Where law meets the planet’s needs
We believe that by changing law we can transform the planet around us
Our unique position as Europe’s leading experts on environmental issues continues to gain recognition

In January we opened the doors to our Polish office and launched a report providing advice on how to protect Poland’s remarkable and fragile biodiversity. Our Warsaw team is also working to support Poland’s transition to a sustainable, low-carbon energy future.

In April we opened the European Union Aarhus Centre, a body dedicated to promoting environmental justice and citizens’ rights within the EU. We successfully took the European Food Safety Authority to the European Court of Justice for withholding information about pesticides in food – a victory for consumers and a breakthrough for access to information.

In May our forest team continued its work against global deforestation through advocacy around the EU Timber Regulation, public procurement law, and laws compelling increased demand for bioenergy. We have begun working with African forest communities to improve forest governance and made a significant impact on debates in Durban on the content and role of social and environmental safeguards for REDD+ (REDD+ aims to reduce emissions from deforestation as part of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change).

In August we submitted the first ever environmental ‘friend-of-the-court’ brief by a European organisation in a U.S. environmental legal case, launched a comprehensive legislative model for the UK’s Green Investment Bank in the UK Parliament, and challenged the Spanish Government on its artificial support for its coal industry.

In December we rounded off the year in the UK’s High Court. Our judicial review of Defra’s plans for tackling air pollution forced the Government to admit that they are breaching laws put in place to protect people’s health.

January 2011
In January we opened the doors to our Polish office and launched a report providing advice on how to protect Poland’s remarkable and fragile biodiversity. Our Warsaw team is also working to support Poland’s transition to a sustainable, low-carbon energy future.

January also saw the launch of our report on the mislabelling of seafood products in the UK. We brought the UK’s major supermarkets into a coalition working to achieve sustainable seafood sourcing. We continue to support Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall’s Fish Fight campaign with scientific, legal and campaign advice. The 760,000 people who signed up to the campaign demonstrate the public appetite for ensuring resilient seas and sustainable fishing practices. We published a series of legal and scientific briefings explaining how this can be achieved through radical and effective reform of Europe’s common fisheries policy.
Six years ago, we put together a business plan for establishing the first public interest law charity in Europe. Public interest means the people’s general welfare and well being – something in which the populace as a whole has a stake. Law represents the mores by which a civil society wishes to live and be governed. ClientEarth is the people’s law group acting on behalf of and representing the people’s environmental values.

Yes, public interest law is about litigation when needed - we have had wins in court in Poland and at EU level in 2011 - but ClientEarth demonstrates that it is about far more than that.

This year we had successes in parliaments in Brussels, London and Warsaw. We built a unique coalition of supermarkets in the UK to improve the sustainability of fisheries. We were deeply involved in efforts to create a UK Green Investment Bank. We began to work on forest issues in Central Africa. Our reputation also grew, and more law and policy makers, judges and NGOs came to trust our work and to turn to us for expertise. People are beginning to appreciate that we can turn policy into law, and that we then enforce it.

It’s also important for us to highlight the less sexy but ultimately essential attention to business management that took place in 2011. We strengthened our finance, development and communications teams and had the entire staff participate in articulating our vision, mission and values.

Our work in building the organisation continues to keep pace with our extraordinary growth rate. We added a substantial number of new staff to our team across Europe and a new office in Warsaw, Poland. We expect our growth rate to continue in 2012 and we are ready for this growth. We are ready to bring our skills to the issues, and the power of the law to addressing the foremost problems of our time.

ClientEarth has grown into a highly professional legal non-profit group that passes the test and earns the trust of its supporters. It accomplishes extraordinary work with the passion of good that it represents. Well done ClientEarth!

Winsome McIntosh  
Chair of the Board of Trustees

James Thornton  
CEO
Programme areas
Environmental law and justice

This year we helped more NGOs to negotiate the often complicated processes for gaining access to information from Europe’s institutions and governments. The major programme development was to set up the European Union Aarhus Centre headed by Professor Ludwig Krämer. The Centre, based in our Brussels office, focuses on ensuring effective implementation of the Aarhus Convention, a law to help citizens gain access to information and public participation in decision making. We look forward to helping more NGOs through the Centre in 2012.

Another ongoing campaign for us concerns a proposal from the European Commission that will restrict citizens’ rights to information. We put together a campaign calling for Members of the European Parliament to protect the transparency of the EU and were backed by around 250 NGOs and investigative journalists.

We challenged the refusal of the European Commission to provide access to studies on the way EU Member States transpose environmental directives into national law. Once before the Court, the Commission gave us partial access, but refused to disclose studies in which the consultants found the transpositions weren’t done correctly. We’re still challenging this decision as we think citizens have the right to know.

We have continued to monitor the European Investment Bank (EIB), the EU’s long term lending institution. The EU has adopted a decision on the conditions under which the EIB can lend to developing countries for the promotion of projects outside the EU. This will now benefit from being underwritten by the EU. We managed to insert some guarantees about transparency and better monitoring of the loans made by the EIB and will continue to watch throughout 2012.

We launched the European Union Aarhus Centre to provide advice to citizens on access to information, participation and the courts.

Visit the EU Aarhus Centre website: www.clientearth.org/aarhus-centre/
Throughout the year we continued to work with celebrity chef Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall’s television campaign Fish Fight, providing the production team with legal and scientific advice. The campaign now has over 760,000 individual supporters. In January, we released a report looking at the findings of our investigation into misleading environmental labels on seafood products sold in UK supermarkets. This work featured in the programmes on Channel 4, when Hugh confronted the supermarket Tesco with the report’s findings.

The report also showed supermarkets how they could overcome inconsistencies in their seafood labelling. Within four months, the UK’s biggest supermarkets and seafood retailers had joined our Sustainable Seafood Coalition. The Coalition, which includes Tesco, Waitrose, Morrisons, Sainsbury’s and Marks & Spencer, is working to agree higher standards for sustainability labelling and for stores to stock a more diverse range of sustainable fish.

The Sustainable Seafood Coalition is working to protect Europe’s fish stocks

The Sustainable Seafood Coalition is a unique partnership of supermarkets, suppliers and other seafood businesses and organisations leading the way for sustainable seafood in the UK. Find out more: www.clientearth.org/ssc
Our collaboration with Fish Fight also led us to put together a letter-writing campaign urging UK citizens to write to their MPs calling on them to support an Early Day Motion (EDM) in the House of Commons. The EDM, which we wrote in collaboration with our patron Zac Goldsmith MP allowed us to put together a common fisheries policy motion to the House which was passed by the politicians. Our EDM attracted the second highest number of MP’s signatures of any EDM in the parliamentary session.

Revision of Europe’s disastrous common fisheries policy (CFP) also began in earnest in 2011. In July, Fisheries Commissioner Maria Damanaki announced the European Commission’s proposal for a new CFP, saying: “75 per cent of EU fish stocks are still overfished... if we don’t make structural changes to the way we do business now, we will lose one fish stock after the other.” ClientEarth immediately looked at the scientific and legal ways in which the proposal could be strengthened to stop overfishing, and we have been working to help Europe’s parliamentarians get it right and continue to do so into 2012.

The year ended with further collaboration with Fish Fight, when we enabled the public to write to their elected officials. This time over 60,000 e-mails were sent to Members of the European Parliament, letting them know that their constituents care about the future of fish and urging them to vote. Look out for further collaboration like this in 2012.

Oil spill liability

In January, the UK Parliament’s Energy and Climate Change Committee released a report looking at the implications of the Gulf of Mexico oil spill. ClientEarth gave evidence to them in 2010. The parliamentary committee agreed with us that oil spill liability and compensation systems across Europe are grossly inadequate and that taxpayers would have to pick up the bill in future spills. In May, we made detailed submissions to the European Commission’s consultation on the EU’s legal framework for oil drilling, and at the end of the year saw a number of our suggestions reflected in the Commission’s proposals for a new offshore safety and environmental protection law.

The political context for EU action on climate remained challenging in 2011. The Commission sought ways to move forward in the face of resistance from some Member States and industry. ClientEarth assessed the legal options and put forward proposals on how to tighten the cap on greenhouse gas emissions under the EU emissions trading scheme. The Commission’s preferred approach for a set-aside of allowances achieves a similar result and should be introduced in 2012.

In the energy efficiency arena, we continued work with the Coalition for Energy Savings, a broad coalition of civil society and business stakeholders, to influence the EU Energy Efficiency Directive. Progress was made in the European Parliament’s industry committee to improve the Commission’s proposal, and our expert advice to the legislators resulted in a positive vote on a number of our amendments on energy efficiency in public procurement.

Programme areas
Climate and energy

Our work on Poland’s coal sector in 2011 led to our first Polish court victory

Read a report on our work to improve Poland’s power sector in The Guardian: http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/jul/11/coal-energy?INTCMP=SRCH
In September 2010, the European Commission declared to be legal Spanish subsidies for power stations using domestic coal. This decision could open the door for other Member States to prop up their coal sectors at the expense of progress on climate change. We applied to intervene in five cases at the EU General Court to present the environmental side of the case. These cases will progress in 2012.

F-gases, found in products such as refrigerators and air-conditioning units, have a severe effect on climate change but their effects are short lived; limiting their use could achieve swift and meaningful gains in Europe’s efforts to tackle climate change. We published a report showing how cost-effective regulation of these ‘super-greenhouse gases’ could mitigate the equivalent of five billion tonnes of carbon dioxide.

We also presented legal research to a high level gathering of stakeholders, successfully demonstrating how the EU could introduce measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from maritime shipping in line with EU and international law. The Commission recognised our contribution demonstrating the legality of EU action and our work has cleared the way to deal with international shipping’s climate-forcing emissions.

Green Investment Bank

According to our partner organisation Transform UK, our legal and policy work was ‘crucial’ to securing a government commitment to establishing the Green Investment Bank in legislation. We showed that the Green Investment Bank needs to be set in legislation to secure its independence, permanence and to instil investor confidence for the future. We developed detailed legislative proposals to show how it can be done. We launched this in a report in the House of Commons where our director of programmes, Karla Hill, made a speech alongside the UK’s first Green Party MP, Caroline Lucas. The Government is drafting legislation to be released in 2012.

Sustainable energy future in Poland

In June, the Polish government adopted legislation with the aim of securing valuable free emissions allowances for its power sector in breach of EU and national law. We brought a series of legal challenges when Polish authorities subsequently issued greenhouse gas emissions permits to 13 ineligible, unbuilt coal fossil fuel power plant projects. On behalf of a group of NGOs, we also submitted a complaint to the European Commission about Poland’s incorrect transposition of the EU emissions trading scheme directive. After extensive investigations in Poland, we submitted 100s of pages of evidence to the Commission demonstrating that the projects do not satisfy legal criteria for free allowances. The cases will be decided in 2012.

We have also raised concerns about failures to properly assess the environmental impacts of projects. In September, we challenged the granting of a pollution permit for the proposed Polnoc power station before the Ministry for Environmental Protection. The Ministry agreed that the plant would pollute the protected Vistula River and that the proper environmental assessments had not been carried out before the permit was issued. This was upheld by the Polish administrative court.

This work also led to our first Polish court victory (in January 2012) where our staff lawyer successfully argued that another proposed coal power plant at Opole had not been adequately assessed for its carbon capture readiness, in contravention of the law. This decision sends a clear message to investors in new fossil fuel power stations that they must consider future carbon emissions and carbon capture and storage before they proceed. Through our work on these issues we hope to help drive investment in this important EU Member State towards a more sustainable energy future.

Friends of the U.S. Court

In August, we submitted the first amicus curiae (friend-of-court) brief by a European organisation in a U.S. environmental court case. It will be heard in a series of legal challenges brought by U.S. fossil fuel industries and others against the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) over its regulation of carbon pollution. Our brief highlighted that greenhouse gases from the U.S. contribute to harmful consequences in the EU and the rest of the world (the transboundary harm implications of the case), and secondly, that the EU has regulated greenhouse gases since around 2005 while maintaining a position of economic strength.

In September we challenged the granting of a pollution permit for the proposed Polnoc power station on the protected Vistula River
London’s air pollution is a serious health problem and, with the Olympics coming in 2012, risks becoming a national embarrassment. In 2011, ClientEarth succeeded in increasing awareness about London’s air pollution and in bringing London closer to complying with legal limits for air quality.

Our judicial review forced the UK Government into a U-turn before it had even got to the High Court. In the face of our legal action they launched a public consultation on London’s air quality plan, allowing citizens, NGOs and campaigners to make their voices heard about the best way to sort out London’s air pollution.

At the hearing in the High Court our case forced the Government to admit it is in breach of its legal obligations under the EU air quality directive. We had considerable success in using this win to underline the problem of air pollution. Look out for further progress in 2012.

In addition to this work we participated in public consultations on national strategies relevant to air quality, notably the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Olympic Transport Plan, as we are concerned that flaws in the plan will actually exacerbate the capital’s air pollution problems. With the Olympics just around the corner, we need to ensure they leave a lasting legacy for Londoners’ health.

We compelled the government to admit it was breaching European Union air pollution limits – an important step on the road to clean air. Read about our case on the BBC: http://bbc.in/tCzUQJ
Programme areas
Health and the environment

We believe that pesticides harmful for human health and the environment shouldn’t be allowed in the EU

Toxics

We don’t believe that pesticides harmful for human health and the environment should be allowed in the EU. We are fighting to ensure this with greater transparency in the EU’s scientific committees and agencies. We are also working to help people understand more about the chemicals and dangerous substances they are exposed to in everyday products, a continuing priority for us moving forward.

Our work in 2011 successfully made the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) and the European Commission more transparent. We have done this with the strategic use of access to document requests, so that “confidential” information is made available.

After we launched a court case against the ECHA for access to the names of chemical substance producers, the agency is now making them public. We built on this by pushing for more information on chemicals through a number of strategic access-to-documents requests.

We have defended citizens’ right to be informed about the implementation of the REACH Regulation (the law for the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and restriction of Chemicals) by obtaining and publishing the reports submitted by all EU Member States to the European Commission. We obliged the EFSA to hand over documents related to its decision making process and this informed legal proceedings we brought in front of the European Court of Justice.
We work with African forest communities to advocate legal reform and to improve forest governance in Ghana, Gabon and Congo

Our programme is about protecting forests and the communities that rely on them. Find out more here: http://bit.ly/Olw8Qx

Our forest team remained intensively engaged in work addressing key drivers of deforestation throughout 2011. Following the EU’s adoption of the Timber Regulation (the law to counter the trade in illegally harvested timber) our briefings explained the due diligence that those placing timber on the EU market were obliged to carry out. We also explained the steps that the EU and Member States must take to effectively implement the regulation.

In July, we sued the European Commission for their lack of transparency over how existing biofuels criteria will be implemented. We also analysed approaches to ensuring that the EU’s use of bioenergy can achieve climate mitigation aims and making sure it does not exceed what can be sustainably supplied.

As part of our programme’s expansion, we began working with African forest communities to empower them to advocate legal reform and improve forest governance in Ghana, Gabon and Congo. We look forward to strengthening these relationships in 2012.

We were also at the Climate Summit at Durban where we made a significant impact on debates on the content and role of social and environmental safeguards for REDD+. REDD+ is the component of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change negotiations aimed at reducing emissions from deforestation.

Public procurement policies guide the way governments spend taxpayers’ money on goods and services. Their purchasing decisions can be used to promote social and environmental objectives. The impact of our work on public procurement law was evident in the European Commission’s December 2011 proposal for revised directives on public procurement. However, there is still much room for improvement. We’re now well-positioned to influence the legislative process going forward and programme leader Janet Pritchard will be giving evidence to the Internal Market and Consumer Protection Committee as a public procurement law expert in 2012.
We think that companies should have to report accurately on their social and environmental impacts.

We believe environmental reporting by companies should be fair, balanced and comprehensive. We’re working to improve the law so companies report responsibly and investors can make informed decisions: http://bit.ly/RoLe1A

In the UK, where many powerful multinationals base their headquarters, the Companies Act 2006 provides a legal framework for non-financial company reporting.

We complained to the Financial Reporting Review Panel (FRRP) – the body responsible for assessing whether the annual reports of UK companies comply with the law – that BP used a wildly unrealistic scenario to underpin predictions of future energy demand. These predictions helped to justify continued investment in risky extraction methods and the type of drilling that resulted in the Deepwater Horizon disaster.

However, as with our complaint regarding Rio Tinto, the FRRP failed to use this opportunity to clarify the law, or set a precedent that could influence future company reporting. That’s why we will continue to engage with the UK Government to improve reporting requirements and enforcement as it moves forward in proposing changes to the narrative reporting framework in 2012. We have also begun efforts to influence the debate on non-financial reporting at the European Union level.
Trustees’ statement

Financial review
During the year ended 31 December 2011 the charity received income of £2,624,442, which represents a 60% increase on the previous year (31 December 2010 £1,639,444). Restricted funding rose by 108.99% to £1,046,649, while unrestricted funding rose by 38.57% to £1,577,793. The financial position of the charity at the year end improved considerably on the previous year. Careful cashflow management has resulted in total assets held of £376,157 at 31 December 2011 – a 60.51% increase on 31 December 2010 (£234,352). At the balance sheet date, unrestricted funds were £148,668, an increase of 23.79% on 2010 (£120,096). Restricted funds increased by 99.10% to £227,489 at the balance sheet date.

Operating capital
Several of the charity’s major grants are paid partly or entirely in arrears, presenting significant challenges to cashflow. The main priority for the Trustees during 2011 has been to increase the charity’s level of capital available to cover cashflow needs – the operating capital. At the year end, the net current assets of the charity had increased by 81.65% on the prior year to £340,341.

Rise in income and expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reserve policy
The challenge in building reserves has been that the charity is still only in its fifth year of operations, and it has experienced extremely rapid growth, largely made possible by restricted funding. The Trustees have established a policy whereby unrestricted funds not committed or invested in tangible fixed assets (the free reserves) held by the charity should ideally be four to six months’ operating costs as budgeted for a given year. For 2011 this equates to between £827,546 and £1,241,318. At the balance sheet date the free reserves of the charity were £112,852, an increase of 54.4% on the prior year. The reserves held are below the target level, and it is the aim of the Trustees to grow the charity’s free reserves over the coming years.

Risk management
The Trustees have examined the major strategic, business and operational risks which the organisation faces, and confirm that systems have been established to enable necessary steps to be taken to minimise these risks.

On behalf of the Directors and Trustees of ClientEarth 28 March 2012

M. Christina Robert

For a full version of our Annual accounts please download a PDF version at www.clientearth.org/reports/annual-trustees-report-2011.pdf

Financial overview

Income
- Charitable activities: £2,271,165
- Investment income: £15
- Voluntary income: £347,246
- Other income: £5,996

Total income: £2,624,442

Expenditure
- Charitable activities (direct costs): £1,883,540
- Charitable activities (support costs): £368,503
- Fundraising costs: £224,592
- Governance costs: £6,002

Total expenditure: £2,482,637

Charitable activities
Charitable activities DC
Charitable activities SC
Fundraising costs
Governance costs
We have audited the financial statements of ClientEarth for the year ended 31 December 2011 which comprise the consolidated Statement of Financial Activities, the Group Summary Income and Expenditure Account, the Group and Parent Charitable Company Balance Sheets. The financial reporting framework that has been applied in their preparation is applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

This report is made solely to the charity’s Members, as a body, in accordance with Chapter 3 of Part 16 of The Companies Act 2006 and to the charity’s trustees, as a body, in accordance with Section 151 of the Charities Act 2011 and regulations made under Section 154 of that Act. Our audit work has been undertaken so that we might state to the charity’s Members those matters we are required to state to them in an auditor’s report and for no other purpose.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or state to them in an auditor’s report and for no other purpose.

Audit work has been undertaken so that we might state to

opinions we have formed.

In accordance with Section 151 of the Charities Act 2011

a body, in accordance with Chapter 3 of Part 16 of The

The financial reporting framework that has been applied

in their preparation is applicable law and United Kingdom

Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice); and

have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Companies Act 2006 and the Charities Act 2011.

Opinion on other matter prescribed by the Companies Act 2006

In our opinion the information given in the Trustees’ Report for the financial year for which the accounts are prepared is consistent with the accounts.

Opinion on accounts

In our opinion the accounts

• give a true and fair view of the state of the group’s and the parent charitable company’s affairs as at 31 December 2011 and of its incoming resources and application of resources, including its income and expenditure, for the year then ended;

• have been properly prepared in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice; and

• have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Companies Act 2006 and the Charities Act 2011.

Opinion on other matter prescribed by the Companies Act 2006

In our opinion the information given in the Trustees’ Report for the financial year for which the accounts are prepared is consistent with the accounts.

Opinion on other matter prescribed by the Companies Act 2006

In our opinion the information given in the Trustees’ Report for the financial year for which the accounts are prepared is consistent with the accounts.

Opinion on other matter prescribed by the Companies Act 2006

In our opinion the information given in the Trustees’ Report for the financial year for which the accounts are prepared is consistent with the accounts.

Matters on which we are required to report by exception

We have nothing to report in respect of the following matters where the Companies Act 2006 and the Charities Act 2011 requires us to report to you if, in our opinion:

• the parent charitable company has not kept adequate and sufficient accounting records, or returns adequate for our audit have not been received from branches not visited by us; or

• the parent charitable company financial statements are not in agreement with the accounting records and returns; or

• certain disclosures of trustees’ remuneration specified by law are not made; or

• we have not received all the information and explanations we require for our audit; or

• the trustees were not entitled to prepare the financial statements in accordance with the small companies regime and take advantage of the small companies exemption in preparing the Trustees’ Annual Report.

Respective responsibilities of trustees and auditors

As explained more fully in the statement of trustees’ responsibilities, the trustees, who are also the directors of ClientEarth for the purposes of company law, are responsible for the preparation of the accounts and for being satisfied that they give a true and fair view. We have been appointed auditor under the Companies Act 2006 and Section 151 of the Charities Act 2011 and report in accordance with those Acts. Our responsibility is to audit and express an opinion on the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland). Those standards require us to comply with the Auditing Practices Board’s Ethical Standards for Auditors.

Scope of the audit of the accounts

An audit involves obtaining evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the accounts sufficient to give reasonable assurance that the accounts are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error. This includes an assessment of: whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the charity’s circumstances and have been consistently applied and adequately disclosed; the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by the trustees; and the overall presentation of the accounts. In addition, we read all the financial and non-financial information in the Trustees’ Annual Report to identify material inconsistencies with the audited accounts. If we become aware of any apparent material misstatements or inconsistencies we consider the implications for our report.

The statement of financial activities also complies with the requirements for an income and expenditure account under the Companies Act 2006.

The accounts were approved by the Board on 29th March 2012 by M. Christina Robert Company Registration No. 2863827

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial summary</th>
<th>Unrestricted funds</th>
<th>Restricted funds</th>
<th>Total 2011</th>
<th>Total 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income from charitable activities</td>
<td>1,224,536</td>
<td>1,046,649</td>
<td>2,271,185</td>
<td>1,515,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income</td>
<td>1,577,793</td>
<td>1,046,649</td>
<td>2,624,442</td>
<td>1,639,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>1,549,221</td>
<td>933,416</td>
<td>2,482,637</td>
<td>1,795,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>28,572</td>
<td>113,233</td>
<td>141,805</td>
<td>(156,333)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consolidated balance sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current assets</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>486,471</td>
<td>427,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at bank and in hand</td>
<td>270,812</td>
<td>130,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current assets</td>
<td>757,283</td>
<td>557,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>757,283</td>
<td>557,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accounts were approved by the Board on 29th March 2012 by M. Christina Robert Company Registration No. 2863827

Sarah Kim
Auditor
Arram Berlyn Gardner Chartered Accountants
29th March 2012
Thank you

Thank you to our supporters and team...

It is impossible to list all the people who give their time and money to ClientEarth so generously, but there are a few individuals and organisations we would like to say a special thank you to for all their support over the last year.
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Sandy Luk
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Kate Miller
Giuseppe Nastasi
Klaudia Nowak
Rose Otluk
Melissa Pritchard
Daniela Rey
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Linda Rivera
Josh Roberts
Rob Ryan
Marcin Stoczkiewicz
Dawid Sześciło
Marta Toporek
Emily Ulwin
Liane Veitch
Lora Verheecke
Ed Walker
Catherine Welfer
Susie Wilks
Marie-Claire Yeo
Daria Zebrowska
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