in place but should first be capturing complaints with the appropriate level of detail and then monitoring their resolution and agreeing what actions need to be taken to ensure the same issues do not arise.

[Feedback Labs](#), with whom Accountable Now collaborated on the [Digital Accountability project](#), also serve as a valuable source of information on how to close feedback loops.



Collaboration with partners, communities and networks (NGO6, EC7 & SO1)

As part of the [10 Accountability Commitments](#), Accountable Now Members commit to working in genuine partnership with local communities and partners. With increased globalisation of information, more empowered citizens engage and civic space is challenged, it becomes ever more important to help local communities and partners to thrive. However, we found that coordination with local communities is still an overall weakness area among the Accountability Reports we received. Some “common” ICSO practices can have intended or unintended consequences on local communities. We would thus like to particularly highlight a lack of contributions to building local capacity and resources. Do you take into account local market conditions and think about working alongside local organisations building their capacity? We suggest that ICSOs should start to consider their impact on the sustainability and independence of local civil society in all their work (such as planning, budgeting, economic impact, etc.).

Adding to what people do to improve their lives (NGO3)

To state the obvious, impact measurement is important. However, many evaluations mentioned in received Accountability Reports focus on collecting relatively large amounts of data on people reached, however, this does not tell us much about the improvement in their lives. Moreover, we should critically ask ourselves: What is the ICSO’s credit in this improvement and what positive impact is actually due to the people and beneficiaries themselves?

While we are of course aware that resources are limited, there is clearly no substitute for a robust and honest impact evaluation of our programmes and activities.

Organisation-specific feedback to Greenpeace International:

Greenpeace International’s eighth accountability report is an interim report based on the Independent Review Panel’s Improvement Analysis on the recent 2014 accountability report. It is a very good, comprehensive, accessible and concise report. There is some progress made on relevant specific policies and practices (e.g. GPI External Complaints Policy).

A great level of strategic and **institutional commitment** to accountability can again be observed in the opening statement by the new International Executive Directors (IEDs); Jennifer Morgan and Bunny McDiarmid. “People Power” and collaboration is at the heart of Greenpeace’s work, which is again at the heart of accountability – which Greenpeace regards as connectedness with stakeholders. It is moreover appreciated that



Accountable Now membership and the **logo** (in its previous form) are published on the organisation's [website](#) and in the Annual Report. Other national offices such as Greenpeace Germany have already included the new logo into their website footers.

As in previous reports, the organisation provides illustrative examples from the national and regional offices (NROs) to highlight some **evidence**. Whereas good accountability practice seems to be in place and these examples are very stimulating for the reader of this report, more formalised approaches (e.g. Global Complaints Policy or impact assessments at the local level) are recommended by the Panel. It is thus appreciated that Greenpeace is currently developing a new Learning and Development strategy and the Panel looks forward to progress in this regard.

The Panel looks forward to the next full report on 2016.

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 these comments or amendments by 25 January 2017.

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

Rhonda Chapman

John Clark

Louise James

Jane Kiragu

Nora Lester Murad

Michael
Roeskau

Saroeun Soeung



Cover Note on Greenpeace International's Interim Accountability Report 2015

Review Round November 2016

PROFILE DISCLOSURES

I. Strategy and Analysis

1.1	<p>Statement from the most senior decision-maker</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Greenpeace appointed two new co-International Executive Directors in April 2016: Jennifer Morgan and Bunny McDiarmid. They provide a very strong opening statement on Greenpeace's successful campaigns and how the organisation has reached more people than ever before in 2015 – "People Power" and collaboration is at the heart of their work, which is again at the heart of accountability. The story of the 7 Shifts drives their engagement approach (see also the Big Listening and Big Thinking sessions). However, Greenpeace is also open about missed opportunities (e.g. their shared HR Information System) and mistakes. They are a learning organisation and have e.g. adapted their internal financial control systems, approach to risk management, and how they work with indigenous people.</p> <p>Overall, 2015 was a year of "re-organising, rebuilding and re-energising" resulting in overall increased income by 12% and the rollout of several shared services globally. Greenpeace continued to strengthen their accountability and transparency around decisions. In particular, Greenpeace International (GPI) is moving from being an implementer to becoming more of an enabler. Consistent standards around the globe is a crucial part in this regard.</p> <p>The Panel looks forward to further progress with regards to implementing the new Operating Model as well as to hearing more about how the three Communications Hubs' impact. The Panel also supports Greenpeace's understanding of accountability – seen as optimal connectedness with stakeholders – to be central to achieving strategic impact.</p>
-----	--



PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

I. Programme Effectiveness

NGO2	<p><i>Mechanisms for feedback and complaints</i></p> <p><i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>Greenpeace was once again unable to complete a Global Complaints Policy but expects to finish the global roll-out by 2016. GPI, on the other hand, developed a GPI External Complaints Policy in 2015, and a link to this policy should be provided in the next report.</p> <p>20 national or regional offices (NROs) were able to provide complaints data in 2015. This is an increase from 17 NROs (out of 28) in 2014. Most public complaints received were about Greenpeace’s strategy, methods or tactics; most supporter complaints were about Greenpeace’s Non-Violent Direct Actions (NVDAs). Does Greenpeace analyse overall trends in their complaints received – in particular around fundraising? Is there evidence that these complaints have been resolved in a timely and satisfactory manner? Which responsibility layer did resolve which complaints? Does Greenpeace generally assess the high number of complaints?</p> <p>For those NROs not having a complaints policy in place yet, it is suggested that GPI provides NROs with some examples of good policy and practice to ensure coherence across the organisation – as a tool that provides valuable information for management decisions.</p>
NGO6	<p><i>Coordination with other actors</i></p> <p><i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>As stated last year, Greenpeace collaborates with other actors in all of its campaign work; however, there is no systematic approach for assessing and coordinating these activities. Campaign efforts are generally led by NROs reflecting the localised approach needed. Greenpeace International’s role is to support the NROs.</p> <p>While this practice seems realistic for Greenpeace’s context, the Panel again suggests implementing a coherent system, which includes conducting a situational analysis to identify which other actors are already active in the same field, analysing how to avoid duplication and to best leverage each other’s impact, ensuring that partners meet high standards of accountability. In light of previous criticism against Greenpeace not allying well with local / indigenous people and their activities, a more systematic approach and</p>



	<p>guidance for NROs should be developed. This approach could of course be adapted according to context and time.</p> <p>The case of cooperation between Greenpeace Greece and Médecins Sans Frontières to rescue refugees provides a commendable example of a well-functioning alliance.</p>
<p>IV. Human Resource Management</p>	
<p>LA10</p>	<p><i>Workforce training</i></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Greenpeace identifies its training needs from its strategy, i.e. the Operating Model. Most formal trainings focus on distributed campaign work – e.g. the Future Leadership Programme (FLP) or Project Management for Distributed Campaigning (PMDC) training. Qualitative feedback is collected in evaluation forms, which generally indicated that training has been helpful towards the transition to the culture shift sought by the People Strategy. The Panel suggests developing more systematic structures beyond collecting qualitative feedback.</p> <p>Overall training expenditures are estimated at 598,530 EUR for 2015. It is assumed that this is applicable for the whole federation, thus being less than 0.01% of Greenpeace’s overall turnover (84,898,000 EUR in 2015 – see Financial Report 2015). What is the intended impact of this investment? Other Accountable Now Members allocate between 2% and 4% for workforce training.</p>
<p>LA12</p>	<p><i>Global talent management</i></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>Previous reports stated that staff development is rather “ad-hoc” in nature and therefore difficult to measure in terms of success. It is thus appreciated that Greenpeace takes this area more seriously now and has appointed a Head of Learning and Development (L&D) in early 2016. The Panel looks forward to hearing more about the integrated L&D strategy in coming years. It will be interesting to hear if the new strategy will help to systematically identify future HR needs and support staff development according to strategic priorities.</p> <p>While Performance Review Talks (PRTs) are expected for each staff member, Greenpeace’s HR structure does not allow the International Secretariat to track that actually all employees have received a PRT. The Panel encourages including a coherent monitoring system in the new L&D strategy.</p>



V. Responsible Management of Impacts on Society

SO1

Managing your impact on local communities

Partially addressed

There is a risk analysis process in place for all Global Projects, which includes a risk analysis tool that prompts Project Leads to scan the project to also identify potential impacts of Greenpeace's activities on the wider community. Greenpeace tries to use its global reach and reputation to raise additional profile to a community's issue.

What is the process Greenpeace uses to assess risks and impacts on society beyond a project-by-project basis? I.e. how does the organisation identify trends and larger risks that pose organisational risks at a strategic or governance level? Moreover, how are these risks incorporated into the global decision-making mechanisms described in the opening statement? And importantly: What kind of community feedback was received in 2015 and how has Greenpeace reacted to this?

Despite the lack of a global formalised approach, the Rainbow Warrior example shows very well how Greenpeace Japan responsibly assesses its impact on local communities as part of their strategic thinking. Could impact assessments of interventions on local communities be made a more explicit requirement for all NROs? Keeping in mind potential (unintended) negative impacts is critical for good relationships with local actors.