India, February 2006
Challenging: a satellite image of the aircraft carrier Clemenceau en route to the Alang shipbreaking yards, taken on the day President Jacques Chirac recalled the ship to be dismantled. Greenpeace mounted a sustained campaign to demand that the Clemenceau - contaminated by asbestos and other toxic substances - be safely broken up in France.
© European Space Imaging
Annual Report 2006
In previous years we have labelled our Annual Reports with the year of issue. This year, we bring the report into line with common practice and its title (06) refers to the year covered by the report.
I am delighted to introduce this Annual Report - my first as Board Chair for Greenpeace International. Greetings, too, from my colleagues on the Greenpeace International Board, a group that brings together multi-cultural perspectives, and diverse realities, expertise and experience.

As the first Asian woman to head this organisation, I feel a special sense of both pride and opportunity to bring in perspectives from the ‘South’. I live in a small village on the West Coast of India, surrounded by small farming communities who depend on the annual monsoons for their livelihoods and survival. As I travel across the country by train, I see the visible signs of new life as women transplant rice; but also the trail of destruction and death that the monsoon rains bring every year in a land where millions are dependent on agriculture for their survival - a grim forecast of climate change in future.

Climate change will eventually affect all of us, but in India and across the developing world we already see its effects on the poor - those who have absolutely nothing in reserve to cope if disaster strikes. Ironically, India is also one of the emerging giants of carbon emissions, as the economy grows phenomenally, and more and more people aspire to the carbon-intensive lifestyles enjoyed by the West for so many decades.

The challenge for Greenpeace is to find new strategies and build new partnerships to create global change on climate and energy. We are increasingly dedicating our resources towards tackling these issues. Our recent publication “Energy [R]evolution” (www.energyblueprint.info), which sets out how we can meet the world’s energy needs while at the same time phasing out fossil fuels and nuclear energy, is a prime example of these efforts.

In this report you can find much more information about how, through strategic partnerships and independent action, we seek solutions to the many environmental challenges the world faces.

It is with a sense of achievement that I would also like to report briefly on the major governance decisions and activities of the Board in 2006:

– The 2006 Annual General Meeting (AGM) approved the decision to develop a formal Greenpeace presence in Africa, and to find and allocate resources to this;
– We continued to monitor closely the project to build a replacement for the Rainbow Warrior;
– We approved a five-year development plan for Greenpeace Russia;
– We evaluated the performance of the International Executive Director, Gerd Leipold, and reappointed him for a further term;
– We ensured the continued financial health of the organisation by timely and regular overview of the global finances;
– A new Board Chair (myself) was appointed after a thorough and well managed search process;
– Three new members, Ayesha Imam, Adam Werbach and Dimitrios Vassilikis, joined the Board in 2006.

Before signing off, I would like to express my thanks for the invaluable contribution of our former Board Chair - Anne Summers - who left office in December 2006 after serving two terms as Board Chair.

We invite you to read this report, and send us your comments and suggestions - not only on the report itself, but what you can do to make a difference.
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 International 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 National and Regional 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 at 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.

---

**Adam Werbach**

**Nationality and residence:** Adam is a US citizen and lives in San Francisco, USA

**Experience and expertise:** Communication, media for social change, NGO governance

**Term of office:** March 2006 - March 2008

---

**Dr Ayesha Imam**

**Nationality and residence:** Ayesha is Nigerian and lives in Dakar, Senegal

**Experience and expertise:** Women’s rights, human rights, democracy, sustainable development, NGO governance

**Term of office:** March 2006 - March 2009

---

**Fabio Feldman**

**Nationality and residence:** Fabio is Brazilian and lives in São Paulo, Brazil

**Experience and expertise:** International environmental law, sustainable development, climate change

**Term of office:** March 2007 - March 2010

---

**Dimitrios Vassilakis**

**Nationality and residence:** Dimitrios is Greek and lives in Athens, Greece

**Experience and expertise:** Human resources, governance, small ship construction and operation

**Term of office:** March 2006 - March 2009

---

**Lieven Denys**

**Nationality and residence:** Lieven is Belgian and lives in Brussels, Belgium

**Experience and expertise:** International tax law, human resource management, finance and accountancy, public interest litigation, international financing for sustainable development.

**First term of office:** May 2003 - March 2006

**Second term of office:** March 2006 - March 2008
During 2006, we worked with the European Renewable Energy Association and the German Aerospace Centre to produce a groundbreaking blueprint for cutting energy-related greenhouse gas emissions. Our Energy [R]evolution is a pragmatic plan demonstrating how to double energy efficiency by 2050 and then use renewable energy sources to provide over half of the planet’s power needs. Nuclear power can be phased out and fossil fuel use greatly reduced, while economic development, energy security and global equity can be promoted.

As I write, governments are moving to claim the fossil resources – minerals and fisheries – made reachable by climate change, made reachable by the thawing of the Arctic ice floes. It is an ominous sign and something Greenpeace opposes. Have we learned nothing? We can’t afford to burn the fossil resources we know exist. A now undeniable ‘carbon logic’ tells us that ruining pristine environments in the pursuit of new fossil fuel resources is nothing short of lunacy.

As climate awareness grows, the exploitation of planet Earth continues. We dredge fish out of the oceans faster than they can reproduce; destructive industrial fleets empty the waters where local fishermen once made a sustainable living. We cut down ancient forests to grow soya and to produce disposable wood and paper products such as toilet paper.

Throughout the year our most ambitious expedition ever, “Defending our Oceans”, highlighted the beauty and brutality, the splendour and stupidity, to be found on the high seas. We confronted whalers in the Southern Ocean, brought illegal fisheries to justice and challenged the rapacious appetite and destructive practice of ‘bottom trawling’. Greenpeace is calling for 40% of our oceans to be designated marine reserves, providing buffers from which marine resources can recover and replenish.

Along with the oceans, the forests are the lungs of our planet. In the Amazon, with the launch of a hard hitting report, “Eating up the Amazon”, we showed the direct link between deforestation to grow soya beans and how the beans in turn feed chickens for cheap meat used in Europe’s food industry.

In a short time we were working with the very companies we targeted, such as McDonald’s, who quickly declared their opposition to buying soya from newly deforested areas in the Amazon. A unique combination of environmentalists and companies brought about the declaration, in July, of a two-year moratorium on soya being planted in newly deforested areas of the Amazon. The moratorium also prohibits buying soya from farms using indentured or forced labour.

Greenpeace will continue telling inconvenient truths, we will continue working for solutions. But we recognise that we need partners. We need individuals, consumers, politicians and CEOs to take real action. The planet and our future generations expect - no, demand - nothing less!
In 2007, we aim to:

- Establish international recognition of the Energy [R]evolution as the strategy of choice for tackling climate change, and campaign against the expansion of nuclear power and coal.

- Consolidate the temporary moratorium on Amazon deforestation and make progress towards a permanent solution in this and other key areas such as the Democratic Republic of Congo and Indonesia.

- Defeat the attempts by pro-whaling nations to return to commercial whaling and lobby for an end to Japan’s so-called ‘scientific’ whaling policy.

- Build consensus for the establishment of marine reserves across 40% of the world’s oceans.

- Achieve commitments from the biggest IT manufacturers to remove toxic components and establish global take-back policies for end-of-life products.

Donated funds spending

Greenpeace is an independent organisation - we do not accept money from governments or corporations. Our funds come from the millions of individuals who share our vision for a green and peaceful planet. So, it’s important that we constantly strive to spend those donations as efficiently as we can.

Detailed financial accounts are available at the back of this document. As you will see from the accounts, 80.2% of our operating budget (excluding fundraising expenditure) is devoted to our campaigning work (up from 78.4% in 2005). Our clear priority is tackling the climate challenge through our Energy campaign. Our renewed commitment to campaign against whaling, and the 2006 global Defending Our Oceans voyage is reflected in the increased spending on our Oceans campaign in 2006. In 2007 and beyond, we aim to increase substantially the proportion of our resources spent on tackling climate change.
It’s official, climate change is real, human-made and potentially devastating. Gavin Edwards, Head of Climate and Energy Campaign, reviews a remarkable year and previews the revolutionary road ahead.

For twenty years, Greenpeace has been ringing the alarm bell on climate change. 2006 saw the issue finally come of age. Greenhouse gas emissions from human activity are altering the climate and threaten catastrophic impacts; in Nairobi, in November 2006, Environment Ministers from all over the world agreed with us that greenhouse gas emissions must be cut by more than half.

Greenpeace’s work highlighting the impacts of climate change, such as melting glaciers, drought in the Amazon and rising sea levels, has played a significant part in bringing the issue to the fore and obtaining this worldwide agreement. We continued to document disturbing evidence of climate impacts throughout the year.

However, Greenpeace is not only a purveyor of inconvenient truths - it also promotes convenient solutions. Together with the European Renewable Energy Council and the German Aerospace Centre, throughout the year Greenpeace developed a plan for a global Energy [R]evolution to help avert catastrophic climate change. It shows that energy efficiency can be doubled by 2050 and how renewable energy sources can then provide half of the planet’s power needs. Nuclear power can be phased out and fossil fuel use greatly reduced, while economic development, energy security and global equity can be promoted - bringing sustainable energy services to the one-third of the world’s population who currently have no reliable access to even the most basic energy services, such as lighting.

While climate rhetoric is increasing, plans are being drawn up for new climate-killing coal-fired power stations and new nuclear plants, and vast subsidies are being squandered on both. Greenpeace works to oppose false solutions to climate change and to promote its vision of a sustainable and equitable energy future.

26 April, 1986, was the day the name Chernobyl became synonymous with catastrophe: following a massive explosion, a radioactive cloud spread out across the globe. On the 20th anniversary, Greenpeace produced a scientific report estimating that the eventual death toll as a result of the accident could be up to 100,000 people, a far cry from the International Atomic Energy Agency’s claim of 4,000. Greenpeace photo exhibitions, in a number of countries, featured portraits of those living with the pernicious and debilitating effects of Chernobyl fallout: people living a ‘half life’. The images were harrowing: bedridden children, in excruciating pain with cancers and degenerative diseases, who need to be turned every fifteen minutes by parents who also suffer from chronic diseases; old people who eat mushrooms and burn firewood from woodland so radioactive that soil samples are treated as radioactive waste in Western Europe.

When we are told about the ‘benefits’ of nuclear power, we should first be looking into these people’s eyes.

2006 Campaign Achievements

* After years of campaigning, the Russian Federal Nuclear Energy Agency cancelled plans for the import - for storage and reprocessing - of nuclear power-generated radioactive wastes.

* An international team lobbied the Asian Development Bank (ADB) annual meeting in India, resulting in the ADB announcing a clean energy investment fund of 1 billion USD and a new policy for renewable energy projects.

* A combination of community protests and a 15,000 signature petition, coordinated by Greenpeace, forced the Philippine National Oil Company to withdraw its plans for an integrated coal mining and power station project.

* We petitioned the World Heritage Committee to list the Great Barrier Reef and the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park, in the US and Canada, because of climate change.
“Climate change is an invitation for an Energy Revolution: renewables and energy efficiency can combat climate change, improve energy security and provide more energy in the developing world.”

Gavin Edwards, Head of Climate and Energy Campaign

Investigating, exposing and confronting: in the shadow of the doomed Chernobyl nuclear power plant, Greenpeace safety advisors check levels of radioactive contamination. Twenty years after the disaster, a thirty-kilometer exclusion zone still surrounds the reactor testimony to the dangers of nuclear power. © Greenpeace/Morgan
Pat Venditti, Head of the Forests Campaign, reveals the background to a campaign to halt Amazon deforestation for soya farming, launched in April and won by July.

Soya is Brazil’s leading cash crop, and by 2006 soya farming - much of it illegal - had become one of the biggest drivers of Amazon deforestation. In 2004-2005 alone, an estimated 12,000 square kilometres of rainforest had been destroyed to grow soya beans, most of which were being exported to Europe to feed chickens, pigs and cows being raised for meat products.

Using satellite images, aerial surveillance, previously unreleased government documents and on-the-ground monitoring, Greenpeace tracked illegal rainforest soya grown in the Amazon to fast food restaurants and supermarkets across Europe.

Following a three-year investigation, in April we launched our campaign against the expansion of soya-related deforestation with a report called Eating Up the Amazon. We backed it up with action, and lots of it.

We targeted McDonald’s, one of Europe’s major buyers of Amazon soya-fed chicken. While seven-foot Greenpeace ‘chickens’ chained themselves to chairs in McDonald’s outlets, Greenpeace supporters inundated the company with protest emails and letters. McDonald’s responded quickly, agreeing to stop buying chicken raised on Amazon soya, and large supermarkets followed suit.

Karen van Bergen, Vice President of McDonald’s Europe said, “When we were first alerted to this issue by Greenpeace, we immediately reached out to our suppliers, other NGOs and other companies to resolve this issue and take action.”

Greenpeace then turned the spotlight on Amazon soya bean traders such as Cargill, a massive US corporation. In May, our ship, the Arctic Sunrise, arrived at Cargill’s illegally constructed soya export facility, in the heart of the Amazon, blockading the port. Meanwhile in Europe, we took action at Cargill’s facilities in the Netherlands, France and the UK.

With their customers expressing concern, and with Greenpeace activists at their front gates, Cargill, ADM, Bunge, Dreyfus, and Amaggi - collectively responsible for most of the Brazilian soya trade - came to the negotiating table.

On 24 July, they agreed to a two-year moratorium on trading in soya from newly deforested areas. They also agreed to work with the Brazilian Government, Greenpeace, other NGOs and civil society organisations in order to improve the mapping of the Amazon and to ensure that soya plantations in the region are properly monitored. Further, steps are to be taken to deal with land-grabbing and slave labour.

Greenpeace is demanding that the moratorium continues until proper procedures for legality and governance are in place and until there is an agreement with the Brazilian Government and key stakeholders on long-term protection for the Amazon rainforest.

Elsewhere, in the ‘Paradise Forests’ of Papua New Guinea, we established a Forest Rescue Station near Lake Murray following a request from local people. After several months we had helped people from 5 tribes and 42 clans regain control of their territory by mapping some 34,000 hectares of ancient forest. Along with local partners we helped train them in forest management, business skills and the use of a portable sawmill. With these skills, local people are now setting up eco-forestry businesses, providing a much-needed income while protecting the forest and its biodiversity.

2006 Campaign Achievements

★ 9.2 million hectares of the Amazon are protected from deforestation.
★ Two million hectares of Canada’s Great Bear Rainforest is protected from deforestation, with the remaining two-thirds of this forest committed to environmentally responsible management - the culmination of ten years’ hard campaigning.
★ Over 40% of the UK book publishing sector is now committed to Ancient Forest Friendly (AFF) policies.
★ We published the first ever detailed satellite mapping of the world’s remaining intact forests, providing a vital tool to hold governments and corporations to account.
“Tracking the chain of destruction from the Amazon rainforest to Chicken McNuggets in Europe, and taking direct action to break the links in that chain, is something only Greenpeace can do - it is this kind of work that leads to changes on the ground that will ultimately help protect the rainforest.”

Pat Venditti, Head of Forests Campaign
From great whales, to the ocean floor and back to shore, Shane Rattenbury, Head of the Oceans Campaign, looks back on Greenpeace’s most ambitious ship expedition.

From the depths of the Southern Ocean to the heights of mysterious seamounts, through storms, oil spills, volcanic eruptions and even war zones, all three Greenpeace ships played a part, alongside more than a million visitors to the website. The beauty and devastation in our oceans were highlighted in equal measure along with a demand for a network of marine reserves covering 40% of the world’s oceans.

The Esperanza took the lead, but with the simple mantra “individually we are a drop, together we are an ocean”, Greenpeace supporters were at the heart of the journey and key to our success.

The campaign proved whaling is bad for business when public pressure forced the financial backers of the Japanese whaling fleet to dump their shares, ending non-government support for the programme.

Stolen fish was taken off the menu after pirate ships, exposed and arrested in West Africa and Las Palmas for stealing fish from Africa, faced unprecedented fines from Spanish and Guinean authorities. More pirates were unmasked in the Pacific, and in Sweden illegal Baltic cod was taken off the shelves. Mediterranean tuna sadly did not get the protection needed when governments failed to cut quotas.

Unique images of deep-sea corals in the Azores delighted scientists and Greenpeace’s ‘Road Map To Recovery’ laid out a clear protection plan for governments for the first time, leaving them no more excuses for inaction.

Determined action from the crews of the Esperanza and the Rainbow Warrior helped clean up massive oil spills from a tanker in the Philippines and the bombing of an oil terminal in Lebanon, but still left marine life devastated.

There was better news when public pressure forced Dutch bank ABN AMRO to reconsider its ties with a Philippines mining company held responsible for ocean pollution.

In India it was time to sparkle when the Esperanza got the full Bollywood treatment, with the stars coming out to defend India’s coastline. Meanwhile, celebration of the declaration of the world’s largest marine reserve off Hawaii was balanced with the revelation of possibly the world’s largest rubbish dump right next door. Greenpeace scientists gathered garbage from microscopic to suitcase-sized in the “Trash Vortex” exposing the global problem of plastic pollution in our oceans. Mexico got the message, though, declaring part of the Gulf of Mexico a marine reserve following our visit.

As the Esperanza sailed into 2007 she came full circle back to the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary. The expedition is now over but the work to defend our oceans continues.

2006 Campaign Achievements

* We put oceans on the political map and political maps on the oceans – the first to outline a comprehensive network of marine reserves. We also changed many governments’ policies on deep ocean protection.

* Collaborations with scientists made the invisible visible – with cutting edge technology exploring the ocean floor and specialist equipment exposing what we dump there.

* Activists drove in front of whalers’ harpoons to save 82 whales; challenged supermarkets selling stolen fish; and exposed excessive fishing practices.

* With local communities we proved the benefits of marine reserves and showed the horrific impacts from pollution.

* We ensured corporations also saw the economic sense in stopping ocean pollution, not funding whaling, and refusing to buy stolen fish.
“Riding in that tiny inflatable in front of the Japanese harpoons in the Southern Ocean was not only a gruesome reminder of the need to end whaling, but is also a graphic display of the needless waste of ocean life across the globe through overfishing and the destruction of key habitats. If we want healthy oceans in the future we need marine reserves to protect them now.”

Shane Rattenbury, Head of Oceans Campaign
Toxic chemicals aren’t just present in e-waste exported to developing countries and in toxic barrels dumped in rivers, lakes and landfills. From the clothes we wear to the electronic devices we use, they are all around us. Olivia Langhoff, Head of the Toxics Campaign, recalls how Greenpeace has addressed these issues over the year.

In December 2006, the European Union finally approved a new chemical law to protect us from toxics in everyday products: REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemical substances).

Under REACH, companies will have to provide safety data for large volume chemicals that they produce or import into Europe. It also includes a mechanism for the substitution of persistent and bioaccumulative chemicals if safer alternatives exist. Further, it allows the public to request information about a limited number of hazardous chemicals if safer alternatives exist. Further, it allows the public to request information about a limited number of hazardous chemicals in products.

REACH, if properly enforced, will help reduce the use, they are all around us. Olivia Langhoff, Head of the Toxics Campaign, recalls how Greenpeace has addressed these issues over the year.

In a novel move, in Spain we worked with top names in fashion - including Mango and Camper - to create Moda Sin Tóxicos, a toxic-free fashion show. Designers provided a high-fashion model of the possible as they unveiled one-off outfits free from the hazardous chemicals commonly used in textiles. Mango and Camper both committed to implement substitution policies over the coming years.

In parallel, we took a new approach to the consumer electronics market, producing our first Guide to Greener Electronics. Mobile phone and PC brand leaders were named, shamed and ranked according to their public policies related to the environmental impact of their products. Not only was the presence of chemicals such as PVC and Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs) in their products listed but so were their systems for taking back products at the end of their useful life. Far too many toxic-laden electronic devices end up being dumped in the developing world, to be taken apart in the most rudimentary ways, exposing people - often children - and the environment to their deadly contents.

Not wishing to bear the stigma of coming last or even of poor performance, the companies soon began to compete. By the end of the year, many had started providing timelines for eliminating PVC and BFRs and had committed to recycling their products when discarded. Surprisingly at the bottom of the league, Apple - being the leader in innovation and design within the industry - refused to review its environmental policies and embrace the challenge. Rather than go head-to-head with the captains of Cupertino, we launched a special website aimed at Apple’s loyal customers - the only ones Steve Jobs really listens to. The message was simple: “I love my Apple. I just wish it came in Green.”
“High-fashion, high-tech, they all contain highly toxic substances. Working with companies and against bad practices, real progress is being made towards a toxic-free future.”

Olivia Langhoff, Head of Toxics Campaign

Spain, June 2006
Driving solutions: a fashion model wears a dress by designer Antonio Pernas at the “Moda Sin Toxics” show in Madrid. The Greenpeace event promoted toxic-free textiles and fabrics, with specially commissioned work from top designers. The show, in front of an invited audience of celebrities and VIPs, was covered by international fashion and news media.

©Greenpeace/Armestre
As country after country moves to ban genetically engineered crops and products, Olivia Langhoff, Head of the Genetic Engineering Campaign, reveals the true cost of rice for companies that mess with our food.

‘An act of God’, is how Bayer described a scandal in which its infamous herbicide-tolerant Liberty Link Rice 601 (LL601) contaminated products around the world. Field trials for this GE (genetically engineered) rice ended in failure in 2001 and it has not been approved for human consumption or planting anywhere in the world.

Following an admission by the US Department of Agriculture that significant quantities of US long-grain rice had been contaminated, Greenpeace moved quickly to buy and test supermarket products in a number of countries. Laboratory analysis revealed that the rogue rice had travelled far and wide; we found it in the UK, France, Germany and the Middle East. By November, it had been found in at least 24 countries.

Far from an ‘Act of God’, the Liberty Rice Scandal demonstrates that there is no such thing as a controlled field trial; contamination is inevitable and the only way to prevent it is to stop all GE planting.

Following Greenpeace’s testing - and subsequent testing by a number of European agencies - retailers, millers and processors announced that they would no longer deal in American long-grain rice. The chairman of Ebro Puleva, the world’s largest rice processor, wrote to Greenpeace saying: “We regret that US rice is facing a problem with GM (genetically modified) rice and have decided to stop any imports of US rice since August 2006”. Ebro Puleva is now committed to being GE-free. Already a bad business, GE is now officially bad for business. The EU, Russia and Japan have all issued import restrictions on US rice.

The fallout from this contamination scandal will have a long financial and legal half-life. The global food industry is now facing massive costs associated with the contamination. Following the scandal the price of US rice plummeted. Some 300 rice farmers have filed at least five multi-million dollar ‘class-action’ lawsuits in the US against Bayer, to recover lost income.

On the flipside, sensing a growing opportunity for true-food rice, traders in Thailand and Vietnam have declared GE-free policies. Together they account for over half of the rice traded on the world market.

Bayer was not the only rice contamination scandal of the year. In September, Greenpeace revealed the presence of illegal Chinese GE rice in a number of products in the UK, France and Germany.

Meanwhile, on 3 October, 2006, Greenpeace activists created giant crop circles in maize fields on three different continents to mark the beginning of a global campaign to protect maize - one of the world’s most important staple foods - against contamination from genetically engineered crops. The crop circles - large enough to be clearly visible from the air - appeared in fields in Spain, the Philippines and Mexico.
“With genetically engineered food now as uneconomic as it is unacceptable, governments in countries that grow or import GE must stop placing farmers, consumers, industry and the environment at such high risk.”

Olivia Langhoff, Head of Genetic Engineering Campaign

Driving solutions: a one million-signature petition against Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) is stretched around the headquarters of the European Commission. Greenpeace activists were assembled to draw attention to the use of imported animal feed.

© Greenpeace/Fristick
Working for nuclear disarmament and peace is made all the more complicated by hypocrisy on the international stage. Nicky Davies, Peace and Disarmament campaigner, calls on the nuclear weapons states to lead by the force of their example and not by the example of their force.

Greenpeace spent the year working for diplomacy, consistency and an end to nuclear double standards.

In 2006 there were 480 US nuclear weapons stationed across Europe: in Germany, Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey and the UK. These cold war relics remained under the banner of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation), each with a destructive capacity up to ten times greater than the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima.

On the morning of 8 June, a Greenpeace truck carrying a full-size 3.6 metre replica of a US B61 nuclear bomb - the type stationed in Europe - blocked the entrance to NATO’s Brussels headquarters. Activists, entering the site carrying banners declaring “Nukes out of NATO”, took up position on the NATO symbol while others dropped a two-metre-square banner, repeating the message, from the main building.

The action was timed to coincide with the arrival of NATO Defence Ministers for a key meeting on the future of the Organisation. Greenpeace believes that NATO’s future must be nuclear-free. The action was backed by the results of Greenpeace-commissioned opinion polls showing that 70% of Europeans living in those countries with US nuclear weapons want to live in a nuclear weapons-free Europe. It is scarcely credible that the very leaders who were imposing sanctions on Iran for developing uranium enrichment technology - which could potentially be used to produce nuclear weapons materials - were at the same time collectively refusing to discuss removing actual nuclear weapons from their own soil.

Meanwhile, in the UK - another country staking a claim on the moral high ground in international efforts to dissuade North Korea and Iran from developing nuclear weapons - the Blair Government took a lead in the ‘nuclear do as I say and not as I do’ school of diplomacy. The government pushed ahead with plans to replace the Trident nuclear weapons system, committing the country to another 30 years of nuclear weapons possession.

We commissioned a legal analysis which demonstrated the illegality of replacing Trident, and provided a briefing to British parliamentarians based on Greenpeace research. This briefing outlined how the £76 billion lifetime-cost of a Trident replacement system could instead help make a major contribution to tackling the real threats we face today - global warming and energy security. For example, spending £76 billion on simply making housing in Britain more energy efficient would save 44% of residential carbon emissions - reducing the UK’s total carbon emissions by 12% and would be recouped within ten years through energy cost savings. That money could then be reinvested in other efficiency measures, reducing total UK carbon emissions by nearly one quarter.

2006 Campaign Achievements

* During the Israel-Lebanon war the Greenpeace flagship, Rainbow Warrior, delivered 75 tons of essential medical aid to Lebanon on behalf of Médecins Sans Frontiers.
* Following the conflict, the Rainbow Warrior returned to Lebanon at the request of the government to document oil spill contamination on the sea bed resulting from the war. In Northern Israel, we documented war-related damage to forests.
* Following North Korea’s nuclear weapons test activities, we protested outside Democratic People’s Republic of Korea embassies across the world.
* We gave a presentation to the UN’s First Committee on disarmament, facilitated meetings between women from the US and Iran with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and discussed peace and security with Israel’s military thinktank.
Brussels, June 2006
Nukes Out of NATO: a full-size replica of a US B61 bomb blocks the entrance of the NATO headquarters in Belgium. Greenpeace demands the removal of 480 US owned and controlled nuclear weapons from Europe, located in six countries under NATO’s nuclear sharing agreement. ©Greenpeace/Philip Reynaers

“By ordering the removal of the US NATO nuclear weapons, European leaders have the opportunity to meet the demands of their citizens, strengthen the position of Europe in negotiations with the Middle East and Russia, and take a tangible step towards achieving a nuclear weapons-free future.”
Donna Mattfield, Disarmament Campaigner
We present in our Annual Report of 2006 not only the financial statements for Greenpeace International and its related affiliates, but also combined statements including the Greenpeace National and Regional Offices. We present these to provide transparency and accountability for our supporters and provide an overview of the combined income, expenditure, assets and liabilities of all the Greenpeace entities worldwide.

These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as adopted by the EU. All expenditure categories include salaries, direct costs and allocated overheads (for example, building costs, depreciation).

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 27.

Since 6 June, 2006, Greenpeace International and ten other international non-governmental organisations have signed the INGO Accountability Charter, which outlines a common commitment to enhance transparency and accountability.

Greenpeace International continues to prioritise the assessment and identification of areas in which it can improve in this respect. Our aim is to ensure that existing policies, procedures and guidelines and, as necessary, additional policies, are put in place, to govern effectively, among other things, aspects of information disclosure, handling external complaints, security principles, and financial and personnel policies. As these policies are reviewed and finalised over the coming months, they will be made available on our public website.

Full details of the International Non-Governmental Organisations Accountability Charter can be found at http://www.ingoaaccountabilitycharter.org
Greenpeace 'Worldwide' Combined Abbreviated Financial Statements

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

In 2006, the total gross income from fundraising for Greenpeace worldwide was EUR 171.4 million, 1% higher than in 2005. Excluding major donations received by Greenpeace International in 2005 and 2006, gross fundraising income actually increased by 4%. The total number of Greenpeace supporters rose from approximately 2.7 million globally at the end of 2005 to approximately 2.8 million by the end of 2006.

Worldwide fundraising expenditure, at EUR 49.2 million (or approximately 29% of the total fundraising income), was 12% higher than in 2005. This increase reflects a greater investment in the acquisition of new supporters. Campaign and campaign-related expenditure increased globally by 4% from EUR 93.8 million in 2005 to EUR 97.3 million in 2006. Allocation of costs across the various campaigns changes from year to year depending on campaign priorities and the timing of campaign work during the year. Organisation support costs across Greenpeace worldwide were reduced by 7% during the year. This was due to an exceptional VAT refund of nearly EUR 2.5 million, received by one of the Greenpeace National Offices, being credited against organisational support costs. Excluding this item, organisational support costs increased overall by approximately 3%.

Years ended 31 December 2006 and 2005. All amounts are thousands of Euros

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

### Income and Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants and Donations</td>
<td>171,367</td>
<td>169,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>3,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising and Licensing</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>177,021</td>
<td>173,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Expenditure</td>
<td>49,205</td>
<td>44,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>127,816</td>
<td>129,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure:

#### Campaigns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oceans</td>
<td>9,694</td>
<td>7,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>10,327</td>
<td>9,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>7,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxics</td>
<td>4,697</td>
<td>4,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate &amp; Energy</td>
<td>15,865</td>
<td>15,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Disarmament</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>3,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campaigns</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; Communications</td>
<td>16,135</td>
<td>14,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Operations &amp; Action Support</td>
<td>20,386</td>
<td>19,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>9,263</td>
<td>10,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political, Science &amp; Business</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>1,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organisational Support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,097</td>
<td>25,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Non-Fundraising Expenditure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121,399</td>
<td>119,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Surplus for the Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,417</td>
<td>9,743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Opening Fund Balance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120,588</td>
<td>109,384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Translation Profit/(Loss):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1,449</td>
<td>1,461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Closing Fund Balance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125,556</td>
<td>120,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Balance Sheet

#### Fixed Assets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,070</td>
<td>23,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Current Assets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Assets</td>
<td>15,856</td>
<td>14,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>119,674</td>
<td>116,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>159,600</td>
<td>154,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Liabilities</td>
<td>34,044</td>
<td>33,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>125,556</td>
<td>120,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities &amp; Fund Balance</td>
<td>159,600</td>
<td>154,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPILED REPORT:** On the basis of information provided by management, we have compiled these financial statements of the World Wide Greenpeace Organisation for the year 2006, consisting of the combined financial statements of Greenpeace International and the Greenpeace National and Regional Offices, for purposes of their presentation in conformity with International Financial Reporting Standards as adopted by the EU. These financial statements are the responsibility of management. We have not audited or reviewed these financial statements and, accordingly, express no assurance thereon.

Amstelveen, 10 October 2007

KPMG Accountants NV

Y.M. Wilders RA
Greenpeace International Combined Abbreviated Financial Statements

Greenpeace International (Stichting Greenpeace Council) acts as the co-ordinating 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 dropped by 3 million euros (7%) in 2006, due to the fact that 2005 income had included exceptional major gift income. Campaign and Media & Communications expenditure increased by 1.5 million euros (9%) in 2006. As 2005 saw higher-than-normal ships’ operational costs due to campaign demands and exceptional maintenance costs, there was a reduction of 1.5 million euros in this year’s Marine Operations & Action Support costs.

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 2006 was less than 0.1 million euros.

### Income and Expenditure 2006 2005

#### Income:
- Grants from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices: 40,569 39,071
- Other Grants and Donations: 1,447 6,151
- Merchandising and Licensing: 32 88
- Interest: 569 375
- Other Income: 23 0
- **Total Income**: 42,640 45,685

#### Expenditure:
- Grants to Greenpeace National and Regional Offices: 7,360 6,782
- Campaigns:
  - Oceans: 3,991 3,310
  - Forests: 3,322 2,586
  - GE: 1,726 1,822
  - Toxics: 1,452 1,559
  - Climate & Energy: 3,994 4,329
  - Peace & Disarmament: 907 651
- Media & Communications: 3,488 3,121
- Marine Operations and Action Support: 8,357 9,864
- Public Information and Outreach: 0 13
- Fundraising-Related Expenditure: 1,188 1,116
- **Total Expenditure**: 41,771 41,635

#### Surplus for the Year
- 869 4,050

#### Opening Fund Balance
- 20,428 16,371

#### Translation (Loss)
- 78 7

#### Closing Fund Balance
- 21,375 20,428

### Balance Sheet

#### Fixed Assets
- 5,158 5,857

#### Current Assets:
- Loans to Greenpeace National and Regional Offices: 2,640 460
- Due from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices: 3,139 4,158
- Other Debtors: 1,058 1,155
- **Total Assets**: 33,200 33,477

#### Liabilities
- Due to Greenpeace National and Regional Offices: 7,240 8,034
- Other Liabilities: 4,585 5,015
- Fund Balance: 21,375 20,428
- **Total Liabilities & Fund Balance**: 33,200 33,477

---

**AUDITORS’ REPORT.** We have audited the combined financial statements for the year 2006 of Greenpeace International, Amsterdam, from which the combined abbreviated financial statements set out on this page were derived, in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as adopted by the EU. In our report dated 17 August 2007 we expressed an unqualified audit opinion on the financial statements from which these combined abbreviated financial statements were derived. These financial statements are the responsibility of Greenpeace International management. In our opinion, the combined abbreviated financial statements set out on this page are consistent, in all material respects, with the financial statements from which they were derived. Amsterdam, 10 October 2007

KPMG ACCOUNTANTS NV
Y.M. Wilders RA
Account Notes
(1) Organisational Support Expenditure: Organisational support includes the costs of the Executive Director’s Office and the Information Technology, Legal, Finance, Human Resources and Governance departments. It also includes any adjustments necessary following an assessment of the collectibility of balances receivable from Greenpeace National and Regional offices. The reduction in organisational support costs in 2006 is related to the reduced provision deemed necessary against these balances.
(2) 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.
(3) Amounts due from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices: Balances receivable from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices are subject to assessments of their collectibility.
(4) Cash and Cash Equivalents: 83% of the cash balance at the end of 2006 was held in the form of interest-bearing deposit accounts. 17% was held on current account, which mainly consisted of payments received from Greenpeace National and Regional Offices shortly before the year end.

Reserves Policy
Greenpeace International’s reserves policy is to hold available reserves equating to approximately 3 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 per 31 December, 2006 is calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Euros million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Fixed Assets</td>
<td>(5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Designated Reserves</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This equates to approximately 3.2 months of expenditure (based on the 2007 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 funds held for investment in fundraising initiatives of Greenpeace National and Regional Offices, and for the purchase of office space for Greenpeace Russia.

Remuneration of Board Members and the Senior Management Team
Greenpeace International remunerates the Chair and Members of its Board at levels reflecting the professional time and responsibility these 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 5 to 7 during the course of the year) of Greenpeace International received remuneration during 2006 of EUR 105,000 (EUR 102,000 in 2005). The Board Chair received EUR 50,000 and all other Board Members received EUR 10,000.

Total emoluments of EUR 705,000 (EUR 700,000 in 2005) were paid to the Senior Management Team (7 positions in all) and may be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Euros thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>705</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emoluments paid to the Senior Management Team are commensurate with their level of responsibility. The International Executive Director, the highest paid member of the Senior Management Team, received total emoluments of EUR 134,201, including salary of EUR 113,036, employer’s pension contribution of EUR 18,151 and other benefits to the value of EUR 3,014.
Greenpeace International is committed to ensuring that its environmental footprint is kept as small as possible, and to implementing measures to be certain that the impact of its operations on the Earth's resources is reduced as far as possible.

A Green Office
All office products are carefully chosen to ensure that we use the greenest options possible. We only use 100% post-consumer recycled paper that is free from chlorine bleach and optical whitening agents. Our office cleaners use environmentally friendly cleaning products. Our drinks machines contain organic fair-trade coffee and tea. Centralised “recycling areas” in the office help to ensure that everything we dispose of is recycled correctly.

Energy Efficient Equipment
Our Electronics Policy guides us in making the best choices for various forms of office equipment, aiming to ensure that the highest standards in energy efficiency are incorporated. Centralised office printing facilities, using reconditioned machines that would normally have been thrown away, mean that our staff use only three machines in the entire office. This saves us energy, paper and toner. We use flat-screen monitors for our PCs, which use less energy than traditional monitors.

Travel and Meetings Policy
An International Travel and Meetings Policy is in place to reduce the environmental impact of our meetings. The main focus is on the careful selection of location in order to keep travelling to a minimum. We also work closely with venues to tailor the facilities to our needs regarding food provided and office supplies used.

Alternatives to face-to-face meetings, such as video and Internet conferencing, have been increasingly adopted since the introduction of the policy, and are encouraged throughout the worldwide Greenpeace organisation.

Public Transport Travel Cards
Approximately 70% of our staff commute primarily by bicycle.

In order to keep travel costs down and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that would be otherwise incurred through the use of private transport, every Greenpeace International employee based in the Netherlands is entitled to a public transport travel card, enabling them to travel to work and meetings in the Netherlands using all forms of public transport. We also participate in a national scheme that enables employers to purchase bicycles for their employees who regularly commute by bicycle for more than 50% of the time.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions
We are now in the third year of this long-term project. Having been able to identify areas in which we can make further reductions in future, we’ve also revised some of the underlying assumptions we made for our 2005 report.

While our 2005 figures have now been revised upwards to reflect the more stringent approach we are taking in ensuring our evaluation is as comprehensive as possible, we are happy to note that the 2006 figures subsequently show a reduction in our emissions, and therefore a clear improvement in our efforts to reduce our own environmental footprint.

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). While WBCSD and WRI are the facilitators, the GHG Protocol is being built by a coalition of businesses, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), government and inter-governmental organisations. The GHG Protocol figures are based on figures from DEFRA (UK Department for Food, Environment and Rural Affairs) in July 2005.
# Greenpeace International GHG (CO2) Emissions

## Scope 1: Direct GHG Emissions
- Direct CO2 emissions for marine transportation (including inflatables) in metric tons: 6812.8 7403.7
- Direct CO2 emissions for helicopter transportation in metric tons: 34.5 36.8
- Direct CO2 emissions for natural gas in metric tons: 55.2 58.7
- Total Scope 1 CO2 emissions in metric tons: 6902.5 7499.2

## Scope 2: Indirect GHG Emissions - Electricity
- Indirect CO2 emissions for office electricity in metric tons: 179.5 148.5
- Indirect CO2 emissions for server electricity in metric tons: 2.8 2.8
- Total Scope 2 CO2 emissions in metric tons: 182.3 151.3

## Scope 3: Other Indirect GHG Emissions
- Total CO2 emissions in metric tons, business travel: 1501.5 1463.7

## Total GHG Emissions in Metric Tons:
- Total GHG emissions in metric tons: 8586.3 9114.2

*2005 figures have been revised upwards to reflect the more stringent approach we are taking in ensuring our evaluation is as comprehensive as possible.
## Our Ships

### The Rainbow Warrior
- **Port of registry:** Amsterdam, Netherlands
- **Date of charter:** 1987
- **Number of berths:** 28
- **Inflatable boats:** 1 outboard RIB and 4 inflatables
- **Call sign:** PC 8024
- **Built:** 1957 by Cochrane & Sons, Selby, UK
- **Gross tonnage:** 555
- **Length:** 55.20m
- **Breadth:** 8.5m
- **Draught:** 4.6m
- **Maximum speed:** 12 knots
- **Engines:** 2 Diesel type Deutz M.W.M. 2 x 6 Cylinder, 2 x 500kW
- **Sailing Speed:** 5-7 knots average
- **Sails:** 650m²
- **Max Airdraft:** 41m

### The Esperanza
- **Port of registry:** Amsterdam, Netherlands
- **Former Name:** Echo Fighter
- **Date of charter:** 2000
- **Number of berths:** 33
- **Inflatable boats:** 2 large RIBs and 4 small inflatables
- **Call sign:** PD 6464
- **Built:** 1984 Poland Gdansk
- **Gross tonnage:** 2076 BRT
- **Length:** 72.3m
- **Breadth:** 14.3m
- **Draught:** 4.7m
- **Maximum speed:** 14 knots
- **Engines:** 5.876 BHP, 2 x 2.938 BHP Sulzer V12
- **Aux engines:** 2 x Deutz BF6M716 208hp (175 kva)
- **Bow & stern thrusters:** 400hp each

### The Arctic Sunrise
- **Port of registry:** Amsterdam, Netherlands
- **Former name:** Polarbjorn
- **Date of charter:** 1995
- **Number of berths:** 28
- **Inflatable boats:** 2 RIBs and 2 inflatables
- **Helicopter capable:** Yes
- **Call sign:** PCTK
- **Built:** 1975 by AS Vaagen Vert
- **Gross tonnage:** 949 tonnes
- **Length:** 49.62m
- **Breadth:** 11.50m
- **Maximum Draught:** 5.30m
- **Main engine:** MAK 9M452AK 2495 IHP 1619kW
- **Aux engines:** 2 x Deutz BF6M716 208hp (175 kva)
- **Bow & stern thrusters:** 400hp each
Greenpeace is an independent global campaigning organisation that acts to change attitudes and behaviour, to protect and conserve the environment and to promote peace.

greenpeace.org