

Article 39
(Registered charity, number 1166092)
Financial statements
for the year ended 31 March 2021

Page	Contents
2 - 12	Trustees' annual report
13	Independent examiner's report
14	Receipts & payments account
15	Statement of assets & liabilities
16 - 17	Notes to the accounts

Article 39
Trustees' annual report
for the year ended 31 March 2021

Full name Article 39

Organisation type Charitable incorporated organisation

Registered charity number 1166092

Principal address

1 Cranmer Street, Nottingham, NG3 4GH

Trustees

Susannah Walker, Chair

Peter Grove, Treasurer

Catherine Brown, Secretary

Suraya Skelland

Ella Dhillon

Lynton Orrett, from 07/09/21

Phillip Noyes OBE, Chair until 12/03/21

Nicola Wyld, Treasurer, until 31/03/21

Independent examiner

John O'Brien, employee of Community Accounting Plus, Units 1 & 2 North West, 41 Talbot Street, Nottingham, NG1 5GL

Governance and management

The charity is operated under the rules of its foundation CIO constitution adopted 15/02/16 and registered as a CIO on 16/03/16.

Apart from the first charity trustees, every trustee must be appointed for a term of three years by a resolution passed at a properly convened meeting of the charity trustees. In selecting individuals for appointment as charity trustees, the charity trustees must have regard to the skills, knowledge and experience needed for the effective administration of the CIO.

Objectives and activities

(1) The relief of need, and promotion of the protection, of children living in institutional settings in England through in particular but not exclusively:

(a) The provision of information to children living in institutional settings about law, policy and professional standards in respect of their care and treatment, and the ways in which they can raise concerns and challenge mistreatment;

(b) Undertaking and disseminating research on safeguarding and child protection matters in institutional settings;

(c) Monitoring child protection concerns and practices in children's institutional settings;

(d) Providing technical advice to government and others on matters related to the safety and well-being of children living in institutional settings;

(e) Commenting on proposed legislation concerned with the needs of children living in institutional settings.

Article 39

- (2) The advancement of the human rights of children living in institutional settings in England by all or any of the following means:
- (a) Raising awareness of the means by which children may seek redress for human rights abuses;
 - (b) Monitoring human rights abuses in children's institutional settings;
 - (c) Undertaking and disseminating research into human rights in children's institutional settings;
 - (d) Providing technical advice to government and others on the human rights of children living in institutional settings;
 - (e) Commenting on proposed legislation concerned with the human rights of children living in institutional settings;
 - (f) Obtaining redress for the victims of human rights abuses in children's institutional settings;
 - (g) Raising awareness of human rights issues;
 - (h) Promoting public support for human rights;
 - (i) Promoting respect for human rights among individuals and corporations.

Summary of the main activities undertaken for the public benefit

Article 39 fights for the rights of children living in state and privately-run institutions (children's homes, boarding and residential schools, mental health inpatient units, prisons and immigration detention) in England.

We take our name from Article 39 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, which grants every child who has been abused or suffered other rights violations the right to recover in environments where their health, self-respect and dignity are nurtured.

This was Article 39's fifth year of funded activity. We are very grateful to all of our funders and to the many organisations and individuals who worked with us throughout the year.

Our report concerns the period 01 April 2020 to 31 March 2021, though it includes significant developments just past this date.

Article 39 had three members of staff (2.4 full-time equivalent) throughout this 12-month period.

Public benefit statement

The Trustees confirm that they have complied with the duty in section 17 of the Charities Act 2011 to have due regard to the Charity Commission's general guidance on public benefit, 'Charities and Public Benefit'.

Article 39

Summary of the main achievements during the period

We informed children of their rights

Our rights4children website provides accessible information about children's rights on topics which children and young people have told us are important to them. The site was used 35,741 times in 2020/21, which is more than double last year.¹ Our most popular topics were: restraint and use of force; feeling safe; and leaving care.

Access to the website was mostly through a desktop computer (55%) but there was also good usage on mobile phones (42%). We received 19 online feedback forms during the year (compared to 26 last year). The majority of visitors 'really liked' (58%) or 'liked' (21%) the content they accessed.

We successfully defended the rights of children in care

In a landmark judgment handed down by the Court of Appeal in November 2020, the Education Secretary was found to have acted unlawfully in failing to consult the Children's Commissioner for England and other children's rights organisations before making "substantial and wide-ranging" changes to legal protections for England's 78,000 children in care.

Article 39 launched the legal challenge after the government removed and watered down 65 safeguards for children in care in England, through The Adoption and Children (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020. Parliament was given no time to debate the changes; the Regulations were introduced on 23 April and came into force the very next day.

The safeguards lost or diluted by the Regulations included timescales for social worker visits to children in care, six-monthly reviews of children's welfare, independent scrutiny of children's homes and senior officer oversight of adoption decision-making for babies and children. The protections in place for disabled children having short breaks and children in care sent many miles away from home were also affected. After starting to review children's legislation in February, officials in the Department for Education, including the Chief Social Worker for Children and Families, had private email, telephone and face-to-face exchanges with a number of local authorities, adoption agencies, private providers and local government bodies during March and April. The views of children and young people in care, or organisations representing their rights, views and interests, were not sought. The statutory body for children's rights, the Children's Commissioner for England, was informed of the changes to children's legal protections in mid-April, after they had been signed off by Ministers.

Giving the leading judgment, Lord Justice Baker, with whom Lord Justice Henderson and Lord Justice Underhill agreed, found: *"It was manifestly in the interests of the vulnerable children who would be most affected by the proposed amendments that those agencies and organisations representing the rights and interests of children in care should be consulted"*.

¹ The site was launched in June 2018, so we track visitors from that month rather than from the start of each financial year.

Article 39

The judges granted a declaration “that the Secretary of State acted unlawfully by failing to consult the Children’s Commissioner and other bodies representing the rights of children in care before introducing the [legal changes]”.

This was a huge victory for children’s rights, which should help other groups defend their right to be consulted before government and other public authorities make significant changes to law and policy. We were delighted to hear in January 2021 that our case had been successfully used by Just for Kids Law charity to ensure children remanded to custody could not be locked up for longer periods without judicial scrutiny (a change that had also been introduced through secondary legislation).

Our legal action would not have been possible without hundreds of very kind donations raised through a CrowdJustice appeal. The funds from this will be kept for future children’s rights strategic litigation.

In addition to legal action, which was expedited because of the gravity of the case, over 60 organisations and several hundred care experienced people, social workers and others were part of a national campaign to scrap the secondary legislation which took away children’s safeguards. The #ScrapSI445 campaign² was led by a steering group which included representatives from Article 39, The Care Leavers Association, Children England, Centre for Outcomes of Care, Children’s Rights Alliance for England, National Centre for Excellence in Residential Child Care, Nagalro, National Youth Advocacy Service and UNISON.

We secured extensive media coverage of the campaign and the litigation, including in *The Times*, *The Guardian*, *The Observer*, *The Independent*, *The Mirror*, *Private Eye*, *Huffington Post*, *Municipal Journal*, *Community Care* and *Children and Young People Now*. The campaign also made great use of social media, especially around the court hearings and a vote in the House of Commons.

We influenced government guidance on the use of force in mental health hospitals, and raised awareness of children and young people’s views and experiences

We gave detailed advice to the Department of Health and Social Care ahead of its consultation on statutory guidance on the Mental Health Units (Use of Force) Act 2018, in order to ensure children’s specific needs and rights are sufficiently represented in the document. We also collated case studies which show the positive impact of children being respected and listened to, including through having help from an independent mental health advocate. Article 39 had worked on the 2018 legislation as it passed through Parliament, managing to secure important protections for children – relating to training, recording and parents being notified of use of force. On the second anniversary of the Act gaining Royal Assent (in November 2020), our Head of Policy and Advocacy wrote a piece for *Children and Young People Now* magazine urging the government to speed up its implementation.

² So-called because the regulations bringing in the changes were the 445th statutory instrument in 2020.

Article 39

Our report on the concerns which children and young people take to their independent mental health advocates – called ‘*A safe space? The rights of children in mental health inpatient care*’ – was published on Children’s Rights Day (20 November). This is part of a new project which aims to ensure that children and young people’s views and experiences of mental health hospitals influence the development of law, policy and practice. Among the report’s findings are that children are being kept in hospital for too long, often many miles from home, and in environments not conducive to their needs and rights as children. Staggering numbers are still being placed on adult wards and are subject to harmful restraint, seclusion and segregation. Informal patients receive fewer legal protections and a child’s right to have help from an advocate when they make a complaint about their care or treatment appears to be frequently ignored. We also published a statistics briefing on children in mental health hospitals, which presents key information such as how long children stay in hospital, the number of applications to mental health tribunals and the use of different types of restraint on children.

Other work to promote and protect the rights of children in mental health hospitals during the year included making submissions on reforming the Mental Health Act to Parliament’s Joint Committee on Human Rights and the Department of Health and Social Care. We were pleased to join the Children and Young People’s Mental Health Coalition, and to work collaboratively with those leading on mental health policy within the Children’s Commissioner’s office.

We launched two new training courses for independent advocates, ran online events and produced a variety of legal guides and materials to protect the rights of children

We launched two new training courses for advocates in October 2020 – one focused on using the law in children and young people’s advocacy, and the other on protecting children’s rights in institutional settings. Both are delivered by Zoom across two half-days.

Independent advocates are employed to ensure children and young people’s wishes and feelings are known and understood, that they are respected and heard, and their rights protected. By the end of March 2021, 126 advocates had attended our two new training courses. Course evaluations show that 100% of participants would recommend our training to others; 100% rated the overall quality of our courses as either ‘excellent’ or ‘good’; and 96% said they expected learning from our training to influence their practice. We also collated more detailed case studies on the impact of our training, and include two examples of these below.

I was asked to write a complaint and instead of just putting in how the person felt about the situation I added in how the council said they would deal with situations in their own policies. This had the desired outcome but I felt it was probably the best complaint I’d ever written because I was able to back it up with facts and not just feelings.

What's law got to do with it? training course

Article 39

I have been visiting a care home for a couple of years and had been shown into a private room to see the children which didn't have a handle on the inside of the door. But this time when I went and was shown in the room once I had finished I asked the staff why the room didn't have a handle on the inside. They told me that previously the room had been used as a 'seclusion' room and I asked if the room was still used for this purpose and they said it wasn't. I reported this to the social worker saying I felt the room should have a handle and she said she would enquire on her next visit. Although I never felt the children were in danger, and they had never mentioned anything to me, I realised how blinkered I was when visiting children in a residential setting and I now open my eyes more. Last time I visited the room it had a handle on the inside.

Protecting children's rights in institutional settings training course

We were extremely grateful to Karon Monaghan QC (Matrix Chambers) and Nick O'Brien (Coram Chambers) who delivered excellent online lectures to advocates on the Equality Act 2010 and the Children Act 1989 respectively. We held several other online events throughout the year, bringing advocates together for peer support and learning. This included a seminar on the EU Settlement Scheme, in partnership with the Migrant Children's Project (Coram Children's Legal Centre), to help ensure child EU citizens (including those in care) received timely assistance to remain living in the UK.

Our specialist materials for advocates this year started with an overview of the different types of law which advocates can use to protect the rights of children. We then produced guides on the Children Act 1989 and the Equality Act 2010, and a detailed handout on key learning from inquiries and investigations into institutional abuse for our 'Protecting children's rights in institutional settings' training course. We published a legal digest each month, focused on a specific legal judgment or decision affecting children's rights, and a quarterly newsletter containing legal and policy updates as well as interviews with advocates working in different settings.

We ended the year with over 260 members in our Children and Young People's Advocates Network, spanning all English regions and a range of specialisms including children's social care, mental health, custody and education.

"This is a fantastic forum for advocates to share ideas, get support and receive up-to-date information regarding legislative changes and what this means for our children and young people."

"The network provides opportunities to meet other advocates with a variety of specialisms to discuss and share information about different themes, issues, trends and experiences within practice. It's especially helpful and positive for advocates who work on their own - just fantastic!"

Article 39

We promoted children and young people's right to high quality advocacy services

As well as our direct work with advocates, we co-ordinate the Advocates4U campaign to strengthen children and young people's advocacy services across England. The campaign name was chosen by Heather and Megan, two members of Sheffield Children in Care Council.

Following the Children's Minister's announcement in March 2020 that the government would undertake a public consultation on a revised set of national standards for advocacy services and accompanying regulations, we were delighted to help civil servants have online discussions with 27 children and young people who have had experience of advocacy, to help inform their work. The discussions went extremely well and we were very pleased that the Children's Minister sent a thank you letter to every child and young person.

To mark the first anniversary of the Children's Commissioner for England's latest review of advocacy services, in June 2020 we published a progress report setting out the actions that have been taken to date in response to each of the Commissioner's recommendations. We were pleased the Children's Commissioner, Anne Longfield, provided a foreword for the progress report which we hope will help encourage more action by central and local government and organisations who run advocacy services. During the year, we also brought young people and advocates together to discuss how funding and governance arrangements for advocacy services may be changed to increase effectiveness and independence.

We protected children from abusive restraint, pushed for greater transparency over the use of pain-inducing restraint, and worked with others to press for the closure of child prisons

As reported in last year's annual report, Charlie Taylor's review of the use of pain-inducing restraint on remanded and sentenced children was published in June 2020. This review was established by the government after we initiated legal proceedings to challenge the Ministry of Justice's authorisation of the use of pain-inducing restraint on children during their journeys to and from secure children's homes. We argued that this was discriminatory and breached children's right to protection from inhuman and degrading treatment since such restraint is banned within the establishments themselves. In August 2020, we received the excellent news that the Ministry of Justice had withdrawn its authorisation of pain-inducing restraint by escort custody officers taking children to and from secure children's homes – one of Charlie Taylor's 15 recommendations.

Charlie Taylor further recommended that escort staff be prohibited from using restraint to make children follow orders (for 'good order and discipline'). This was also part of our legal action against the Ministry of Justice. In April 2021, we learned that the contract for escorting services provided by GEOAmev and Serco now states that restraint "must never be used as a punishment or to simply obtain compliance with staff instructions". This applies to all children who are remanded or sentenced to custody. Having this specified in a statutory instrument would have given children far greater protection. However, the impact of this litigation (our application for judicial review was stayed in January 2019) far exceeded our initial goals: as well as the

Article 39

changes above, the Ministry of Justice accepted Charlie Taylor's recommendation that pain-inducing restraint be taken out of the core syllabus for child prisons, with such techniques only being taught and available for emergency self-defence scenarios.

We are extremely grateful to our legal team for helping us achieve this breakthrough protection for children – Mark Scott, Partner at Bhatt Murphy Solicitors, and Dan Squires QC and Tamara Jaber from Matrix Chambers. Successive governments had repeatedly refused to ban the use of pain-inducing restraint after the appalling death of 14 year-old Adam Rickwood. Adam was unlawfully restrained in a Serco-run child prison in August 2004, and inflicted with the so-called 'nose distraction' – a karate-like chop to the nose. His nose bled for nearly an hour and officers ignored his request to go to hospital. Adam hanged himself that evening and before doing so left behind two notes – one setting out his funeral wishes, and the other giving his account of the 'restraint'. Adam explained: "I asked them why they hit me in the nose and jumped on me. They said it was because I wouldn't go in my room so I said what gives them the right to hit a 14-year-old child in the nose and they said it was restraint".

In tandem with the legal action above, we made freedom of information requests to probe the officially recorded reasons for use of pain-inducing restraint on children. In December 2020, our Director represented Article 39 at an information tribunal following the Ministry of Justice's refusal to release information showing the recorded reasons why children had been inflicted with pain-inducing techniques in prisons in 2017/18. The Information Commissioner supported this refusal after Ministry of Justice officials told her it could take 85 hours to retrieve such information. We argued that this contradicted the Ministry of Justice's child safeguarding policy which states that the use of pain-inducing restraint is reviewed centrally. Moreover, careful review of the use of these extreme techniques – deliberately designed to cause children severe pain – would be necessary to protect children from human rights breaches. It was disappointing that the information tribunal decided in the Ministry of Justice's favour – because of its insistence that it does not hold the information centrally. However, the tribunal judge acknowledged in his decision the importance of our challenge: "the implementation of the policy to avoid future tragic incidents to children in custody is at the core of the charity's aims". We will continue to push for transparency as we monitor the Ministry of Justice's implementation of Charlie Taylor's recommendations.

We suggested extensive amendments to the Ministry of Justice's draft revised policy on the use of force (November 2020), and shared the views and experiences of a young person who had been abusively restrained in prison himself and had also witnessed another young person being assaulted by prison officers.

In December 2020, as part of our End Child Imprisonment campaign, Article 39, the Alliance for Youth Justice³, the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies, Child Rights International Network, INQUEST and the National Association for Youth Justice published a joint document setting out why child prisons in England must close, and

³ Formerly the Standing Committee for Youth Justice.

Article 39

how this can be achieved. On the day of publication, we were pleased to read an article in *The Spectator* magazine written by the Chief Inspector of Prisons which contained very similar arguments to our own. Following its agreement in December 2016 to phase out young offender institutions and secure training centres, the joint document urges the government to publish its plans for closing down child prisons. We were therefore delighted when, a couple of months later, the House of Commons Justice Committee recommended the government publish a timetable for the closure of child prisons.

We defended the rights of teenagers in care

Last year, we brought organisations together to consider how children in care living in unregulated accommodation could be protected, cared for and supported. With other charities, we launched the #KeepCaringTo18 campaign, which has been very busy throughout the year.

The Department for Education held a consultation on its plan to stop councils putting children in care who are aged 15 or younger in non-care settings. As reported last year, we co-ordinated a joint letter (with 73 signatories) to the Children's Minister to ask that the timescale for this be extended given the pandemic and the importance of care experienced children and young people being able to contribute their views. The deadline was then extended from April to June 2020.

We submitted a very detailed response ourselves, which included the views and experiences of children and young people seeking help from independent advocacy services. In addition, we co-ordinated a comprehensive submission from the Refugee and Migrant Children's Consortium which included the views and experiences of 21 children and young people. We also facilitated an online consultation session with 10 young people who had lived in unregulated accommodation as children. This was observed by a civil servant, and a verbatim record of young people's views and experiences was sent to the Department for Education.

In February 2021, the Department for Education announced the outcome of its consultation. Despite huge concerns about the care and safety of 16 and 17 year-olds, Ministers decided to press on with only introducing legal protection for those aged 15 and younger. A statutory instrument was laid in February, which came into force in September 2021, guaranteeing that children in care aged 15 and younger always live in care settings.

We made a freedom of information request to obtain all of the responses to the consultation. After a two-week delay, the Department for Education released the responses and, with help from a volunteer, we reviewed the documents (over 400 responses in all including from young people) to try and understand how the government had come to the decision it had. We were alarmed to discover that the academics commissioned by the Department for Education to analyse the responses were not asked to review the views and experiences of the 165+ young people who had contributed to the consultation. We then sought legal advice and ended the year preparing for litigation to challenge the discriminatory changes.

Article 39

In autumn 2020, we became increasingly concerned about the Home Office keeping unaccompanied children in short-term holding facilities beyond 24 hours (the maximum period set out in law). Children arriving in the UK, by boat or lorry, without family members to care for them are meant to be looked after by local authorities under the Children Act 1989. We sought information and had meetings with the Home Office alongside other concerned organisations.

We sought an independent review of the care system

Having committed to a review of the care system in its 2019 general election manifesto, in January 2021 the government announced it was establishing a wholesale review of children's social care and this would be led by the Chief Executive of the fast-track social work training organisation Frontline, Josh MacAlister. We co-ordinated a joint letter of concern to the Education Secretary, which was signed by 35 organisations and over 250 individuals with substantial experience of children's social care. This raised serious questions about the independence of the chair and his lack of experience in children's social care, the wide scope of the review and the speed at which it was to be carried out. We asked that any changes to the Children Act 1989 be considered by the Law Commission, the statutory body for legal reform. We received a response from the Children's Minister the following month, which did not answer our concerns. We ended the year discussing the possibility of a number of networks and coalitions working together to try and ensure the review uses the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) as its framework. This rights-based approach was integral to Scotland's care review, 2017-2020, whose final report explained: "The UNCRC should be the bedrock upon which all legislation is based to ensure that children's rights are upheld as a matter of course".

We gave expert advice on a number of other children's rights matters

We gave written evidence to the following organisations and bodies across the year:

- Children's Rights Alliance for England – civil society evidence to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child ahead of its next periodic review of the UK;
- Department for Education – consultation on revised standards for boarding and residential special schools;
- Ministry of Justice – consultation on the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme;
- Independent Human Rights Act Review Panel – review of the Human Rights Act 1998;
- Independent Review of Administrative Law Panel – review of judicial review;
- Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse – final investigation which focused on effective child protection leadership (senior witnesses from the NSPCC and The Children's Society were asked about key parts of Article 39 Director's witness statement when they gave oral evidence in December 2020);

Article 39

- House of Commons Education Select Committee – inquiry on education and children’s services during COVID-19; and its hearing with the government’s preferred candidate for the next Children’s Commissioner for England (2021-27);
- Parliament’s Joint Committee on Human Rights – inquiry on the human rights implications of the government’s response to COVID-19; and its inquiry into the review of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Our Director was a member of the Care Quality Commission’s advisory group on closed cultures, our Head of Policy and Advocacy was a member of the government’s UNCRC Action Group and we remained members of other important coalitions, including the Alliance for Children in Care and Care Leavers, the Alliance for Youth Justice, the Participation Forum and the Refugee and Migrant Children’s Consortium.

We promoted human rights in the media and elsewhere

Article 39 staff were interviewed and quoted in the media on a wide range of children’s rights matters and spoke at a number of national events. Articles and book reviews were written for a variety of publications including the *International Journal of Children’s Rights*, *The Guardian* newspaper, the *Big Issue*, Nagalro’s *Seen and Heard* journal and a collective online magazine *Social Work 2020 & Covid-19*. Our main website was used more than 116,000 times in 2020.

The charity’s policy on reserves

Article 39’s target level of reserves is 3 months of running costs.

Signed on behalf of the charity’s trustees:

Signed _____ Date _____
Susannah Walker, Trustee

**Independent examiner's report to the trustees of
Article 39
for the year ended 31 March 2021**

I report to the trustees on my examination of the accounts of Article 39 (the charity) for the year ended 31 March 2021.

Responsibilities and basis of report

As the trustees of the charity you are responsible for the preparation of the accounts in accordance with the requirements of the Charities Act 2011 ('the Act').

I report in respect of my examination of the charity's accounts carried out under section 145 of the 2011 Act and in carrying out my examination I have followed all the applicable Directions given by the Charity Commission under section 145(5)(b) of the Act.

Independent examiner's statement

I have completed my examination. I confirm that no matters have come to my attention in connection with the examination giving me cause to believe that in any material respect:

1. accounting records were not kept in respect of the charity as required by section 130 of the Act; or
2. the accounts do not accord with those records.

I have no concerns and have come across no other matters in connection with the examination to which attention should be drawn in this report in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.

Signed _____ Date _____

John O'Brien MSc, FCCA, FCIE
Employee of Community Accounting Plus

Article 39
Receipts & payments account
for the year ended 31 March 2021

2020			2021
Total		Unrestricted	Restricted
Funds		Funds	Funds
£	Note	£	£
	Receipts		
136454	Grants & donations	2 71699	102062
2196	Strategic litigation refund	-	-
-	Sales & fees	25	25
<u>138650</u>	Total receipts	<u>71724</u>	<u>102062</u>
	Payments		
1532	Children's engagement	-	220
18	Hospitality & publicity	-	-
480	Independent examination	384	96
460	Insurance	365	91
3519	IT & online surveys	-	2986
835	Payroll service & BACS fees	608	152
858	Printing & stationery	426	192
-	Professional fees	-	389
1250	Recruitment	-	-
82904	Salaries, NI & pensions	38936	86078
3240	Staff travel inc. associates	109	-
401	Telephone & postage	213	464
20	Training & subscriptions	28	180
213	Trustees' expenses	-	-
<u>95730</u>	Total payments	<u>41069</u>	<u>90848</u>
42920	Net receipts/(payments)	30655	11214
33285	Cash funds at start of this period	16881	59324
<u>76205</u>	Cash funds at end of this period	<u>47536</u>	<u>70538</u>
		<u>118074</u>	

Article 39
Statement of assets and liabilities
at 31 March 2021

2020		Note	2021
£			£
<u>76205</u>	Cash assets		
<u>76205</u>	Bank accounts		<u>118074</u>
			<u>118074</u>
	Other monetary assets		
-	Debtors - Fees		125
63	Debtors - Donations		-
<u>414</u>	Prepayments - Insurance		<u>410</u>
<u>477</u>			<u>535</u>
	Liabilities		
<u>(4553)</u>	Creditors	4	<u>(3912)</u>
<u>(4553)</u>			<u>(3912)</u>

These financial statements are accepted on behalf of the charity by:

Signed _____ Dated _____
Peter Grove, Trustee

Article 39
Notes to the accounts
for the year ended 31 March 2021

1. Receipts & payments accounts

Receipts and payments accounts contain a summary of money received and money spent during the period and a list of assets and liabilities at the end of the period. Usually, cash received and cash spent will include transactions through bank accounts and cash in hand.

2. Grants & donations

	Unrestricted £	Restricted £	Total £
Esmee Fairbairn Foundation	60000	-	60000
The Baring Foundation	-	30825	30825
The Bromley Trust	10000	-	10000
The Hadley Trust	-	20000	20000
The Legal Education Foundation	-	28000	28000
Anonymous donor	-	8750	8750
Sundry grants & donations	1699	14487	16186
	<u>71699</u>	<u>102062</u>	<u>173761</u>

3. Funds analysis

	Opening balance £	Receipts (Payments)		Closing balance £
	£	£	£	£
Restricted funds				
Ending child imprisonment	201	-	-	201
Children's advocacy project	583	20000	(20545)	38
Litigation fund (children in custody)	7552	-	-	7552
Mental health research & advocacy	33986	8750	(37720)	5016
Legal education (advocates)	17002	28000	(28958)	16044
Litigation fund (children in care)	-	14487	-	14487
Double punishment child imprisonment (COVID-19)	-	30825	(3625)	27200
	<u>59324</u>	<u>102062</u>	<u>(90848)</u>	<u>70538</u>
Unrestricted funds				
General fund	16881	71724	(41069)	47536
	<u>16881</u>	<u>71724</u>	<u>(41069)</u>	<u>47536</u>

Article 39

4. Creditors

	£
Independent examination	480
Salaries, NI & pensions	3372
Payroll service & BACS fees	60
	<u>3912</u>

5. Trustees' remuneration

Trustees received no expenses, remuneration or benefits in this period.

6. Related party transactions

There were no related party transactions during the period

7. Glossary of terms

Creditors: These are amounts owed by the charity, but not paid during the accounting period.

Debtors: These are amounts owed to the charity, but not received in the accounting period.

Prepayments: These are services that the charity has paid for in advance, but not used during the accounting period.

Restricted funds: These are funds given to the charity, subject to specific restrictions set by the donor, but still within the general objects of the charity.