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While the exact genesis of the uprisings in the Middle East and the demands of “Occupy” may not have always been clear, the moniker “social media revolution” seemed to stick and follow every step. The use of online channels to organise, advertise and promote demonstrated a “coming of age” for the medium. Similarly Greenpeace’s use of online media gained considerable traction in challenging environmental abuse and the corporate modus operandi. Through our Forest and Detox campaigns, and the “VW Rebellion”, we worked with online supporters to challenge major corporations and their destructive practices.

With this, we have changed the way we count our supporters. We no longer refer to having 3 million “financial supporters”, but instead talk of over 17 million people who have given us approval and agency to contact them and work with them on future campaigns. They are all to be considered Greenpeace supporters, partners and collaborators, and together we have become more effective and powerful.

Campaigning with people, rather than simply for them, we continue to explore the power of working in and with “movements”, something we are looking to accelerate through the work of our “mobilisation lab” and the adoption of a global mobilisation strategy. For instance, building a mass movement to demand Arctic protection is a key part of our Polar Project.

As I said just before being arrested on an Arctic oil drilling rig: “I did this because Arctic oil drilling is one of the defining environmental battles of our age. I’m an African but I care deeply about what’s happening up here. The rapidly melting cap of Arctic sea ice is a grave warning to all of us, so it’s nothing short of madness that [oil] companies … see it as a chance to drill for the fossil fuels that got us into this climate change mess in the first place. We have to draw a line and say no more. I’m drawing that line here and now in the Arctic ice.”

Fukushima showed Greenpeace’s capacity to act quickly; our nuclear team’s network of trained radiation specialists – created in the knowledge that it was not if but when there would be another nuclear disaster – were able to investigate, document and expose the extent of radioactive contamination outside the so-called exclusion zone. They provided independent information to a frightened public, forcing the relevant authorities to improve protection measures.

Working with our office in Japan allowed us to show that the Fukushima nuclear crisis was man-made, albeit precipitated by a natural disaster. This work played a strong role in bringing about the nuclear phase-out in Germany and bringing in a vote against new nuclear build in Italy.

As the year ended, we witnessed the continued erosion of the “multilateral process” with the failure of the Durban COP17 UN climate conference. The Greenpeace meme “Listen to the people, not the polluters” took hold across the media and civil society and became the drumbeat of protest around the failed conference.

In Durban we “outed” the carbon corporations and cartels who are working to preserve their “business as usual” approach by lobbying against global action on climate change. We gave face to the “dirty dozen” polluting companies blocking climate protection. The power of those corporations is increasing and must be challenged. Greenpeace is ready to act.

In naming “The Protestor” as Person of the Year in 2011, Time Magazine asked: “Is there a global tipping point for frustration?” The answer is undoubtedly: “Yes, it is fast approaching.” We are witnessing a curious convergence of equity, economic and ecological crises.

Our campaigns are embracing the changes we see in the world, and the technologies that bring about change. They are working in parallel with the emerging movements, and calls for equity, ecology and economy. But if we are to actually “be the change we want to see in the world”, we will have to pick up the pace.

Kumi Naidoo
Executive Director
Greenpeace International
Taking over as Greenpeace International’s Board Chair in March 2011 was both deeply challenging and stimulating. It was the year in which Greenpeace celebrated its 40th anniversary as a campaigning organisation, and this prompted us all to reflect on the organisation’s origins, ambitions and direction. It was also the year we launched our new Rainbow Warrior – Greenpeace’s first ever purpose-built ship using state-of-the-art green technology of the highest standards. She was delivered on 14 October 2011 and has visited some 40 ports in Europe, the US and South America during her maiden voyage.

While the environment may have been under threat in 1971, it is in a state of crisis today. With the world’s political and industrial leaders unwilling to avert climate chaos, swaths of the world’s forests destroyed daily, the Arctic under threat, and unsustainable consumption rife in all industrialised countries – the urgency of our work is increasing exponentially. Within this context, Greenpeace has expanded and strengthened its mobilisation and empowerment of people all around the globe to take action. In India, tens of thousands of people were mobilised to oppose coal mining in the nation’s diminishing forests; by mobilising Facebook fans we were able to secure a commitment from the company’s founders to run its data centres on clean renewable energy; and through mobilisation and an expanding network of coalitions our three-year campaign in Indonesia persuaded the prominent palm oil producer Golden Agri Resources to end its involvement in deforestation. Other victories included convincing major brand names to change damaging production practices and switch to sustainable production.

However, we recognise that protecting the planet “company by company” is not a viable solution – we must work harder to commit industry as a whole to embrace the ethos of sustainability. We also recognise that to do this, we must further strengthen our mobilisation capabilities, expand our coalitions and alliances, and look more deeply into the economic structures that drive unsustainable development. Our task ahead is huge, but we are ready for the challenge. Organisationaly, we have worked to re-shape our structure, operations and capabilities – investing in becoming stronger in the emerging economies and building the tools we need in the years to come. We are becoming faster, more incisive and even more global.

Ana Toni, Chair, Stichting Greenpeace Council
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A NEW WARRIOR

The Greenpeace ships are used at the forefront of our campaigning, often sailing to remote areas to bear witness and take action against environmental destruction. The third in a proud and honourable line of Rainbow Warriors was officially launched in Bremerhaven, Germany, on 14 October 2011.
Beginning with our first action in 1971, when Greenpeace sailed towards the remote island of Amchitka to bear witness to the US government’s nuclear testing activities, we have always been prepared to travel to the furthest reaches of the planet to stop environmental crimes.

The new Rainbow Warrior is a virtual office at sea. A top-notch on-board communications centre will allow us to harness the power of social media while also transmitting images to the world’s media in minutes, so that people can witness the reality of what is happening, and be invited to take action. A helicopter pad will give us the ability to observe from the sky so that no place remains completely inaccessible, whether it be tracking illegal fishing operations, whalers or illegal wood transports. Ample space to store rigid inflatable boats means that our activists will be able to mount rapid response actions anywhere in the world.

This custom-designed Rainbow Warrior is also a sailing vessel, and has been built using the latest advances in environmental construction, capitalising on wind power for much of her travels. In this way, not only will we greatly reduce our own carbon footprint, we will also serve as an example to others of smart environmental investment.
GLOBAL PROGRAMME

There is no question that human societies must find new ways of living in peace with the planet, and within ecological limits. Greenpeace pushes for positive change through real engagement, and by building strong alliances. And, in a way that perhaps only Greenpeace can, we tackle the powers that stand in the way of change and help drive real solutions, giving voice to those who demand a world fit for our children.
Greenpeace campaigns work together to move us towards a world where people and planet are at peace with each other. Our Programme drives change; we promote the best of the new and oppose the worst of the old.

Greenpeace’s Long-Term Global Programme sets out our view of the global crisis and how we will respond to it. But the Programme is more than a collection of campaigns, it also contains our fundamental and enduring values, our overall vision and mission, and the unique ways of working that underpin our campaigns. Taken together, the different components of our Programme enable us to influence the course of events in favour of a planet able to nourish life in all its diversity.

Because it exists in different operational time frames, our Programme allows us to respond to immediate campaigning opportunities while maintaining overall direction towards our long-term aims. It describes those aspects of Greenpeace that endure through time: our vision, mission and identity, the most fundamental descriptions of “who” Greenpeace is and what it believes in. It also provides our analysis of the global crisis and then describes our long-term campaigning direction – to 2050 – in response to the crisis. Finally the Programme looks in more detail to 2020, and sets out critical campaign goals that must be reached by that date if our long-term aims are not to be compromised. These critical goals are our Programme priorities.

Our Programme priorities

Our climate and forest goals are the priority for Greenpeace, on the basis of urgency. Our goal is that greenhouse gas emissions peak by 2015 and decline thereafter. To achieve this we need to ensure a global energy revolution – moving away from fossil fuels and nuclear energy to renewable energy and energy efficiency; to see zero deforestation globally; and to ensure that an effort-sharing framework exists for tackling climate change that is both equitable and has environmental integrity.

Our goal for our oceans campaign is that global marine diversity recovers from a history of overexploitation. Substantial progress needs to be made towards achieving a global network of effectively implemented, no-take marine reserves covering 40% of the oceans. We also need to bring about an end to overfishing in the world’s oceans, and ensure that there is no commercial whaling, including its equivalent under the guise of so-called “scientific” whaling.

Our goal for our sustainable agriculture campaign is to see a halt to the expansion of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) into the environment. As a priority in Asia and the Global South, we need to catalyse a paradigm shift from chemical-intensive agriculture to sustainable agriculture, by shifting policies and significantly reducing the use of chemical pesticides and fertilisers.

And our goal for our toxics campaign is to reduce by half by 2020 the releases of hazardous chemicals of industrial origin into water resources in the Global South, with a view towards elimination of these chemicals within one generation.

Our campaigns and projects

To achieve our goals we work through short-term, two-to-three year campaigns and projects; short-term initiatives and objectives that are designed to achieve these strategic goals. Our campaign and project objectives are agreed and reviewed annually, as well as on a rolling basis.

The following pages describe our campaigns and projects over the course of 2011, and how these have contributed towards the attainment of our critical mid-term goals.

Of course external events can impact our Programme at any level. Rapid response to such unforeseeable circumstances has been and will remain a hallmark of Greenpeace’s work. For an example of a Greenpeace rapid response in 2011, please see the section describing the events of the Fukushima nuclear reactor disaster.
Our Climate and Energy Campaign in 2011 focused on discouraging investment in coal and nuclear projects, and promoting development of clean energy and energy efficiency.
Our global campaign builds on a variety of different strategies in key countries that aim to make nuclear and coal energy companies pay for the environmental, health and social costs of their activities. This is the only way to create a level playing field for renewable energy.

To protect the world from dangerous climate change, energy investments – especially in China, the US, India and Europe – need to be changed. The “investment climate” for dirty and clean energy varies considerably between countries, as it is shaped by governmental policy, the perception of risk by investors, and the vested interest of national industry.

Our global campaign builds on a variety of different strategies in key countries that aim to make nuclear and coal energy companies pay for the environmental, health and social costs of their activities to create a level playing field for renewable energy. During the year we mobilised tens of thousands in India to oppose unbridled coal mining in the dwindling forest area of the country and support measures that would protect a threatened tiger reserve. The team also promoted renewable energy as the solution to the serious energy deficiency in the Bihar region and an alternative to the government’s plans for more thermal power.

In China we released a major report highlighting the health impacts of coal ash and other pollutants from the burning of coal. Following the release, the government announced that it intended to add small particles to air quality monitoring. Our team in South Africa campaigned against massive new coal plants and urged the president to focus on the development of renewable energy. In the US we began a major “Quit Coal” campaign in 2011. One significant success came in Chicago as a result of campaigning against two old, dirty coal plants in the centre of the city; they will be closed in 2012. In the US, 30,000 megawatts of coal-fired generation has been shut down in the past few years.

The Fukushima nuclear disaster in Japan also dominated work by the campaign on nuclear energy. The reaction of Germany and Japan to Fukushima demonstrated how phasing out nuclear power will strengthen the development of renewable energy. Immediately after Fukushima, Germany closed about half its nuclear reactors and pledged to shut the rest within a decade; later, Parliament voted overwhelmingly for replacing nuclear with renewable energy. By the end of 2011, Japan had shut down most of its 54 reactors for testing.

Victory: Facebook
To drive change to a clean energy economy, it is essential for a significant number of influential and iconic global IT companies to break their dependency on energy powered by coal and publicly chose smart and renewable energy sources. Corporate climate responsibility is about making the right energy choice to foster a debate in different industrial sectors to establish carbon policies. Greenpeace began with the IT sector.

After almost two years of mobilising, agitating and negotiating with Facebook, the internet giant announced in December 2011 its goal to run its data centres on clean, renewable energy. More than 700,000 people from all over the world joined the campaign. Facebook’s message to energy producers and its peers in the IT sector is clear: invest now in renewable energy, and move away from coal power.

In addition, Greenpeace and Facebook will collaborate in the promotion of renewable energy and encourage major utilities to develop renewable energy sources. Facebook announced publically a siting policy that states a preference for access to clean, renewable energy supply for its future data centres.

The threats of coal combustion waste have been vastly underestimated in China due to regulatory loopholes.

The Greenpeace airship flies over Facebook headquarters in Palo Alto, California, US.

The threats of coal combustion waste have been vastly underestimated in China due to regulatory loopholes.

© Zhao Gang / Greenpeace
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At the COP17 talks in Durban, we encouraged the EU and G77 parties to ignore US blocking tactics and move forward without them to a new climate deal.

Who’s holding us back?
Securing an internationally binding agreement to seriously address climate change remains a key focus for the campaign. At the COP17 talks in Durban, we pushed the EU and G77 parties to ignore US blocking tactics and move forward without them to a new climate deal. Our Who’s Holding Us Back? report, targeted corporations most responsible for climate change emissions and then profiting from those emissions. The report highlighted the countries reluctant to take the necessary steps forward – the US, Canada and South Africa (responsable as host).

The report exposed how the carbon-intensive corporations in those countries campaign to increase their access to international negotiations, like COP17, and work to defeat progressive legislation on climate change and energy around the world. Unfortunately, the EU was not strong enough; and the talks were another failure as delegates listened to the polluters instead of the people.

EU POWERSHIFT
CLIMATE CAMPAIGN
In Europe, our project, coordinated by Greenpeace offices in EU countries, focused on calling on governments to support an unconditional 30% cut in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020, from 1990 levels.

The public face of the project is the ‘Hot Wheels’ campaign to convince VW to stop undermining the EU’s work to strengthen car efficiency standards. Lower car emissions will make it is easier for the EU to meet the 30% cut. The campaign was also preparing for the new EU fuel efficiency standards that will be announced at the end of 2012.

VW’s famous Star Wars advertisement, aired during a US Super Bowl telecast, was spun into the “Dark Side” campaign (www.vwdarkside.com) to turn VW’s dirty cars into cleaner cars with much higher fuel efficiency standards.

RED CARPET
RESOLUTION
In August 2011, the long-standing case of our “Red Carpet” activists was finally resolved. They were arrested and charged on the last evening of the Copenhagen Climate Summit in 2009 after unfurling a banner reading “Politicians Talk, Leaders Act” on the red carpet at a state banquet as 120 world leaders arrived. Together with a Greenpeace International climate campaigner, the three activists spent 20 days in prison over Christmas and New Year, before they and another seven activists were charged.

While the Danish public prosecutor called for harsh punishment, the court took a different view, giving the “Red Carpet 11” 14-day suspended sentences and not deporting or fining them. Two judges made clear that the activists had carried out a peaceful political protest, and acknowledged the debate-generating nature of the protest and its political context at that moment in time. Greenpeace vigorously defended the right to peaceful protest and objected to the use of harsh and inappropriate legal charges that have a chilling effect on non-violent dissent.
Greenpeace’s 40-year experience of campaigning against nuclear power came to the fore in March 2011 after a huge earthquake and tsunami struck the coast of Japan and triggered a nuclear disaster at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant on the coast.
Because of our experience, we were able to respond quickly to the meltdown at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant, and had a team of radiation experts on the ground as soon as logistically possible.

The natural catastrophe destroyed communities, taking the lives of tens of thousands of people. Greenpeace immediately expressed its condolences to those who lost loved ones, and its admiration for the efforts of the Japanese people in immediate relief work, as well as those struggling to prevent the worst case scenario.

The campaign launched a rapid response to the meltdown at Fukushima, and had rotating teams of radiation experts on the ground shortly after the nuclear accident began. Our specialists published the first independent analysis of radiation contamination. We gave people information, not disclosed by the government, about levels of radiation. We also identified dangerous hotspots in populated areas and provided safety advice. The team analysed the contamination of seafood, seaweed (a dietary staple), as well as the soil at playgrounds, school yards and public spaces on land.

With every finding and report, we not only released test results, but also urged the government to act and do more for the protection of people and environment. Some of the additional measures taken, such as the expansion of the evacuation zone or better radiation monitoring, were implemented due to our early presence, scientific work and public demands. One major supermarket responded to our testing by declaring that it would only sell foods that had zero radiation, and implemented its own independent screening.

Our independent investigation, informing the public and supporting impacted communities continued throughout the year and into 2012. At the end of August 2011 we tested school yards and other public areas in Fukushima City and found high levels of radiation contamination. We urged the government to keep schools closed until they were properly decontaminated so that parents would not have to make a decision on whether or not to put their children at risk. The team returned to some of those places in December to bear witness to the insufficient action and slow progress.

Throughout 2011 the campaign highlighted the serious failures in the Japanese system for ensuring the safety of nuclear reactors and the dangers of nuclear power. It also showed that these problems are not isolated to Fukushima and Japan, but exist wherever there are reactors.

Greenpeace has been campaigning against nuclear power for 40 years. Because of our experience, we were able to launch a rapid response to the meltdown at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant, and had a team of radiation experts on the ground as soon as logistically possible. The team bore witness to events as they unfolded and provided independent analysis of what was happening in Fukushima.

“I will never forget the sleepless nights that began for me on 11 March; endless hours organising the Greenpeace response to the Fukushima nuclear disaster. I was looking for any new information with better clues to what was really happening at the Fukushima nuclear power plant. My mind was in Japan. I worried about everyone in the country, first hit by natural disasters and then exposed to an unfolding nuclear disaster. I could not stop thinking about the heroic efforts of plant workers who risked their lives and fought against time. After living through the Chernobyl nuclear accident in 1986, and now Fukushima, I tell myself repeatedly that disasters like these must never ever be allowed to happen again.”

Jan Beranek,
Head of Greenpeace International’s Nuclear Campaign
New analysis prepared for Greenpeace by a nuclear reactor expert shows that enough radioactivity has been released into the atmosphere to rank at Level 7 on the International Nuclear Event Scale.

Timeline of Greenpeace’s Rapid Response:

23 March
New analysis prepared for Greenpeace by a nuclear reactor expert shows that enough radioactivity has been released into the atmosphere to rank at Level 7 on the International Nuclear Event Scale (INES). This is the scale’s highest level, the same category as for the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear disaster.

26 March
Greenpeace specialists begin independent measurements of radiation in the contaminated region and immediately find radiation levels high enough to require evacuation in several locations outside the official evacuation zone around the crisis-stricken Fukushima Daichi nuclear plant. Although the Japanese government rejects these findings, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) experts confirm the need for evacuation two days later.

4 April
Based on more detailed findings, Greenpeace calls for an expanded evacuation zone, and urges the evacuation of pregnant women and children from high-risk areas. A few days later, our radiation experts begin food testing and find radiation levels above official limits in vegetables collected from gardens near Fukushima City, Koriyama and Minamisoma, and from a supermarket in Fukushima City.

May
The Rainbow Warrior arrives in Japan. Greenpeace urges the Japanese authorities to undertake comprehensive radiation testing of sea and sealife along the Fukushima coast, after we carry out the first marine radiation monitoring. Initial tests register very high levels of radioactive contamination, far beyond allowable limits for food consumption. Our radiation experts find very high levels of contamination in the backyards of Fukushima City schools and kindergartens, as well as on access roads that children use. We call on the government to implement better monitoring, provide better information and protection of people, and give support to highly vulnerable members of the community – such as children and pregnant women – to allow them to voluntarily evacuate from highly contaminated places.

August
Greenpeace calls on the Prime Minister to delay the opening of schools in Fukushima City after finding radiation dose rates again exceeding international safety standards at several schools and many public areas in the city. The findings indicate that the schools should not reopen as planned until properly decontaminated.

CHERNOBYL ONGOING CONTAMINATION 25 YEARS LATER:
At the exact moment that the disaster was unfolding in Japan, a team of Greenpeace scientists were carrying out research in Ukraine to see how radiation was still effecting its population, 25 years after reactor number 4 melted down on 26 April at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. It took the team just one day to find contamination in foodstuffs in an agricultural region four hours drive away from the site of the nuclear accident. The team’s mission was to test the milk contamination in the area. Contamination was also found in other foodstuffs such as berries and mushrooms. Greenpeace scientists concluded that key foodstuffs sourced in the region are still subject to contamination with radioactivity. Caesium-137 appears to be the most important component of this contamination, but at least one of the samples suggested that other long-lived radionuclides could be present. The results show that numerous instances of regulatory limits on the consumption of radioactive food are being exceeded, both for adults and for children.
2011 saw Greenpeace’s Arctic and oil campaign begin in earnest. This renewed focus on oil was triggered by the Deepwater Horizon and Dalian oil spills of 2010, where we documented the devastation wrought on the local environments.
The Arctic campaign aims to officially protect the North Pole as a global commons, and implement a ban on all oil drilling and destructive fishing industries within the wider Arctic region.

Our campaign message is clear: we can’t let Big Oil and polluting industry rush to the ends of the Earth, risking one of the world’s last pristine environments to get at the last drop of oil, when instead we should be seeking clean energy alternatives and better fuel efficiency to end our addiction to oil.

Cairn Energy

The campaign engaged in a high profile confrontation with Cairn Energy, the only company drilling in the offshore Arctic during 2011. It had a permit to drill at depths of 1,500m. Companies operating in warm waters are already operating at these depths, but in freezing temperatures, amid severe weather and in a highly remote location, it would make it virtually impossible to contain and clean up an oil spill. This fear was backed by confidential UK government documents obtained and released by Greenpeace that revealed that the British Foreign Office believed any oil spill in Arctic waters would be impossible to deal with.

As part of Greenpeace’s activities to prevent Cairn’s drilling from proceeding, we launched an international effort to demand publication of Cairn’s oil spill response plan. Some 22 activists from Greenpeace, including the organisation’s international executive director Kumi Naidoo, repeatedly boarded Cairn Energy’s oil rig, the Leiv Ericksen, over several weeks in the freezing waters off Greenland. Many of these activists, including Kumi Naidoo, spent time in jail in Greenland. Independently, Greenpeace UK sent 60 activists, many dressed in polar bear costumes, to the company’s headquarters in Scotland to ask for the missing spill response plan. Cairn repeatedly refused to publish the plan, with the company’s lawyers claiming that the Greenlandic authorities did not permit its release. This claim was refuted by our independent legal advice, and eventually the Greenland government published the plan, which showed quite clearly that Cairn would not be able to deal with an Arctic oil spill.

Kumi Naidoo blogged the following before heading to the rig:

“For me this is one of the defining environmental battles of our age, it’s a fight for sanity against the madness of those who see the disappearance of the Arctic sea ice as an opportunity to profit. As the ice retreats the oil companies want to send the rigs in and drill for the fossil fuels that got us into this mess in the first place. The Arctic oil rush is such a serious threat to the climate, to this beautiful fragile place and to our hopes for a better future that I felt we had no choice. So I volunteered to come to the rig and make a personal appeal backed by Greenpeace supporters everywhere to call for an end to this dangerous Arctic oil drilling.”
The sea ice minimum in 2011 was the second-lowest level on record, just behind the 2007 record. The past five years have seen the five lowest sea ice extents recorded, indicating just how urgent positive action to save the global climate now is.

Sea ice minimum
The Arctic sea ice is of enormous importance because it acts as a global air conditioning system, moderating temperature levels around the planet by reflecting solar energy back into space. Because of this important cooling function, the extent of sea ice reflects the health of our climate and, worryingly, recent scientific research has shown that the amount of ice in the Arctic is in serious decline.

In the Arctic Ocean, sea ice grows dramatically each winter, usually reaching its maximum in March. The ice melts just as dramatically each summer, generally reaching its minimum in September. In 2011 we had planned to undertake extensive research in the Arctic region to examine the impacts of this melt, but because of our extended confrontation with Cairn Energy, this project was somewhat curtailed.

But the campaign was onsite with the Arctic Sunrise to record the annual sea ice minimum, marking the moment by taking along some key international journalists and commissioning artist John Quigley to create an iconic piece of art entitled “Melting Vitruvian Man”, based on Da Vinci’s famous sketch of the human body. The sea ice minimum in 2011 was the second-lowest level on record, just behind the 2007 record. The past five years have seen the five lowest sea ice extents recorded, indicating just how urgent positive action to save the global climate now is.

COOPERATION WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES
Greenpeace is campaigning against Arctic destruction in areas that are home to many indigenous peoples. As such, it is essential to the success of the campaign that we open a dialogue with indigenous leaders and work together to ensure the health of a region they have lived in since time immemorial.

We hope to work with the Arctic indigenous peoples to ensure their constitutional right to sustain themselves off the land in a traditional way is protected. So far the campaign has begun discussions with indigenous leaders, particularly in the margins of Arctic Council processes, but also on concrete issues like oil drilling and environmental impacts.
In 2011 Greenpeace continued to campaign for zero deforestation by 2020 by challenging destructive industries to change their practices and lobbying political power holders to take the coordinated international and local political action that’s needed to protect the world’s forests.
Global teams are empowered to develop the strategies and activities that will help protection of the forests in Indonesia, the Amazon and the Congo Basin.

**FOREST NETWORK**

In 2011 Greenpeace changed direction in the way in which we structure our national and international forest work, by introducing the “Forest Network” pilot. The aim of the pilot network model enables us to campaign through a structure that integrates offices and functions across the world, that is designed so that strategic and tactical decisions are taken closer to the ground, based on local knowledge, and that will make Greenpeace even more flexible in responding to external events. The global teams are empowered to develop the strategies and activities that will help protection of the forests in Indonesia, the Amazon and the Congo Basin – our priority areas. The learnings from this pilot will be used to inform the wider Greenpeace organisation on how to calibrate our organisational structure to be even more effective in campaigning for a green and peaceful future.

**Indonesia**

In February, our three-year campaign paid off when Indonesian palm oil producer, Golden Agri Resources (GAR), committed to end its involvement in deforestation. This campaign included targeting Nestle’s Kit Kat to stop using palm oil coming from deforestation. We worked closely with GAR throughout 2011 to make sure that its commitment translated into practical action in the forest areas under its control.

Indonesia’s two-year moratorium on deforestation also finally came into effect in May but needed strengthening. The organisation campaigned hard for the moratorium to include a review of activities in all forest areas with existing licences for forest and peatland clearance, as well as protection for all peatland.

2011 also saw us taking a stand against the other main driver of deforestation in Indonesia, the pulp and paper industry. We began by challenging Asia Pulp & Paper (APP) to make the same commitment as its sister company, GAR. In June, we launched a campaign against toy sector packaging that is destroying rainforests. By the end of the year Mattel, Hasbro and Lego had announced forest conservation policies. In September and October, our “Eyes of the Tiger” tour of Sumatra documented ongoing destruction of the rich forests that local people as well as endangered Sumatran tigers depend on.

Additionally, we undertook an investigation that revealed that JBS – the world’s largest beef exporter and signatory to the Cattle Agreement 2009 – was still involved in buying cattle from farms involved in illegalities, slave labour and invasion of indigenous lands. We reported our findings to the market, to ensure economic pressure would be put on JBS to take definitive action.

The cattle industry needs to look to the soya industry for inspiration; the soya moratorium that has been effective in halting deforestation for soya was renewed again in 2011.

**The Amazon**

For the Amazon, most of our work in 2011 focused on resisting the efforts of vested interests in the rural sector to change the Brazilian Forest Code, the law that protects the country’s forests. Proposed changes to the code would drive massive new deforestation in the Amazon, so Greenpeace urged the Brazilian government not to approve the changes. By the end of the year there was no decision – in part due to the massive public opposition to the changes.

Cattle ranching is the primary driver of forest destruction in the Brazilian Amazon.
Deforestation accounts for more climate pollution than all the world’s cars, trucks, trains, planes and ships combined.

Congo
In 2011, we met our goal to help ensure that a moratorium on new logging operations was maintained. Public funding of the Danzer logging group was suspended by Germany, in the aftermath of the release of our crime file, Stolen Future – Conflicts and Logging in Congo’s Rainforests.

Furthermore, the success of a youth poetry competition in the DRC culminated with the projection of the film “The Future of Congo Forests” in Greenpeace’s solar tent in Durban during the 2011 climate negotiations. It demonstrated how people in the Congo Basin are eager to take steps to protect their forest.

GLOBAL POLITICAL PROJECT
Deforestation accounts for more climate pollution than all the world’s cars, trucks, trains, planes and ships combined. From the climate point-of-view, the mechanism for protecting the forests is known as reducing emissions from tropical deforestation and degradation or REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation). The concept is simple: rich, developed countries provide funding to help developing countries protect their forests and invest in clean, green development.

In 2011 we focused much of our attention on McKinsey and Company, who advise many governments on their REDD policy. The advice they provided unfortunately failed to address the real drivers of deforestation and would not lead to an end to forest destruction or degradation. We also campaigned on how to finance REDD. This should be through public monies and not based on the markets. A lot remains to be done before a good agreement is reached on this.

FORESTS GLOBAL SOLUTIONS
Strengthening the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) was the priority for 2011, with a particular focus on poor performance in the Congo Basin. A much improved Congo Basin regional standard neared completion. There was acknowledgement in FSC guidance that Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs) are high conservation value, and the Policy of Association also came into force.

We launched two major complaints on destructive logging companies in Democratic Republic of Congo (Sodefor and Siforco) leading to one certificate being immediately suspended, however we failed to gain a moratorium on new certification of industrial logging in the Congo Basin. A successful General Assembly gave direction to FSC on a number of key issues including forest carbon, controversial “controlled” wood, and a “No” to supporting research into genetically modified trees.

As well as our lobbying work, during the year we also launched a report on why it is essential to protect IFLs, and another, On the Ground, detailing the failures of the PEFC (Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification) to support our efforts against Indonesian forest destroyer APP’s use of the scheme as a greenwashing exercise. In collaboration with our local partner Elang we launched a video in support of village palm oil producers in Sumatra, Indonesia, who had committed to zero deforestation and protection of their forests, which promoted good practice. In addition, we initiated a collaborative study on “Green Jobs” in the palm oil sector, alongside a major Indonesian labour union and local partners.

Tropical timber from the Congo Basin, shipped by the German logging company Danzer, was uncovered by Greenpeace in the French port of Caen.
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Our work to defend the oceans focused on consumer markets in 2011, as we pressed governments and companies to change the global seafood marketplace, end overfishing, and create fully-protected marine reserves.
Ocean protection begins on land and we are campaigning to end overfishing by making the global seafood marketplace full of sustainable seafood options.

Defending our oceans at sea
2011 began with the East Asia Ocean Defenders ship tour, the final large-scale ship tour of the previous Rainbow Warrior. Taiwan is home to the world’s most aggressive tuna fishing fleet, and where our campaign to end overfishing is focused.

The tour concluded with a peaceful protest against an apparently illegal fish transport vessel, the Lung Yuin. Activists hung from the ship’s anchor chain, preventing it from departing, and demanded that the Taiwanese government act to prevent Pacific overfishing. The protest resulted in a high-profile legal battle in Taiwan, after which our Taiwanese campaigner was found not guilty of aggravated defamation for speaking out against Taiwan’s questionable fishing boat registration laws. The Rainbow Warrior then travelled to South Korea, home of Greenpeace’s newest office, where we projected our demands for better fishing practices on the headquarters of one of South Korea’s largest seafood producers. This helped raise awareness in South Korea about the consequences of destructive fishing on our oceans and the millions of people dependent on them for food and jobs.

During the final months of 2011, the Esperanza and her crew encountered illegal fishing operations in the Pacific Commons, areas of tuna-rich international waters declared off-limits to destructive fishing by the island nations surrounding them.

Defending our oceans on land
We are campaigning to end overfishing by transforming the global seafood marketplace and ensuring consumers get the sustainable fish options they want.

As Greenpeace had only just opened its office in Taiwan, the tour was focused on raising public awareness of the crisis facing our oceans and the solutions that Greenpeace is advocating globally. During the ship tour, our team in Taiwan made numerous media appearances and held public events – nearly 5,000 people visited the Rainbow Warrior during 10 open days.
We are working to change the politics of fishing, by lobbying governments to end destructive fishing methods and better manage fishing industries.

Before the launch of our UK tuna campaign, only three major retailers were sourcing tuna caught using sustainable pole-and-line fishing methods. Due to our campaign, all other major UK retailers have now made similar commitments. Major UK brands John West and Princes have committed to source tuna caught sustainably and not buy tuna caught in the Pacific Commons.

Thanks to our campaign work, in May 2011 New Zealand retailer Foodstuffs agreed to introduce a pole-and-line canned tuna line, and only a month later announced it would shift about 85% of its canned tuna products to more responsibly-caught fishing methods.

In Australia, we secured a commitment from Safcol tuna brands to use 100% pole-and-line caught skipjack tuna. We have also convinced Australian retailers Coles and Woolworths to introduce a pole-and-line tuna product line, as have Aldi and IGA. Work to change the global seafood market is having huge success: seafood companies are increasingly abandoning destructive fishing methods and retailers are stocking more and more sustainable seafood options.

TOKYO TWO CASE COMES TO A CLOSE

In 2008, two Greenpeace activists, Junichi Sato and Toru Suzuki (known as the “Tokyo Two”) presented evidence of routine whale meat embezzlement and other irregularities in Japan’s dying whaling industry. Instead of investigating Greenpeace’s claims, authorities arrested our activists and placed them on trial for theft and in September 2010 the Japanese court handed down a guilty verdict. In December 2010, high-ranking whaling industry officials admitted wrongdoing and publicly apologised, but despite this the appeals court upheld the conviction and rejected our appeal in July 2011. While this means that Sato and Suzuki have been punished for standing up to embezzlement, our work nevertheless continues to expose the disastrous financial reality of the industry, and we recently exposed details of the huge subsidies Japanese taxpayers are being forced to pay in order to keep Japan’s shameful whaling programme afloat.

A MORE TRANSPARENT IWC

At the 2011 meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in Jersey, governments at last agreed new transparency measures and financial accountability mechanisms. These changes, while modest, will bring the Commission into the 21st century and hopefully be the first step in transforming the IWC into a body that focuses on protecting whales, not perpetuating dying whaling industries. The proposal, introduced by the UK government, should cut down on vote-buying and other corrupt practices that help whaling nations maintain a stranglehold on the IWC. The 2011 IWC meeting failed to reach any other meaningful agreements after Japan and other nations walked out, refusing to vote on creating a new whale sanctuary in the southern Atlantic Ocean.
Industrial pollution is a severe threat to water resources around the world, particularly in the Global South where the view often prevails that pollution is the price to pay for progress.
The main aim of the campaign during its first year was to link the pollution on the ground in China to global fashion brands.

In 2011, with over 30 years experience in addressing the problems related to the use of hazardous chemicals, Greenpeace’s toxic team turned its attention to finding solutions to the urgent issue of global water pollution.

Before launching the campaign we carried out substantial research, published in our Hidden Consequences report. The report illustrates the many mistakes made by countries in the Global North during periods of rapid industrialisation and the price they and their rivers continue to pay. It also provides valuable lessons for policy makers in the Global South to help them avoid making the same mistakes with their rivers and waterways.

Given the persistent, bio-accumulative and toxic nature of many of the chemicals currently used by industry, the only effective way to address the hidden dangers they bring to our waterways is to completely phase out their use and release, rather than attempt to control the damage with end-of-pipe treatment methods.

As such, Greenpeace is calling on governments to adopt a political commitment to “zero discharge” of all hazardous chemicals within one generation, based on the precautionary principle and a preventative approach to chemicals management. The campaign has already contributed at key moments to the debate in Thailand, the Philippines and China.

Activities ranged from the world’s largest coordinated striptease – which took place outside brand stores in 10 countries and 29 cities – to giant football pitch sized banners in the middle of Buenos Aires, and human banners on the banks of the Chao Phraya in Thailand. Online, hundreds of thousands of people mobilised to persuade their favourite brand to “Detox” by signing petitions, writing letters to CEOs and sharing our video with their friends. At various events and shopping malls around the world supporters, clothes mannequins, consumers and celebrities signed up to the campaign, took photos and modelled the “Detox” temporary tattoos. Initially it was hoped that one or two brands would publically announce a change of policy and commit to eliminate all toxic chemicals from their supply chains and products, but after months of mobilising, awareness raising and targeted pressure, six brands signed up to the Detox challenge. These include the sportswear giants Nike, Adidas, Li-Ning and Puma, as well as retailers H&M and C&A.

Greenpeace is now asking these brands to turn their commitments into meaningful actions on the ground, and to act as catalysts for further industry-wide and societal change with regard to the use of hazardous chemicals. The campaign will be working to ensure that brands sign up to the Detox challenge and work with their suppliers to provide transparent data on the release of hazardous chemicals as they move towards toxic-free production. Consumers and affected communities have a right to this information, and transparency and transformative progress in key countries in the Global South will be important themes for the campaign in 2012 as we continue to mobilise people around the world to push these brands to create positive change where it is needed most.

Exposing the textile industry’s Dirty Laundry

The main aim of the campaign during its first year was to link the pollution on the ground in China to global fashion brands. The idea was to expose these polluting practices, and to ask textile brands to take responsibility for this pollution by working with their suppliers to eliminate all releases of hazardous chemicals from across the entire production and lifecycle of their clothes.

In July 2011, the results of our investigation were released in the first of our Dirty Laundry reports, which exposed links between a number of major international clothing brands and the toxic water pollution coming from two facilities on the Pearl and Yangtze rivers. The report was accompanied by the launch of the global “Detox” campaign, which harnessed global people-power to challenge these brands to clean up their act and create a toxic-free future. The focus was initially on the world’s major sportswear brands, Nike, Adidas and the Chinese brand Li-Ning, to have them compete to become Detox Champions.

Activities ranged from the world’s largest coordinated striptease – which took place outside brand stores in 10 countries and 29 cities – to giant football pitch sized banners in the middle of Buenos Aires, and human banners on the banks of the Chao Phraya in Thailand. Online, hundreds of thousands of people mobilised to persuade their favourite brand to “Detox” by signing petitions, writing letters to CEOs and sharing our video with their friends. At various events and shopping malls around the world supporters, clothes mannequins, consumers and celebrities signed up to the campaign, took photos and modelled the “Detox” temporary tattoos. Initially it was hoped that one or two brands would publically announce a change of policy and commit to eliminate all toxic chemicals from their supply chains and products, but after months of mobilising, awareness raising and targeted pressure, six brands signed up to the Detox challenge. These include the sportswear giants Nike, Adidas, Li-Ning and Puma, as well as retailers H&M and C&A.

Greenpeace is now asking these brands to turn their commitments into meaningful actions on the ground, and to act as catalysts for further industry-wide and societal change with regard to the use of hazardous chemicals. The campaign will be working to ensure that brands sign up to the Detox challenge and work with their suppliers to provide transparent data on the release of hazardous chemicals as they move towards toxic-free production. Consumers and affected communities have a right to this information, and transparency and transformative progress in key countries in the Global South will be important themes for the campaign in 2012 as we continue to mobilise people around the world to push these brands to create positive change where it is needed most.
The fight for sustainable agriculture is key to solving the world food crisis and providing food for all in the future.
The industrial model of agriculture is destroying our future ability to produce food, as it is relying on toxic chemicals and synthetic fertilisers that strip the soil of its fertility.

In February 2010, the Indian government passed a moratorium on Bt eggplant commercialisation, to protect the country’s agriculture. In its decision, the Environment Ministry said that the science behind Bt eggplant is inadequate to answer the concerns raised by civil society groups, and that the country’s GE regulatory system is inadequate. However this did not stop the Philippine government from starting field trials. A Greenpeace decontamination unit removed Bt eggplant from a field trial site in Barangay Paciano Rizal in Bay, Laguna, and sealed the experimental food crop in hazmat (hazardous materials) containers to prevent further contamination of neighbouring fields and the environment. The activists were supported by organic farmers from Davao, who had participated in a similar operation carried out by their provincial government last year.

Widespread and increasingly intensive use of glyphosate poses further risks to the environment and human health.

In 2011 the campaign published a report looking at the role of glyphosate (a herbicide), exposing its widespread and increasingly intensive use in association with GE crops. The report also showed that glyphosate poses further risks to the environment and human health. We also continued to work at keeping Bt (Bacillus thuringiensis) eggplant out of circulation. Building on our previous work in India we started fighting the crop in the Philippines. Bt eggplant is genetically engineered to contain a built-in toxin to kill the fruit-and-shoot borer insect. It is currently not approved in any country including India, where the technology was sourced for use in the Philippines.

NO COMMERCIALISATION OF GE RICE IN CHINA

It took seven years and successive teams of young campaigning, but finally in late September 2011 Beijing said it was suspending the commercialisation of genetically-engineered (GE) rice. Even with the most formidable of opponents, from both government and industry, positive change can be achieved.

The origins of rice cultivation can be traced to the valleys of China’s Yangtze River, with some estimates putting it at over 7,000 years ago. In that time, rice has become an integral part of Chinese life and culture and is today its main food crop. It dictates the lives of millions of farmers in the Chinese countryside, feeds over a billion Chinese every day and is synonymous with Chinese cuisine and culture.
Using social media to help win campaigns is key to Greenpeace. In 2011 we increased our supporters – people who are happy for us to contact them via email, phone or via our social networks – to 17 million people globally.
In a world in which digital networks, mobile technology, and the democratisation of broadcast and organising tools are changing the face of activism, we want to offer our supporters a wider menu of ways they can campaign with us in their daily lives and in their local communities.

Our use of online media gained considerable traction in challenging environmental abuses and the corporate status quo. We launched an innovative and successful campaign in which our supporters used popular toy dolls Barbie and Ken to challenge Mattel to stop using rainforest-destroying packaging. We won commitments from Adidas, Puma and Nike to clean up supply chain problems that are polluting Chinese rivers. Our “VW Rebellion” campaign cast Volkswagen in the role of Darth Vader for lobbying for relaxed CO2 regulations in the EU.

We continue to explore the power of harnessing our supporters’ willingness to do more than donate or sign a petition. We’re expanding volunteer programmes – eight offices now have dedicated supporter mobilisation programmes, and we continue to develop online campaigns that go beyond “clicktivism”.

We launched the Digital Mobilisation Lab, powered by a growing global network of staff and volunteers dedicated to people-powered campaigning. Designed to capitalise on Greenpeace’s fearless embrace of the experimental, the lab provides the global organisation and its allies a dynamic, forward-looking space to envision, test, and roll out creative new means of inspiring larger networks of leaders and people around the world.

In a world in which digital networks, mobile technology, and the democratisation of broadcast and organising tools are changing the face of activism, we want to offer our supporters a wider menu of ways they can campaign with us in their daily lives and in their local communities.

Ultimately, we seek to create an environment where we reach new supporters in creative new ways to build a robust base of real “people power” around Greenpeace’s mission. We envision a more active and empowered supporter network.

Greenpeace activists protesting against Mattel, the manufacturer of Barbie, in front of toy shops in Helsinki, Finland.

Greenpeace activists exposed the “Dark Side” of VW’s environmental record.

Greenpeace activists protested against Mattel, the manufacturer of Barbie, in front of toy shops in Helsinki, Finland.

Greenpeace activists exposed the “Dark Side” of VW’s environmental record.

Greenpeace activists protesting against Mattel, the manufacturer of Barbie, in front of toy shops in Helsinki, Finland.

Greenpeace actions around the world called on sportswear giants to remove toxic chemicals from their supply chains.
We rely entirely on voluntary donations from individual supporters, and on grant support from foundations. We don't accept money from governments, political parties or corporations.

You are at the heart of everything we do.
If you think you are too small to make a difference, try sleeping in a closed room with a mosquito. African proverb

Your gift to Greenpeace means we can act rapidly and independently. Our independence is a core Greenpeace principle, and the credibility and authority that comes with it plays a large role in making our work successful. 2.9 million people around the world supported Greenpeace with a financial gift in 2011. Importantl, over 85% of you have made an ongoing commitment to fund our work. This support is vital because it enables us to plan our campaigns into the future. Thank you so much for keeping us in action.

In 2011, Greenpeace globally received €237m in donations. This is 5% more than in 2010. Supporters in Germany, the US, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the UK were in our top five countries for giving.

We take our responsibility for transparency and accountability very seriously, and we always ensure the efficient use of funds given by the millions of people who support us.

We would like to extend a very special thank you to our top funders: The Dutch and Swedish Postcode Lotteries (Nationale Postcode Loterij and Svenska Postkodstiftelsen) generously donated over €1.5m to Greenpeace in 2011, in support of oceans and forest preservation. Project Oceans is focused on protecting our oceans and supporting sustainable seafood options. Our Forest protection initiative targets the most critical regions in the world – the Amazon, Congo and Indonesia.

Greenpeace Switzerland received a €1.2m legacy from a long-term supporter whose spirit and generosity will live on through the work of Greenpeace.

The Oak Foundation is a long-term supporter of Greenpeace, and in 2011 it made a generous donation of $1m US dollars over three years to our priority Climate and Energy campaign. The Oak Foundation also contributed to our work on sustainable fisheries in Japan and seafood markets projects around the world.

In the US a long-time and loyal individual supporter donated a major gift of $1m US dollars in 2011. This important gift was given for general support to the US office, enabling Greenpeace to progress its vital work for the environment.

The future of the environment rests with the millions of people around the world who share our beliefs. It is through the collective voices of our supporters that we can tackle environmental problems and promote solutions.

Greenpeace’s successes are yours – thank you so much.

We are grateful to each and every one of our supporters who made our work possible in 2011.

“Africa Roars” banner in Durban. Thousands of South African youths formed a giant lion’s head, and called for urgent action on climate change during the Durban 2011 climate talks.

Over 200 Greenpeace members from Germany, Switzerland and Austria took part in a demonstration in Strasbourg to move France to a renewable energy pathway.

"Africa Roars" bannerank. Thousands of South African youths formed a giant lion’s head, and called for urgent action on climate change during the Durban 2011 climate talks.
Genuine giving should not be based on having strings attached. It should be based on the goodness of one’s heart but also trusting that the people you are contributing to have integrity and know best how to use the resources.

Kumi Naidoo

Testimonials

Donna Baines, Canada

“Some years ago when I was drawing up my will, I tried to think of the best thing I could leave my kids. I decided a cleaner, safer, kinder planet was the best thing. So I wrote a gift to Greenpeace into my will. Even when I’m not around, hopefully Greenpeace and others like them will be working to sustain and nurture our planet.”

Nikita Crasta, India

“For the past 10 years I have been supporting Greenpeace India because I am very proud of the work that Greenpeace does. At the risk of sounding corny, Greenpeace does things I wish I had the time and wherewithal to do. It makes me very happy to contribute, in the miniscule way that I do, to this work. I am proud to be a member of the family of Greenpeace supporters. I believe all of us together can make a world of a difference if we try in whatever small way we can.”

Jurg Hepp, Australia

After Jurg passed away in 2011, his generous donations were taken over by Imogen, his partner and soul mate of 18 years: “The myriad abundance of Jurg’s life harvest is testimony to his generous spirit, life skills and commitment to conservation. The natural world was his greatest passion.”

Jurg Hepp was a monthly supporter of Greenpeace for over a decade, due to his deep commitment to the environment. After he passed away in 2011, Jurg’s generous donations were taken over by Imogen.

Anton Moll van Charante, Netherlands

“You are the largest environmental organisation and at least you are doing something,” was the retired doctor’s reply when asked why he has supported Greenpeace since 1991. “I believe in actions, really going for it. If you stop taking action, I would stop supporting you. I hope my grandchildren will say: Grandpa made a gesture.”

Andreas Reinhart Volkart Stiftung, Winterthur, Switzerland

“The Volkart Foundation has been decisively supporting Greenpeace Switzerland and internationally for over 15 years. During visits to projects we have been able to testify that the organisation packs an incredible punch thanks to its combination of scientific research, as well as fresh, provocative and always constructive action, and also has lots of charm. We know our donations to Greenpeace are in good hands and put to good use.”
Gross fundraising income
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Number of financial supporters
For each Greenpeace National & Regional Office in 2011 compared to 2010
Greenpeace built its campaigning strength and supporter base in Europe and North America.

To challenge the drivers of global environmental destruction today, we have to create at least the same levels of activism in the Global South.
In shifting our focus to the areas of big economic and power growth, Greenpeace is placing itself to match the “new world order”.

Over the last 40 years, Greenpeace has built its campaigning strength and supporter base in Europe and North America. A glance at the expenditure graphs on the following pages shows that our activities – as represented by expenditure – are mostly occurring in Europe. To challenge the drivers of global environmental destruction today, we have to create at least the same levels of activism in the Global South. We have now embarked on a process to build our presence in other parts of the world to levels adequate to the challenge.

Beginning in 2011, we have started to invest heavily in building Greenpeace in India, China, Africa, Southeast Asia, Brazil – and in the US, where much still needs to be done. Already in 2011 we increased the expenditure of our offices in these countries by an average of 18%. In 2012 we have added Russia to this list. Our new strategy will result, in future years, in an increase in the percentage of our activities and expenditure in the key countries of the Global South. In shifting our focus to the areas of big economic and power growth, Greenpeace is placing itself to match the “new world order”.

In 2011, South Africa attended its first BRIC meeting as a full member, joining Brazil, Russia, India and China to become the BRICS. Collectively they represent nearly half of the world’s people and around a fifth of its GDP. They are the dominant emerging economies, doubling their share of global economic output since the 1990s, and they are projected to overtake the output of the eurozone by 2015.

They are clearly engaged in discussions about a power shift broader than simply economic. Joint positions are being discussed and adopted on a number of issues, including opposition to military action against Syria and Iran.

As the larger countries in the Global South become economic and political powerhouses and leaders, and even though the latest BRICS summit included strong indications of support for “sustainable development” and promotion of a “green economy”, these countries also increasingly join the Global North in driving unsustainable economics and environmental destruction. So too must Greenpeace’s focus change to ensure that we are challenging these trends.
Greenpeace International (Stichting Greenpeace Council) acts as the coordinating body for Greenpeace National and Regional Offices, as well as running international campaigns and operating the Greenpeace fleet.

Set out on these pages are the abbreviated financial statements for Greenpeace International and its related affiliates for the year ended 31 December 2011, as well as the combined statements including the Greenpeace National and Regional Offices for the same period. These are presented to provide transparency and accountability for our supporters and provide an overview of the combined income, expenditure, assets and liabilities of all the Greenpeace entities worldwide.

The accounts of all of the Greenpeace National and Regional Offices are independently audited in accordance with local regulations. Copies of these may be requested from the appropriate office, addresses for which are listed on page 55.

In 2011 for the first time a Global Resource Plan was agreed. This provides a three year framework for the annual budget of Greenpeace International, including additional funding of approximately €52m for the period 2011-2013, based on global priorities as agreed between Greenpeace International and the Greenpeace National and Regional Offices. This will enable us to shift more resources to countries and regions where we need to have more impact for our Long-Term Global Programme, as well as to global strategic initiatives and projects, which are executed in close cooperation between Greenpeace International and the Greenpeace National and Regional Offices.

In 2011 we have enhanced our financial management and processes, which we will continue in 2012 and beyond, to ensure efficient and effective use of our financial resources for our global programme (campaigns, communication, mobilisation, actions and fundraising) as well as our global organisation (IT, ships, office development, staff and volunteers).

Compensation of Board Members and Remuneration of Senior Management Team

The Chair and Members of the Greenpeace Board do not receive a salary, but their expenses are refunded and they receive a compensation (attendance fee) for time spent on activities such as board meetings and preparation. The compensation is based on a ruling of the Dutch tax authorities.

The Board of Greenpeace International received a compensation during 2011 of a total of €100,000 (€100,000 in 2010): the Board Chair received €40,000 and all other Board Members each received €10,000. The Board members would have been entitled to a higher compensation based on time spent, but the amounts have been capped at these levels by the Annual General Meeting of Greenpeace International.

The International Executive Director received total emoluments of €125,334, including salary of €115,955, employer’s pension contribution of €6,788 and other benefits to the value of €2,591. In 2010, the International Executive Director received total emoluments of €123,704, including salary of €115,769, employer’s pension contribution of €5,595 and other benefits to the value of €2,340.

The International Executive Director and the Senior Management Team are paid emoluments commensurate with their level of responsibility.

In total, emoluments of €740,000 (€642,000 in 2010) were paid to the members of Senior Management Team in 2011. The increase between 2010 and 2011 is largely due to the addition of two new senior management positions during the year. These emoluments may be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Radboud van Delft, Organisation Director, Greenpeace International
GPI Reserves

Greenpeace International’s reserves policy calls for available reserves to adequately cover risks to its operations. These risks are assessed annually.

In this context, available reserves equals the fund balance less fixed assets and less reserves held for restricted or designated purposes. The reserves level is calculated as follows:

For 2011, restricted and designated reserves comprise:
• €2.7m (€1.5m in 2010) held for investment in fundraising initiatives of Greenpeace National and Regional Offices;
• €4.7m (€5m in 2010) reserved to support the implementation of Greenpeace global strategic initiatives;
• €0.3m (not applicable in 2010) reserved for the decommissioning of the previous Rainbow Warrior, in accordance with the highest decommissioning standards.

(2010 reserves of €3.9m, held for the building of the new Rainbow Warrior, and €1.3m, held for support of a priority Greenpeace Regional office, were not applicable in 2011.)

The amount of available reserves of €6m is needed to pursue unforeseen opportunities, cover risks according to the Greenpeace International risk policy, and to provide adequate working capital coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance</td>
<td>40,403</td>
<td>41,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Fixed Assets</td>
<td>(26,535)</td>
<td>(9,808)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Restricted and Designated Reserves</td>
<td>(7,718)</td>
<td>(11,729)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>20,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenpeace International and Related Entities
Abbreviated Financial Statements

The combined abbreviated financial statements are derived from the financial statements of Greenpeace International and its related entities, but exclude the Greenpeace National and Regional Offices.

The total income of Greenpeace International in 2011 was €60.8m, representing a decrease of €197,000 (0.3%) against 2010 levels. Income fell primarily as a result of decreased interest income, relating to the revaluation of loans. However, this was largely offset by an increase in grants and investment contributions received from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices.

Total expenditure increased in 2011 by €10.8m (21%), reaching a total of €62.3m. This is mainly attributable to an increase in Grants and other support to National and Regional Offices (€4.5m), which reflects the wider organisational strategic initiative to shift more resources to those countries and regions where we need to have more campaigning impact. Campaign and Campaign Support expenditure also increased in 2011, by €3m. Fixed and Financial Assets increased in 2011 to €27m (€15m in 2010), largely as a result of the investment in the building of the new Rainbow Warrior, which was completed at the end of 2011.
Greenpeace International
Abbreviated Financial Statements
Years ended
31 December 2011 and 31 December 2010

The combined financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2011 of Greenpeace International, from which the abbreviated financial statements were derived, were prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards for Small & Medium-sized Entities, as adopted by the EU, and are in accordance with Part 9 of Book 2 of the Dutch Civil Code.

The 2010 figures have been restated in order to reflect the split of expenditure across cost categories that have been utilised in 2011. This is due to the reallocation of some types of costs from Campaigns and Organisational Support to Grants to National and Regional Offices.

Ernst & Young audited the financial statements of Greenpeace International and issued an unqualified audit opinion on 22 May 2012.

### Income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2010 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants from National and Regional Offices</td>
<td>58,709</td>
<td>58,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants and Donations</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>(181)</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,027</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Total Income less fundraising expenditure**: 58,670 Euros thousands in 2011, 58,562 Euros thousands in 2010.

### Expenditure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2010 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants to National and Regional Offices</td>
<td>15,656</td>
<td>11,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns and Campaign Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate &amp; Energy</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>3,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceans</td>
<td>3,193</td>
<td>2,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxics</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campaigns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Operations and Action Support</td>
<td>9,757</td>
<td>9,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>5,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Support</td>
<td>9,848</td>
<td>7,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Costs</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Exchange (Gain)/Loss</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>(767)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-fundraising expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,208</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,078</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tax**: (6) Euros thousands in 2011, - Euros thousands in 2010.

**Surplus/(deficit) for the year**: (1,544) Euros thousands in 2011, 9,484 Euros thousands in 2010.

This summary shows the assets, liabilities and fund balance of Greenpeace International.

### Statement of Financial Position

**Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2010 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed and Financial Assets</td>
<td>26,535</td>
<td>14,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from National and Regional Offices</td>
<td>10,312</td>
<td>7,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Assets</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>28,453</td>
<td>32,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,491</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,484</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liabilities and Fund Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2010 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to National and Regional Offices</td>
<td>17,367</td>
<td>9,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Liabilities</td>
<td>8,721</td>
<td>4,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>40,403</td>
<td>41,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,491</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,484</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenpeace 'Worldwide' Combined Abbreviated Financial Statements

These accounts are a compilation of the individually audited accounts of all the legally independent Greenpeace organisations operating worldwide, including Greenpeace International. In compiling these abbreviated financial statements, the financial statements of individual Greenpeace National and Regional Offices have been adjusted, where appropriate, to harmonise the accounting policies with those used by Greenpeace International.

In 2011, the gross income from fundraising for Greenpeace worldwide was €237m. This was €11m (5%) more than in 2010. Fundraising income increased in 2011 across all channels, with a significant increase in income from continuing supporters. Total income in 2011 was €241m (€231m in 2010).

Total expenditure worldwide increased by €29m (14%), from €208m in 2010 to €237m in 2011.

- Fundraising expenditure at €77m (32% of total fundraising income) was €8m (12%) higher than in 2010. This reflects our strategy to increase our supporter base to be able to have more impact globally.
- Campaign and campaign support expenditure increased by €9m (8%) from €114m in 2010 to €123m in 2011. €29 million was spent on Climate & Energy in 2011 (€25m in 2010), which is our priority campaign.
- Organisation support costs across Greenpeace worldwide increased by €5m (16%) in 2011. This increase reflects the wider organisational strategic initiative to shift more resources to Greenpeace entities in the Global South. As part of this shift, capacity boosting initiatives have been undertaken, as well as increased investment in information technology projects including the new Greenpeace global fundraising database.
- There was a foreign exchange gain of €0.4m in 2011 (€6m gain in 2010).

The Fixed Assets balance of €59m (€44m in 2010) increased mainly due to investment in the building of the new Rainbow Warrior, which was completed at the end of 2011.
These financial statements of the worldwide Greenpeace organisation for the year 2011 consist of the Greenpeace International and Related Entities financial statements together with the financial statements of Greenpeace National and Regional Offices. The worldwide combined financial statements have been prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards for Small & Medium-sized Entities, as adopted by the EU.

The 2010 Campaign area breakdown has been restated in order to present comparable figures to 2011: the Peace & Disarmament expenditure line has been incorporated into expenditure on Other Campaigns.

The compilation of the financial statements has been reviewed by Ernst & Young.
While the organisation expands its activities we continue our efforts to become more efficient to relatively reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.
Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions

Greenpeace Worldwide GHG emissions for 2011 totalled 20,504 metric tonnes, 1,009 tonnes more than the previous year. The total worldwide figures reported below include the emissions from Greenpeace International and all Greenpeace National and Regional Offices around the globe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenpeace worldwide GHG emissions (in CO₂ equiv. metric tonnes)</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE 1: Direct GHG emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for marine transportation</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>6,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for helicopter transportation</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for inflatables</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for natural gas</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for vehicles</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scope 1</td>
<td>6,778</td>
<td>7,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE 2: Indirect GHG emissions – electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect emissions for office electricity</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect emissions for server electricity</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scope 2</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE 3: Other indirect GHG emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect emissions for business travel</td>
<td>10,893</td>
<td>9,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect emissions for paper consumption</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scope 3</td>
<td>12,759</td>
<td>11,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GHG Emissions:</td>
<td>20,504</td>
<td>19,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1. The emissions methodology and emission factors are taken from the following resources:
   - http://www.defra.gov.uk
   - http://www.iea.org
   - http://cfpub.epa.org
   - http://www.edf.org
2. CO₂ equiv. refers to all measurable GH gases including CO₂ and CO₂ equivalents of CH₄ and N₂O.
3. Due to operational procedures, a small amount of information had to be estimated based on last year’s performance, amounting to 1.6% of the total.

We continue our efforts to become more efficient to relatively reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. While increasing the size of our activities during the year by 14% (total expenditure) we managed to limit the increase of CO₂ emissions to just 5%. To improve even further we are implementing different measures such as the video conferencing system to control travel.

A quarter of our greenhouse gas emissions are attributable to our marine operations. The new Rainbow Warrior is designed to make maximum use of her sails and has the latest engines for environmental performance. However, being a larger vessel than the previous Rainbow Warrior, and having higher air quality standards for engine emissions, will not automatically translate into lower CO₂ emissions. We plan and execute voyages at maximum fuel-saving mode, and measure CO₂ emissions with a view to reducing our carbon footprint.

The previous Rainbow Warrior has been donated to a Bangladeshi non-profit organisation, and is being converted to a hospital ship for local medical relief.

Positive effects are seen in electricity consumption. This is in part due to a global 100% Renewable Energy Policy, aimed at converting all our office and technology consumption to renewable energy – as it becomes possible in local markets.

Travel emissions developed with the same percentage as our activities. For all our CO₂ emissions, we get a certified offset by MyClimate, a Swiss non-profit organisation.
Adherence to the INGO Accountability Charter has spurred us to codify existing best practices in a series of new policies to ensure transparency and adherence to high standards of conduct.
In 2011 the Board approved three new policies covering whistleblowers, bribery and corruption and security.

The **Whistleblower Policy** is designed to support an environment where our people can fulfil their duty to disclose malpractice and misconduct that is detrimental to our mission and values, without fear of retaliation. It establishes a system where whistleblowers can go directly to the Chair of the Board Audit Committee with their concerns, bypassing the line management system of Greenpeace International. It reflects best practice in giving all staff the right to find redress in situations where the regular management channels are not able to escalate issues. Our national and regional offices are in the process of implementing similar policies and procedures.

The **Bribery and Corruption Policy** was written with the assistance of Transparency International, and codifies our intolerance for corruption. It obliges us to put measures in place, such as guidelines and training, with the goal of reducing facilitation payments (grease money/baksheesh) to zero. Even if bribery is not an issue in many countries, some of our staff travel to places where it is more common. Facilitation payments made abroad may be illegal in many countries where we operate. Of greater importance, bribery and corruption divert resources, with consequential erosion of human rights, health and safety, education, etc., disenfranchising the very people who desperately need these rights and services.

We are aiming in 2012 to synchronise this type of policy across our national and regional offices and to develop and roll out training for all staff.

The **Security Policy** describes Greenpeace International’s duty of care to our people who operate in places of higher risk, be this due to local conditions or as a result of our campaign activities. It obliges us to put measures in place to manage risk, and explains the limits to this, allowing our staff to make informed decisions prior to committing to activities on behalf of Greenpeace.

Managing our security in this manner, rather than making us “risk averse”, increases our skills so that we can operate with higher levels of safety in potentially dangerous situations.

Throughout 2011 and 2012 we have been rolling out a programme of assessing and increasing security, risk awareness and risk management in Greenpeace National and Regional Offices.
Numbers of male & female staff members (globally)

Board member diversity

- Board members from outside each office's country or region
- Total Board members

Staff age

- Male & female staff on permanent contract

Male & female staff on permanent contract

- Females employed on permanent contract
- Males employed on permanent contract

North America

- Staff: 106 (Males) + 208 (Females)

Central & South America

- Staff: 92 (Males) + 89 (Females)

Brazil

- Staff: 48 (Males) + 56 (Females)
As part of our commitment to the INGO Accountability Charter, this year we have begun to report on key human resource statistics. As the map and the graphs here show, the gender balance is almost equal throughout the organisation. We also have a good spread agewise, taking advantage of the knowledge of our more experienced campaigners and using that in combination with the enthusiasm of our younger members of staff.
GREENPEACE IS AN INDEPENDENT CAMPAIGNING ORGANISATION THAT ACTS TO CHANGE ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR, TO PROTECT AND CONSERVE THE ENVIRONMENT, AND TO PROMOTE PEACE.