

## Improvement Analysis Greenpeace International September 2019

### Minimising negative impacts on stakeholders (C4)

The report explains the mechanisms in place to ensure a safe and just environment within the organisation – this is addressed under question H3 on safe working environment.

It wasn't very clear which sections of the report explained how Greenpeace aims to minimise negative impacts on its external stakeholders. There is information on how Greenpeace collaborates with partner organisations and community groups when building and implementing campaigns, and this is covered under questions D2 and D3. Greenpeace has a Model Code of Conduct and Integrity policies, but as these were not linked, we were not able to assess to what degree this relates to internal or external interactions.

Does Greenpeace have a Safeguarding Policy? Are there risk assessments when planning and carrying out projects? An example of the type of information we are looking for is [CARE's advocacy handbook](#) which includes a section on risk management (pp. 39-42), outlining how they understand and mitigate unintended negative impacts on the people they work with, including partners.

### Key stakeholders and how they are identified (D1)

Greenpeace's traditional stakeholders are their financial supporters, volunteers, online communities, allies and activists. The organisation is now looking beyond this, with additional stakeholder groups now including those entities Greenpeace seeks to persuade, and those who depend on the industries and ecosystems impacted by Greenpeace campaigns.

It is stated that stakeholders are identified through detailed analysis as part of the campaign planning process. The Panel would like to see more information about this in future reports, as well as an insight into how stakeholders are prioritised. Are local partners/communities involved in identifying others who should be engaged in Greenpeace's work?



The [2016 report](#) (pg. 16) had provided some more information, stating that, “stakeholder analysis should identify and analyse the motivation and needs of specific groups of people, communities and organisations as primary or secondary stakeholders. It explains how we will engage them, why, and whether (or how) we will be accountable to them.” This could be built on in the next report.

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

The report includes some quotes from coalition members, activists, and Greenpeace offices from around the world, speaking about their experience working with/in Greenpeace. However only a few seemed to include specific likes or what improvements they would want to see. No examples of potentially negative feedback were included in the report.

On pp. 12-14 the quotes express appreciation for Greenpeace’s expertise and support in organising actions and campaigns. The quote on pg. 12 flagged increased transparency on decision making as an area for improvement

The Panel appreciates these examples, but in future reports we would also like to see a summary of overarching themes from feedback received (both positive and negative). Were there likes/dislikes which were raised in several regions, or by a majority of stakeholders in one region?

We would also like to know how Greenpeace is responding to this feedback – either by continuing or increasing their efforts in areas where they received positive feedback, or by making changes to address key dislikes.

### Availability of key policies and information on your website (G1)

Greenpeace’s values, goals, cornerstone principles, and information about the organisation’s structure and finances can be found on the [website’s about page](#).

The report states that policies relating to complaints, governance, staffing and operations, as well as evaluations and statistics about the organisation are online in a variety of languages. However, we were not easily able to locate these, and there does not appear to be one place on the website which collates this information. The Panel requests that Greenpeace provide links to the relevant pages in future reports, and make key documents more easily accessible.



## Board oversight of adherence to policies, resource allocation, potential risks, and complaints processes (J2)

The Panel was not able to find information on this point in the report. Greenpeace's Board is, as stated on the [website](#), "responsible for decisions on wide-ranging strategic and high level campaign areas: deciding organisational policy; approving the global programme planning process; [and] ratifying [Annual General Meeting \(AGM\)](#) decisions".

The Panel would like to see some more information, such as how regularly policies and finances are reviewed, whether there are any dedicated committees such as a finance and risk committee, and if/how the Board receives an overview of complaints.

This is an area to address in the next interim report.

## Complaints handling mechanisms and overview of complaints (external) (J3)

The report explains Greenpeace's Integrity System, which seems to be for internal concerns and complainants, and which is addressed under question J4.

In terms of external stakeholders, the report states that NROs have been able to receive complaints through multiple channels, but that there is no formal complaints framework. Greenpeace is currently developing an External Complaints Policy, which is expected to be rolled out in 2019. This is identified in the report as an opportunity for improvement, and the Panel echoes this, as it has been an issue we have consistently raised for the past several years.

Given it is September 2019 at the time of the Panel's review of this report, we would like to know when exactly the policy will be finalised, implemented, and communicated, including on Greenpeace's website.

This is an issue to focus on in Greenpeace's next interim report, and we also request an update in Greenpeace's response letter to the Panel on this report.

In subsequent reports, we would like to know how complaints are responded to, if/how they are monitored centrally, what key issues have been raised in the year, and how Greenpeace is responding.

Finally, while the report provides the number of complaints received, investigated and upheld, the Panel understands that these figures relate to internal complaints. Can Greenpeace provide an overview of the number and nature of concerns raised by external complainants in future reports?