Message from the Board Chair

"Civil resistance is not an easy path, but given abdication of responsibility by the government, it is an essential path... Direct action is necessary because the democratic process is not bringing about policy change fast enough."
Prof. James Hansen, NASA

As external challenges mount and multiply on all sides – so too do our responsibilities to those with whom we are increasingly sharing platforms and building alliances. Shared goals and objectives are a precondition, but transparency is paramount as we transform and prepare ourselves to respond to the rapidly growing threats to our planet from the now universally acknowledged and imminent danger of global warming and climate change.

As institutions grow older, so too do modes of communication and action. Anticipating the need to remain relevant and dynamic, we are putting in place structures that we believe will enable us to maximise our global impact, especially when dealing with the political and economic forces we are called upon to confront. Greenpeace is developing a Global Strategic Framework, which we believe will speed up and enable better delivery of cutting-edge campaigns on the critical issues the planet faces. Cutting-edge delivery in a demanding environment also demands state-of-the-art systems for our communications, IT, rapid response capability, financial stability and resource mobilisation.

We are also exploring new frontiers for our work – taking us beyond our traditional areas of visibility. The Board and the management are therefore delighted to announce that our vision of creating a Greenpeace presence in Africa was ratified by the Greenpeace Council at our AGM in March 2008, with offices opening in South Africa, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Senegal.

Greenpeace continues to make and surf the waves, but this continuity goes hand-in-hand with change. After nine years at the helm of Greenpeace International, during which time he has made fearless, bold and visionary contributions to Greenpeace globally, Gerd Leipold announced that he would be stepping down as at the end of October 2009. So the Board is geared up to ensuring that we provide the best of our collective vision and leadership in ensuring a transparent and rigorous process to put in place the next generation of inspirational leadership for Greenpeace.

Inputs from around the Greenpeace world, with few exceptions, indicate that our supporters continue to trust and invest in us. As always – we salute everybody, in all continents, who continue to believe that a different and a better world is possible – and who lend us their regular support to help us go forth, bear witness, climb chimneys, go to jail, dare to be audacious, and force the world to listen.

If I were to reflect on one defining moment of 2008, it would be my visit to the DRC for the formal launch of Greenpeace in Africa, a fantastic opportunity for interaction and dialogue across many boundaries and barriers. It was a moment to savour and celebrate, an intense and uplifting experience for me. With the Arctic Sunrise berthed on the Congo in Matadi, I remember dancing spontaneously on the jetty to the irresistible rhythm of drums and local dancers – it is people like this who give Greenpeace support and the legitimacy and ability to be independent. I felt empowered by their rhythms, their ability to be creative and audacious, their power and defiance but above all their passion. This, for me, is the enduring message – the non-violent, creative soul of Greenpeace.

- Lalita Ramdas
Our Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of Greenpeace International (Stichting Greenpeace Council) approves the annual budget of Greenpeace International and the audited accounts, and appoints and supervises the Executive Director.

Greenpeace International’s Board Members are normally elected for a three-year period at the AGM by its Council of Trustees, which comprises representatives from the Boards of all national and regional Greenpeace offices. Board members may be re-elected for subsequent terms. The Board reports annually to the Stichting Greenpeace Council AGM.

Greenpeace International searches widely for candidates for its Board. They must be independent of Greenpeace internal affairs, and have no vested interests that might be in conflict with Greenpeace’s interests and objectives. They should also be distinguished in their recognised fields. Collectively the Board should provide skills, input and experience representing the world at large. We aim to maintaining a wide geographical representation and gender balance on the Board, as well as a good spread of expertise in areas such as activism, the environment, communications, management, finance and law.

More on the Greenpeace International Board and the governance of Greenpeace can be found at http://www.greenpeace.org/international/about/how-is-greenpeace-structured/governance-structure.
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Remuneration of Board Members and Senior Management Team

Greenpeace International remunerates the Chair and Members of its Board at levels reflecting the professional time and responsibility their tasks require. Board Members are based all over the world, are usually professionally active and are expected to dedicate substantial attention to guiding the organisation’s complex global activities. Board Members (numbering from six to seven during the course of the year) of Greenpeace International received remuneration during 2008 of €94,000 (€93,000 in 2007). The Board Chair received €40,000 and all other Board Members received €10,000.

Total emoluments of €651,000 (€612,000 in 2007) were paid to the Senior Management Team (which increased to seven positions during 2008 from six in 2007) and may be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 Euros thousands</th>
<th>2007 Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>651</strong></td>
<td><strong>612</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emoluments paid to the members of the Senior Management Team are commensurate with their levels of responsibility. The International Executive Director, the highest paid member of the Senior Management Team, received total emoluments of €139,969 (€138,738 in 2007), including salary of €117,567, employer’s pension contribution of €20,000 and other benefits to the value of €2,402.
Towards the end of 2008, everyone watched as the pillars of industry and banking were shaken to the core, and the world faced an economic crisis of staggering proportions. However, the recession was a familiar form of crisis for world leaders to tackle. They were able to look into history and draw on the lessons of the past, and establish their responses for today. Recession is painful, but will end.

World leaders should look to the bigger crisis that is underway. Science has shown that climate change continues to accelerate. Left unchecked the climate crisis will – at a minimum – make poverty permanent in the developing world and strangle growth in the developed. It raises the prospect of mass extinction, mass starvation and mass migration within the next century.

The UN Climate Summit in Copenhagen in December 2009 will, to a large extent, tell us if we are up to the challenge. Climate science tells us that we must keep any temperature increase below 2°C, the tipping point at which runaway catastrophic climate change will become inevitable: a point beyond which our children will face life that is nastier, shorter and more brutish.

Our children do not deserve that.

The science cannot be changed; therefore, the politics must. We need to invest in ‘win-win’ scenarios that not only avert climate chaos but create a new green economy, halt tropical deforestation and place the planet on a path to sustainability.

Throughout 2008, Greenpeace worked not only to highlight the threats of climate change, but also on showcasing the opportunities and solutions that tackling climate change can bring.

Greenpeace’s Energy [R]evolution shows how to replace fossil fuels quickly and completely. We developed it in partnership with the German Space Agency and universities around the world. It supports current projections of both population and economic growth. It uses existing technologies and rejects unproven carbon capture and storage technologies and dangerous nuclear power.

Our ‘Forests for Climate’ plan describes how deforestation can be halted by 2015 for priority areas such as the Amazon, the Congo and the paradise forests of Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, and by 2020 globally. It shows how to halt deforestation by investing money raised on carbon markets into forest protection, and by implementing it on a global scale how to avoid the risk that deforestation is simply displaced.

Our ‘Cool Farming’ report describes how sustainable agriculture systems can feed the world while reducing climate changing emissions from fertilisers and livestock. Our call for a global network of large, fully-protected marine reserves covering 40% of our oceans will not only restore the health of fish stocks and protect ocean life from habitat destruction and collapse, but also make our oceans more resilient to the ravages of climate change.

Greenpeace sounded the alarm on climate change over 20 years ago, driven by science and by principle; if only governments had done the same. The climate crisis threatens all we hold dear, and should be the wake-up call that now moves the world to action.

Our children deserve that.

The world needs a fair, ambitious and legally-binding Copenhagen deal that delivers emissions cuts of at least 40% by 2020 from the developed world, an end to tropical deforestation and $140 billion US dollars a year to support adaptation, mitigation and forest protection in the developing world. Our world leaders should have the courage and foresight to rapidly leave climate-changing fossil fuel behind.

Big changes have a way of looking impossible as we approach them, but they will be seen to have been inevitable once they fade into history. Greenpeace will continue to push for the changes that are needed for a green and peaceful world.
The task of tackling climate change, the biggest environmental threat of our times, could not be more urgent; we need to drastically reverse the current path of ever-increasing greenhouse gas emissions. At Greenpeace, we direct our creativity and energy towards those issues in which we most urgently need to make a difference.

Our 2008 Global Programme outlined how Greenpeace would take on climate change throughout the year. It also informs and directs our Global Programme for subsequent years.

To maximise our ability to halt climate change, our 2008 Global Programme comprised the following:

- **one clear global priority**: our Climate and Energy Campaign, with a focus on the Energy [R]evolution, Zero Deforestation and climate-friendly refrigeration and cooling
- our Oceans Campaign continued to focus on whales, stolen fish and marine reserves
- our GE Campaign focused on campaigning for strong controls on genetically modified organisms, and preventing the commercialisation of GE rice
- our Toxics Campaign focused on toxic technology, and driving change in the electronics industry.

Within this framework, we identified seven global projects for 2008:

- **Energy [R]evolution: Energy Efficiency** – focusing on cars, engaging and empowering citizen activists and increasing public pressure in support of the Energy [R]evolution and in support of legislation to make energy efficiency compulsory.

- **Energy [R]evolution: Quit Coal**, aiming instead for renewable and decentralised energy and energy efficiency – exposing the true cost of coal by showing how much of the taxpayers’ money went towards subsidising this industry.

- **Energy [R]evolution: No Nuclear**, aiming instead for renewable and decentralised energy and energy efficiency – showing that investment in nuclear energy would do nothing to tackle climate change, but instead divert money from true climate solutions.

- **Zero Deforestation: Paradise Forest**, tackling emissions from Indonesia, the world’s third largest greenhouse gas emitter – focusing on palm oil production as the major driver for forest destruction in Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, and aiming for a moratorium on deforestation and expansion of industrial logging by 2010, as a first step towards national commitments to zero deforestation.

- **Zero Deforestation: Amazon Forest**, tackling emissions from Brazil, the world’s fourth largest greenhouse gas emitter – aiming to extend and permanently secure the current two-year moratorium on deforestation for soya, and stopping trade in illegal and destructive logging.

- **Kyoto Plus**: because a global agreement is essential for tackling climate change – aiming towards deep emission reduction targets, a massive transfer of clean energy technology to developing countries and clear commitments towards forest protection.
Energy [R]evolution - a climate solution

“I can't understand why there aren't rings of young people blocking bulldozers and preventing them from constructing coal-fired power plants.”

Nobel Peace Prize winner Al Gore
The launch of our updated Energy [R]evolution scenario provided a challenge to the International Energy Agency’s view of the world, and established Greenpeace as a key player on the debate over how to meet the world’s energy needs. One positive contribution made by the EU in 2008 was its renewable energy directive, which Greenpeace had a big hand in shaping. It puts in place clear policies to help governments meet the EU’s 20% target for renewable energy by 2020. The Philippines also put in place a strong renewable energy feed-in law, which will guarantee a fair price for each kilowatt of clean energy that is produced. New Zealand adopted a target of 90% renewable energy by 2025. Renewable energy continues to go from strength to strength as the industry matures and the technology proves itself on a massive scale.

2008 was the year that we helped bring coal into the centre of the climate debate. High profile ship tours, a climate rescue centre of this campaign (‘deep in a campaign to stop all new coal plants’, as Newsweek observed in January). We achieved some important victories (such as in the UK, where a jury ruled that building a coal plant is a much greater crime than climbing on one – see feature), and produced some solid evidence to undermine the coal industry’s push to paint itself green. We also launched ‘Quit Coal’ campaigns in India and China. Around the world, we have continued to push for laws that ban coal and urged governments to take action to protect the climate.

When it came to EU laws on car efficiency standards, some very creative direct communications and actions in Brussels - along with reports and waves of lobbying by Greenpeace national and regional offices and the Greenpeace EU Unit - helped prevent a bad deal for EU fuel efficiency targets from being much, much worse. Sometimes in campaigning, the best you can achieve is to hold ground. The EU’s efficiency standards for cars are a major missed opportunity. They are extremely weak short-term targets that will barely reduce emissions over the next six years. In the longer term, a non-binding commitment to cut emissions by more than a third by 2020 (down to 95g CO₂ per km) was a slightly more positive result. The car-industry is all powerful and its healthy profits depend upon selling high-end car models. The industry needs to be tackled directly, or governments will continue to bow to its formidable pressure.

We continued to expose problems at the nuclear industry’s flagship new nuclear plants in Flamanville, France and Okiluto, Finland. Both continue to fall way behind schedule and are billions of euros over budget. We continued to expose other problems with nuclear power, such as radioactive contamination found in Spain and Brazil. We continued to build pressure on governments to admit that nuclear power is no solution to climate change, in places as diverse as Japan, Indonesia and the UK. As a result of our efforts, new nuclear programmes were seriously stalled in Turkey and South Africa.

Due to its high greenhouse gas emissions - for which coal-fired power stations are the biggest offenders - the energy sector is responsible for some two-thirds of the world’s total greenhouse gas emissions.

In an unprecedented trial, a UK Crown Court jury acquitted six Greenpeace activists of criminal damage to a coal-fired power plant. In the previous year, the activists attempted to shut down the Kingsnorth power station in Kent, the United Kingdom, by scaling the chimney and painting the UK prime minister’s name down the side. They were accused of causing £30,000 of criminal damage to the Kingsnorth smokestack from painting. Their defence was that they had a “lawful excuse” – because they were acting to protect property around the world ‘in immediate need of protection’ from the impacts of climate change, caused in part by the burning of coal.

The jury, consisting of representatives from the British public, found the actions justified when considering the damage done to property around the world caused by CO₂ emissions from the plant. During the trial, the world’s leading climate scientist, James Hansen of NASA, came to court and challenged the UK government’s plans for new coal, calling for Prime Minister Gordon Brown to announce a moratorium on all new coal-fired plants without carbon capture and storage.

After hearing the evidence, the jurors supported the right to take direct action to protect the climate from burning coal.
Kiribati, Pacific Ocean

Greenpeace activists lay a floating banner in the net of the world’s largest tuna destroyer – the Spanish-owned Albatun Tres, which can net 3,000 tonnes of tuna in one trip. Foreign fishing nations including those of the EU are fishing unsustainably where Pacific island countries depend on tuna for income and food.
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Protecting Our Ancient Forests

A view from the airplane of manmade forest fires to clear land for cattle and farming, near the BR 163 road and the Florestal do Trairao (Trairao National Forest), West of Itaituba National Forest, Para State, Brazil.
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In 2008, Greenpeace’s forest campaign continued to challenge deforestation at the frontiers, focusing efforts throughout the year on the Amazon, Indonesia and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Palm oil and its role in forest and climate destruction was the focus of our work in Indonesia. Field investigations revealed the destruction of carbon-rich forests and orang-utan habitats, while in the latter half of the year our ship the Esperanza supported the campaign with a week-long blockade of a palm oil export ship. A major consumer campaign against the world’s largest end user of palm oil – Unilever – was launched in April, and featured actions and widespread media coverage across Europe. It also delivered a web parody of a popular Unilever commercial for ‘real beauty’, which attracted over half a million viewers on Youtube. This campaign was brought to a successful conclusion when Unilever’s CEO said the company would support Greenpeace’s demands for a moratorium on further forest conversion for palm oil plantations (for more, see feature).

In the Amazon we saw the extension of the two-year Greenpeace-inspired moratorium on the planting of soya in newly-deforested areas. An investigation into illegal logging followed by a high profile action in France led the Brazilian environment agency to crack down on timber exports, while we successfully campaigned against changes in the Brazilian Forest Code that would significantly increase the level of deforestation.

At the international level, pressure from Greenpeace and others led the Brazilian Environment Minister to announce a target of a 72% reduction in deforestation at the UN climate conference in Poznan, Poland. Greenpeace photographer Daniel Beltrá was awarded the Global Vision Award from Pictures of the Year International for his photos of the rainforests.

2008 also saw the arrival of the Arctic Sunrise in the Democratic Republic of Congo - a first visit to this country for a Greenpeace ship, which coincided with the official opening of the Greenpeace Africa office in Kinshasa. Our work to ensure that a World Bank/DRC government review of logging concessions put illegally granted concessions out of production concluded with a partial success, with over 10 million hectares removed from concessions. The moratorium on new logging concessions remains in place, a testament to our work with other NGOs in the region and globally.

“We are trying to save our remaining forests at any costs and are committed to rehabilitating whatever others have destroyed.”

Ali Mursyid, community leader in Riau Province, Sumatra

The problem of palm oil

Destruction of the world’s tropical forests is one of the great ecological disasters of our time. It is responsible for a fifth of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions. Some of the ancient forests under greatest threat are the ‘Paradise Forests’ stretching from Southeast Asia, across the islands of Indonesia to Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands in the Pacific.

Indonesia’s forests are being felled at a rate faster than in any other major forested country. The massive amounts of greenhouse gases being released by deforestation and forest fires make the country the world’s third-largest greenhouse gas emitter. In April 2008 we launched our report Burning up Borneo, providing further evidence of the expansion of the palm oil sector in Indonesia into orang-utan habitat and peatlands in Kalimantan.

The report linked some of the largest palm oil producers in Indonesia to Unilever, the world’s largest single consumer of palm oil, and head of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, a group of manufactures, retailers and suppliers representing over 40% of production, and whose aim is to create standards for the production of sustainable palm oil.

After Greenpeace took direct action against Unilever, its CEO Patrick Cescau announced in May 2008 that his company would support our call for a moratorium. In August, the regional governor of Riau province announced an interim ban on deforestation in Riau. This moratorium will buy time, allowing proper regulations to be put in place to protect the rainforest in years to come – good news for orang-utans, and good news for the climate.
"Fisheries Ministers are failing to protect single species, let alone marine ecosystems. What kind of management organisation ignores the advice of its own scientists and sets quotas that condemn the very species it is responsible for?"

Sebastián Losada at the ICCAT meeting, which failed to limit fishing of bluefin tuna despite scientific warnings of its near collapse.
The Whales campaign in 2008 met, and in some cases exceeded, every goal it had set for the year. This included maintaining the conservation majority at the International Whaling Commission; getting global exposure for our Southern Ocean expedition to oppose Japan’s ongoing so-called scientific whaling in the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary - we had the BBC on board broadcasting live on TV, radio and web on a daily basis; generating large-scale public engagement and new supporters through the Great Whale Trail and created a new global whale icon - Mr. Splashy Pants! Most successfully and most controversially, we also raised a major scandal within Japan, with the revelations of the whale meat embezzlement investigation. The Greenpeace allegations - while prompting an extremely heavy-handed legal response (see feature) - also prompted significant debate and questioning within Japanese media and political circles. A major milestone was achieved in May 2008 as the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted criteria for the identification of a network of Marine Protected Areas on the high seas. The achievement of this objective means that the global community now has all the tools necessary for identifying areas on the high seas as Marine Reserves with criteria very similar to those used by Greenpeace and included in our global network in our 2006 publication, *Roadmap to Recovery*. To drive home the need for Marine Reserves out on the water, Greenpeace Nordic, Greenpeace Germany and Greenpeace Netherlands undertook a confrontational and controversial action at the Sylt Outer Reef, placing boulders on the sea-bed to prevent fishing boats from bottom trawling. The action exposed the lack of real protection for sites designated under the EU Habitats Directive, gained significant profile for the issue and was effective in closing the area to destructive fishing.

In May, our strategy to continue building solidarity between Pacific Island Nations delivered an historic agreement to close the high seas pockets to tuna fishing between 8 of the 17 Forum countries. The campaign continued to build pressure on distant water fishing nations and at the regional tuna commission meeting in December, two out of the three high seas pockets were officially closed to tuna fishing from 2010 onwards. We took our message straight to the retailers causing a stir at the Brussels Seafood Fair, making it clear that time and tuna are running out. Our market objective to secure commitments from five key retailers to avoid bigeye, bluefin and yellowfin tuna was successful through work in the UK, the Netherlands and the Nordic region. Partly in reaction to our pressure the tuna industry is now poised to launch a major sustainability initiative.

In the Mediterranean we launched the Balearic Islands tuna sanctuary proposal in Spain with support from the Balearic parliament. We generated scientific support for the concept of Marine reserves in Libya during our ship tour. In Lebanon, progress was made towards the Byblos marine reserve. However, despite achieving our objective to uncover and expose two scandals related to bluefin tuna and report these to the authorities, the annual ICCAT meeting once again failed to address this continuing problem.

The Whale Meat Scandal and the Tokyo Two

A four-month undercover investigation by Greenpeace Japan revealed evidence of an embezzlement ring involving crew members on board the Japanese factory whaling ship Nisshin Maru, who were taking the best cuts of whale meat during the so-called scientific whaling hunt, smuggling it ashore disguised as personal luggage and then passing it on to traders for illegal sales. Activists from Greenpeace Japan were able to track a box offloaded from the ship to a depot in Aomori Prefecture and intercept it in order to verify the contents and establish the fraud. The consignment notes claimed the box contained “cardboard” – but in reality, it held 23.5kg of salted “prime” whale meat worth up to $3,000 US dollars.

However, in the early hours of the morning of 20 June, the Aomori District Public Prosecutors’ Office arrested Junichi Sato and Toru Suzuki of Greenpeace Japan, despite the fact that the two men had sent detailed statements of what they did and why to the Aomori Police almost a month earlier.

Meanwhile in Tokyo, the offices of Greenpeace Japan and the homes of some staff were raided by the police. On the same day, the Tokyo Public Prosecutor announced that he was dropping the investigation into the whale meat scandal that we had exposed.

Junichi and Toru were released after 26 days in detention, but their trial is ongoing and the activists potentially face 10 years’ imprisonment for their role in exposing the whale meat scandal. Peaceful protests have been held at Japanese embassies around the world in support of the ‘Tokyo Two’, calling for a full investigation into the scandal.
“My ministry is in possession of new scientific studies showing that GMOs are not safe for human health and the environment... the future of Romania is organic.”

Attila Korodo, Romanian Minister of Environment, Romania
“How can we reduce hunger and poverty, improve rural livelihoods, and facilitate equitable, environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development through the generation, access to, and use of agricultural knowledge, science and technology?” This is the overarching question to be addressed by the International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD). The IAASTD is an international effort – in which Greenpeace has played a role, and will continue to play a role in promoting – that was initiated by the World Bank to evaluate the relevance, quality and effectiveness of agricultural knowledge, science, and technology, and the effectiveness of related public and private sector policies and institutional arrangements.

In April 2008, the IAASTD published its findings. It strongly condemned the current industrial agricultural model, and rejected genetically modified (GM) crops as a way to promoting sustainable agriculture.

Rejecting genetically-modified organisms (GMOs) was a conclusion that many governments in the EU had already reached. Early in 2008, France joined Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy and Poland in banning Monsanto’s MON 810 maize, the only GM crop allowed for commercial cultivation in Europe. In March, Romania’s environment minister Attila Korodi also announced a ban, at an event organised by Greenpeace, Slow Food and the Organic Farmers Organisation of Romania.

Greenpeace Germany had been working on the dairy sector for over four years, facing an industry that for a long time “closed ranks” and resisted Greenpeace’s arguments. However, in 2008 Campina became the first big dairy producer to switch to produce from animals fed without GM plants, and announced that it would introduce Germany’s new GM-free label to its leading brand.

Europe remained free from any GM staple crops; but the reform of the authorisation system was not halted as hoped, although a review of the assessment process is moving ahead.

Throughout the year, Greenpeace maintained the campaign to keep Mexico - “the centre of diversity of maize” – free from GMOS despite reports of seed contamination. In Australia, the ‘GM-Free Chefs Charter’ was launched at a high-profile Sydney restaurant, and more than 150 chefs and restaurateurs signed on to commit to helping Australia remain GM-free. Similar initiatives with the restaurant industry followed in Thailand and the Philippines.

The hardest setback was the loss of the campaign to prevent the commercial cultivation of GM maize in Brazil; this makes our work to keep rice GM-free globally a key objective in 2009.

The year also saw the publication of our Cool Farming report, which explained that industrial farming is responsible for a substantial proportion of greenhouse gas emissions (NOx emissions from fertilisers, deforestation due to the expansion of agricultural lands, animal farming, etc.). The report is the first comprehensive analysis of agricultural impacts on climate change. If the world’s agricultural system was converted to sustainable farming, farming could very much reduce its greenhouse gas emissions – and even provide a carbon sink, therefore becoming part of the climate solution, as opposed to being part of the climate problem.

Climate change will profoundly affect agriculture worldwide. Food security in many countries is under threat from unpredictable changes in rainfall and more frequent extreme weather.

Food for thought, and food for the future

A Greenpeace report released on the eve of World Food Day 2008 warned of the threats posed to China’s food security by climate change. Climate change doesn’t only mean a warmer world – it also means a hungrier world.

Under a high greenhouse gas emissions scenario, basic food supplies will become insufficient, and China could face difficulty producing enough food to feed its population by as soon as 2030. Climate change affects agricultural production through changes in temperature, water availability, soil condition, extreme weather conditions, crop diseases and pest outbreaks.

Eco-farming provides solutions to these challenges.

For example, data on farming from around the world has provided unequivocal evidence that mixing different crops and varieties is a proven and reliable method of increasing crop resilience to erratic weather changes. Biodiversity-intensive farming reduces the probability of pests and diseases by diluting the availability of their hosts. Millions of farms on all continents have proven that organic and sustainable agriculture can increase food security, replenish natural resources and provide better livelihoods for farmers and local communities.

In China, thousands of farmers have taken to the ‘duck-rice’ method of farming; the farmers keep ducks, which eat pests and weeds and trample the muddy water, helping to make the rice plants grow strong. Keeping ducks means that farmers don’t have to use poisonous herbicides and pesticides. Diversity in production and growing is the answer – and not monoculture and GE technology.
Creating a Toxics-Free Future

"The bulk of the computers that are shipped here - the old, obsolete, second-hand computers - are broken, they just don't work. Why would anyone give us computers that don't work? It is dumping, and nothing more."

Mike Anane, local environmental campaigner in Ghana

Image
Unloading shipping containers full of electronic goods from the Netherlands. Many second-hand electrical goods that are imported from developed countries are not working and beyond repair. These obsolete goods contain hazardous chemicals that are released into the environment, both in landfills and in small-scale ‘recycling’ that involves breaking and burning the goods to reclaim metals such as copper and aluminium.
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Belgium
More than 80 activists place thousands of windmills with the message to ‘Quit Coal’ at the site of E.ON’s proposed coal-fired power plant in Antwerp Harbour. The action illustrates the choice facing Flemish authorities: authorising the construction of a huge coal power plant or investing in wind power and greater energy independence instead.
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Our report *Not in Our Backyard* revealed that the fate of millions of tonnes of electronic waste generated each year is still largely unknown. As electronics increasingly become part of the throw-away culture in many developed countries, the amount of ‘e-waste’ has dramatically increased while the solutions have lagged far behind. Even in the EU, which has tighter regulations than most, 75% of e-waste is unaccounted for—of the estimated 8.7 million tonnes created annually in the EU, 6.6 million tonnes is not recycled. We successfully brought the e-waste problem to wide public attention with a further report, *Poisoning the Poor*, which detailed the results of our research into the dumping of e-waste in Ghana (see feature).

Greenpeace is pressuring the biggest electronics companies to phase-out toxic chemicals from their products and to introduce global recycling schemes—both are vital to tackle the growing tide of toxic e-waste. Philips and Sharp stood out for refusing to accept any responsibility for recycling their old products. We delivered a clear message to Philips—at its offices in Mumbai, Amsterdam, Moscow and Copenhagen. Despite its promises to enact takeback policies by mid-July, Philips’ response to date has been less than satisfactory, and we continue to apply pressure.

Our report *Playing Dirty* revealed that the world’s most popular games consoles all tested positive for hazardous chemicals and materials. What was interesting, however, was that each of the consoles featured at least one innovative step in replacing dirty components with toxic-free materials. This gave us the chance to throw the manufacturers a new challenge, since what it required was for them to look ‘inside the box’ of their competitors to see how they could all improve on their own efforts.

We did reach new milestones in our campaign to green the electronics industry in terms of the toxic content of its products, however: Nokia, Sony Ericsson and Apple all had products on the market completely free of polyvinyl (PVC) plastic and brominated flame retardants (BFRs). In January 2008, during the MacWorld conference and expo in San Francisco, CEO Steve Jobs spoke about the environment in his keynote speech for the first time. The new MacBook Air was a strong contender in the race to build a green PC. As a mercury-free and arsenic-free laptop, it exceeded European standards and raised the bar for the rest of the industry. In September, the latest batch of iPods were released, now free of PVCs, BFR, mercury and arsenic.

Companies steadily improved in their rankings in our quarterly ‘Guide to Greener Electronics’, but we continued to push them to do even better. Our presence at the CeBIT electronics fair earlier in the year had already shown that Greenpeace is positioned as the only critical voice that is well recognised in the IT industry, and we put the industry’s need to seriously address climate change firmly on the table as well. As of its eighth edition, our ranking guide included energy-efficiency criteria, requiring companies to cut the energy use of their products and to commit to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions of their own operations. The criteria also required companies to show their political support for global mandatory cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. The new criteria subsequently saw all company rankings plummet, but scores were rising once more by the end of the year, proving again that Greenpeace is being heard by the industry, that our challenge has been successful, and that the finishing line in the race for truly green electronics products is steadily coming within sight.

Poisoning the poor: E-waste in Ghana

More than 1,000 containers of used electronic equipment from developed countries arrive in Ghana every year. They contain, at a rough estimate, 300,000 electronics appliances—mostly TVs, fridges and computers. Most of the devices are broken and can’t be re-used, so they are sold directly to scrap dealers, who collect metal from the waste and sell it for recycling. The so-called ‘recycling’ takes place at scrap markets—big dumpsites covered in waste, and the electronic waste contains lots of toxic chemicals that are released into the environment during the recycling process. In the yards, unprotected workers—many of them children—dismantle computers and TVs with little more than stones, in search of metals that can be sold. The remaining plastic, cables and casings are either burnt or simply dumped.

Greenpeace International’s Science Unit (see pages 22-23) analysed samples taken from two scrapyards in Ghana and discovered severe contamination with hazardous chemicals. Many of the chemicals released may affect children’s developing reproductive systems, while others can affect brain development and the nervous system. One sample also contained a high level of chlorinated dioxins, known to promote cancer.

The stance of powerful multinationals, who refuse to accept responsibility for recycling their obsolete products, creates a dangerous divide; it is unprotected workers in developing countries who are left to face the toxic legacy of e-waste. Greenpeace continues to press the biggest electronics companies to phase-out toxic chemicals from their products and introduce effective and safe global recycling schemes.
Rainbow Warrior

The beginning of 2008 saw the Rainbow Warrior campaigning on climate and energy issues in New Zealand, where it took part in the successful action to block coal shipments at the Port of Lyttleton. It then travelled to the Philippines to begin the southeast Asian ‘Quit Coal’ tour. Here, among other things, it blocked the berthing of one ship at the Pigbilao coal-fired power plant, and activists painted ‘Quit Coal’ on another ship waiting to discharge its cargo of coal. The ‘Quit Coal’ tour continued to Thailand.

In the latter half of the year, the Rainbow Warrior travelled back to Europe for the Mediterranean-Europe Quit Coal tour – visiting Egypt, Israel, Turkey, Greece, Spain, the UK, Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany and undertaking direct actions against coal along the way. It finished the tour in Copenhagen, Denmark, which will be the venue for the UN Climate Summit in December, 2009.

Arctic Sunrise

At the beginning of 2008, the Arctic Sunrise completed a project in Spain about coastal pollution and participated in two actions related to illegal logging shipments around Caen, France. Throughout the summer months, it undertook the three-month ‘Defending Our Mediterranean’ tour, documenting fishing vessels in the Mediterranean and taking action against Italian fishing vessels, seizing the driftnets of vessels fishing illegally. It also documented Turkish fishing vessels in the seas between Cyprus and Turkey, where it was intentionally rammed by one of the vessels but fortunately suffered little damage.

The Arctic Sunrise also helped to map threatened posidonia sea-grass meadows off the Greek coast, and carried out underwater documentation, sampling and public work in Libya. It joined the Rainbow Warrior for the Mediterranean-Europe ‘Quit Coal’ tour, seeing action in Spain and Italy, before heading off to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where it took part in the official opening ceremonies of the new Greenpeace Africa office in Kinshasa.

Esperanza

The Esperanza began 2008 in the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary, where it defended the whales from the harpoons of the Fisheries Agency of Japan’s so-called ‘scientific’ whaling fleet. It then returned to Australia, to prepare for the Pacific fishery campaign.

Off the western Pacific Islands, the Esperanza’s crew stopped, boarded and searched Taiwanese longliners and Philippines fishing vessels trying to fish or offload illegal catches at sea. A 25-metre floating banner was deployed in the water near the world’s biggest fishing vessel, the Spanish-registered Albatun Tres, while it was hauling in nets full of yellowfin tuna; the ship was prevented from fishing for several days.

The Esperanza ended the year with its ‘Forests for Climate’ tour in Papua New Guinea and Indonesia. It took action to block a palm oil shipment from departing for Europe from the Sumatran port of Dumai, and halted the loading of illegally-logged trees onto the China-bound Harbour Gemini in Papua New Guinea; the action was supported by local people, who watched joyously from boats, singing and dancing.
Total ships budget split over ships

TOTAL SPEND 7,771

Ship budget breakdown by ship

- Arctic Sunrise: 52% Crew costs, 8% Maintenance and repairs, 33% Other costs, 8% Dry Dock
- Esperanza: 50% Crew costs, 13% Maintenance and repairs, 21% Other costs, 6% Dry Dock
- Rainbow Warrior: 85% Crew costs, 14% Maintenance and repairs, 27% Other costs, 3% Dry Dock

All figures in thousands of euros
Our people
and you
Greenpeace visits Ghana to investigate workplace contamination from e-waste recycling and disposal in the country and uncovers evidence that e-waste is being exported, often illegally, from Ghana to Europe and the US.

Greenpeace scientist Dr. Kevin Brigden takes samples from sites where electronic components have been burned to reclaim their copper content. The samples will be sent back to the UK to test for any toxic chemicals in the soil as a result of burning hazardous materials.
During 2008, Greenpeace International’s Science Unit, based at Exeter University in the UK, published the following discussion papers, technical briefings and reports, including:

> A report on the environmental and societal impacts of the rapidly-expanding aquaculture industry, often at its most destructive in the coastal regions of poorer countries.

> A major new report on the consequences for our seas, lakes and rivers of nutrient pollution from agriculture, sewage, atmospheric emissions and urban run-off, including the formation of ever larger ‘dead zones’ in which massive algal blooms deplete oxygen to levels at which few species can survive.

> Paper to the first Global Conference on GMO Analysis, held in Italy.

> Paper on industrial hotspots of persistent organic pollutant (POP) contamination published jointly with numerous other academics in Environmental Science & Pollution Research.

> High-profile interview to the international journal Science on the trend for development of ‘nutrient-rich’ GE crops, and contributed to a briefing highlighting Monsanto’s ‘deadly sins’.

The Science Unit carried out research in the following areas:

> Analysis of various games consoles for the presence of hazardous substances.

> Fieldwork to investigate and analyse environmental contamination from e-waste disposal in Ghana, with assistance provided to another organisation conducting similar investigative work in Pakistan.

The Science Unit provided advice on a host of issues, including:

> A technical and logistics support for a number of Greenpeace projects focusing on water pollution, including to Greenpeace China (on the Yangtze River), Greenpeace Spain (targeting sub-sea discharges from heavy industry) and Poland (on the Vistula River and its tributaries). Advice also given to Greenpeace China on sampling to detect water pollution related to agrochemicals.

> Closely involved in preparation of submission to the ongoing review of the EU RoHS Directive, making the case for further restrictions on the use of hazardous substances in electrical and electronic goods.

> Contributed to the review of EU criteria on acceptable land-use changes linked to the production of biofuels, as well as technical objections to the reauthorisation of insect-resistant MON 810 for growth in Europe.

The Science Unit represented Greenpeace at international meetings and seminars, including:

> The May 2008 31st meeting of the Scientific Group to the London Convention/Protocol, where it influenced discussions on use of wastes to construct artificial reefs at sea.

> The first meeting of the Reference User Group guiding the EU EPOCA research programme on ocean acidification, just another problem arising from increasing CO₂ emissions.

> At the CBD, presented on forest degradation and greenhouse gas emissions and input to limit proposals for the trialing of GE trees.

> A meeting of the SKEP (Scientific Knowledge for Environmental Protection) project on ‘converging technologies’, hosted in Paris and attended by environmental protection agencies from all over Europe.
Greenpeace launches the office in Kinshasa as its second presence in Africa after the recent opening of the Johannesburg office. A local man wears a t-shirt with a Greenpeace Africa logo and looks out at the new Greenpeace ship Arctic Sunrise entering the port of Matadi.
Greenpeace International’s Development Office leads the design of a global development strategy for the worldwide organisation. It relies on the Global Strategic Framework to provide strategic direction by coordinating the support to national and regional offices through both financial and non-financial means. The Development Officers liaise directly with National Boards and are the guardians of the governance systems. The team also supports and monitors the development and performance of national and regional offices according to their potential for the global organisation.

Greenpeace worldwide is in a healthy state of development. We are increasing our efficiency systems in all offices and most offices are operating efficiently. This year, all of our developing offices have completed or began the process of developing three year plans. These will be reviewed annually alongside our Organisational Development Plan.

We continue to grow in North and South America. In the US, our operations continue to be strengthened despite the economic crisis and are growing in a robust and forward-thinking design. Some of our more dynamic, innovative ideas continue to come from South America. However, the economic crisis that hit toward the end of the year will probably take its toll in 2009, and this will probably be the main challenge for the whole organisation in 2009.

Our offices in Australia, the Pacific and New Zealand are among the most stable in the organisation, but they too are predicting setbacks due to the credit crunch.

In Europe we continue to overcome stagnated growth with more dynamic and novel programmes. In countries where we are still in development stages our campaigns are successful and strong and contribute considerably to our global goals. Our more established offices continue to contribute expertise to Greenpeace worldwide as well as deliver upon important campaign milestones.

In November 2008, we saw the launch of Greenpeace Africa, with the opening of two offices - one in Johannesburg, South Africa, and the other in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of Congo. Plans to open a third office in Africa have been put on hold until the final scoping study is complete. In the meantime, Greenpeace Africa is running a very strong Forests Campaign and is developing a Climate Campaign that will already contribute to the goals of the global organisation in the lead up to the UNFCCC Climate Summit in Copenhagen in December 2009.

In 2008, the Development Office initiated a more strategic and consistent approach towards the four Asian Greenpeace offices - China, Southeast Asia, India and Japan. This was important both economically and politically, with Asia being the fastest growing, developing and changing region in the world. Our focus on Asia has lead to significant investments in our offices in the region, all carefully planned within the three-year plans mentioned above. Our development plans for the Asian offices will provide strong support and help build a solid foundation to achieve strong climate campaigns and a significant increase of the supporter base there. With this initiative we are also aiming to increase the contribution from our Asian offices to the global organisation, thereby creating a new image for a truly global organisation.
Greenpeace can only take risks and confront others because of our political and economic independence - we do not accept funding from any government or corporation. Our independence gives us authority and credibility.

We are supported by individuals and trusts who believe in our aims. By the end of 2008, Greenpeace supporters numbered 2.86 million. The future of the environment rests with these millions of people around the world who share our beliefs, and who continue to support us.

We thank all of these supporters. Because of them, Greenpeace is able to tackle environmental problems and promote solutions. Together with them, the power to change things is global.

How we spend donated funds

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

Detailed financial accounts are available at the back of this document. As you will see from the accounts, 72% of our operating budget (excluding fundraising expenditure) is devoted to our campaigning work.

Our clear priority is tackling climate change – mainly through our Climate & Energy and Forests Campaigns, on which campaigns our expenditure has increased from €29.1 million in 2007 to €32 million in 2008 (an increase of 10%), or from 57.6% of our direct global spending on campaigns to 62.1%. The climate imperative, nevertheless, underpins all of our international campaigns, and in 2009, as in 2008, we will continue to increase substantially the proportion of our resources spent on tackling climate change.

Where is income raised, proportions, global income trends

In 2008, Greenpeace globally had gross fundraising income of €196.6 million. The top five income-raising offices were the same in 2008 as in 2007, being Greenpeace Germany, Greenpeace Netherlands, Greenpeace USA, Greenpeace UK and Greenpeace Switzerland. These five offices bring in 58% of the global income.

The biggest growing offices in 2008 were Greenpeace Argentina and Greenpeace Southeast Asia, with 108% and 67%, respectively, of gross fundraising income compared to 2007.

Looking at the global trend we can see a growth in income but a stagnation of donor numbers. By the end of 2008, Greenpeace globally had 2.6 million active donors (those who supported Greenpeace with a financial gift during 2008).
Growth markets and growth challenges

With a looming recession during the preparation of 2009 budgets, most Greenpeace offices followed the guidelines of prudent financial management, conservative budgeting, continuous investments in fundraising and contingency planning or caution in structural increases of non-fundraising costs.

As vindication of this strategy, Q2 2009 results are already showing growth in more than 70% of the Greenpeace national and regional offices.

What is covered by Greenpeace International's fundraising budget (direct vs indirect fundraising costs)

Greenpeace International’s fundraising department is the coordinating body within Greenpeace that supports and facilitates Greenpeace national and regional offices in raising as much income as possible with preferably the highest return of investment (ROI).

This support consists of general office support focusing on monitoring and reviewing of the fundraising activities of the office, and support directed towards specific programmes; direct dialogue, new media, upgrade, retention, supporter relations, legacies, middle and major donors.

Greenpeace International raises some income through major donors and foundations, legacies, and from donors in countries where there is no Greenpeace office.

Greenpeace International fundraising income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Positive/ (negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporter Services</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Donor</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL fundraising</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,080</strong></td>
<td><strong>950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total fundraising budget for 2008 was €1.7 million. Of this, 6% was direct fundraising costs for Greenpeace International.
The continued evolution of Greenpeace globally requires an improvement of our administrative processes and infrastructure. Over 2,400 people, located in more than 40 countries, work for Greenpeace worldwide. Many projects are staffed with international teams, working across borders - both geographically and in campaign issue areas - towards our global goals. Greenpeace International continues to improve the facilitation of this cross-border work through new policies and standards to ensure that the global organisation is able to deploy its best talent throughout the world in places and on projects where it is most needed.

The ability to integrate Greenpeace’s finances and related reporting becomes ever more important. In order to coordinate our finances across the world we continue to work at standardisation of our reporting and moving many Greenpeace offices onto shared financial systems.

We are developing and upgrading a number of major technology tools for our entire network. It will be no surprise that this development is directed at the evolution of skills and software to improve the quality of contact with our supporters as well as the ability to communicate online with all the tools available to us. In doing so, we started two major technology projects in 2008 that will be rolled out to many Greenpeace offices in 2009 and 2010:

- In order to reach more people more frequently and more effectively, we are upgrading our capabilities for communicating globally - including social networks on the web and through the use of mobile phones. We are moving towards an ever more online connection with our supporters.
- To better serve our donors and our activists around the world, we are upgrading our global relationship management systems.

Our technological and administrative capabilities are being aligned to the demands and opportunities presented by new technologies and new types of communication.

Greenpeace International is a founding signatory of the INGO (International Non-Governmental Organisations) Accountability Charter, which outlines a common commitment to enhance transparency and accountability among various International Non-Governmental Organisations. A set of reporting standards Charter signatories is being developed by the Global Reporting Initiative (www.globalreporting.org) and is set to be finalised in 2010. During 2008 and 2009, Greenpeace International has been working with founding signatories to finalise these standards. Even while they are still in draft format, we have been assessing our performance against them. As a result of this, during 2009 and 2010 we are overhauling our international operational policy base, considering changes to our programme evaluation cycle, and are making amendments to our internal and external reporting practice to better support our transparency commitments. Some changes in our Annual Report have already been made, and we will make further amendments during 2010. Greenpeace International’s Interim Reports to the INGO Charter are posted on the INGO Accountability Charter website: www.ingoaccountabilitycharter.org
Financial Report

Total expenditure

7,035 - Organisational Support
- 7,044 - Grants to NROs
- 29,035 - Programme
- 1,956 - Fundraising
- 1,758 - Fair Value adjustment on loans
- 1,415 - Foreign Exchange Losses
- 178 - Interest Paid

All figures in thousands of euros

Organisational support

TOTAL EXPENDITURE 7,035

2,604 - Information Technology
1,495 - Human Resources
1,285 - Facilities
1,074 - Finance
330 - Legal
247 - Global Training

All figures in thousands of euros

Ratio of staff costs vs other costs

20% - Staff
15% - Office Related
14% - Grants to NROs
13% - Consultancy
8% - Travel
8% - Ships Operation
8% - Ships Crew
4% - Other
1% - Telecomms

All figures in thousands of euros

7,044 - Grants to NROs
29,035 - Programme
1,956 - Fundraising
1,758 - Fair Value adjustment on loans
1,415 - Foreign Exchange Losses
178 - Interest Paid

TOTAL EXPENDITURE 48,421

29% - Staff
15% - Office Related
14% - Grants to NROs
13% - Consultancy
8% - Travel
8% - Ships Operation
8% - Ships Crew
4% - Other
1% - Telecomms

All figures in thousands of euros
Financial Report

Greenpeace International Combined Abbreviated Financial Statements

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

The total income of Greenpeace International rose by €0.8 million (2%) in 2008. This was attributable to an increase in major donors of €1.6 million whereas grants received from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices decreased by €1.5 million. This decrease was due to the €3.9 million exceptional contribution received from the UK office in 2007 following a substantial value-added tax (VAT) refund received by that office. In addition the increase in Other Income by €0.4 million is mainly due to the €0.3 million profit realised on the sale of a helicopter.

Total expenditure increased by approximately €4.2m. This was mainly attributable to an increase of €1.4m in campaign expenditure, an increase of €0.6m in organisational support, a fair value adjustment loss on loans of €1.8m and a foreign exchange loss of €1.4m.

The increase in campaign expenditure relates to a €2.8 million increase in expenditure on the Climate & Energy campaign following a decision across the organisation to further prioritise this campaign area. The increase in organisational support costs was mainly related to 2008 costs in reviewing the strategic framework for Greenpeace worldwide and increased costs in upgrading the Human Resources function. The main reason for the foreign exchange loss was appreciation of the euro during the year, which reduced the euro value of a loan provided to an entity that owns Greenpeace office premises, and reduced value of non-euro currency deposits held mainly for short-term commitments. Greenpeace International is in the process of reviewing its treasury procedures with the aim of reducing exposure against such foreign exchange fluctuations in the future.

The combined financial statements for the year 2008 of Greenpeace International, from which the abbreviated financial statements above were derived, were prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as adopted by the EU and have been audited by Ernst & Young who expressed an unqualified opinion.

### Income and Expenditure 2008 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income:</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices</td>
<td>46,130</td>
<td>47,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants and Donations</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>1,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising and Licensing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,660</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,905</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure:</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Greenpeace National and Regional Offices</td>
<td>7,044</td>
<td>7,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceans</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>4,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>3,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>2,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxics</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate &amp; Energy</td>
<td>7,112</td>
<td>4,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Disarmament</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; Communications</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>3,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Operations and Action Support</td>
<td>9,295</td>
<td>8,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Fundraising-Related Expenditure</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Organisational Support</td>
<td>7,035</td>
<td>6,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Exchange Loss/(Gain)</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair value adjustment on loans</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,421</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surplus for the Year

2,239

### Opening Fund Balance

27,094

### Closing Fund Balance

29,333

### Balance Sheet

#### Fixed Assets

3,413

#### Current Assets:

(4) Loans to Greenpeace National and Regional Offices | 3,626    | 1,540    |
(5) Due from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices | 1,977    | 1,556    |
Other Debtors                         | 1,575    | 1,430    |
Cash and Cash Equivalents             | 26,533   | 27,977   |
**Total Assets**                      | **38,124** | **37,211** |

#### Liabilities

Due to Greenpeace National and Regional Offices | 3,255    | 4,287    |
Other Liabilities                      | 5,536    | 5,830    |
Fund Balance                           | 29,333   | 27,094   |
**Total Liabilities & Fund Balance**  | **38,124** | **37,211** |
Notes to the Abbreviated Financial Statements

(1) Greenpeace International’s fundraising expenditure mainly concerns the provision of technical support to the fundraising functions of Greenpeace National and Regional Offices. Expenditure relating directly to Greenpeace International’s own fundraising operations in 2008 was less than €0.1m.

(2) Organisational Support Expenditure: Organisational support includes the costs of the Executive Director’s Office and the Information Technology, Legal, Finance, Facilities, Human Resources and Governance departments. It also includes any adjustments necessary following an assessment of the collectability of balances receivable from Greenpeace National and Regional offices.

(3) Fixed Assets: fixed assets are stated at cost less depreciation. Depreciation is provided to write off the cost of fixed assets over their useful lives. Fixed assets comprise the fleet of three ships operated by Greenpeace International, a freehold property, and campaigns, communications and office equipment.

(4) Loans to Greenpeace National and Regional Offices: the increase in this balance to €3.6 million (€1.5 million in 2007) mainly relates to the granting of a loan to the entity which is the owner of Greenpeace premises.

(5) Amounts due from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices: Balances receivable from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices are subject to assessments of their collectability.

Reserves Policy

Greenpeace International’s reserves policy is to plan to hold available reserves equating to approximately three months of expenditure. In this context, available reserves equals the fund balance less fixed assets and less reserves held for restricted or designated purposes. The reserves level as of 31 December 2008 is calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Euros million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Fixed Assets</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Designated Reserves</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This equates to approximately 3.4 months of expenditure (based on the 2009 budget) and is necessary to cover working capital requirements and provide cover for unexpected operational expenditure and income fluctuations, as well as any increased future investment needs.

The designated reserves comprise €4.8 million held for the planned replacement of the Rainbow Warrior, €1.0 million for the planned implementation of a new fundraising system in Greenpeace National and Regional offices, €2.6 million funds held for investment in fundraising initiatives of Greenpeace National and Regional Offices and €2.3 million reserved for long-term loans in support of infrastructure requirements of National and Regional Offices.
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.

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 Greenpeace National or Regional Office, addresses for which are listed on page 35.

In 2008, the total gross income from fundraising for Greenpeace worldwide was €197 million. This was €8.4 million (4%) less than in 2007. The reason for the decrease was the receipt of a major legacy of $27.4 million US dollars (approximately €20 million) by Greenpeace USA in 2007. Excluding this item, gross fundraising income rose by approximately €11.6 million (6%), mainly related to increased income from supporters giving on a regular basis. The total number of Greenpeace supporters remained consistent from end of 2007 to end of 2008 at approximately 2.9 million.

Total expenditure worldwide rose by approximately €15.1 million (8%) from €186.7m to €201.8m. Fundraising expenditure at €60.3 million (approximately 31% of the total fundraising income) was €4.7m (8%) higher than in 2007. This increase is mainly attributable to a greater investment in the recruitment of new supporters to secure the future financial strength of Greenpeace.

Campaign and campaign-related expenditure increased globally by €3.2 million (3%) from €99.0 million in 2007 to €102.2 million in 2008. There was a significant increase of €3.6 million (19%) in expenditure on the Climate & Energy campaign following a decision across the organisation to further prioritise this campaign area.

Organisation support costs across Greenpeace worldwide increased by nearly €2.5 million (9%) in 2008. This is partially due to a change in the allocation method of costs in 2008 for the Greenpeace UK office, which resulted in €1.5m higher organisation support costs. This change of method occurred in 2008 in order to be consistent with the allocation method used by other Greenpeace offices.

### Years ended 31 December 2008 and 2007.
All amounts are thousands of euros

This summary shows the total income, expenditure, assets and liabilities of all Greenpeace offices (including Greenpeace International) worldwide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income and Expenditure</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants and Donations</td>
<td>196,620</td>
<td>204,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>4,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising and Licensing</td>
<td>(474)</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>2,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>202,563</td>
<td>212,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Expenditure</td>
<td>60,332</td>
<td>55,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>142,231</td>
<td>156,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceans</td>
<td>9,479</td>
<td>9,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>9,024</td>
<td>9,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>4,457</td>
<td>5,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxics</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>2,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate &amp; Energy</td>
<td>22,962</td>
<td>19,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Disarmament</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>2,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campaigns</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; Communications</td>
<td>17,829</td>
<td>17,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Operations &amp; Action Support</td>
<td>21,603</td>
<td>20,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>9,474</td>
<td>9,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political, Science &amp; Business</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Support</td>
<td>30,455</td>
<td>27,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Exchange Loss</td>
<td>3,355</td>
<td>4,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on Investments</td>
<td>5,936</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Fundraising Expenditure</td>
<td>141,497</td>
<td>131,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus for the Year</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>25,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Fund Balance</td>
<td>151,193</td>
<td>125,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Fund Balance Adjustment</td>
<td>955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Fund Balance</td>
<td>152,882</td>
<td>151,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Balance Sheet

| Fixed Assets            | 30,907 | 25,180 |
| Current Assets:         |      |      |
| Other Assets            | 15,085 | 15,707 |
| Cash                    | 142,227| 146,191|
| Total Assets            | 188,219| 187,078|

| Liabilities             |      |      |
| Other Liabilities       | 35,337| 35,885 |
| Fund Balance            | 152,882| 151,193|
| Total Liabilities & Fund Balance | 188,219 | 187,078|

These financial statements of the worldwide Greenpeace organisation for the year 2008 consist of the combined financial statements of Greenpeace International and the Greenpeace National and Regional Offices, and have been presented in conformity with International Financial Reporting Statements as adopted by the EU. The compilation of the financial statements has been reviewed by Ernst & Young.
The foreign exchange loss of €3.4 million (€4.0 million in 2007) is partly related to foreign exchange losses of Greenpeace International (see page 30) and partly related to the book loss incurred from the strengthening of the euro during the year against the majority of the major currencies, which, because the reporting currency is euros, negatively affects the conversion into euros of non-euro based Balance Sheet balances of Greenpeace National and Regional Offices.

The loss on investments of €5.5 million (Nil in 2007) relates to the decrease in value of investments held by Greenpeace USA.

The Direct Fund Balance Adjustment in 2008 of €0.9 million relates to the first time consolidation of the opening fund balance of an entity which is the owner of Greenpeace office premises and which Greenpeace has a controlling interest in as of 2008.

The Fixed Assets balance of €30.9 million (€25.2 million in 2007) increased mainly due to the inclusion of the entity referred to in the preceding paragraph.
Environmental Report

CO₂ Emissions

Greenpeace International’s CO₂ emissions for 2008 totalled 7,691 metric tonnes. This is 1% less than recorded in 2007 and is due to a reduction in the amount of fuel consumed by the three ships operated by Greenpeace International.

The electricity used by the Greenpeace International office is now sourced 100% from renewable sources.

The increase in business travel emissions of 38% is partly the result of ships’ crew travelling to and from the ships, two of which were operating for the majority of the year in the Pacific and Australasia regions in order to support campaigns there. The increase can also be attributed to increased operations in Asia and Africa, as a result of the response to the Tokyo Two trial in Japan and the opening of the new Greenpeace Africa offices in Kinshasa and Johannesburg.

The CO₂ emissions for Greenpeace worldwide will be published for the first time in the 2009 Annual Report.

---

Greenpeace International GHG (CO₂) Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOPE 1: Direct GHG Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct CO₂ emissions for marine transportation (including inflatables) in metric tonnes:</td>
<td>5,800.9</td>
<td>6,325.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct CO₂ emissions for helicopter transportation in metric tonnes</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct CO₂ emissions for natural gas in metric tonnes:</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scope 1 CO₂ emissions in metric tonnes:</strong></td>
<td>5,932.6</td>
<td>6,401.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOPE 2: Indirect GHG Emissions – Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect CO₂ emissions for office electricity in metric tonnes:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect CO₂ emissions for server electricity in metric tonnes:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scope 2 CO₂ emissions in metric tonnes:</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOPE 3: Other Indirect GHG Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CO₂ emissions in metric tonnes, business travel:</td>
<td>1,758.8</td>
<td>1,271.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GHG Emission in metric tonnes:</strong></td>
<td>7,691.4</td>
<td>7,742.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The emissions factors are taken from 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).*
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Greenpeace is an independent campaigning organisation that acts to change attitudes and behaviour, to protect and conserve the environment, and to promote peace, by

› Investigating and confronting environmental abuse
› Challenging the political and economical power of those who can effect change
› Driving environmentally-responsible and socially-just solutions that offer hope for this and future generations
› Inspiring people to take responsibility for the planet

For more information on Greenpeace and its structures:

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE
http://www.greenpeace.org/international/about/how-is-greenpeace-structured/management

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE
http://www.greenpeace.org/international/about/how-is-greenpeace-structured/governance-structure

LIST OF LICENSED GREENPEACE OFFICES
http://www.greenpeace.org/international/about/how-is-greenpeace-structured

LEGAL STRUCTURE
http://www.greenpeace.org/international/about/how-is-greenpeace-structured/legal-structure

FINANCIAL STRUCTURE
http://www.greenpeace.org/international/about/how-is-greenpeace-structured/financial

OUR CORE VALUES
http://www.greenpeace.org/international/about/our-core-values