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It is always with mixed feelings that I sit down to write the introduction to our Annual Report. As the International Executive Director, it falls to me to sum up the year. In doing so, I alternate between pride and disappointment, between hope and despair.

With pride – and you can read this for yourselves – I can say we are growing. Our campaigns are having an impact, and our reach is increasing. We are adapting to a rapidly changing world: we are expanding our work and campaign design to match the changes we see in the world.

Looking back at 2012, I can say that I am proud of our work and campaigns. Last year, at the Rio+20 Earth Summit in Brazil, we launched our “Save the Arctic” campaign, a bold people-powered initiative to draw a line in the ice, saying to those who would scour the ends of the Earth for the last drop of oil: “You go no further!” The campaign has attracted millions of supporters, and is already getting results. The Arctic ice melting is an inducement to speed up the transition to a future powered by cleaner and more equitable renewable energy sources backed by smarter and more efficient energy use.

In 2013, carbon dioxide concentrations breached 400ppm (parts per million). I am told this number is meaningless. But that does not make it unimportant, nor does it prevent me from indulging in a little despair. To put this into context: our job, our mission, and our need to prevent catastrophic climate change gets harder every time we pass a major threshold. 400ppm is the highest level in human history, and it means we are hitting the accelerator towards mass extinction, mass migration, and mass starvation. It makes it perfectly clear that we are now in the “Anthropocene”, a time when the major force shaping the environment and all that depends upon us is people. It also means we have a choice: we can change course. That choice offers hope and fuels activism.

Often in interviews and in speeches I find myself saying: “We are winning battles, but losing the planet.” The Rio+20 Earth Summit was without doubt a huge disappointment. In our 40 years of history, Greenpeace has borne witness to many environmental crimes, but Rio+20 was a crime scene of the highest order. Nothing was achieved, and no agreements to tackle the deepening environmental crisis were made. “Disappointment” barely does it justice.

“The shift in national power may be overshadowed by an even more fundamental shift in the nature of power. Enabled by communications technologies, power will shift toward multifaceted and amorphous networks that will form to influence state and global actions,” observes the US National Intelligence Council’s recent 2030 Alternative Worlds Report.

Greenpeace has a growing supporter base of some 24 million: those who work for us, volunteer, donate, follow, like, and take online action. They share our work and we share theirs, challenging the most fundamental threat to our future: Apathy. In such a future, there is always hope.

We are part of a growing global movement. One that is more connected than ever before, and that understands the links between green and peace, equity and ecology. It understands that to secure one, we must secure them all. We are part of that movement.

Finally, and still on the subject of hope: one of the privileges of leading Greenpeace International – often tiring, and not as glamorous as people may think – is that I get to travel the world and visit our offices. I have travelled relentlessly between our older established offices to the brand new ones. Here I discover that hope is a renewable energy source. I meet the many young activists joining the older, more seasoned ones. They bring renewed passion, desire and demand for a better world. In their eyes I can still see a green and peaceful future.

Kumi Naidoo
Executive Director, Greenpeace International
With the environmental crisis deepening and climate change impacts being felt across the globe, our work in 2012 has proven increasingly more challenging and demanding. We have, however, completed remarkable work, executed groundbreaking campaigns, and secured environmental victories all over the world.

At the same time, internally Greenpeace has dived into deeper analysis and discussions about changing our structures and procedures to match and impact the changes we see in the world. While changes in governance and organisational processes are usually painful and unglamorous, they are vital to ensure we are fit to meet new challenges and continue to stay on the frontline of social change.

The agreed new direction is the result of a very extensive organisation-wide process of consultation, and I would like to sincerely thank and acknowledge the incredibly hard work of all who have contributed.

We have agreed that it is vital to strengthen our campaigning and “mobilising” capacity both where environmental degradation is caused and where its impacts are felt most. These changes aim to ensure that Greenpeace will be more agile and strategic, with decisions taken at ground level.

We will also decentralise campaign design and implementation to our national and regional offices. Greenpeace International will focus more on coordination and will assist in capacity building of our staff and our volunteers.

We will become more integrated from North to South and from East to West, and hopefully more inspiring as a movement catalyst that can “mobilise” tens of millions, at least, of people to work together and with us to protect the environment and promote peace.

I would like to congratulate our staff all over the world, as well as the entire Greenpeace community, including national Boards, volunteers and partners, for their progressive thinking, dedicated work, and their endless passion for our environment and for Greenpeace.

Sincerely,

Ana Toni
Chair, Stichting Greenpeace Council
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THE 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.

But it is not carved in stone. It undergoes periodic evolution and even, on occasion, radical change, so that we can keep up with the changes we see in the world and so that we can continue to influence them. Over the last year we have continued to shift our resources and alter the way we design our campaigns, to match and get ahead of the forces that will dictate whether or not our future will be green and peaceful.

We have made significant investment in increasing our capacity – staff and volunteers – and impact in key areas of the world, in particular in Africa, Brazil, East Asia, India, Russia, South East Asia, and in the US. We will continue to reshape our strategic framework to embrace the profound impact of digital communication on global politics, and the changing geopolitics to a new multi-polar world; a world in which emerging economies play a key role in global development and their impacts on the planet’s ability to support life. We are also strengthening our ability to campaign against industrial ingestion on new frontiers such as the Arctic.

Our Programme allows us to respond to immediate campaigning opportunities while maintaining overall direction towards our long-term goals. Importantly, it also describes those aspects of Greenpeace that endure through time: our vision, mission and identity, the most fundamental descriptions of “who” or “what” Greenpeace is and what it stands for.

It provides our analysis of the global crisis and opportunities, and then describes our long-term campaigning direction – to 2050 – in response to the crisis, and how we can seize the opportunities. It also looks in more detail to 2020, and sets out critical campaign goals we need to reach if our long-term aims are be realised. 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 and impact. Our goal is that greenhouse gas emissions peak in keeping with the best climate science and then decline. We work to ensure a global energy revolution – phasing out fossil fuels and nuclear energy and promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency. We work to see zero deforestation globally. Key to this is ensuring that an effort-sharing framework exists for tackling climate change that is equitable.

For our oceans campaign we work to make sure marine diversity recovers from a history of overexploitation. For that to happen we need 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.

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

Our toxics campaign goal 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 though short-term, two-to-three year campaigns and projects; 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 2012, and how these have contributed towards the attainment of our critical mid-term goals. Including how we have responded to unforeseen external events.
An overview of our ships’ travels throughout the year, and some of the key moments during these journeys.

**THE GREENPEACE FLEET**

**Amazon**  In the lead up to the UN Rio +20 summit in Brazil, the *Rainbow Warrior* sailed up the Amazon to expose the drivers of deforestation.

**Rainbow Warrior**

**Chukchi and Beaufort Seas**  We documented the impact Shell’s drilling could have on the pristine ecosystems of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. Using state-of-the-art submarines and UAVs we undertook the first manned underwater trip in the Chukchi Sea, discovering a treasure trove of marine life in the process.

**Esperanza**

**West Africa**  The *Arctic Sunrise* visited the waters of West Africa, where foreign fleets of monster fishing ships scoop up vast amounts of fish at the expense of the local communities.
Arctic/Pechora Sea Greenpeace activists from our ship Arctic Sunrise, including our International Executive Director Kumi Naidoo scaled the side of a vast, rusting Gazprom drilling platform in the icy waters of the Pechora Sea.

Mozambique In the Indian Ocean, we worked together with the government of Mozambique to monitor illegal fishing.

Indian Ocean The Rainbow Warrior’s Indian Ocean tour allowed us to talk with local communities who are unable to compete with massive (and often foreign-owned) industrial fishing ships.

Taiwan When the Esperanza visited Taiwan in late 2012, we took action against the heart of the overfishing crisis: the construction of new monster boats.
Throughout 2012, Greenpeace continued campaigning to highlight the need to divest from dirty energy and increase investments in clean energy to address climate change. In China, India and South Africa, Greenpeace exposed the impact of coal mining and coal burning on water resources.
In all of our confrontations with coal and nuclear power, we highlighted our highly recognised Energy [R]evolution report, which details how renewable energy and energy efficiency can replace dirty and risky energy.

Confronting coal globally

Coal-fired power plants are the largest source of the carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions that have already changed our climate. Continued coal burning will cause even more catastrophic climate change and other serious environmental impacts.

In 2012, Greenpeace Australia enjoyed a major success when it blocked $100m Australian dollars in public funds for a coal project. Our campaigning contributed to the cancellation of five more coal projects in Germany. In the Czech Republic, we got expropriation excluded from the mining code. And in Italy, Greenpeace won an important victory for fair criticism and free speech when a court threw out energy company Enel’s attempt to gag Greenpeace Italy for saying the company’s use of coal is killing people and making them sick.

Thanks to implementing targets for renewable energy, power production from wind has already surpassed nuclear generation in China. Power production from coal, however, remains high, and its impacts continue to be felt. Greenpeace East Asia released a key report on the loss of thousands of lives from PM 2.5 pollution – tiny particles, including acids and heavy metals, in the air – mainly caused by burning coal. The report led to the government introducing targets for curbing PM 2.5 pollution, cutting water use by fossil fuel plants, and capping coal demand.

In India, we campaigned against government plans to build 71 new coal plants in areas where farmers – already struggling to feed their families in the face of serious droughts – will now lose even more precious water to these new coal plants. Greenpeace India continued to oppose the expansion of coal mining in biodiversity-rich forests in central and eastern areas of the country. Mobilising over 150,000 people, and with celebrities, local communities, and other NGOs, we brought international exposure to the Indian government’s lack of commitment to protecting these forests.

Greenpeace Africa’s coal work in South Africa focused on energy giant Eskom, which is building new coal plants that are likely to cause severe water shortages. Greenpeace Australia-Pacific’s coal campaign highlighted the risks to the Great Barrier Reef from plans for a massive expansion of coal mining and new terminals to bring significant new and destructive tanker traffic to the reef.

Lessons from Fukushima

We successfully campaigned against the early restart of Japan’s nuclear reactors, and the country enjoyed its first nuclear-free summer, without blackouts, for 50 years. Marking the first anniversary of the March 2011 nuclear disaster, we released Lessons from Fukushima, a report that moved the focus of discussions from technical issues to the institutional and human failures that really caused the disaster — ignoring risks, too close ties between the nuclear industry and regulators, weak regulations, and lack of supplier responsibility. We exposed how these fundamental problems persist in Japan and everywhere else.

We also released Toxic Assets – Nuclear Reactors in the 21st Century, underlining the real financial risks of nuclear energy. The report noted that TEPCO, the owner of the Fukushima plant, lost 90% of its market capitalisation and had its bonds rated as junk. Investments in nuclear utilities around the world were eroded.

Throughout 2012, we continued to emphasise the impacts of the Fukushima nuclear disaster, supporting its victims while pushing key lessons from the accident around the world. In South Korea, we worked to ensure that both the government and the nuclear industry did not downplay the inherent risks of nuclear reactors, and the underlying flaws in regulations and emergency systems.

Energy [R]evolution

In all of our confrontations with coal and nuclear power, we highlighted our highly recognised Energy [R]evolution report, which details how renewable energy and energy efficiency can replace dirty and risky energy.
All around the world coal power plants are shutting down and renewable energy is on its way to becoming cheaper than fossil fuels.

**Renewable champions**

After actions across the globe and 220,000 people writing to the companies, Apple announced its ambition to switch to renewables and be “coal free” by 2013.

We had challenged Apple, Amazon and Microsoft to commit to renewables, and to work to influence dirty power companies – such as Duke Energy in the US – to supply more renewables. The campaign built on the success of our 2011 Facebook victory, with a major push to convince large technology companies to follow the lead of Google and Facebook and to ditch dirty coal in favour of clean renewable energy to power the explosive growth of the internet.

Despite the disappointing outcome of the UN climate negotiations, our work in 2012 has shown that there is indeed positive change, all around the world. Coal power plants are shutting down, and renewable energy is on its way to becoming cheaper than fossil fuels.

**THE ENERGY [R]EVOLUTION IS UNDER WAY**

In 2012, Greenpeace launched a new and advanced Energy [R]evolution scenario for rescuing the climate and transitioning the world’s energy system from dirty and hazardous technologies to clean, renewable energy. An important new insight in the global scenario was that with greater use of renewable energy and increased fuel-efficiency standards, we could protect the Arctic and keep other marginal sources of oil, such as the tar sands in Canada, from exploitation.

The growth of renewables has outpaced even our predictions. In 2012, the installed capacity of renewable energy (excluding hydro) hit 500GW, with wind growing by 19% and solar PV by 42%.

Importantly, our scenario shows that developing a clear energy future includes strong economic growth and job creation. And greater use of renewables could provide energy to the two billion people who do not have access now.

Our offices in India, China, Japan, the EU, South Korea, South Africa and elsewhere used the report as a basis for their renewable energy campaigns. Our work in Bihar, India pushed the state government to adopt high goals for renewable energy, with a focus on providing energy access to the poor. In China, we pushed for a better energy policy and for better support for installing decentralised solar PV. In Japan, we worked with the government and business on progressive renewable policies that have already produced an increase in wind and solar power.

**CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS IN DOHA**

Despite warnings from the World Bank, the CIA, the IEA, and UNEP about the consequences of unchecked climate change before COP18, Doha did not deliver enough. Governments managed a second, but weaker, commitment period for the Kyoto Protocol, and not much else.

But nature does not negotiate. During the talks, the devastating typhoon Bopha struck the Philippines, costing the lives of hundreds of people. Greenpeace responded by sending our ship, the Esperanza, to transport emergency supplies and to assist local relief agencies with the humanitarian crisis.

In Doha, our role was to prevent governments from “greenwashing” the outcomes. As Kumi Naidoo, International Executive Director, said: “The outcome in Doha is a clarion call to people around the world that they cannot rely on politicians, but instead must build a robust movement to make the changes that we need. In this movement lies the true hope for the future of the planet and for humanity.”
SAVING THE ARCTIC

The campaign focused on exposing the dangers of drilling for oil in the Arctic throughout 2012 as well as harnessing public support to stop the oil companies from destroying the environment and fuelling climate change.
Arctic oil drilling is a dangerous, high-risk enterprise and an oil spill under these icy waters would have a catastrophic impact on one of the most pristine, unique and beautiful landscapes on Earth.

Our Arctic campaign was launched in the summer of 2012, and we’ve achieved an incredible amount in just a short time. Our call to “Save the Arctic” got the support of a million people in less than three weeks. Many organisations and celebrities have joined forces with Greenpeace to demand a global sanctuary be declared around the North Pole, and are pushing this message to their fans and supporters. Among them are Sir Paul McCartney, Penelope Cruz, Robert Redford, Alejandro Sanz, Sol Guy, Javier Bardem, One Direction, Ben Affleck, Cameron Diaz, Ezra Miller, Alexandra Burke, Jarvis Cocker, and Sir Richard Branson.

Confronting and exposing the Arctic’s enemies

Through high-profile confrontations with Shell and Gazprom, both at land and on the high seas, we have drawn global attention to the reckless Arctic oil rush we’re now witnessing. The campaign was launched in early February by Greenpeace UK, who scaled the National Gallery in London to paint Shell as the new face of Arctic destruction. Shortly after, Greenpeace New Zealand took action against Shell’s drillship, Noble Discoverer, in Port Taranaki, while activists from Greenpeace Nordic and Greenpeace Germany did the same against one of Shell’s icebreakers, the Nordica, in the Baltic Sea.

Greenpeace confronted Shell around the world, culminating in a global week of action. Greenpeace UK shut down almost 100 Shell petrol stations, with the action broadcast live on Greenpeace TV. Greenpeace Argentina shut down a massive oil refinery, Greenpeace France turned its French office into a polar bear sanctuary, and the Executive Director of Greenpeace Netherlands occupied the offices of Shell’s CEO. Other activities took place against the company in Mexico, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

We also teamed up with the Yes Men to mock Shell’s multimillion-dollar advertising campaign, building a spoof “Arctic Ready” website and hosting a fake send-off party for Shell’s drilling rigs in Seattle. Over 10,000 supporters got involved with the site and a secret video of the farcical launch event became an overnight internet hit. The website generated nearly 4 million page views, over 12,000 user submissions, and twice reached the number one spot on the hugely popular website Reddit.

Shell’s Arctic project in 2012 was so bad that the US government didn’t believe it could operate safely and refused the company permission to drill for oil. The sustained light that Greenpeace shone on the company in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas, in Alaska, meant that the whole world knew about every accident, every crashed oilrig and every failed safety test of key equipment Shell was responsible for. We helped make it impossible for President Obama and the US government to allow Shell to take a monumental gamble with the unique ecosystem of the polar north.

The campaign also turned its attention to Russian energy company Gazprom, which set up a vast, rusting drilling platform in the icy waters of the Pechora Sea, and planned to produce Arctic oil in 2012. A team of six intrepid Greenpeace activists from our ship Arctic Sunrise, including International Executive Director Kumi Naidoo, scaled the side of the platform, where they withstood hours of water bombardment and being pelted with metal objects. For five days, new teams came in day and night, undeterred by the frigid conditions and Arctic waters, to continue the action.

The media attention surrounding our confrontations with Shell and Gazprom and their inadequacies in the Arctic supported our push for stricter drilling legislation right around the far north.
The year ahead will be crucial in helping the world to choose design over disaster, and the Arctic is the stage on which this choice will unfold.

Investor awareness
This media exposure has made investors aware of the huge financial risks and uncertainty inherent in Arctic Oil projects. Undermining investor confidence will undermine the capacity of oil companies to drill for Arctic oil in the future.

In May, Greenpeace UK published the report Out in the Cold, which analysed the financial risks faced by Shell – and therefore by its investors – in attempting to drill in the Arctic. The risks range from questions about the commercial viability of some proposed Arctic projects, to the inadequate spill response plans that prove that no company can clean up a spill in treacherous Arctic waters.

Now oil companies are finally getting the message. The chief executive of French oil giant Total said the risk of an oil spill in such an environmentally sensitive area as the Arctic was simply too high for them to consider working there. The campaign has come a long way in 2012, but despite the news that Shell and others are rethinking their strategies, interest in the Arctic is high and the oil industry will be active there in 2013.

We are living in an era in which people are the major determinant of our global ecology. This means we have the power, the choice, to change the planet’s ecology by disaster or by design. The year ahead will be crucial in helping the world to choose design over disaster, and the Arctic is the stage on which this choice will unfold.

INDIGENOUS ALLIANCE
Greenpeace investigated, documented and exposed the environmental destruction caused by oil companies in Russia’s far north and its impact on the indigenous peoples who live there. Our work with these people is helping to improve our standing within indigenous communities all over the Arctic. We hosted the first annual Arctic Indigenous Peoples’ conference in Russia last year, where we agreed a Joint Statement of Indigenous Solidarity for Arctic Protection, and this year we’ll host the second event in Kiruna, northern Sweden, where senior representatives of the Arctic Council will be meeting soon after.

ARCTIC SCIENCE
We sent our ship Esperanza to Alaska to document the impact Shell’s drilling could have on the pristine ecosystems of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. Using state-of-the-art submarines and UAVs we undertook the first manned underwater trip in the Chukchi Sea, discovering a treasure trove of marine life in the process: molluscs, starfish, sponges and rare corals such as the sea raspberry. This rich habitat would be directly impacted by Shell’s attempts to drill for Arctic oil.

The annual sea ice minimum is a crucial indicator of the health of the Arctic, and the signs are becoming increasingly worrying. Sea ice is in rapid decline and in 2012 we were there at the ice edge with scientists to bear witness to the lowest ever Arctic sea ice minimum in recorded history. Working with experts from Cambridge University and the US National Snow and Ice Data Centre, we helped generate crucial data on the thickness and volume of ice at the top of the world, as well as the impact that increasing areas of open water are having on ice cover.
In 2012, we continued our work to achieve zero deforestation by 2020, and to protect the forests globally.
The planet’s most beautiful forests are still under threat from the main drivers of deforestation.

Greenpeace’s forest campaign remained focussed in 2012 on making sure that politicians take international action and enforce national political standards to protect the remaining forests. We campaign in three of the planet’s largest rainforests to achieve zero deforestation.

**Indonesia**

The establishment of new plantations for the pulp industry in Indonesia has gone hand-in-hand with social conflict and the clearance of peat lands and wildlife habitat. Two companies, Asia Pacific Resources International Limited (APRIL) and the Sinar Mas-owned Asia Pulp & Paper (APP) control 70 to 80% of the total pulp capacity in Indonesia.

As a result of our campaign, APP is now in discussion with Greenpeace about how to implement a forest conservation policy that will help it win back its clients. Other NGOs working on environmental and social issues have played a critical role in bringing about this important change, through their own campaigns both in Indonesia and internationally.

APP’s commitment creates a template as to how large corporations can operate in a developing country, play a critical role to end deforestation, and support the local community. We will continue to use this template to lobby APRIL to end its deforestation.

**Amazon**

In the lead-up to the UN Rio+20 summit in Brazil, the Rainbow Warrior sailed the Amazon, exposing drivers of deforestation in the region, including deforestation to produce charcoal to make steel. Following a 10-day occupation of a charcoal shipment scheduled to leave Brazil for the US, producers in Maranhão state signed a landmark agreement to eliminate Amazon deforestation from their supply chains and to implement a monitoring system for the charcoal used in their production processes.

Successful industry agreements to remove deforestation from the agribusiness sector, including the soya moratorium from 2006, continue to play an important role to reduce deforestation. However, for the first time in five years, deforestation in the Amazon rainforest is on the rise again.

The sudden increase in deforestation rates can be directly attributed to the dismantling of the laws and agencies that protect the Amazon. Greenpeace will continue to work on making zero deforestation law a reality.

**Congo Basin**

After five years of being present in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), we undertook a comprehensive review of our Congo Forest campaign. The review led to a new three-year strategy. The campaign will build on our work on logging in the DRC to a wider Congo Basin forest protection approach, focusing first on a palm oil campaign in Cameroon. The expansion of large-scale palm oil operations in Africa presents a campaign opportunity to influence its development before it is too late.
We engaged key industry and political players in an international conference on palm oil in Accra, where we demonstrated that Greenpeace is watching them not only in Indonesia, but in Africa as well.

A new campaign on palm oil in Africa started in September 2012, with a briefing paper highlighting the threats of unchecked expansion of industrial palm oil projects in the continent. We engaged key industry and political players in an international conference on palm oil in Accra, where we demonstrated that Greenpeace is watching them not only in Indonesia, but in Africa as well. Together with the Oakland Institute we published a report that exposed illegalities and controversies surrounding the US-based Herakles Farms' oil palm plantation project in Cameroon.

We also continued to play a watchdog role on logging in the DRC, with inspiring mobilisation tools such as a “Forest Song” and a petition with partner NGOs signed by over 22,000 Congolese. Following the release of Greenpeace Africa’s report about illegal logging, the petition, and follow-up political meetings, the DRC environment ministry committed to cancel illegal permits.

FUNDING FOR FORESTS
Greenpeace has been a strong and vocal advocate for credible deals to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD). At the same time, we have not hesitated to publicly reject false solutions to REDD, such as the push to include sub-national forest offsets in California’s emerging carbon market. In 2012, Greenpeace International released a report that revealed irreconcilable problems in the California offset proposals, as well as concerning new evidence from Chiapas, Mexico (one of the areas proposed for early inclusion in the carbon markets). The publicity from this report and our work with partners has elevated the issue to the Governor’s desk in California, and a decision on whether and how the State of California will proceed is expected to come next year.

We also undertook a global effort to ensure that the multiplicity of funding currently directed at forests, including from REDD, guarantees that biodiversity would be protected while the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities would be fully respected. A number of countries and institutions, such as the World Bank, have already begun to develop their own competing safeguard standards. Yet, there is still no detailed international standard in place that would ensure a baseline level of protection for all people and animals living in, and dependent upon, tropical forests. Greenpeace is working to change that.

GLOBAL FOREST SOLUTIONS
In the days leading up to the Rio+20 summit we gathered a group of key players at a workshop to create a road-map for zero deforestation in Brazil. At the same time we launched Good Oil, the first in a series of case studies that showcase inspiring examples of forest protection. Good Oil focuses on smallholder palm oil farmers in Riau Province, Indonesia, who are protecting and restoring forest while practicing responsible management of their oil palm plantations. This case study led to a visit and praise from the Minister for Agriculture and interest to replicate elsewhere in Indonesia.

Also in Indonesia, we supported communities to take advantage of a “Village Forest” permit mechanism to protect their forests in Sumatra and Papua. Further, we collaborated with the world’s second largest palm oil producer GAR and The Forest Trust, to develop an approach to protect remaining forest areas important for carbon and biodiversity in palm oil development areas.
On land and at sea, in 2012 the oceans campaign focused on exposing scandals within the fishing sector, building solidarity with key stakeholders such as small-scale fishermen and impacted communities, and leveraging change in the marketplace.
In Senegal, we brought activists from Europe and Africa together, to put pressure on leaders in both continents to change the way fish is caught in West African waters.

The year began with a visit by the *Arctic Sunrise* to the waters of West Africa, where foreign fleets of “monster” fishing ships scoop up vast amounts of fish at the expense of the local communities. In Senegal, we brought activists from Europe and Africa together, to put pressure on leaders in both continents to change the way fish is caught in West African waters.

We initiated new relationships with countries in the Indian Ocean, home to the second largest tuna fishery in the world. The *Rainbow Warrior* sailed to South Africa, Mozambique, Mauritius and the Maldives, where we talked with local communities unable to compete with the massive, and often foreign-owned, industrial fishing ships. In the Indian Ocean, we also worked with the government of Mozambique to monitor illegal fishing. Partnerships like this are important to ensure that only sustainable fishing takes place.

In the Pacific, Greenpeace took to the high seas with the *Esperanza*, with representatives of the government of Palau onboard, again to confront and halt pirate fishing. Due to our increased presence in Asia, we were able to put more pressure on key governments and companies there. In South Korea, Greenpeace East Asia launched the first ranking of major tuna brands sold there. Within days, the industry responded and, as we have seen in the past, important direct dialogue with the companies concerned, coupled with consumer pressure, can lead to very positive results, including the use of sustainable fishing techniques such as pole-and-line fishing.

In the Philippines, which hosted the 2012 meeting of the Pacific Tuna Commission, the *Esperanza’s* visit helped mount pressure on the government to act more responsibly while fishing in the Pacific. Our office also enlisted thousands of new Ocean Defenders to demand governments rescue our Pacific for future generations. Greenpeace activists visited embassies all over Manila, demanding action and reminding the fishing industry that we will continue to take action to ensure that the oceans we leave to future generations are healthy.
Greenpeace is working to end overfishing, to create healthy oceans, with ample seafood and sustained fishing jobs forever.

NEW INFLUENCE IN TAIWAN
Taiwan is home to the world’s largest tuna fishing fleet – one of the biggest oceans destroyers – and is also one of the most irresponsible political presences at important oceans governance meetings. In early 2012, Greenpeace won an important legal victory in Taiwan that will help pave the way to future success; one of our oceans campaigners was acquitted of making defamatory statements about the fishing industry there. Greenpeace’s right to criticise the overfishing by Taiwanese companies was protected.

When the Esperanza visited Taiwan in late 2012, we took action against the construction of new monster boats, which are at the heart of the overfishing crisis. In October, Greenpeace’s office in Taiwan undertook its first large-scale banner hanging at a shipyard near Kaohsiung, the home port to the massive Taiwanese fishing industry. This was also Greenpeace’s first-ever peaceful protest at a shipbuilding facility. Our campaign to stop new boats from overfishing and destroying our oceans will continue to escalate in 2013, in Asia and elsewhere.

MONSTER BOATS
Greenpeace is working to end overfishing, to create healthy oceans, with ample seafood and sustained fishing jobs forever. This means stopping the world’s most destructive fishing vessels from indiscriminately taking everything out of our oceans. In 2012, we were able to follow some of the most notorious ships and force them out of waters. While Greenpeace’s Arctic Sunrise was in West Africa, we encountered the Margiris and attempted to stop its fishing activities. Along with dozens of other fishing vessels, it was banned from fishing in Senegalese waters by President Macky Sall.

However, the Margiris’ path of destruction continued to Europe, where it again encountered Greenpeace activists, who delayed its departure from its home port of Ijmuiden in the Netherlands for over six days. The Margiris’ Dutch owners sent it across the world to Australia, and hoped that by changing its name to Abel Tasman it might continue its destructive fishing practices. However, Greenpeace helped organise local communities to oppose the massive vessel fishing. Due to this pressure, the Australian government also banned the monster boat from Australian waters.

PROTECTING WHALES IN SOUTH KOREA
On the morning of 5 July 2012, South Korea announced to a meeting of the International Whaling Commission that it would begin a programme of “scientific” whaling. Yet, within a few days, the press was reporting that South Korea had abandoned its plans. Two weeks later, Greenpeace East Asia confirmed that the South Korean government was quietly proceeding with its whaling plans, despite its public announcement. In response, we prepared a report on how research can be done on whales without harming them, and took advantage of the presence of the Esperanza in South Korea, as part of our Oceans Defenders tour, to demonstrate this.

Two independent scientists participated in a short research cruise in South Korean waters, showcasing non-lethal techniques, and presented their findings at a press conference. Greenpeace East Asia continued to monitor, attended consultation meetings, and staged the first ever Greenpeace whales demonstration in Seoul. Work started on an email alert directed to the Prime Minister. Six days before the deadline for a formal notification of the start of the programme, Greenpeace East Asia presented a letter to the Prime Minister’s office on behalf of over 100,000 people from around the world. The 3 December deadline passed without the required notification being made. A month later, South Korea formally notified the IWC that it had decided to use only non-lethal methods to study whales, instead of killing them.
DETOKING OUR WATER

Behind the beautiful advertising, the catwalk glamour and the perfectly manicured nails of the fashion world, is an industry contributing to toxic pollution that is destroying our beautiful waterways.
Fashionistas, activists, models, designers and bloggers form around the world joined together, united by the common belief that the clothes we wear shouldn’t cost the Earth.

During the first year of the Detox campaign in 2011, we exposed the links between textile manufacturing facilities using and releasing hazardous chemicals into local waterways in China. Subsequent investigation revealed the presence of hazardous chemicals in branded clothing items purchased from around the world. We focused on sportswear brands, securing public commitments from Nike, Adidas, Puma and Li-Ning (the biggest Chinese sportswear brand). Following intense public pressure, the fast-fashion giants H&M and C&A also committed, and in 2012 this was followed by an even more ambitious commitment from the British retailer Marks & Spencer.

Our investigations in 2012 took our work even further. We revealed how these same branded clothing items continue to leach chemicals into local water supplies wherever they are washed. These chemicals break down to form even more hazardous and hormone-disrupting substances when released into waterways in Europe, Asia, North America, and around the world.

A total of 141 items of clothing were purchased from 29 countries and regions worldwide, and the chemicals found included high levels of toxic phthalates, cancer-causing amines from the use of certain azo dyes, and nonylphenols (NPEs).

Online and offline, activists took action to urge Zara to detox. Over 300,000 joined online in just over a week – including over 100,000 people in less than 24 hours – and tens of thousands of tweets and Facebook and Weibo messages were sent to the brand. Offline, 700 Greenpeace activists in over 80 cities across the world participated in the “Detox” Day of Action, demanding that Zara stop selling clothing contaminated with hazardous chemicals.

The call for fashion made without pollution was also echoed by big names within the fashion scene, including designers, models and bloggers who signed the “Detox Fashion Manifesto”. After just nine days, Zara buckled under public pressure and committed to detox, and was soon followed by other big name retailers including Mango and Esprit.

Detoxing Zara
We called upon Zara, the world’s largest fashion retailer, to lead the industry toward toxic-free production and commit to “detox”. In the report Toxic Threads: The Big Fashion Stitch-Up, Greenpeace International investigations revealed the presence of hazardous chemicals in garments purchased from 20 international clothing brands, including Gap, Levi’s and Zara.
As global actors, fashion brands have the opportunity to work on global solutions that ensure that hazardous substances are completely eliminated throughout their supply chains and products.

**Detoxing Levi’s**

We followed our success with Zara with another global push in December. This time, the focus was on Levi’s, after further investigations in China and Mexico revealed connections between the US retailer and toxic water scandals in those countries. These revealed both the scale of the issue in countries in the Global South, and the smokescreen behind which much of this environmental destruction occurs.

Accordingly, a major part of the campaign’s demands was linked to increasing transparency within the sector, and ensuring that big brands require their suppliers to release publicly accessible information about what they are discharging on a chemical-by-chemical, and facility-by-facility, basis. Levi’s commitment – which came after eight days of public campaigning – included a promise to require 15 of its largest suppliers in China, Mexico and elsewhere in the Global South to disclose pollution data by as early as the end of June 2013. Other brands have also followed suit, by including similar concessions in their Detox commitments.

In 2013, we will be making sure that the brands turn their ambitious words into concrete actions on the ground – where the pollution is most acutely felt – and ensure that transparency levels are maintained across the sector.

**DETOXING FASHION**

As global actors, fashion brands have the opportunity to work on global solutions that ensure that hazardous substances are completely eliminated throughout their supply chains and products.

In 2012, over half a million people took action to challenge international brands to take responsibility for their toxic footprints – urging them to work with their suppliers to clean up fashion – and these major corporations are listening. From luxury houses like Valentino, to fast fashion retailers including H&M, Mango and Benetton, big brands are paying attention to the global call for toxic-free fashion.

These brands are now using their power and influence within the sector to begin substituting out the worst chemicals – and are being encouraged to share their learnings with others. They are also working with their suppliers and the chemical industry to develop alternatives, helping to create a growing marketplace for non-hazardous alternatives.
ECOLOGICAL FARMING

Ecological farming is the only agricultural system with a positive effect on our health, our environment, our community, our climate, our soil, and our water.
Ecological farming ensures healthy farming and food for today and tomorrow.

Too much of the world’s agriculture is dominated by an industrial model that relies on toxic chemicals, and on synthetic fertilisers that strip the soil of its fertility, damage the environment and affect wildlife. This is why in 2012 Greenpeace continued to promote ecological farming that protects soil, water and climate, and promotes biodiversity.

Ecological farming represents an effective and sustainable alternative to the current industrial agricultural approach, which is heavily reliant on synthetic inputs and genetic engineering, and only beneficial to agribusiness’ corporate profits. Industrial agriculture is increasingly causing damage to the environment on a global scale, and undermining the farmers’ ability to produce healthy and environmentally sustainable food.

The campaign commissioned an agricultural economist to conduct a forecast of the impacts of the introduction of herbicide-tolerant genetically engineered (GE) crops in Europe. The report was promoted during an 18-day European tour aimed at exposing GE impacts in the US and maintaining GE rejection in Europe. During the tour, public screenings were organised of a documentary featuring two American farmers who have personally experienced the agricultural and social catastrophe caused by herbicide-tolerant GE crops.

**CHINESE TEA CONTAMINATION**

In 2012, we focused our work in China on challenging the overuse of agrochemicals, and exposed a pesticides contamination scandal in tea, a daily drink for millions of Chinese and others around the world. Following investigations and testing, Greenpeace East Asia found illegal pesticides in some of China’s most popular tea brands. Unilever’s Lipton was among the brands that had high levels of contamination, with some samples containing pesticides unapproved by the EU, such as bifenthrin, which scientists say could negatively affect male hormone production. The Chinese Ministry of Agriculture has banned some of the pesticides detected – including highly toxic methomyl, as well as dicofol and endosulfan, which may affect fertility – from use in tea production.

Following our exposé, several tea companies in China committed to sustainable tea sourcing and a full traceability system. Unilever agreed on a timeline by 2015. The issue received very high media coverage in China and globally, which in turn put pressure on the local government bodies to prioritise work on pesticide reduction. The campaign will continue promoting ecological farming without agrochemicals in our food.

**GE FOOD CROPS OUT OF INDIA**

In India, we built on our previous work against GE and worked with the various stakeholders opposing the release of GE in India. A key step in that battle was the decision of the Parliamentary Agriculture Standing Committee’s verdict on GE food crops. After an extensive consultation with farmers, environmental groups, scientists, and consumer groups, the Committee concluded that GE food crops are not suited for the Indian continent, since they pose a threat to people’s health and biodiversity, as well as putting livelihoods and food security at risk.

**“GOLDEN” RICE – THE BATTLE CONTINUES**

Vitamin A deficiency (VAD), one of the most serious health problems in developing countries, is used as a reason to promote the genetically engineered “golden” rice. The marketing of this GE rice in southeast Asia, the centre of origin of rice, is not only ecologically irresponsible but also economically unsustainable for farmers in the event of environmental contamination of traditional rice varieties, which represent a staple food.

In the Philippines, we supported and highlighted the community rejection of golden rice in the Mindanao area. We will continue our campaign to halt release of GE rice to the environment, and to support public resistance to GE foods, by promoting existing, more effective and more sustainable solutions for tackling vitamin A deficiency.
Greenpeace used Rio+20 to work with other civil society organisations to deliver on our agenda rather than waiting for governments to take action.
Our message was clear: After Rio+20, the world needs people to mobilise and force change.

In the face of urgent global crisis, the Rio Earth Summit was an unmitigated disaster. The meeting delivered no concrete action and no targets for the transformational changes we need.

Greenpeace had seen this failure of responsibility coming. We had therefore focused our attention outside the official Summit. Greenpeace Brazil used the occasion to highlight the plight of the Amazon, threatened by a new, destructive change to Brazil’s “Forest Code” law. Great strides were made in collecting signatures for a zero deforestation law, together with allies such as the Catholic Church. By the end of 2012, more than 600,000 Brazilians had supported Greenpeace Brazil’s law proposal, which would end deforestation in Brazil once and for all while delivering benefits and livelihoods to the people of the Amazon.

We launched our “Save the Arctic” campaign at Rio+20 as a sign of hope and determination in the face of the “business as usual” from the governments and corporations attending the summit. Our message was clear: After Rio+20, the world needs people to mobilise and force change. The Arctic is a key battleground where masses of people from around the world are needed to demand the necessary action to protect it. A ban in the Arctic on oil drilling and industrial fishing would be a huge victory against the forces that won out at Rio+20, and would provide a future for the four million people who live there.

Greenpeace exists to give the Earth a voice – and on the inside of the conference hall we spoke loud and clear on the failure of our governments. We succeeded in preventing governments from passing a “polluter’s charter”. With our Greenwash+20 report, we showed who is really to blame for the failure at Rio, highlighting the corporations – from Shell to Duke Energy – whose interests governments were putting before those of the people.

PROTECTING THE HIGH SEAS

We also made the protection of the High Seas a key issue – both for the negotiators, and the media that led to political progress. The majority of governments actively called for a UN biodiversity agreement, including Brazil’s President Dilma Rousseff, Australia’s Prime Minister Julia Gillard, as well as many European leaders and the heads of Pacific Island states.

Unfortunately, Venezuela and the US – backed by Russia and Canada – prevented the world from launching a High Seas rescue plan at Rio. But governments did commit to making a decision about a High Seas protection agreement by the end of 2014. This deadline ensures that discussions that have been dragging on for years will no longer continue forever without action. On the back of the attention the High Seas received at Rio, the oceans campaign is now building the political support necessary to agree on ending the exploitation of the High Seas in 2014.
YOUR SUPPORT MATTERS

Your support gives the planet the voice it deserves and ensures Greenpeace is in the best position to take action and confront corporations, governments and people destroying our environment.

You are at the heart of everything we do.
“We do not inherit the Earth from our ancestors, we borrow it from our children.”

Native American proverb

Essential to Greenpeace’s core value is our political and economic independence, giving us effectiveness and credibility. Greenpeace does not accept donations from governments, corporations or political parties. We rely solely on contributions from individual supporters and independent trust and foundation grants.

Thanks to you, Greenpeace stands on the frontline of environmental destruction, exposing environmental criminals, challenging government and corporations, taking action and promoting solutions to safeguard our planet. We have grown from a small group of concerned citizens into the world’s best-known environmental activist group.

In 2012, Greenpeace worldwide received €260m in donations. Despite the global financial crisis, this was 9% more than was received in 2011. Germany, the US, Switzerland, the Netherlands, the Nordic countries and the UK were among our highest-giving countries in 2012. There was also an increase in income and supporters for our East Asia, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and Mediterranean offices.

Your donations empower Greenpeace to continuously safeguard our environment and to strengthen our impact worldwide. Every year our supporter base is growing. In 2012, 2.9 million people generously gave Greenpeace a financial gift. Importantly, the vast majority of you make long-term commitments to our global campaigns, enabling us to plan ahead and remain flexible and independent.

Thank you to all our supporters who make our work possible and for your continued investment in our future. Each and everyone one of your contributions does make a difference!

Our top donations in 2012

We would also like to thank those organisations and individuals who supported us with a gift over €1,000,000 in 2012.

The Swedish Postcode Lottery (Svenska Postkodstiftelsen) continued its generous support in 2012 with grants totalling €2,634,941. These important grants support climate work in China, and forest work in the Amazon and Indonesia. For the first time the Swedish Postcode Lottery grants will also support our polar work and a unique three-year project that aims to further establish the rights of over 4 million people living in the Arctic – whose cultures and traditions have been followed for generations – ensuring that their combined voices are part of the debate about the Arctic’s future.

The Dutch Postcode Lottery (Nationale Postcode Loterij) generously donated €2,250,000 to Greenpeace Netherlands in 2012. In addition, Greenpeace International received €800,000 of extra funding for Postcode Lottery Project Oceans – a unique initiative in which Postcode Lottery and Greenpeace (among others) work together with the Dutch public to save all life across the world’s oceans, engaging the Dutch public and more specifically our participants with the good causes of Greenpeace.

In 2012, €1,646,000 was granted to Greenpeace Switzerland from the estate of the late Mrs Ellen Schuppli. Greenpeace Germany received a legacy of €3,550,460.11 from Ms Hildegard Bühmann, and Greenpeace Central & Eastern Europe received a legacy of €1,700,000.

A legacy gift to Greenpeace in your Will is a very special act of generosity and foresight, honouring your memory and ideals into the future. To support Greenpeace’s work with a gift in your Will, please contact your local Greenpeace office or Stephanie Allen at stephanie.allen@greenpeace.org.
“The struggle to save our environment is the defining fight of our generation.”

TESTIMONIALS

Judith Lingeman, Head Charity Department, Dutch Postcode Lottery

“Thanks to the 2.5 million participants of the Postcode Lottery, we support Greenpeace with a yearly donation. The Postcode Lottery was founded to support organisations working towards a greener and fairer world. Operating internationally as an independent, creative, non-violent campaigning organisation, Greenpeace is striving to ensure the ability of the Earth to nurture life in all its diversity. We are proud to be a valued partner of this widely supported organisation!”

Miho Kaneko, Japan

“I and other mothers just want to protect children from radiation. Though media don’t report facts in Fukushima, the time will come when people find that there are hidden facts. I support Greenpeace, for children to be able to have hope in their future in Japan.”

Sachin A Deshmukh, India

“Supporting Greenpeace is caring about our Earth. Due to routines and busy work schedules, it is very difficult for us to participate in activities against the unconstitutional and hazardous damages happening to our beautiful nature. For us, the best way to express our care is to support the people who are really working for it. Not physically, but financially. You will always find us as your supporter.”

Eva Maria, USA

“Some people don’t believe they can solve these environmental problems, but I believe every individual can make a difference, even with the small things we do in our daily lives. I have a lot of admiration for Greenpeace and the work it does.”

Eva-Maria, an active member of Greenpeace since 1988, has found yet another way to lend her support. In her Will, she has left a bequest to Greenpeace.

Glen Brown, Canada

“The struggle to save our environment is the defining fight of our generation. I’m proud that I can direct some of my estate to helping Greenpeace continue its important work. Greenpeace is politically savvy, street-smart, creative and determined. They inspire the public and change public policy. Greenpeace speaks ‘truth to power’, for which it is denied charitable status in Canada; that’s all the more reason to include Greenpeace in my Will.”

A multinational Greenpeace alpine team delivers messages of support and hope for the victims of the Fukushima nuclear disaster to the summit of Mount Fuji. Collected from thousands of people in Japan and all over the world, we hope the messages will encourage the Japanese authorities to listen to the people of Japan in opposition to nuclear power.
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For each Greenpeace national and/or regional office in 2012 compared to 2011
Greenpeace’s online and offline subscribers, donors, volunteers and activists, grew stronger and brought change to government and corporate policies around the world in 2012.
Over the year, our subscriber base grew from 17 to 24 million people, with above average growth in Taiwan, South Korea, China, Brazil, India, Thailand, Turkey and Russia.

Throughout the year Greenpeace continued to use the power of social media and networking to support and deliver positive changes for all of our campaigns. Our fastest growing petition in the history of the organisation brought together three million people to demand protection for the Arctic from oil and gas exploration. We mocked Shell’s lack of preparedness for a spill in videos, faux tweets, and faux press releases co-created with The Yes Men, and the shares, likes, and retweets of our supporters drove them to front pages from Mashable to the Times of India.

Efforts to stop the pollution of China’s rivers led us to challenge the fashion industry as part of our “Detox” campaign, which racked up record website views thanks to our high-fashion, celebrity-studded direct communications to fashion brands. Volunteers around the globe turned out to help spread the detox message with street theatre, mannequin protests, and mock runway shows, which helped to secure commitments from brands including Zara, Levi’s and Victoria’s Secret, to publish pollution data publicly. The Chinese government itself also took measures to blacklist many of the chemicals targeted within our campaign, and singled out the textile sector as one of the six priority control industries to be monitored as part of the latest “Five Year Plan for Chemical Environmental Risk Prevention and Control”.

Perhaps the greatest return on our investment in “People Power” was the end of a decade long struggle to get pulp-and-paper giant APP to stop unsustainable forest practices. Supporter pressure on its biggest customers – from Dove to KFC, and Nestle to Mattel – finally pushed the company to a commitment on sustainable forest practices, including a stop to clearing natural rainforest (the habitat of tigers and orangutans) for oil palm plantations. The New York Times dubbed it “Activism at its best”.

Growing our network

Over the year, our subscriber base grew from 17 to 24 million people, with above average growth in Taiwan, Korea, China, Brazil, India, Thailand, Turkey, and Russia. In 2012, the Chinese micro-blogging site Weibo became our third largest source of subscribers among social media sites, after Facebook and Twitter.

We define a “subscriber” as anyone who has given us permission to contact them, be it by email list, a cell-phone number, or as a follower of our accounts on Twitter or Facebook, or other social media channels such as Pinterest or Instagram.

For the first time, we shared plans for 2013 with a group of supporters from around the world, the Greenpeace Compass community, which gave us feedback and creative suggestions on project proposals and priorities with critical insights into how to bring our issues out to a wider public and involve supporters more deeply in our work.

Our Mobilisation Lab continued to explore the forefront of online and offline activism, hosting skillshares, trainings and symposiums that brought Greenpeace and fellow change organisations together to share best practice, develop new ways of working, and investigate new ways to analyse and evaluate our performance.
In 2012 the number of active volunteers rose to 14,500 dedicated and passionate people around the world.
To further build and develop Greenpeace’s global volunteer community – not only in numbers, but also the relationships, skills and impact our volunteers can bring – we launched the Volunteering Lab.

Our volunteers are active members of communities and take action on the ground. Holding lectures, collecting signatures, running local campaigning, and doing research and lobby work are just a few activities these engaged and passionate people do to add impact to our campaigns. They give their local voice to Greenpeace’s international causes.

“I really enjoy being active with such a powerful organisation - this way I can make global change with my local engagement. Besides that, I got to know so many inspired and skilled people in Greenpeace, it is incredible.”

Kerstin Lehmann, Germany

Motivation is key when it comes to this intense form of engagement. People join Greenpeace worldwide to take on responsibility for society. They want to put an effort into nature and environment, and into fulfilling interesting tasks together with people who think alike. They simply want to change the world.

“It really works for me about Greenpeace is that it works on all different levels. The actions part is really nice visually, but I like the way that Greenpeace is also involved in politics broadly – it really can make a difference, like the recent ‘Detox’ campaign. It’s not just making a pamphlet and raising awareness.”

Thomas Hooning van Duyvenbode, Netherlands

It is important to us to support our volunteers in their regional projects, and in their individual abilities and preferences, to build Greenpeace’s volunteer base as a community of leaders. That why we now have over 130 dedicated staff in Greenpeace offices around the world who enable these volunteers to be as effective and as impactful as possible in achieving positive environmental change.

“Anything and everything you need to know to run a campaign I was taught by Greenpeace, and it was really nice because I was able to look back on my campaign from the previous year and critique myself, and see what works and what doesn’t.”

Josh Chamberland, USA

To further build and develop Greenpeace’s global volunteer community – not only in numbers, but also the relationships, skills and impact our volunteers can bring – we launched the Volunteering Lab. Together with national volunteer coordinators, it sets out to find new ways to connect, up-skill and upscale our global volunteering and grassroots communities. It exists to help Greenpeace engage all the potential energy that volunteers are willing to give.
Greenpeace International (Stichting Greenpeace Council) acts as the coordinating body for Greenpeace national and regional offices (NROs), 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 2012, as well as the combined statements including the Greenpeace NROs for the same period. These are presented to provide transparency and accountability for our supporters, and to provide an overview of the combined income, expenditure, assets and liabilities of all the Greenpeace entities worldwide. The accounts of all of the Greenpeace NROs are independently audited in accordance with local regulations. Copies of these may be requested from the appropriate office, addresses for which are listed on pages 54-55.

Stichting Greenpeace Council, as signatory to the INGO Accountability Charter, is committed to enhancing transparency and accountability, both internally and externally. We strive for openness and ease of access to information, to constantly improve our accountability and performance, and to be able to provide information to those who request it. In 2012, Greenpeace adopted its open information policy, which is designed to ensure best practice in the handling of Greenpeace’s information. This policy follows the principles of availability, integrity and confidentiality (in priority order), in order to allow it to be shared in a transparent and efficient way, while at the same time safeguarding, from abuse or compromise, sensitive information, whether our own or that of our staff, supporters, allies or partners. All staff are responsible for complying with this policy, and with related management systems and procedures. The policy is publicly available on our website www.greenpeace.org.

In 2012, Greenpeace International adjusted its treasury policy, enabling the use of sustainable (“green”) banks for its current savings. The sustainable banks that Greenpeace uses have been assessed by an external agency on their sustainability and social responsibility, as well as financial risk profiles.

Radboud van Delft  
Organisation Director,  
Greenpeace International

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 NROs have been adjusted, where appropriate, to harmonise the accounting policies with those used by Greenpeace International.

In 2012, the gross income from fundraising for Greenpeace worldwide was €265m. This was €28m (12%) more than in 2011. Fundraising income increased in 2012 across all channels, with a significant increase in income from legacies and planned giving (+31%). Total income in 2012 was €268m (2011: €241m).

Total expenditure worldwide increased by €37m (16%) from €237m in 2011 to €274m in 2012. This reflects our strategy to increase our activities on a global scale in order to achieve our ambitions.

- Fundraising expenditure at €91m (34% of total fundraising income) was €14m (18%) higher than in 2011. This investment in fundraising is a direct result of our strategy to increase our supporter base to be able to have more global impact.
- Campaign and campaign support expenditure increased by €15m (12%) from €123m in 2011 to €138m in 2012. €31m was spent on our climate and energy campaign in 2012 (2011: €29m), which is our priority campaign.
- Organisation support costs across Greenpeace worldwide increased by €8m (21%) in 2012. This increase reflects the investment made in capacity boosting initiatives in the Global South and the US, as well as an investment in developing our global digital strategy. As a percentage of our total expenditure our organisation support cost stayed at the same level as 2011: 16%.
- There was a foreign exchange loss of €0.6m in 2012 (€0.4 gain in 2011).
Greenpeace Worldwide
Abbreviated financial statements
Years ended
31 December 2012 and 31 December 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income:</th>
<th>Euros thousands</th>
<th>Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other grants and donations</td>
<td>264,940</td>
<td>236,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising and licensing</td>
<td>(978)</td>
<td>(167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td><strong>268,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>241,114</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising expenditure</td>
<td>90,874</td>
<td>77,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income less fundraising expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>177,451</strong></td>
<td><strong>163,848</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure:</th>
<th>Euros thousands</th>
<th>Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns &amp; campaign support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate &amp; Energy</td>
<td>31,040</td>
<td>28,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>13,394</td>
<td>12,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceans</td>
<td>11,743</td>
<td>9,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>4,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxics</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>3,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campaigns</td>
<td>3,464</td>
<td>2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; communications</td>
<td>24,784</td>
<td>22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine operations &amp; action support</td>
<td>29,921</td>
<td>26,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public information &amp; outreach</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>11,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political, science &amp; business</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>2,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support</td>
<td>45,253</td>
<td>37,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign exchange (gain)/loss</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>(391)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-fundraising expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>183,477</strong></td>
<td><strong>159,867</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Deficit)/surplus for the year</th>
<th>Euros thousands</th>
<th>Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(6,026)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening fund balance</strong></td>
<td>178,143</td>
<td>174,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct fund balance adjustment</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing fund balance</strong></td>
<td>172,753</td>
<td>178,143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of financial position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities and fund balance    | Euros thousands | Euros thousands |
| Liabilities                     | 45,378          | 44,191          |
| Fund balance                    | 172,753         | 178,143         |
| **Total**                       | **218,131**     | **222,334**     |

The fund balance of €173m (€178m in 2011) decreased as a direct result of the 2012 deficit and a €0.6m direct fund balance adjustment. The deficit is mainly due to planned release of reserves for further investment in the development of activities in the Global South and the US.

Greenpeace’s reserves policy calls for available reserves to adequately cover risks to its operations. These risks are assessed annually. In this context, more than 75% of the fund balance is tied by fixed assets and held for other restricted or designated purposes.

These financial statements of the worldwide Greenpeace organisation for the year 2012 consist of the Greenpeace International and related entities’ financial statements and the financial statements of Greenpeace national and regional offices, and have been presented in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards for Small & Medium-sized Entities as adopted by the EU. Ernst & Young has performed agreed-upon procedures on the compilation of the worldwide financial statements.
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 (NROs).

The total income of Greenpeace International in 2012 was €70.8m, representing an increase of €9.9m (16.3%) against 2011 levels. Income increased primarily as a result of increased grant income from Greenpeace NROs.

Total expenditure increased in 2012 by €9.4m (15.1%) reaching a total of €71.8m. This is mainly attributable to an increase in grants and other support to NROs (€6.7m), 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 increased in 2012 by €0.8m and organisation support by €1.6m.
The combined financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2012 of Greenpeace International, from which the abbreviated financial statements above were derived, were prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards for Small & Medium-sized Entities as adopted by the European Union and are in accordance with Part 9 of Book 2 of the Dutch Civil Code.

Ernst & Young audited the financial statements of Greenpeace International and issued an unqualified audit opinion on 26 June, 2013.

### Abbreviated financial statements

**Years ended 31 December 2012 and 31 December 2011**

---

**Income:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants from national and regional offices</td>
<td>69,017</td>
<td>59,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other grants and donations</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>(181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td>70,774</td>
<td>60,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fundraising expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>2,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Income less fundraising expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68,253</td>
<td>58,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Expenditure:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants and other support to national and regional offices</td>
<td>22,376</td>
<td>15,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns &amp; campaign support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate &amp; Energy</td>
<td>8,477</td>
<td>8,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>5,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceans</td>
<td>3,457</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxics</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; communications</td>
<td>4,433</td>
<td>4,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine operations &amp; action support</td>
<td>11,825</td>
<td>9,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support</td>
<td>11,405</td>
<td>9,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest costs</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign exchange loss</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-fundraising expenditure</strong></td>
<td>69,248</td>
<td>60,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surplus/(deficit) for the year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(995)</td>
<td>(1,544)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

**Statement of financial position**

**Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed and financial assets</td>
<td>25,045</td>
<td>26,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from national and regional offices</td>
<td>13,976</td>
<td>10,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other current assets</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>22,622</td>
<td>28,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62,792</td>
<td>66,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liabilities and fund balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to national and regional offices</td>
<td>14,790</td>
<td>17,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities</td>
<td>8,594</td>
<td>8,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance</td>
<td>39,408</td>
<td>40,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62,792</td>
<td>66,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenpeace International 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total fund balance</td>
<td>39,408</td>
<td>40,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Fixed assets</td>
<td>(25,045)</td>
<td>(25,714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Restricted and designated reserves</td>
<td>(7,100)</td>
<td>(7,718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,263</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,971</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 2012, restricted and designated reserves comprise:

- €4.2m (2011: €2.7m) held for investment in fundraising initiatives of Greenpeace NROs;
- €2.6m (2011: €4.7m) reserved to support the implementation of Greenpeace global strategic initiatives;
- €0.3m (2011: €0.3m) reserved for the decommissioning of the previous Rainbow Warrior, in accordance with the highest decommissioning standards;

The amount of available reserves of €7.3m needs to be available to pursue unforeseen opportunities, cover risks according to the Greenpeace International risk policy, and to provide adequate working capital coverage.
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 compensation during 2012 of a total of €81,000 (€100,000 in 2011): the Board Chair received €36,000, one Board member received €5,000 and four 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 and the Senior Management Team are paid emoluments commensurate with their level of responsibility.

The International Executive Director of Greenpeace International received total emoluments of €133,000, including salary of €117,000, employer’s social charges and pension contribution of €12,000, and other benefits to the value of €4,000. In 2011, the International Executive Director received total emoluments of €126,000, including salary of €111,000, employer’s social charges and pension contribution of €12,000, and other benefits to the value of €3,000.

In total, emoluments of €983,000 (€740,000 in 2011) were paid to the eight other members of the Senior Management Team in 2012. The increase between 2011 and 2012 is largely due to the fact that some positions within the Senior Management Team were not all filled during 2011, whereas in 2012 they were.

These emoluments may be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2011 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer’s cost social charges</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other benefits</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>983</strong></td>
<td><strong>740</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the organisation expands its activities, we continue our efforts to become more efficient at reducing our greenhouse gas emissions.
Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions

Greenpeace worldwide GHG emissions for 2012 totalled 22,883 metric tonnes, 563 tonnes more than in the previous year. (*) The total worldwide figures reported below include the emissions from Greenpeace International and all national and regional Greenpeace offices around the globe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCOPE 1: Direct GHG emissions</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for marine transportation</td>
<td>8,014</td>
<td>7,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for helicopter transportation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for inflatables</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for natural gas</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emissions for vehicles</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scope 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,981</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,594</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCOPE 2: Indirect GHG emissions – electricity</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect emissions for office electricity</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect emissions for server electricity</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scope 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,012</strong></td>
<td><strong>967</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCOPE 3: Other indirect GHG emissions</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect emissions for business travel</td>
<td>11,324</td>
<td>10,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect emissions for paper consumption</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scope 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,759</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total GHG Emissions in metric tonnes:** | **22,883** | **22,319** |

Notes
1. The emissions methodology and emission factors are taken from the following resources: http://www.ghgprotocol.org. The GHG Protocol operates under the umbrella of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) and the World Resources Institute (WRI).

We continue our efforts to become more efficient at relatively reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. Despite the increasing size of our activities during the year (2012 total expenditure being 16% more than in the previous year), we managed to cap the increase of global CO2 emissions at 2.5%.

More than one third of our greenhouse gas emissions are attributable to our marine operations. Despite efforts to increase the efficiency of our fleet, due to increasing marine and related activities, the direct fuel consumption emissions slightly increased.

Electricity consumption and travel emissions slightly increased, due to our increasing global activities. Emission-cutting measures for paper use started to show positive impacts.

* In the 2011 Greenpeace International Annual Report, we erroneously reported a lower amount than our actual total global CO2 emissions, due to an interpretation difference in the marine gas oil emission rate. The 2011 figures shown in the table above represent the recalculated and now correct 2011 emission figures.
STAFF MEMBERS ON PERMANENT CONTRACT

Board members
- Total Board members: 168
- Board members with nationality different from the country or region covered by the Greenpeace office: 33

Staff age
- <25: 545
- 26-30: 552
- 31-35: 412
- 36-40: 738

Management
- Males in management positions: 319
- Females in management positions: 233
As part of our commitment to the INGO Accountability Charter, we 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.