

**GREAT BRITAIN-CHINA CENTRE
TRIENNIAL REVIEW 2013
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

A Review of the Great Britain-China Centre was carried out in May-July 2013, in line with Cabinet Office guidance on “light touch” reviews of non-departmental public bodies (NDPBs).

Phase 1: Is there a continuing need for the functions carried out by GBCC; for GBCC to do them; and for GBCC to retain NDPB status?

The relationship-building (the UK-China Leadership Forum and the UK-China Young Leaders Round Table) and project work undertaken by GBCC with Chinese partners in rule of law reform and judge training both continue to be needed. The GBCC model has valuable and unique characteristics deriving from its distinctive mix of policy dialogue and practical projects which could not be simply replicated by the private sector or the voluntary or NGO sectors, nor could they be done in-house; nor is there currently any clear fit for a GBCC merger. GBCC continues to meet two of the Cabinet Office's three tests for NDPB status and should therefore retain NDPB status.

Phase 2: how well does GBCC deliver; does it comply with recognised good governance principles?

In terms of delivery, GBCC, with its Chinese and other partners, has produced a series of outstanding projects with real and lasting results in a number of important rights-related rule of law fields. It has built up a unique set of relationships and deep trust which enables it to engage in complex areas where Chinese partners are seeking change and development. In terms of good governance, GBCC continues to maintain good levels of accountability; has effective financial management systems in place; is open, transparent, accountable and responsive and therefore complies with recognised principles of good governance.

Phase 2: GBCC's level of ambition against organisational resources and value for money

GBCC's core mission statement and objectives are well-focused around wider FCO objectives and around its clear fields of expertise in rights-based rule of law. They represent a realistic level of ambition if programme funding can be secured. In general, the relationship between FCO and GBCC is good. However, with the large resource redirected into the China network in recent years, there has been some drift in the relationship at the strategic level. Both GBCC and the FCO would benefit from reassessing the strategic delivery role of GBCC and the value of its unique contribution, with a view to ensuring that opportunities which arise are fully realised and the enduring impact of its activities and contribution to FCO objectives are fully measured and acknowledged.

In terms of resourcing, GBCC as currently resourced is at the edge of sustainability: a tiny outfit is less able to survive year-on-year salami slicing than a large department. GBCC provides excellent value for money, consistently leveraging up the FCO Grant-in-Aid (which this year will only cover 55% of its core running costs), to secure five to six times as much in programme funding and corporate sponsorship. When China network resourcing is next reviewed, if not before, consideration should be given to recognising GBCC's effectiveness as a delivery partner and reinforcing its core Grant-in-Aid.

CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION

- Reasons for the Review
- Structure of Review and Methodology
- Key documents

B. STRATEGIC CONTEXT

- The UK-China Relationship
- About the Great Britain China Centre

C. REVIEW PHASE 1: SHOULD GBCC REMAIN AN NDPB?

- GBCC key functions and whether they contribute to the core business of the FCO
- whether those key functions are still needed
- whether there are other options than GBCC for delivering those key functions
- GBCC and the Government's "three tests" for NDPB status

D. REVIEW PHASE 2: HOW WELL IS GBCC DELIVERING?

- assessment of effectiveness of GBCC's political dialogue programme;
- assessment of effectiveness of GBCC's rule of law project work.

E. REVIEW PHASE 2: DOES GBCC COMPLY WITH RECOGNISED PRINCIPLES OF GOOD CORPORATE GOVERNANCE?

- accountability, both within GBCC and in the FCO ;
- roles and responsibilities, including strategic direction and the quality of the relationship between FCO and GBCC;
- effective financial management, both in GBCC's daily operations and in FCO;
- communications, between FCO and GBCC, and GBCC's external communication strategy;
- conduct and behaviour, of both GBCC Board and its staff.

F. ASSESSMENT OF LEVEL OF AMBITION FOR GBCC ACTIVITIES

- whether the level of ambition for GBCC activities is correct;
- whether its organisational resources are correctly aligned with this level of ambition;
- whether it provides value for money.

G. LIST OF CONCLUSIONS

H. LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNEXES

A: Terms of Reference for 2013 Triennial Review of the Great Britain China Centre

B. List of stakeholders consulted

C. List of documents consulted

D. Table of GBCC projects since the 2010 Review

A: INTRODUCTION

About the Great Britain China Centre

A.1 GBCC was originally established by Far East Department of the FCO when China began to open up in the early 1970s, with the aim of "promoting contacts of all kinds between Britain and China". It was incorporated in 1974, as a membership organisation offering a portfolio of services. It remains a company limited by guarantee and an NDPB under the FCO umbrella. GBCC has proven adept at changing the way it approaches and meets this broad objective, responding both to changes on the ground in China and to changing priorities on the part of the UK government, including as recommended by previous Reviews. GBCC funds its work by leveraging up the Grant-in-Aid from the FCO, which now funds only 55% of its core running costs, through private sector sponsorship and project funding (mostly from FCO and EU programmes). GBCC bases its overall strategy on the FCO's wider China strategy and coordinates with the UK Embassy in Beijing and China Department in the FCO in London but maintains operational independence in delivering its work, in line with its arms length status. GBCC has excellent networks of relationships in China and in the UK, built up and maintained over its years of continuous operation. Its staff also have an excellent understanding of how to navigate the complexities of the government and party systems in China and it has built a reputation in China for being a trustworthy and sensitive interlocutor.

Reasons for the Review

A.2 GBCC was last reviewed in 2010. As a non-departmental public body (NDPB), it must be reviewed every three years in line with published Cabinet Office guidance (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/62129/Cabinet-Office-Guidance-on-Reviews-of-Non-Departmental-Public-Bodies.pdf).

A.3 The Terms of Reference for the 2013 Review (Annex A) are based on the Cabinet Office guidance and are designed to ensure that the Review meets the Cabinet Office's two stated principal aims:

- (i) to provide a robust challenge of the continuing need for NDPBs - both their function and form;
- (ii) where it is agreed that a particular body should remain as an NDPB, to review the control and governance arrangements in place to ensure that the public body is complying with recognised principles of good corporate governance.

The Terms of Reference also require that in undertaking (ii), the Review should also consider:

- (iii) the extent to which GBCC as an NDPB contributes to achieving FCO objectives as set out in the China Strategy;
- (iv) what improvements might be made to enhance that contribution;
- (v) whether the level of ambition for GBCC activities is correct; whether its organisational resources are correctly aligned with this level of ambition; and whether it provides value for money.

Structure of Review and Methodology

Phase 1: Should GBCC remain an NDPB?

A.4 The previous Review concluded that GBCC should retain NDPB status. The current Review looked again at this conclusion based on the following questions in the Cabinet Office guidance:

- what are GBCC's key functions and how do they contribute to the FCO's core business?
- are those key functions still needed?
- if those key functions are still needed, are there other options to GBCC delivering them: eg move out of central government to the voluntary or private sector; bring in-house; merge with another body?
- if GBCC is to continue to deliver as an NDPB, do the key functions it provides pass at least one of the Government's "three tests": (i) is this a technical function (which needs external expertise to deliver); (ii) is this a function which needs to be, and be seen to be, delivered with absolute political impartiality (such as certain regulatory or funding functions); or (iii) is this a function which needs to be delivered independently of Ministers to establish facts and/or figures with integrity.

Phase 2: how well is GBCC delivering and does it comply with recognised principles of good corporate governance?

A.5 The previous Review made a number of recommendations in respect of corporate governance. This Review looked to see the extent to which those recommendations had been implemented and the state of current compliance with recognised principles of good corporate governance including:

- accountability, both within GBCC and in the FCO ;
- roles and responsibilities, including strategic direction and the quality of the relationship between FCO and GBCC;
- effective financial management, both in GBCC's daily operations and in FCO;
- communications, between FCO and GBCC, and GBCC's external communication strategy;
- conduct and behaviour, of both GBCC Board and its staff.

A.6 The Reviewer conducted interviews with more than 50 stakeholders in the UK and in China (list at Annex B) and had access to GBCC records and FCO records relating to GBCC.

A.7 The Reviewer attended (as an observer) two GBCC Board meetings and one GBCC Audit Committee meeting, and spent time in the GBCC office.

A.8 The Foreign Secretary wrote to the Foreign Affairs Committee on 15 May informing them of the Review and inviting comments.

Key documents

A.9 The Reviewer took into account a wide range of documents, listed at Annex C.

B. STRATEGIC CONTEXT FOR GBCC'S WORK

The UK China relationship

B.1 The UK-China bilateral relationship is important, enduring and dynamic: there are more people-to-people exchanges, more students studying in each other's countries, more trade and investment than ever before. For both governments it is a partnership for growth: the UK and China share many common interests from trade to reform and development to international security.

B.2 The Chinese Government's approach to reform is set out in the 12th Five Year plan (2011-2016) and subsequent statements by the new leadership since the 18th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in October 2012. Reform and development activities take place within the context of China's Scientific Outlook on Development, now enshrined in the Party Constitution. One of Chinese President Xi Jinping's first speeches as Party General Secretary focused on the rule of law and called on officials to respect and protect citizens' rights, including human rights, and to reinforce public confidence in the law.

B.3 The rule of law is a central component of the UK Prime Minister's vision of the 'golden thread' of factors that make open, fair and prosperous societies possible. Under this umbrella, the FCO sponsors work around the world to promote progress in two areas: abolition of the death penalty and preventing torture and ill treatment in detention, aiming to increase the number of abolitionist countries or countries with a moratorium on use of the death penalty; to secure further restrictions on its use in countries where it is still applied; and, when it is applied, to ensure the right to a fair trial and a prohibition on the execution of juveniles. On torture, the majority of allegations seen around the world relate to torture and mistreatment by police in the early stages of detention or in pre-trial detention. The FCO aims to help improve conditions in detention and understanding of detainee rights, including through monitoring, complaint processes and police training.

B.4 The UK also promotes work in sustainable economic development, good corporate governance and transparency. These mirror the current key reform areas and specific annual targets in China's 12th Five year plan: rebalancing the Chinese economy; rolling back the state from the economy and reducing unnecessary regulation and bureaucracy; building the infrastructure and services needed to manage steadily increasing levels of urbanisation; improving environmental protection; cutting waste and corruption; and strengthening Party structures internally; and making the rule of law more effective through continued reforms to the criminal justice system.

C. REVIEW PHASE 1

SHOULD GBCC REMAIN AN NDPB?

GBCC key functions and whether they contribute to the core business of the FCO

C.1 GBCC carries out **two** main categories of function, which both contribute to the core business of the FCO and to the achievement of FCO objectives, as set out in the FCO's China Strategic Framework and the China Country Business Plan. The **first** function is about relationship-building and centres round activities to build engagement and understanding between UK political parties and the Chinese Communist Party. The **Leadership Forum** and the **Young Leaders Round Table** are the current headline activities in this category. These activities enable the participants to learn about each other's parliamentary and wider governance structures and processes, and to exchange views and experience on current issues of interest. The **second** aims to support China's process of modernisation and internal reform through carefully designed projects carried out with Chinese partners in the area of rule of law. Recent projects have explored areas of **criminal justice**, particularly in limiting the use of the **death penalty**, **rights of detainees** and introducing **lay visiting of detention centres**. An assessment of the effectiveness of GBCC's implementation of these functions is in Section D.

Are those key functions still needed?

Function 1: activities to build engagement and understanding between political parties in the UK and China

C.2 All stakeholders (in the UK and China) interviewed attested to the need for continued efforts at all levels to improve links and deepen understanding between British and Chinese interlocutors. On the specific need to build engagement and understanding between political parties of the two countries, **UK** stakeholders interviewed were clear that there was a continuing need to provide opportunities for UK Members of Parliament of all parties to learn about China, and in particular the Chinese political system, through direct exposure through visits and meetings. They also saw value in being able to explain the workings of the UK systems to Chinese participants. **Chinese** stakeholders interviewed were clear that for their part they too saw a continuing value in enabling their rising leaders to gain experience of overseas political systems, with a high focus on the UK's Parliamentary and wider governance systems. The UK-China Leadership Forum and UK-China Young Leaders Round Table were regarded as top quality, high level events, professionally delivered by GBCC, with well-focused themes and relevant in-country visits, meeting well the requirement to build engagement and understanding between UK political parties and the Chinese Communist Party. Because of their non-governmental nature, these party-to-party activities have continued during difficult periods in the government-to-government relationship.

C.3 The Review concludes that the UK-China Leadership Forum and the UK-China Young Leaders Round Table **relationship-building function** currently provided by GBCC continues to be needed (conclusion 1)

Function 2: support China's process of modernisation and internal reform in the rule of law

C.4 The Reviewer conducted several interviews with project partners in China and in the UK with a view to understanding (i) the extent to which there continues to be a need for work in the area of the rule of law; and (ii) how well GBCC undertakes such work and what, if any, unique value GBCC brings to it. The assessment drawn from (ii) is in Section D.

C.5 On (i) relating to the on-going need for this function, interviews with project partners at **Renmin University, Beijing Normal University** and **Wuhan University** in China, as well as with the **UK Supreme Court**, provided good evidence relating to China's approach to reform of the criminal justice system and the contribution GBCC has made. Legal academics in China can play a key role in researching the application of law at and by different levels within the Chinese judicial system, in analysing the impact of the way the law is applied, and in making recommendations relating the application of the law back into the judicial system which, if accepted, may then be incorporated into revised guidelines for applying the law passed down to judges. This method of development through experimental pilot projects is well-established in China and the appetite for continuing to use it for the criminal justice system seems strong. Those interviewed put particular emphasis on their appetite for exchanging experience and views with the right top level counterparts in international criminal justice circles, especially relating to how laws are implemented in different countries and the guidance given to their judges (eg on tariffs). It was clear from discussion with these stakeholders that, given the complexity of China's legal system and structures, there continued to be areas where they felt such work could and should be developed. The criminal justice fields on which Chinese partners wished to work fell within rights-related areas also of continuing interest to the UK.

C.6 Complementing these reform projects, GBCC has run a Judicial Studies Training Programme dating back to the beginnings of legal reform in China in 1979 and responding to China's desire to professionalise its courts and judiciary. The Programme has been a unique collaboration between the UK and the Supreme People's Court to provide training for Chinese judges in advanced specialist areas of law and legal culture. Some 79 judges from 34 courts across China have benefited from the programme, creating a countrywide network of judges with UK training and experience. Many alumni of the programme have been promoted since returning China. Until 2012, the programme was funded by the UK Ministry of Justice and supported by bi-annual judicial seminars held in China. All the legal interlocutors on the Chinese and UK side highly praised this programme and the network developed through it and strongly advocated its resumption.

C.7 The Review concludes that the **project work function** currently undertaken by GBCC with Chinese partners in rule of law reform and judge training continues to be needed **(conclusion 2)**

Are there other options than GBCC for delivering those key functions?

C.8 The Cabinet Office guidance lists a number of delivery options to be considered when reviewing the functions of their NDPBs and these are considered here.

Abolish?

C.9 This Review has concluded above that the two core functions done by GBCC continue to be needed and that they contribute to achieving core FCO objectives, justifying FCO funding. If GBCC were abolished, there would therefore be a need to deliver the two core functions by another method. Options for this are considered as follows:

Move out of central government to eg the voluntary or private sector?

C.10 This option has been considered in previous reviews and rejected in part because of the political nature of the relationship-building function and in part because of the sensitivity of the areas of rule of law which GBCC projects have covered, which private sector sponsors in particular have been judged unlikely to be interested in pursuing. In addition, it has previously been judged that the GBCC model had characteristics which it would be hard to replicate in other organisations. This Review sought to test these judgements.

C.11 The Reviewer asked stakeholders in UK and China to consider possible alternatives to the GBCC model. No stakeholder was persuaded of the existence of an alternative likely to be able to provide the same balance of functions as the GBCC. In respect of the value of the GBCC's connection to UKG by virtue of its NDPB status, there was unanimity that this was an essential element of its effectiveness both in China and within the UK. This status meant that GBCC could be trusted to operate effectively and in an open and transparent way; would deliver work to professional standards; would be politically impartial and discreet in dealing with sensitive issues and high-level interactions; and would provide value for money according to UK Civil Service standards (to which it is bound as an NDPB). Removing NDPB status or handing over the GBCC's work to private sector or voluntary/NGO organisations was seen as likely to undermine confidence in those areas and lead to withdrawal of funding and/or participation by both sides.

C.12 To test assumptions about the voluntary/NGO sector, the Reviewer interviewed two organisations doing work in China which also had knowledge of the GBCC's project work - Save the Children China Programme and Raoul Wallenberg Institute in China, both of whose current China Directors previously worked for GBCC, and therefore also had a good understanding of the GBCC model. They are also examples of different structures of organisations delivering projects in China and serve therefore to some extent as comparisons for GBCC.

C.13 Save the Children China Programme deliver programmes primarily in education, health and emergency response across China and possess therefore a good experience base from which to comment on methods of working in China. Discussion led the Reviewer to conclude that one advantage of the GBCC model which other types of organisations do not have is its **unique mix of policy dialogue and practical projects**. In contrast, programme-based organisations such as Save

the Children quite properly focus primarily on delivery of their specific mandate, rather than on influencing core policy development; governmental overseas aid organisations often focus on trying to influence the way in which development work is done at the government level, but if they do not also undertake programmes it can be difficult for them to have a measurable policy impact; and campaigning organisations, whose stated purpose is to influence policy and who use more confrontational measures to raise awareness and apply pressure, can often find themselves less trusted by their local interlocutors and thus in reality less able to take on sensitive work. Each model has its strengths and its place. However, the GBCC model of building on the Chinese approach of using practical pilots to help test and develop policy in complex policy areas would appear to be a unique blend which could not be simply replicated in existing models of private or voluntary/NGO organisations.

C.14 The Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI) is an independent academic institute with a mission to promote universal respect for human rights and humanitarian law through research, education, and institutional development. RWI in China undertakes "a comprehensive programme of human rights education capacity-building support to Chinese academia and to key justice sector actors such as the Chinese prosecution service". It is therefore operating in a similar space to GBCC's project work. Discussion around funding models demonstrated a key difference with GBCC. The **RWI in China programme is fully funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency** (currently amounting to some 36 million Swedish krona over three years, roughly £3.5 million). GBCC's need to secure programme funding project-by-project is a clear disadvantage over the RWI model. However, RWI's strong core mission meant that it by definition needed to keep a strong focus on that, while the GBCC model provided some flexibility to respond to emerging opportunities. This ability to respond to emerging opportunities and changing priorities was cited by other stakeholders as a major advantage of GBCC, attributable both to the skills and experience of its personnel and to GBCC's long experience and reputation in China.

C.15 This Review concludes that the GBCC model has valuable and unique characteristics deriving from its distinctive mix of policy dialogue and practical projects which could not be simply replicated by the private sector or the voluntary or NGO sectors (conclusion 3)

Bring in-house?

C.16 This option has been considered and rejected by previous reviews. This Review agrees that this is not a feasible option. The Reviewer considered the model of the UK-India Round Table (UIRT) which delivers one round table event annually (bilateral programme funding of £20,000 in 2013-14, with additional funding from the Indian side). Since its inception in 2004, UIRT has been run from the India desk in the FCO with no external staff or secretariat. UIRT does not have the same level or complexity of ambition as GBCC and would not appear to be an effective model for GBCC. Also, in considering the effect of bringing GBCC in-house, the relationship-building activities between political parties of the two countries which GBCC undertakes would be undermined if the GBCC's functions were assimilated into the FCO because they would by definition no longer be done with the political impartiality and distance from the government of the day that GBCC provides as an Arms Length Body. Stakeholders in both China and UK regarded this political impartiality as essential. Similarly, it is clear that the specialist rule of law expertise and wide knowledge of the

Chinese academic and legal structures and system which GBCC staff possess could not be replicated by diplomatic staff in the Embassy in Beijing or in the FCO in London.

C.17 This Review concludes that GBCC's functions could not be done in-house (conclusion 4)

Merge with another body?

C.18 Previous reviews have considered and rejected a number of ideas for mergers. It was suggested to the Reviewer that GBCC might merge with the **Westminster Foundation for Democracy** (WFD - another FCO NDPB), the **China Britain Business Council** (CBBC - which receives £2.9 million Grant-in-Aid from UKTI but is no longer an NDPB) or the **British Council**.

C.19 On **WFD**, the Reviewer considers that although there are superficial elements in common since both look at links between political parties, their purpose is fundamentally different. WFD's aim is to work with countries "undergoing a transition to democracy". It provides expertise in developing the institutions that make up a functioning democracy - parliaments, political party structures and civil society organisations. As China's 12th 5-year plan makes clear (Chapter 54), China is pursuing political development in the context of socialism with Chinese characteristics under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. So there appears no clear fit between WFD and GBCC.

C.20 On **CBBC**, the Reviewer has also taken into account queries as to whether GBCC should try to do more work directly on the Prosperity agenda (see also Section F). According to its website, CBBC

"is the leading organisation helping UK companies grow and develop their business with China. We help companies of all sizes and sectors, whether new entrants or established operations. CBBC has worked with China for 60 years and our team has extensive experience of doing business there. We offer practical in-market assistance, services, industry initiatives and a membership programme delivering access, seminars and networking."

C.21 CBBC receives some £2.9 million Grant-in-Aid from UKTI and is UKTI's recognised trade service delivery partner in China. The Grant-in-Aid is provided against a Memorandum of Understanding covering revenue targets; quality targets; provisions of services such as events, missions, seminars; supporting the bilateral relationship through organising visits, providing Overseas Market Introduction Service (OMIS) in China; etc. These functions are very different from those undertaken by GBCC. However, both GBCC and CBBC senior leadership view their activities as to some extent complementary: GBCC's relationship-building and broad rule of law work might be seen as enabling activities which may open up opportunities; while CBBC's part is to pick up and deliver on opportunities, wherever they arise. In practical terms there is already cooperation over visits and events. Several stakeholders were clear that GBCC's rule of law work was however a different matter which would not sit easily with the CBBC business-led approach: both British and Chinese businesses were likely to be nervous about some of the more sensitive project work. While there is always scope for closer coordination, the functions and operating models of the two organisations appear fundamentally different.

C.22 On the **British Council**, in its early days GBCC undertook cultural and educational work similar to the British Council's role. However, over the years, GBCC's role has evolved and the political relationship-building and complex rule of law issues which are GBCC's speciality could not be delivered within a British Council context, not least because in China the British Council is regarded as a government organisation and its formal status in China is granted as the cultural department of the British Embassy. GBCC would thus lose its clear and trusted arms length status in the eyes of Chinese partners. There appears no scope for merging GBCC and the British Council.

Executive Agency

C.23 The requirements for establishment as an Executive Agency relate to size and viability, and to provision of a public service. GBCC is not providing a service direct to the public and the cost of conversion to an Executive Agency would not appear to be viable given the GBCC's small size and funding model. There thus appears no scope for establishing GBCC as an Executive Agency.

C.24 This Review concludes that there is currently no clear fit for a GBCC merger (conclusion 5)

GBCC and the Government's "three tests" for NDPB status

C.25 The Cabinet Office guidance on reviewing NDPBs sets out three tests, of which the organisation must meet one to justify NDPB status. The 2010 Review considered that GBCC met two of the three tests. The three tests and the Reviewer's assessments are:

(i) is this a technical function (which needs external expertise to deliver)?

Yes. GBCC does perform a technical function requiring external expertise (ie in this case expertise different from core FCO diplomatic skills and expertise). GBCC staff expertise in rule of law issues and in the legal systems and structures in China have been accumulated over many years and this could not be replicated in-house. It is also, as described by Chinese rule of law projects partners, a key source of GBCC's effectiveness.

(ii) is this a function which needs to be, and be seen to be, delivered with absolute political impartiality (such as certain regulatory or funding functions)?

Yes. GBCC does not undertake statutory or regulatory functions but the political nature of its relationship-building work requires absolute political impartiality. In this respect the value of its rule of law expertise also lies in its political independence which enables GBCC to interact effectively at a technical level on complex and sensitive issues, to share experience and act as a conduit to the wider rule of law/criminal justice professional world.

(iii) is this a function which needs to be delivered independently of Ministers to establish facts and/or figures with integrity.

No. GBCC's functions are not primarily linked to establishing facts or figures or other statistical analytical work.

C.26 This Review concludes that GBCC continues to meet two of the Cabinet Office's three tests for NDPB status and that it should therefore retain NDPB status (conclusion 6)

D. REVIEW PHASE 2: HOW WELL IS GBCC DELIVERING?

Assessment of effectiveness of GBCC's political dialogue programme

D1. This year GBCC plans to deliver the 7th UK-China Leadership Forum (27-29 November, London and Ditchley Park) and the 4th UK-China Young Leaders Round Table (10-12 July in UK at Lancaster House and other UK locations) which will be combined for the first time with Chevening Chinese Young Leaders Training Programme. Both events alternate between the UK and China.

D2. GBCC organises the UK-China Leadership Forum jointly with the International Department of the Chinese Communist Party. Its purpose is enable participants to discuss and debate key issues, build lasting relationships between influential figures in the political world of both countries, and to strengthen the relationship between the UK and China. Participants of both sides should increase their understanding of the political systems and governance structures of the other through their participation. Because of their non-governmental nature, these party-to-party activities have continued even when the government-to-government relationship has been difficult. In 2012, the UK delegation was led by Lords Mandelson, Powell and Sassoon with eight cross-party MPs and a number of private sector sponsor representatives.

D3. Both sides value the dialogue as a unique method of developing relationships and experience at the senior leadership level. On the Chinese side, there is a strong and organised system for selecting participants: they will already have achieved senior positions and will have the potential to go still further. They are drawn from a wide range of backgrounds and experience. For them, the Forum is an opportunity to interact with British parliamentarians and senior business leaders, and to experience British parliamentary and governance systems. They can explore how the British multi-party system works and in return show UK participants how the Chinese system works. The format gives participants the confidence to go beyond formalities and engage in open debate with full respect for each other's views. Most Chinese participants who have attended the Leadership Forum go on to be promoted. On the UK side, the parliamentary parties see the Forum as an essential tool for exposing MPs to the whole range of China issues and enabling them to engage openly on matters of serious policy. As for the Chinese side, this is an opportunity for British parliamentarians with limited or no experience of China to learn about numerous aspects of the Chinese political and governance structures, and for those more experienced to deepen their understanding and friendships. The relationships and networks established are viewed by both sides as valuable and both sides believe more should be done to make use of the network.

D4. The UK-China Young Leaders Round Table grew out of the Leadership Forum and focuses on the youth wing of the Chinese Communist Party and new UK MPs. Again, the aim is to enhance communication, understanding and friendship and to bring on a new generation of connections to build sustainability for the future into the UK-China relationship. As for the Forum, the selection process on the Chinese side is rigorous and brings in a wide range of backgrounds and experience. The themes discussed are current 'hot topics' - eg in 2012 the Round Table discussed welfare systems, both current and their historical development. in 2013 the theme will be 'soft power', a UK strength on which it wishes both to share experience and learn from others.

D5. Chinese interlocutors spoke very positively of the quality of cooperation with GBCC over the Forum and the Round Table. They saw it as a mutually respectful relationship in which the two sides worked together to design and bring about very high quality and purposeful events. After each event, the two sides do a lessons learned exercise and look to build on each experience to improve the next. The Chinese side regard these events as a 'special brand' without any direct equivalent. There are similar conference-style events with the US and with European political parties but the GBCC brand is unique, and could not be replaced by eg an Embassy-led event. GBCC staff are seen as having a great combination of intellect, emotional intelligence and China experience.

D.6 UK participants highly value these events both in themselves but also for the long term investment in building relationships which is so essential to operating effectively in China. Continued participation over the years shines a light on changing social and political preoccupations in both China and the UK.

D.7 The Review assesses that the Leadership Forum and the Young Leaders Round Table are effective methods for building relationships, undertaking political dialogue and sharing experience of different parliamentary and governance structures and recommends that in drawing up its new strategy post-Review, GBCC respond to the demand shown by both sides and consider the possibilities of increasing the number and themes of these events. This will require a new approach on sponsorship as already recognised by the establishment of the Board's Sponsorship Committee (see also para E.11 below on the UK-China Forum). (recommendation 1)

Assessment of effectiveness of GBCC's rule of law project work

D.8 A table of GBCC projects since the last Review is at **Annex D**. The table briefly describes key outputs and key achievements for each project. This Review seeks to synthesise the achievements for five major project streams over time below. China's "White Paper on Progress in Human Rights in China" was published in May 2013 (http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2013-05/14/c_132380706_2.htm). There are several references in the White Paper to progress in areas where GBCC has undertaken projects with Chinese partners, in particular on reducing the use of the Death Penalty and on rights of detainees. It is worth quoting in full the relevant parts of the White Paper to reflect the Chinese policy context within which this rule of law work has been done and to see China's own evaluation of success in these areas. The White Paper's section on "Protection of Human Rights in the context of Chinese political restructuring", sets the policy context (Xinhua official translation, Reviewer's highlighting):

"The formation of the socialist legal system with Chinese characteristics is an important milestone in the development of China's human rights cause, and **it ensures that the country's human rights protection is done within the framework of the law**. In recent years, the state has paid great attention to proceeding from the requirement of protecting human rights to amend relevant laws and regulations. In 2012 "respecting and protecting human rights" was added to the newly amended Criminal Procedure Law and attention was paid to see it that the spirit of this clause was implemented."

It later states:

"In February 2011 the NPC Standing Committee examined and approved Amendment VIII of the Criminal Law, which **removed the death penalty from 13 economic and nonviolent crimes, thus reducing the death penalty charges by nearly one fifth**. The Amendment also adopted a restrictive regulation for the application of death penalty to offenders aged 75 or above at the time of the trial. In June 2010 the Supreme People's Court and Supreme People's Procuratorate jointly issued the Rules for Reviewing and Judging the Evidence in Handling Death Penalty Cases, **adopting more rigorous standards for reviewing and judging the evidence in death penalty cases**. The amended Criminal Procedure Law requires that all trials of second instance for death penalty cases be held in public and the supervision over the review of death sentences be tightened."

and:

" In 2011 the Ministry of Public Security and the Ministry of Health jointly issued the Basic Standards for Establishment of Clinics in Detention Centres to improve the accommodation, living and medical conditions of detainees. By the end of 2012, a detainee security risk assessment and ranking mechanism had been established in 2,391 detention centres, or 89.1 percent of the national total; psychological counselling rooms for detainees had been established in 1,774 detention centres, or 66.1 percent of the national total; two-way online video meetings for inmates had been established in 1,893 detention centres, or 70.5 percent of the national total; and a **complaints handling mechanism** had been set up in 2,532 detention centres, or 94.3 percent of the national total. This mechanism had been employed in handling 2,633 complaints from the detainees. In addition, **guest supervisors** had been hired in 2,664 detention centres, or 99.2 percent of the total."

These changes are in areas where GBCC and its Chinese partners have undertaken project work, described in more detail below.

Death Penalty

D.9 GBCC has undertaken four successive Death Penalty (DP) projects with Chinese partners, two of them since the last Review. DP2 (2006-2009; Beijing Normal University, Max Planck Institute Germany) achieved a revision of criminal law and an overall reduction in the number of capital crimes. **DP3** (2009-12; Wuhan University, National University of Ireland) built on this to promote judicial discretion in the restriction and reduction in the use of the death penalty. **DP4** (2012-2015, Beijing Normal University) aims to promote effective enforcement of current policy on reducing capital punishment; to improve the use of evidence in death penalty cases; and to develop better safeguards in trial procedures for capital crimes.

D.10 GBCC is the only international delivery partner working with Chinese partners on the death penalty. Chinese interlocutors interviewed gave high praise to GBCC's working methodology. GBCC is seen as a bridge between China and the UK and as highly expert in rule of law issues and in both the Chinese and the British legal systems (GBCC's former Deputy Director was previously a prosecutor in China and the current (Chinese) project manager for judicial projects was called to the Bar in 2004). GBCC use their knowledge and networks to find the right professional links for the

Chinese side to carry out their research and comparative analyses. GBCC also provide 'intelligent' project design and management, helping the academic partners to frame their research ideas into a deliverable process.

D.11 On **DP3**, GBCC and the Chinese partners were proud of the results achieved and the methodology. DP3 focused on use of the death penalty in drug-related crimes. The project first investigated how the death penalty had been applied in Kunming Intermediate Court and Yunnan High Court (in a province which suffers much drug-related crime); then chose some of the cases at random and the research team plus two judges applied a test set of principles aimed at reducing and restricting use of the death penalty in these cases; finally they analysed the difference in outcomes. The results were written up and submitted to the Supreme People's Court in Beijing¹. The Supreme People's Court indicated that this was high quality and detailed research and later promulgated revised guidelines on death penalty sentencing in drug-related cases and on use of evidence in drug-related cases. The results of a further project - **the Power of Evidence** - fed directly into the drafting of the revised Criminal Procedure Law adopted in March 2012, since the project's lead professor was also one of four legislation experts providing advice on the revision process. These areas of progress are reflected in China's 2013 White Paper on Progress in Human Rights.

Rights of Detainees

D.12 GBCC has a long-established partnership with Renmin University and University of Maastricht Law School to work on rights of detainees: Preventing Torture and ill treatment of prisoners (2008-2012), Complaints Mechanisms for victims of torture (2011); Pre-trial detention centres: complaining with confidence (2012-2013) (also with CCPR and UK Prisons and Probations Ombudsman). The focus of all these projects is to strengthen the legal and practical mechanisms for holding law enforcement agencies accountable for preventing torture and ill treatment in detention. These mechanisms included promoting external monitoring of detention centres, ethical investigations and robust complaints mechanisms.

D.13 GBCC and the Chinese partners were proud of the combined results of these projects, which were significant enough to appear in China's White Paper. A direct development from the Preventing Torture project was the issuing of a directive on 2011 from China's Ministry of Public Security requiring all pre-trial detention centres to instigate a system of prison visitors (translated as 'guest supervisors' in the White Paper quoted) based on the UK volunteer prison visitor system. By the end of 2012, 99.2% of detention facilities across China had established such a system. 94.3% had also set up a complaints-handling mechanism and, recognising that simply setting up a system does not mean that it will be immediately effective, follow-up projects provided training on handling complaints and on EU best practice and UN standards, and study visits to the UK.

¹ All death penalty sentences must be submitted to the Supreme People's Court in Beijing to be approved. If the sentence is not approved, the case returns to the relevant court for re-sentencing. The death penalty cannot then be imposed. The Supreme People's Court also plays a role in promulgating guidelines for the application of the law to judges throughout China. Hence the importance of its role in the projects GBCC has undertaken with Chinese partners.

D.14 The Chinese partners were complimentary about GBCC. As a project implementing partner, GBCC provided a much wider range of skills and service than others, including intelligent project design, an egalitarian approach and dedication to sustainable outcomes. The UK itself was of real interest to the Chinese legal world because of the unique combination of the different types of law found in the UK's legal systems, making it an excellent source of information and exchange of experience for Chinese partners. GBCC provided an outstanding range of connections in the UK and other European Countries which the Chinese partners were clear they would not have been able to access themselves.

Judges Training

D.15 The Judicial Studies Training Programme ran from 1998-2012 and its demise (when UK Ministry of Justice could no longer fund it) was universally regretted by all those interviewed in China or the UK working in the legal world. 79 young Chinese judges took the programme, which included a one year MA or LLM degree, followed by 4 weeks practical work experience in the UK. Different legal specialisms were covered year by year. The training and network were maintained through the additional mechanism of biannual seminars in China.

D.16 Chinese interlocutors spoke of the impact of this network of UK-trained judges in terms of values, common understanding, broadening of experience and a real jump in professionalism. Many of the alumni of the scheme have been promoted. All have multiplied the benefits of their training by writing articles for Chinese legal journals, giving lectures to fellow judges and through professional networks. UK interlocutors characterised the scheme as one of the best ways of sharing experience and influencing the development of legal practice: judges are much more likely to seek and listen to advice from other judges; if they have some connections with them through programmes like this one, so much the better. Reviving the Judicial Training Scheme would be one of the most effective ways of promoting developments in the legal sphere in China.

Promoting Legal Protection for the Media

D.17 GBCC has undertaken two linked projects on Promoting Legal Protection for the Media (2011-2014, with Peking University, Renmin University, Oxford University; and 2012-2013 with Renmin University). The projects took a practical approach, based on promoting greater policy and professional understanding of the standards required for freedom of media in a modern society, seeking a judicial reinterpretation of Tort Law as it applies to the media, and strengthening the capacity and role of media legal advisors in the protection of the rights of journalists. This was done through a series of workshops for Chinese judges who handle Tort law cases to identify current problems and challenges with the media law according to their experience, which resulted in the development of judicial manuals. There were also research placements in the UK and judges training on handling Tort Law cases for over 70 participants, provoking vigorous debate on the basis of the judicial manual, and with UK and EU experts providing views on the practical problems they had encountered in handling legal protection for the media.

Rights in the workplace

D.18 GBCC undertook one project on Grievance Procedures in the Chinese Textile Industry (2012-2013, with the Social Resources Institute (SRI), a Chinese NGO). A follow-up project unfortunately did not secure funding at the first bid but will be resubmitted. This relates directly to rights in the workplace and addresses a gap identified by Chinese partners. There are existing workplace resolution mechanisms but they are seen as top down and they are not constructed from the perspective of the rights of the worker. Workers do not often perceive that they have a right to redress for their workplace grievances. The project succeeded in raising awareness of UN norms as well as achieving the practical result of developing and publishing an advisory draft for a non-judicial grievance procedure in factories. Importantly, this draft was endorsed by the China National Textile and Apparel Council (CNTAC) and can therefore be a blueprint for any factory from any sector that wishes to establish a grievance mechanism. The follow-up project would seek to implement the grievance procedure in pilot factories.

D.19 The Chinese partner was very clear about the value of the GBCC partnership. GBCC engaged in the project design and provided excellent outreach to the right international experts which the NGO would not have been easily able to find (from the US and from ACAS in the UK). They were clear about the mechanics of project management and exerting discipline over budgets. SRI had experience of working with numerous other organisations and in comparison felt that GBCC provided very much a bespoke approach which robustly supported the particular needs of that project but did not dominate the partnership.

D.20 The Review concludes that GBCC, with its Chinese and other partners, has produced a serious of outstanding projects with real and lasting results in a number of sensitive rights-related rule of law fields. It has built up a unique set of relationships and deep trust which enables it to engage in complex areas where Chinese partners are seeking change and development. This is valuable to both the UK and China and there remain areas of work where Chinese partners wish to continue to work with GBCC to push forward reform of China's legal system (conclusion 7)

E. REVIEW PHASE 2: DOES GBCC COMPLY WITH RECOGNISED PRINCIPLES OF GOOD CORPORATE GOVERNANCE?

E.1 The Cabinet Office's guidance for conducting NDPB reviews sets out the principles of good corporate governance for executive NDPBs such as GBCC. In general, the Reviewer believes that GBCC does comply well with these principles and both the GBCC Board and its staff strive to ensure that their activities are of the highest possible standard, and the assessment relating to different aspects of corporate governance follows below (paras E.11 on). However, the Reviewer was concerned at the high burden of 'corporate overheads' caused by such a tiny organisation (currently five staff and carrying one vacancy) attempting to comply with all the centrally-generated requirements meant for large and complex government departments, by which GBCC is bound by virtue of being an NDPB. GBCC is obliged to abide by and apply all Civil Service practice and all FCO-specific measures. One stakeholder commented that a much larger amount of funding granted to a single project from one of the FCO programme funds would bring with it only a fraction of the governance requirements associated with GBCC's small Grant-in-Aid from the FCO.

E.2 There is already some recognition of this burden on the FCO corporate side (DG Operations) and a desire to consider ways to help. Since FY 2012-13, GBCC's accounts have been fully consolidated with the FCO's accounts and the FCO PUS is therefore now the Super Accounting Officer for GBCC. The FCO Internal Audit Department have now brought GBCC into their Internal Audit Shared Services arrangements. They will conduct a limited and proportionate amount of internal audit testing to give the PUS assurance, which will also satisfy the GBCC Director's responsibilities as GBCC Accounting Officer at no cost to GBCC. This has enabled GBCC to end their audit contract and save money. More importantly in terms of the governance overhead, the direct connection to FCO Internal Audit will provide a source of corporate advice and support to GBCC.

E.3 There are some further steps which FCO DG Operations might consider which would help support all the FCO's small NDPBs², especially now that the FCO PUS has to sign "FCO Group" accounts that contain the transactions of the NDPBs, and therefore has a direct responsibility. For example, Information and Technology Directorate (ITD) could help support NDPBs needing to use FCONet or the new Unclassified Portal; Finance could invite NDPB Finance Staff to FCO events; Estates and Security Directorate could share their work interpreting the Bribery Act with NDPBs and Internal Audit could provide counter-fraud presentations and other compliance advice; Human Resources Directorate could guide on best practice and procedures eg in personnel management and development, terms and conditions etc. There have been attempts at this before but it seems to have been difficult to ensure continuity.

E.4 The Review recommends that DG Operations consider establishing an NDPB focal point and policy to support the FCO's NDPBs and as a matter of good corporate practice for the FCO itself (recommendation 2)

² The FCO's full list of NDPBs is: BBC World Service, British Council, FCO Services, Foreign Compensation Commission, GBCC, Marshall Aid Commemoration Commission, UK-India Round Table, Westminster Foundation for Democracy, Wilton Park.

E.5 Directly relevant to this recommendation, the Reviewer found at the outset of the review that only one GBCC staff member had access to the unclassified FCO Intranet and they therefore had only very limited access to FCO administrative and policy guidance, corporate news, staffing directories etc. Access to the FCO Intranet is essential to enable "self-help" and to keep up to date; without access the task of finding out information is needlessly burdensome. This has now been rectified and all GBCC staff now have log ins. None of GBCC's staff currently hold any level of security clearance.

E.6 The Review recommends that the FCO consider security clearing the Director of GBCC to enable access to strategic policy discussions on matters relating to GBCC's work. **(recommendation 3)**

E.7 The Reviewer discussed with the Head of FCO Internal Audit whether there were other direct ways of alleviating the burden on GBCC (which might also be relevant for the FCO's other small NDPBs). Two of GBCC's five staff currently work predominantly on management and finance issues and the proportion of their time spent essentially on corporate compliance and transactions has risen inexorably over recent years, pushing out other, value-added elements. All the staff consistently work very long hours (further discussion of GBCC's structure is in section F below). Alleviating the operating burden would enable the staff to focus more time on delivering GBCC's core functions - the relationship-building, project design and administration, sponsorship and funding activities, and maintaining their valuable China knowledge and networks up to date.

E.8 One possibility is a change in operating model (rather than a change in corporate status or a merger which, as assessed in Section C above, is not recommended). In this case, it means finding a way for GBCC to benefit from its NDPB status by sharing back-office services. High corporate overheads is a wider issue than just for GBCC, which the FCO has sought to address by moving some or all transactional processing from eg some Regional Networks overseas to the FCO's Corporate Services Centre (CSC) in Milton Keynes. In this first scenario, all transaction processing, such as payroll and invoice processing, would be undertaken by the CSC, which could also prepare the GBCC's accounts, leaving GBCC to focus on project bid and delivery.

E.9 Along similar lines, a second scenario would be to look to outsource the Transactional Processing to an external organisation, rather than the CSC. This is what another FCO NDPB, the Marshall Aid Commemoration Commission (MACC), has done: the Association of Commonwealth Universities administers and recovers the costs of the Marshall Scholarship Scheme, MACC's core function. Given the specialised nature of GBCC's functions, these could not, as already discussed, easily be replicated in another organisation and it would seem unlikely that a third party would provide as cost-effective an option as the FCO's CSC for just the transactional processing (if the latter is able to take on GBCC's transactional processing).

E.10 The Review recommends that China Department, as the sponsoring department within the FCO, investigate the possibility of GBCC's transactional processing being undertaken by the Corporate Services Centre with Internal Audit Department and the Corporate Services Centre **(Recommendation 4)**

Accountability, both within GBCC and in the FCO

E.11 As found by previous Reviews, GBCC maintains good levels of accountability. In respect of statutory accountability, it complies with HM Treasury statutory principles and policies; it publishes information in line with the Freedom of Information Act 2000; It complies with Data Protection legislation; and it is subject to the Public Records Acts 1958 and 1967.

E.12 On accountability for public money, the GBCC Director is formally designated as its Accounting Officer and the FCO PUS is overall accountable to Parliament now that GBCC's accounts are consolidated within the FCO's. FCO Internal Audit Department have brought GBCC into their Internal Audit Shared Services arrangements and expect to conduct a limited and proportionate amount of internal audit testing to give the PUS assurance, which will also satisfy the GBCC Director's responsibilities as GBCC Accounting Officer at no cost to GBCC. GBCC has an active Audit Committee which undertakes the usual functions, including considering risk.

E.13 In terms of Ministerial accountability, the relevant FCO Minister exercises supervision, delegated appropriately for day-to-day operation to China Department.

E.14 The Review concludes that GBCC continues to maintain good levels of accountability
(conclusion 8)

Roles and responsibilities, including strategic direction and the quality of the relationship between FCO and GBCC;

E.15 The Reviewer found there to be generally close working relationships and understanding of roles between GBCC and the UK Embassy in Beijing, and between GBCC and China Department at the working level. However, GBCC's interactions at a senior level in London seem to have dipped and this shows in the limited reflection of the role of GBCC in delivering FCO objectives in the FCO's strategic documents, or assimilation of the impact delivered by GBCC's activities into China Department's or the FCO's overall assessment of its performance. To an extent this reflects GBCC's small size versus the great shift in resources over recent years into the FCO's China network. However, given the high value placed on the very specific functions that GBCC provides, the Reviewer sees potential benefit to both sides in refreshing GBCC's strategic framework, particularly reflecting the arrival of the new Director in October 2012, and so recommends (recommendation 5)

E.16 On the role of the Sponsoring Department, China Department is GBCC's sponsor in the FCO and the Head of China Department attends GBCC's Board meetings. The Reviewer feels that both sides would benefit from more interaction at that level outside Board meetings, and with the Asia Pacific Director. GBCC's governance arrangements are set out in its Management Statement (and Financial Memorandum). As with previous Reviews, the current Reviewer finds the Management Statement lengthy and over-complex for day-to-day purposes and recommends GBCC and China Department agree a one page document or memorandum of understanding setting out a practical approach to their relationship, ie what each should expect of the other during the course of a business year. It may also serve to explain GBCC's purpose and status as an FCO NDPB to other departments in the FCO (in particular those responsible for programme funds such as the Human Rights Fund, the

Emerging Powers Fund, the Strategic Projects Fund etc) and to other potential public sector stakeholders. **(recommendation 6)**

E.17 On the role of the Board, the Reviewer judges that the Board meets the requirements outlined in the Cabinet Office guidance. The Board has reduced in size in line with the recommendation of the previous Review. It was suggested that it should reduce even further to become a "small, tight Executive Board". The Reviewer does not altogether agree. The GBCC Board is not an executive board running a large organisation. It carries multiple functions - executive, strategic, advisory, sponsorship - and is itself a representation of the work of GBCC and embodies the mix of skills and long-term China experience which underpins GBCC's success. GBCC's website states that "members of the Board are persons of distinction in their field with a strong interest in China". GBCC does need a mix of stakeholders and at present Board members include current and former diplomats with China experience; a representative from the three main parliamentary parties; and private sector representatives. It was suggested that, given GBCC's focus on the rule of law, there could be advantage in having a representative of a China-focused law firm and/or legal academics on the Board. The Reviewer does not wish to bind the Board but recommends that the composition and tenure of the Board be kept under review, regularly refreshed and slightly expanded if necessary to ensure that the right sectors and interests are represented (recommendation 7). In this context, the Reviewer notes that the Board has recently established a Sponsorship Committee, tasked to advise the Director with a view to optimising the GBCC approach to new sponsorship.

E.18 On the role of the chair, the duties, role and responsibilities and terms of office are clearly set out in the Management Statement. The position of Chair is unpaid though expenses may be reimbursed. The Reviewer notes that the current Chair is in the final year of his appointment. The Management Statement does not set out a clear recruitment process beyond stating that the candidate should be selected by the GBCC Board and approved by the Secretary of State and done in accordance with the government's Code of Practice on Ministerial Appointments to Public Bodies. The review recommends that the GBCC Board agree an open and transparent recruitment process and adjust the Management Statement accordingly to ensure a timely succession. In this respect the Reviewer found the process for selecting the Chairman of CBBC to be a useful model. **(recommendation 8)**

E.19 On the role of the non-executive Board members, the duties, role and responsibilities and terms of office are clearly set out in the Management Statement. The Board members are unpaid though expenses may be reimbursed. Since the last Review, the Board has reduced in size and its workings have become more focused; the use of sub-committees (Audit Committee, Management Committee, Sponsorship Committee) has helped.

E.20 Overall, the Review finds that the quality of the relationship between FCO and GBCC is generally good. However it is possible that, with the large amount of resource redirected into the China network in recent years, there has been slight drift in the relationship at the strategic level. Both GBCC and the FCO would benefit from reassessing the strategic delivery role of GBCC and the value of its unique contribution, with a view to ensuring that opportunities which arise are fully realised and the enduring impact of its activities and contribution to FCO objectives fully measured and acknowledged and the Review so recommends. (conclusion 9 and recommendation 9)

UK-China Forum Ltd

E.21 UK-China Forum Ltd (UKCF) is the body originally set up to deliver the UK-China Leadership Forum and is now subsumed into GBCC. UKCF still has its own corporate structure, with a Trustee Board of five members (three of whom are the current and last Director of GBCC and the current GBCC Chair). Its accounts, which were audited and given a clean bill of health for FY 2012-13 by its external auditors, are now fully consolidated into GBCC's.

E.22 In speaking to UKCF trustees, the Reviewer found that UKCF's separate identity was currently not being used effectively to promote a wide range of relationships and exchanges. UK and Chinese interlocutors interviewed placed high value on the Leadership Forum and the Young Leaders Round Table and consistently expressed a desire for more interactions between these main events both to maintain the momentum and to increase the number of themes that could be addressed. There is a demand for exchanges on economic issues and on wider governance issues, including corporate governance, anti-corruption and transparency, as well as a desire to build more regional or city-to-city relationships. The Reviewer considers that since a core purpose of the leadership relationship-building activities is to increase understanding of the two countries' parliamentary and political systems and their governance structures, GBCC could make more use of the UKCF brand to expand the range of governance issues able to be addressed. The GBCC Board's Sponsorship Committee would have an important role to play in developing this activity. Increasing understanding in these areas would also underpin UK government's aims in the prosperity agenda, in particular promoting growth, open markets and good governance. If this route is followed, UKCF's Board structure would need to change accordingly.

E.23 The Review recommends that the GBCC respond to the demand for a wider range of relationship activity, including on economic and wider corporate governance issues by making more effective use of the UK-China Forum brand (recommendation 10)

Effective financial management, both in GBCC's daily operations and in FCO:

E.24 GBCC's systems of financial management and internal control are set out in the Financial Memorandum attached to its Management Statement, as well as the FCO's financial guidelines. For its project work, sponsors indicated that GBCC abide closely by the financial requirements of the funding organisations. GBCC's Annual Report and Accounts are now consolidated with the FCO's and comply with HM Treasury guidance. At GBCC's Board meeting on 11 June 2013, the Audit Committee reported that the NAO (GBCC's external auditor) had substantially reviewed GBCC's internal controls and concluded, given GBCC's size, that they are appropriate and appear to be operating effectively. NAO have given GBCC a clean audit report for 2012-13.

E.25 GBCC is now part of the FCO Internal Audit Department's Internal Audit Shared Services arrangements. GBCC now works closely with FCO Internal Audit Department, who are satisfied with GBCC's internal controls. They provide GBCC with the latest FCO guidance on anti-fraud and anti-corruption. GBCC has an Audit Committee which carries out the expected functions, included considering risk.

E.26 The previous Review noted a problem arising from an EU audit of the second Death Penalty project, which ruled some of the expenditure ineligible, though GBCC had followed standard project expenditure accounting practice in line with guidance from the FCO Strategic Programme Fund. In summary, GBCC was penalised in two ways: the EU refused to reimburse payment for printing of the project report because of a timing issue; and the EU required GBCC to repay a portion of disbursed project funding because the auditors were not satisfied with the level of detail in the receipts provided by the Chinese partners for activities undertaken in China. The Chair and the Board were convinced that no impropriety had occurred and that the issue lay in a mismatch of expectations relating to the accounting requirements. They made strenuous efforts to convince the EU not to penalise GBCC for these technical reasons. In the end the loss was lower than originally feared but still had to be absorbed by GBCC reserves. GBCC have learned the lesson and now ensures both that the Chinese partner shares the financial accounting risk and understands the stringent EU requirements, and maintains its own file of EU best practice. The Review recommends that the GBCC Director take steps with the Head of China Department to ensure that GBCC staff undertake the latest project and programme training (both for FCO systems and an external professional qualification such as PRINCE 2 and Managing Successful Programmes (MSP)) (recommendation 11)

E.27 The Review finds that overall GBCC does have effective financial management systems in place and makes no additional recommendations. (conclusion 10)

Communications between FCO and GBCC, and GBCC's external communication strategy

E.28 Stakeholders interviewed in China and the UK showed clearly that GBCC had effective channels of communication with them; understood stakeholder interest and conveyed GBCC messaging with clarity, respect, and openness. The Reviewer judged that GBCC might with advantage refresh some of its relationships at the UK end in the same way that it deploys great skill in making and maintaining valuable networks in China. The need to chase project funding has led to GBCC prioritising its efforts in those areas where funding has been open for bidding, leaving little time available for maintaining wider relationships. This is clearly a question of overstretch rather than a lack of will. For example, the FCO's Human Rights and Democracy Department were clear that they had every confidence in the excellence of GBCC's previous project work but a couple of recent bids had failed and the department felt that more contact with GBCC at the strategic level, even before the project design began, would have been beneficial. Those administering programme funds were clear about the value of GBCC as a project delivery partner. The Review recommends that GBCC draw up a stakeholder outreach and communication strategy as part of its refreshed strategic approach, with a focus on UK public and private sector stakeholders (the Sponsorship Committee of the Board will have a role) (recommendation 12).

E.29 GBCC's public communication is done primarily through its website. It publishes details of Board members and staff; its work; China events; the Great Britain-China Educational Trust (which GBCC administers); and its sponsors. It uses the website to publish Freedom of Information items (either via a link or on request and payment of a small administration fee). These include minutes of Board meetings and project documents. GBCC provides information as required to members of the public or to Members of Parliament asking questions (in line with the FCO's guidance on

answering parliamentary questions). The Reviewer found that the website is not up-to-date and does not fully reflect GBCC's purpose and activities. It is clear that work on the website has lapsed because of staff over-stretch rather than a lack of understanding of the importance of good media presence. The Review further recommends that China Department consider sponsoring a short term (4-6 month) secondment into GBCC to help design the outreach and communication strategy, including helping GBCC to refresh the website (recommendation 13)

E.30 GBCC abides by the Government's conventions on publicity and marketing. It does not engage in political lobbying. GBCC's relations with Parliament are strong and non-partisan. The All-Party Parliamentary China Group (APPCG) is GBCC's main interlocutor and the APPCG's current Chairman sits on the GBCC Board.

E.31 The Review concludes that GBCC is open, transparent, accountable and responsive and makes no additional recommendations (conclusion 11)

Conduct and behaviour, of both GBCC Board and its staff.

E.32 GBCC staff follow the Civil Service code. There is also a code of conduct for the Board and a register of interests. In interviews, stakeholders expressed clear views that GBCC operates with the highest standards of conduct and behaviour. The Review has no recommendations in this area.

F. ASSESSMENT OF LEVEL OF AMBITION FOR GBCC ACTIVITIES

Is the level of ambition for GBCC activities correct?

F.1 GBCC's mission statement as set out in its Corporate Plan 2013-16 is:

To make a significant and lasting contribution to UK-China relations through:

(i) Building stability, mutual respect and understanding - by creating and managing informal political dialogues between key leaders

(ii) Influencing developments in China aligned to British and universal values in areas such as the rule of law, good governance, sustainable development and internal reform - by designing and delivering programmes with partners and a range of funders to deliver measurable results.

GBCC base this mission statement on four key assessments:

- China's rise as a major global power and potentially the world's largest economy in future makes mutual understanding between China and the UK imperative;
- Healthy partnerships with China, based on common understandings and common ground, are essential for political and economic security;
- The UK and Europe have a major economic and political interest in supporting China's internal reform and successful transition to a stable, prosperous and open country;
- There are few organisations in the UK, or in Europe, that have the standing and experience of GBCC to provide a trusted channel of communication with both official and unofficial China.

F2. GBCC's specific objectives for 2013-14 include:

RELATIONSHIP-BUILDING ACTIVITIES

UK-China Leadership Forum: 7th UK-China Leadership Forum, 27-29 November, London and Ditchley Park

UK-China Young Leaders Roundtable: 4th Round Table 10-12 July in UK at Lancaster House and other UK locations. Combined for the first time with Chevening Chinese Young Leaders Training Programme.

GBCC is looking to bring in additional and new sponsorship for these two prestigious activities.

PROJECT WORK: RULE OF LAW, GOOD GOVERNANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Current projects: (I) 4th Death Penalty project, (II) project promoting legal protection for the media, (III) EU-China Civil Society Dialogues project.

On-going project bids and further developments: (I) EU Access to Justice project (won by British Council; GBCC is the reserve bidder), (II) launching an EU-China judiciary exchange (bid failed; concept being reworked), (III) combating torture by supporting China's institutional reform (bid failed; being revised), (iv) better safeguards in trial procedures for capital crimes (bid being considered), (v) promoting human rights(grievance mechanisms) for textile factory workers (bid failed; new funders being sought), (vi) rights protection for victims of land disputes (Big Lottery funding bid), (vii) freedom of expression (developing new consortium to bid for EU funding), (viii) anti-corruption methodologies (developing new project initiatives working with international NGOs such as Transparency International, university-based experts in UK and China and and experts on rule of law development in related fields such as procurement).

F.3 The Review judges that GBCC's mission statement and objectives are well-focused around wider FCO objectives and around its clear fields of expertise in human rights and the rule of law, and represent a realistic level of ambition if programme funding can be secured (conclusion 12). GBCC's strategy to fulfil this mission and meet these objectives is to leverage its core strengths and expertise through bringing in funding (either programme funds or corporate sponsorship). However, the Reviewer is concerned that GBCC has had a recent run of not quite securing programme funds for good projects because of the quality of the bids or concept. While it is often the case that bids are reworked to meet the funding panel's requirements, there is clear evidence that the enormous time and effort needed to put together the bid for the very large EU Access to Justice project (for which GBCC is the reserve behind the British Council) detracted from the bids for some smaller but worthwhile projects, resulting in GBCC unfortunately winning none of the funding first time round.

F.4 The Review recommends that GBCC take advantage of this Review and the fact that several major GBCC projects ended in 2012-13 to develop a "new business pipeline" of ideas for new projects for implementation over the next three years, and to plan a bidding strategy including to new sources of funding (recommendation 14).

Are GBCC's organisational resources correctly aligned with this level of ambition?

F.5 The FCO Grant-in-Aid to GBCC has again been reduced by 10% for 2013-14 in line with the 10% cut to departmental funding, and is now **£243,000**. As a point of comparison, in 1993 the Grant-in-Aid was £210,000 which, if index-linked to RPI equates to some £342,000 today. The Grant-in-Aid now only covers about **55%** of GBCC running costs (down from about 60% in 2012-13). GBCC's funding model is that the remainder of the running costs has to be made up from the management fees element of project funding and event sponsorship. This is a big ask.

F.6 For the first time, the Grant-in-Aid has been classified as Overseas Development Assistance (ODA). This is important because as part of its 2011 Spending Review settlement, the FCO agreed it would substantially increase its contribution to UK ODA, in line with the UK Government's

commitment to meet the UN target of 0.7% Gross National Income devoted to ODA by 2013. ODA is defined by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee as financial flows to developing countries or territories (in cash or in kind) the main objective of which is promotion of economic development and welfare. It can and does include activities such as programme spend, scholarships to developing country students, work on governance and the rule of law, and the cost of staff whose work contributes directly to development. To count as ODA, the funding provided must relate to work: (a) undertaken by the official sector; and (b) with promotion of economic development and welfare as the main objective; and (c) at concessional financial terms (if a loan, having a grant element of at least 25 per cent). FCO and DFID experts administering the ODA scheme for UKG agreed that Grant-in-Aid to GBCC meets all these criteria.

F.7 GBCC currently delivers all this with five staff members, including the Director, all based in London. It does not have an office in China. It has been carrying one vacancy since the recent resignation of the Deputy Director and her return to Beijing, pending confirmation of the level of Grant-in-Aid and a decision on whether a replacement can be afforded. The GBCC Audit Committee has now authorised the recruitment. The Reviewer observed that the GBCC staff often work very long hours. Staff commented that the need to put together top quality project bids at the same time as managing projects in China has often meant them "working til midnight and then just continuing the following day". The Director and the two project staff frequently travel to China (as did the former Deputy Director). Staff are aware that this heavy travel burden can lead to inefficiencies and difficulties in handing on work while all are in transit, causing additional remedial work and stress. The Reviewer is concerned that dedication and the desire to deliver projects with real impact, at the same time as the need to secure new project funding, is driving GBCC staff far beyond reasonable workloads, particularly while they are carrying a gap. Members of GBCC's Board have signalled a similar concern. The Review concludes that GBCC as currently resourced is at the very edge of sustainability: a tiny organisation is less able to survive year-on-year salami slicing than a large department (conclusion 13)

F.8 The current resource climate is not one in which the FCO will easily be able to reinforce GBCC's core Grant-in-Aid, even with ODA status. However, the Review challenges the basic assumption in the resourcing of the network shift in China that the best and most cost-effective way to deliver all FCO objectives is by increasing headcount in the China network (Embassy and Consulates), with all the additional contingent liability that that brings. The total £243,000 Grant-in-Aid provided to GBCC for FY 2013-14 equates roughly to the cost of two A2 administrative officers in the Embassy in Beijing. The £27,000 reduction from the FY 2012-13 Grant-in-Aid of £270,000 is a little over a fifth of the cost of one A2. This Review concludes that GBCC is delivering impact that provides a unique contribution to FCO objectives and that neither the FCO, the Embassy nor any other existing organisation could replicate the GBCC balance of political relationship-building and practical progress on key rule of law and human rights issues which remain of significant importance for the UK. The Review recommends that when China network resourcing is next reviewed, if not before, consideration should be given to recognising GBCC's effectiveness as a delivery partner of the FCO and reinforcing its core Grant-in-Aid. (recommendation 15)

F.9 The role of the GBCC Director is key. At least 50% of his time should be spent on outreach, relationships and sponsorship activities. At present, this is not being achieved because of the need

to pursue project funding. Given the precarious resource position following the further 10% cut in the Grant-in-Aid this year, and the recommendations in this Review that GBCC should look to consolidate its project work in its area of excellence - rights-based rule of law - and that it should look to devise a strategy to widen the areas of relationship-building delivered under the UK-China Forum banner, it is imperative (i) that the Director is able to occupy the strategic space; and (ii) that there is oversight of the project bidding processes needed to bring in the new work stream. The latter is *inter alia* the responsibility of the Deputy Director job, freeing up the specialist project managers to deliver the results. The Review recommends that GBCC move ahead as soon as possible with recruitment for the Deputy Director position (as advised by the GBCC Audit Committee) **(recommendation 16)**

F.10 The Director is already looking at creative ways of easing the burden including through interns. The Reviewer notes that although GBCC does have a performance management system based on the FCO's, there has over the years been little focus on training or on development opportunities for GBCC staff. The FCO's Asia Pacific Directorate is currently having a campaign to revive its cadre of alumni and the Directorate has a specific focus on China experience and skills as part of its Diplomatic Excellence work, including encouraging work placements (job shadowing or secondments) in and out of the Directorate. The Reviewer suggests that GBCC and China Department consider how they could coordinate on this. For example, FCO staff with Chinese language skills could find a short secondment with GBCC would enable them to maintain or improve them between postings; GBCC staff could find that a stint with China Department would improve their International Policy Skills. The Review recommends that GBCC and China Department work together to find ways of cooperating through Asia Pacific Directorate's Diplomatic Excellence programme. **(recommendation 17)**

OFFICE LOCATION

F.11 GBCC operates in the UK from a single office rented from the Society of Chemical Industry, a registered charity in Belgrave Square. The rent is £14,700 per annum. When GBCC last renewed the lease in 2011, other options were considered but the Board judged that there was no more cost-effective option available in central London, where GBCC needs to operate to fulfil its core mission. At that time, GBCC downsized its offices, as recommended in the previous Review, to the small open-plan office it now occupies.

F.12 GBCC does not have a permanent presence in China and its staff carry out frequent visits. Project partners in China observed that they had assumed that GBCC staff were based in Beijing and strongly advocated a GBCC presence in China. GBCC aim to have representation in Beijing to make their project delivery more effective and sustainable. This is likely to be a part-time representative rather than a formal office both for resource reasons and also because of the administrative difficulty in establishing new offices of this sort in Beijing. Other ideas such as a colocating with the Embassy would compromise GBCC's impartiality. Sharing office space with CBBC in the British Centre might be a possibility.

F.13 The Review notes that GBCC's UK office is an effective operating base currently offering good value for money and recommends that when the lease next expires, GBCC continue to consider cost-

effectiveness as well as the Cabinet Office Controls for Departments and Arms Length Bodies. (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/205750/Cabinet_Office_Controls_guidance_v3_1_2_full_doc.pdf) **(recommendation 18)**

F.14 The Review recommends that GBCC consider methods of representation in Beijing, including on a part-time or consultancy basis, both to improve the effectiveness of its operations and to reduce the burden of constant travel on staff and on the budget. **(recommendation 19)**

Does GBCC provides value for money?

F.15 Over the years GBCC has consistently leveraged up the FCO Grant-in-Aid (which this year will only cover 55% of its core running costs), securing five to six times as much in programme funding and corporate sponsorship. For example, in 2012-13, against £270,000 Grant-in-Aid, GBCC secured some £ 1.2 million. The Review concludes that GBCC provides excellent value for money **(conclusion 14)**

G. LIST OF CONCLUSIONS

Phase 1: Is there a continuing need for the functions carried out by GBCC; for GBCC to do them; and for GBCC to retain NDPB status?

G.1 The Review concludes that the **relationship-building function** (the UK-China Leadership Forum and the UK-China Young Leaders Round Table) and the **project work function** currently undertaken by GBCC with Chinese partners in rule of law reform and judge training both continue to be needed (**conclusions 1, para C.3 and 2, para C.7**).

G.2 This Review concludes that the GBCC model has valuable and unique characteristics deriving from its unique mix of policy dialogue and practical projects which could not be simply replicated by the private sector or the voluntary or NGO sectors (**conclusion 3, para C.15**); nor could they be done in-house (**conclusion 4, para C.17**); nor is there currently any clear fit for a GBCC merger (**conclusion 5, para C.24**).

G.3 This Review concludes that GBCC continues to meet two of the Cabinet Office's three tests for NDPB status and that it should therefore retain NDPB status (**conclusion 6, para C.26**)

Phase 2: how well is GBCC delivering; does it comply with recognised principles of good governance?

G.4 In terms of delivery, the Review concludes that GBCC, with its Chinese and other partners, has produced a serious of outstanding projects with real and lasting results in a number of sensitive rights-related rule of law fields. It has built up a unique set of relationships and deep trust which enables it to engage in complex areas where Chinese partners are seeking change and development. This is valuable to both the UK and China and there remain areas of work where Chinese partners wish to continue to work with GBCC to push forward reform of China's legal system (**conclusion 7, para D.20**)

G.5 In terms of good governance, the Review concludes that GBCC continues to maintain good levels of accountability (**conclusion 8, para E.14**); does have effective financial management systems in place (**conclusion 10, para E.27**); is open, transparent, accountable and responsive (**conclusion 11, para E.31**) and therefore complies with recognised principles of good governance.

Phase 2: GBCC's level of ambition against organisational resources and value for money

G.6 In terms of assessing the level of ambition, the Review judges that GBCC's core mission statement and objectives are well-focused around wider FCO objectives and around its clear fields of expertise in human rights and the rule of law, and represent a realistic level of ambition if programme funding can be secured (**conclusion 12, para F.3**). The Review finds that in general the quality of the relationship between FCO and GBCC is good. However it is possible that, with the large amount of resource redirected into the China network in recent years, there has been slight drift in the relationship at the strategic level. Both GBCC and the FCO would benefit from reassessing the strategic delivery role of GBCC and the value of its unique contribution, with a view

to ensuring that opportunities which arise are fully realised and the enduring impact of its activities and contribution to FCO objectives fully measured and acknowledged. **(conclusion 9, para E.20).**

G.7 In terms of resourcing, the Review concludes that GBCC as currently resourced is at the edge of sustainability: a tiny organisation is less able to survive year-on-year salami slicing than a large department **(conclusion 13, para F.7)**

G.8 The Review notes that over the years GBCC has consistently leveraged up the FCO Grant-in-Aid (which this year will only cover 55% of its core running costs), securing five to six times as much in programme funding and corporate sponsorship. For example, in 2012-13, against £270,000 Grant-in-Aid, GBCC secured some £ 1.2 million. The Review concludes that GBCC provides excellent value for money (conclusion 14, para F.15)

H. LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation H.1 The Review assesses that the Leadership Forum and the Young Leaders Round Table are effective methods for building relationships, undertaking political dialogue and sharing experience of different parliamentary and governance structures and recommends that in drawing up its new strategy post-Review, GBCC respond to the demand shown by both sides and consider the possibilities of increasing the number and themes of these events. This will require a new approach on sponsorship as already recognised by the establishment of the Board's Sponsorship. (para D.7)

Recommendation H.2 The Review recommends that DG Operations consider establishing an NDPB focal point and policy to support the FCO's NDPBs and as a matter of good corporate practice for the FCO itself (para E.4)

Recommendation H.3 The Review recommends that the FCO consider security clearing the Director of GBCC to enable access to strategic policy discussions on matters relating to GBCC's work (para E.6)

Recommendation H.4 The Review recommends that China Department, as the sponsoring department within the FCO, investigate the possibility of GBCC's transactional processing being undertaken by the Corporate Services Centre with Internal Audit Department and the Corporate Services Centre (para E.10)

Recommendation H.5 Given the high value placed on the very specific functions that GBCC provides, the Reviewer sees potential benefit to both sides in refreshing GBCC's strategic framework, particularly reflecting the arrival of the new Director in October 2012, and so recommends (para E.15)

Recommendation H.6 The Review recommends GBCC and China Department agree a one page document or memorandum of understanding setting out a practical approach to their relationship, ie what each should expect of the other during the course of a business year (para E.16)

Recommendation H.7 The Reviewer does not wish to bind the Board but recommends that the composition and tenure of the Board be kept under review, regularly refreshed and slightly expanded if necessary to ensure that the right sectors and interests are represented. (para E.17)

Recommendation H.8 The Review recommends that the GBCC Board agree an open and transparent recruitment process and adjust the Management Statement accordingly to ensure a timely succession. In this respect the Reviewer found the process for selecting the Chairman of CBBC to be a useful model. (para E.18)

Recommendation H.9 Overall, the Review finds that the quality of the relationship between FCO and GBCC is good. However it is possible that, with the large amount of resource redirected into the China network in recent years, there has been slight drift in the relationship at the strategic level. Both GBCC and the FCO would benefit from reassessing the strategic delivery role of GBCC and the value of its unique contribution, with a view to ensuring that opportunities which arise are fully

realised and the enduring impact of its activities and contribution to FCO objectives fully measured and acknowledged, and the Review so recommends. (para E.20)

Recommendation H.10 The Review recommends that the GBCC respond to the demand for a wider range of relationship activity, including on economic and wider corporate governance issues by making more effective use of the UK-China Forum brand (para E.23)

Recommendation H.11 The Review recommends that the GBCC Director take steps with the Head of China Department to ensure that GBCC staff undertake the latest project and programme training (both for FCO systems and an external professional qualification such as PRINCE 2 and Managing Successful Programmes (MSP)) (para E.26)

Recommendation H.12 The Review recommends that GBCC draw up a stakeholder outreach and communication strategy as part of its refreshed strategic approach, with a focus on UK public and private sector stakeholders (the Sponsorship Committee of the Board will have a role) (para E.28)

Recommendation H.13 The Review further recommends that China Department consider sponsoring a short term (4-6 month) secondment into GBCC to help design the outreach and communication strategy, including helping GBCC to refresh the website (para E.29)

Recommendation H.14 The Review recommends that GBCC take advantage of this Review and the fact that several major GBCC projects ended in 2012-13 to develop a "new business pipeline" of ideas for new projects for implementation over the next three years, and to plan a bidding strategy including to new sources of funding (para F.4)

Recommendation H.15 The Review recommends that when China network resourcing is next reviewed, if not before, consideration should be given to recognising GBCC's effectiveness as a delivery partner of the FCO and reinforcing its core Grant-in-Aid. (para F.8)

Recommendation H.16 The Review recommends that GBCC move ahead as soon as possible with recruitment for the Deputy Director position (as advised by the GBCC Audit Committee) (para F.9)

Recommendation H.17 The Review recommends that GBCC and China Department work together to find ways of cooperating through Asia Pacific Directorate's Diplomatic Excellence programme. (para F.10)

Recommendation H.18 The Review notes that GBCC's UK office is an effective operating base currently offering good value for money and recommends that when the lease next expires, GBCC continue to consider cost-effectiveness as well as the Cabinet Office Controls for departments and Arms Length Bodies.

([https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/205750/Cabinet Office Controls guidance v3 1 2 full doc.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/205750/Cabinet_Office_controls_guidance_v3_1_2_full_doc.pdf)) (para F.13)

Recommendation H.19 The Review recommends that GBCC consider methods of representation in Beijing, including on a part-time or consultancy basis, both to improve the effectiveness of its operations and to reduce the burden on constant travel on staff and on the budget. (para F.14)

ANNEX A: 2013 Triennial Review of GBCC: Terms of Reference

1. A formal review of GBCC is required in 2013 to fulfil the Cabinet Office requirement that non-departmental public bodies (NDPBs) should be reviewed at least triennially and the results of the Review published. In doing so, the review should meet the Cabinet Office's two stated principal aims:

- i) to provide a robust challenge of the continuing need for NDPBs - both their function and form;
- ii) where it is agreed that a particular body should remain as an NDPB, to review the control and governance arrangements in place to ensure that the public body is complying with recognised principles of good corporate governance.

In undertaking (ii), the review should also consider:

(iii) the extent to which GBCC as an NDPB contributes to achieving FCO objectives as set out in the China Strategy;

(iv) what improvements might be made to enhance that contribution;

(v) whether the level of ambition for GBCC activities is correct; whether its organisational resources are correctly aligned with this level of ambition; and whether it provides value for money.

2. The review should be conducted in line with Cabinet Office principles for a light touch review, being proportionate, timely, challenging, inclusive, transparent and providing value for money. The report produced must be clear and readable and contain a description of work carried out. It should explain the reasoning behind any recommendations made. It should be published and copies placed in the Libraries of both Houses.

3. The format of the review will follow Cabinet Office guidance for both stages (i) and (ii). In respect of stage (ii) the review will take a wide interpretation of corporate governance, to include strategic alignment between FCO and GBCC; governance mechanisms; resourcing; structure; quality of project and programme activities, both their management and their impact; transparency and accountability. The reviewer will consult stakeholders, sponsors and beneficiaries in the UK and in China; will report findings based on those consultations; and will make recommendations accordingly.

ANNEX B: 2013 Triennial Review of GBCC: Stakeholders Consulted

GBCC Staff

Richard Pascoe, Director
Orlando Edwards, Senior Project Manager Human Rights and Communications
Zhang Xiaoping, Project Manager Judicial Exchanges
Laura Rivkin, Operations Manager and Archivist
Mike Rumble, Finance Manager

GBCC Board Members

Lord Howe of Aberavon, President
Sir David Brewer, Vice President
Peter Batey, Chairman
Hugh Davies, Vice Chairman
Lorna Ball, Vice Chairman
Chris Fitzgibbon, Honorary Treasurer and Chair of the GBCC Audit Committee
Liam Byrne MP, (Labour) Board Member
Martin Davidson, (Chief Executive, British Council) Board Member
Richard Graham MP (Conservative) Board Member
Duncan Hames MP (Liberal Democrat) Board Member
Clare Hammond (Lotus Global (Consultants) Ltd) Board Member
John C Hughes (Group Political Advisor, BP plc) Board Member
Sir Christopher Hum KCMG, (former British Ambassador to China) Board Member
Madeleine Sturrock (Director of PanCathay Consulting Ltd) Board Member
Dr Rod Wye (Chatham House) Board Member
Joanna Roper (Head, China Department, FCO) ex officio Board Member

UK Government departments

John Hews, Head, Internal Audit Department, FCO
Chris Bedford, Director for FCO and GBCC, National Audit Office
Lee Mansfield, Efficiency and Reform Group, Public Bodies Reform Team, Cabinet office
Tom Kennedy, Deputy Head, Human Rights and Democracy Department, FCO
Ailsa Latham, China Department, FCO
Sue Bishop, UKTI

UK Embassy in Beijing

Dan Chugg	Mike Liu
John Edwards	Giles Montagnon
David Ellis	Caroline Quinn
Andrew Key	Catherine Rand
Stephen Lennard	Catherine Webb

Other Interviewees in China

He Ronggong, Wuhan University
Jiang Bing, former Deputy Director, GBCC
Remi Cristini, Royal Netherlands Embassy in Beijing (sponsor)
Adam Williams, Chief Representative, Jardine Matheson Group in China
Merethe Borge, Head of China Office, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Perrine Lhuillier, Director, Donor and Member Relations, Save the Children, Beijing
Dr Cheng Lei, Director, Centre for Criminal Procedure and Judicial Reform Renmin University, Beijing
Prof Yang Lixin, Director, Centre for Civil and Commercial Jurisprudence, Renmin University, Beijing

John Holden, Senior Consultant to Hill & Knowlton China; Chairman Emeritus, Board of Governors, American Chamber of Commerce in China

Justin Zhang, Researcher, Social Resources Institute, Beijing

Prof Yin Jianfeng, Dr He Ting, Dr Zhou Zhenjie: International Death Penalty Research Centre, Beijing Normal University

Ma Hui, DG, International Liaison Department, Chinese Communist Party

Dong Xia, International Department, All-China Youth Federation

Other Interviewees in the UK

Stephen Phillips, Chief Executive, CBBC

Lord Powell of Bayswater, Board member, UK-China Forum Ltd

Jenny Rowe, Chief Executive, UK Supreme Court

ANNEX C: 2013 Triennial Review of GBCC: Key Documents

The Reviewer took into account a wide range of documents including:

- GBCC's constitutional documents: the agreed joint Management Statement (including Financial Memorandum) and the Articles of Association;
- GBCC's performance documents: GBCC rolling 3-year Corporate Plan, updated to 2013-16; GBCC's Annual Report and accounts; GBCC's in-year progress documents presented to the Board; GBCC's papers to the Audit Committee and its Risk register.
- FCO strategic documents: the FCO's Priorities 2013-14; [the FCO's China Strategic Framework 2015]; [the China Country Business Plan 2013-14]; FCO report on Human Rights and Democracy 2012
- UK central government guidance on NDPBs: Cabinet Office Guidance on Triennial Reviews of NDPBs; HM Treasury's March 2010 Document "Reforming Arm's Length Bodies"; Code of Practice for Ministerial Appointments to Public Bodies;
- previous Reviews of GBCC: 2010 Review and 2005 Review.
- Chinese strategic documents: China's 12th 5-year plan 2011-2015 (published March 2011) ; China's White Paper: Progress in China's Human Rights 2012 (published May 2013)

ANNEX D: GBCC TRIENNIAL REVIEW 2013 TABLE OF GBCC PROJECTS SINCE THE 2013 REVIEW

2010-11					
Project title	Date, Donor & Value	Objective/ outline	Partners	Key outputs/ outcomes	Key Achievements
Death penalty #2	2006-2009 EU funded (80%), FCO (GOF) co-funded (20%) Value: €885,777	Moving the Debate forward: China's Use of the Death Penalty	College of Criminal Law Science, Beijing Normal University; Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften e.V, Germany	-The establishment of an International Research Centre on Death Penalty at the Beijing Normal University -The development and launch of a website www.death-penalty.cn - An opinion survey on attitudes towards the death penalty by both legal professionals and the general public.	-Reduced numbers of executions -Revision of criminal law, and an overall reduction of number of Capital Crimes -More public debate against use of the death penalty
Death penalty #3	2009-2012 EU funded (80%), FCO (SPF) co-funded (20%) Value: €997,130	Promoting Judicial Discretion in the Restriction and Reduction of Death Penalty Use	Centre for Criminal Law Science, Wuhan University; Irish Centre for Human Rights, National University Of Ireland , Galway	180 judges attended 3 training course on international human rights standards and death penalty Publications: -Discussion and vision for the reform of China's current death penalty system -Research report into the application of the death penalty for drug related crimes in China -The study of the application of criminal policy and the use of the death penalty for drug-related crimes - Research on the Crime of Drug Trafficking Two legislative recommendations were submitted to the Supreme People's Court: -Death Penalty Sentencing Guidelines in	-Decreased number of death penalty sentences made in the pilot courts -The legislation recommendation of 'Death Penalty Sentencing Guidelines in Drug Cases in China' developed under this Action was submitted to the Supreme People's Court. -Theoretical development on the issue of the use of the death penalty for drug offenses

				Drug Cases in China (based on Yunnan pilot component of this project) -Use of Evidence in Drug Related Cases in China (based on Yunnan pilot component of this project)	
Preventing Torture in China	January 2008 – June 2012 EIDHR €991,000	To strengthen the legal and practical mechanisms for enhanced accountability of law enforcement agencies in the prevention of torture through promoting external monitoring, ethical investigations and robust complaint mechanisms.	Centre for Criminal Procedure and Reform, Renmin University of China (Prof. Chen Weidong), University of Maastricht Law School, The Rights Practice	Key outcomes in 2010: Practical capacity building/training: - Police training; PLOT – Belgium Policy and legislative reform: - 4 Chinese researchers spent 1 month researching EU human rights law relating to management of detention centres at the University of Maastricht -10 Chinese officials and academics visited NGOs and organisations specialising in the prevention of torture in Geneva, Strasbourg, Copenhagen and Amsterdam to learn from EU best practice in detention centre management and torture prevention	Increased understanding of EU best practice
Strengthening Defence lawyers' rights by promoting effective implementation of the new Lawyer's Law	2008-2011 SPF £166,197	To promote effective implementation of the new Lawyers Law through co-operation between prosecutors, police and lawyers and thereby better guarantee the rights and safeguards for criminal suspects and defendants.	Centre for the Criminal Law Science, Renmin University (CCLSR); No2 Beijing Municipal Procuratorate. The project was supported by the Criminal Defence Lawyers Committee of the all China Lawyers Federation, with co-operation from	- A field research report to analysis the key problems and barriers in the implementation of the new Lawyers Law. - Prosecutors, police in pilot have better knowledge and understanding of the safeguards for suspects and defendants set up by international standards and defence lawyers' role in the criminal procedures. - Internal guidelines developed and implemented in the three areas which provide new models of co-operation and professional relationships between prosecutors, police and lawyers.)	This project had widespread impact: the comprehensive field research report triggered debate throughout China; the pilots of the new models and working procedures between police and prosecutors attracted attention at both local and central level and provided solutions for possible adoption nationwide. A draft judicial interpretation to guide the implementation of the new lawyers' law and the key issues in the criminal procedure law as related to defence lawyers rights was finalized

			local police bureaux, procuratorates and law firms in Chaoyang District, Beijing, and Chongchuan District, Nantong, Jiangsu province.	- Legislative recommendations based on project findings and practices to feed in the judicial interpretation and forthcoming Criminal Procedure Law revision during the project life time or after the completion of the project.	after successive revisions and submitted to relevant legislative organisations for consideration.
Judicial Studies Training Programme	1998-2012 UK government (DFID, MOJ) Value (last three years approx.): £570,000	Training Chinese young judges on UK legal system	Chinese Supreme People's Court	Over the lifetime of this project, a total of 79 Chinese young judges completed a one year MA or LLM degree followed by 4 weeks practical work experience in the UK. Each year a group of 6 judges specialised in a particular area of law. These included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criminal Law • Civil Law • Administrative Law • Intellectual Property Law • Private International Law • Environmental Law • Maritime Law • Commercial Law 4 bi-annual judicial seminars were held in China over the 14 year programme	The 79 judges, on their return to China, cascaded and multiplied the main learning points from their training in the UK by writing articles for Chinese legal journals, giving lectures to fellow judges and through professional contact with colleagues.
Improving transparency and capacity in the management of China's local government budgets - aka "Public Finance Management"	2008-10 SPF £135,830	To improve transparency and capacity in the management of China's local government budgets through setting up a pilot in	UNIRULE (a leading Chinese public policy think tank founded in 1993.) CRIFS (China Research Institute for Fiscal Science) is affiliated to the	- Publication of an academic analysis of current issues in local government budget management; researchers and government officials introduced to UK local government financial management - Production of guidelines for budget planning, expenditure monitoring and evaluation for running a local pilot	The purpose was achieved - a pilot was set up in the Jiaozuo municipality to test new budget practices, such as continuous budgeting and gender budgeting. These new practices were seen by the Chinese government as improving transparency and capacity in the management of China's local

		selected local authorities and contributing to national reform in the area by providing policy recommendations based on field research and pilot project findings.	Ministry of Finance. The Audit Commission in the UK.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 45 local officials (30 local financial management bureau officials and 15 officials in the local People's Congress) trained in China in current UK principles on public budget management - Development of a basic training pack on the principles of public budget management and monitoring - Pilot project in place for eight months (May to December) - Evaluation of pilot project - Policy recommendation for central reform in the area 	<p>government budgets.</p> <p>There were also strong indications that the pilot will contribute to influence national reform: since April 2009 Jiaozuo has been an officially-designated municipal level pilot for continuous budgeting.</p> <p>Unirule were able to submit a policy recommendation on the basis of the project to central government. The project results and policy recommendation were widely disseminated through the media, with positive references highlighting the importance of this GBCC project in partnership with the Ministry of Finance.</p>
UK-China Leadership Forum Beijing (UKCLF)	2010 Income from sponsorship: £153,000 mainly from Barclays, BP and Rolls Royce. Expenditure £148,887	High level political dialogue between the Communist Party of China and the three leading political parties in the UK. Dialogue theme: <i>The UK-China Partnership in a post-financial crisis world</i>	International Department of the Chinese Communist Party	2010 was the fourth meeting of the Leadership Forum which took place in Beijing. The level of participants on both sides was very senior and overall this meeting of the UK-China Leadership Forum was considered by both sides to be a success. Two UK Ministers, Jeremy Browne and Mark Prisk participated.	The Forum delegation of 13 UK MPs and peers, led by Lord Mandelson, met Li Yuanchao, Head of the CPC Organisation Department and a politburo member. They also called on China National Petrochemical Corporation and in Shanghai on the Deputy Party Secretary, the Head of the Shanghai Office of Financial Services, Fang Xinghai, and the Shanghai Institute of Strategic Studies.
UK-China Young Leaders' Roundtable London (UKCYLRT)	2010 Sponsors: Rio Tinto and Standard Chartered	Inaugural meeting	The All-China Youth Federation (and the Secretariat of the Communist Youth League)	The first meeting of the Roundtable took place at Tate Modern on October 18th. Participants were asked to share their own personal leadership stories in roundtable sessions and then consider	This inaugural meeting established the Roundtable as a new annual format for younger politicians from the UK and China to learn about the other's political, parliamentary and

	Bank Figures as UKCLF above			some key defining characteristics of the two countries.	governance systems. They will alternate between Beijing and London.
Expert Group of the China Center for Contemporary World Studies (CCCWS) UK study visit	July 2011 GIA & Chinese funded	The purpose was to expose delegates to discussion and debate with MPs, leading UK Think Tank scholars and editors of the UK's leading newspapers.	Party History Research Centre of the CPC Central Committee		Built closer ties

2010: A note on unsuccessful funding proposals which consumed significant management time

2010.i EIDHR

GBCC developed a full EU bid for a project on China's relationship with the International Criminal Court with two Chinese partners (the School of Law, Tsinghua University and the Political Science and Law University) and the University of Amsterdam. This project proposal aimed to promote China's accession to the Rome Statute of the ICC and continued criminal justice reform in compliance with international fair trial standards. The total budget under this bid was around 1.1m Euros of which the EU would cover 80%. The bid was unsuccessful.

2010.ii FCO Strategic Programme Fund (SPF)

GBCC submitted a bid to the FCO to establish an improved and more effective complaint mechanism for victims of torture as part of GBCC's EU-funded EIDHR Prevention of Torture #2 project. The FCO project assessors approved the bid, but no funds were available at the time. This would have partially covered the outstanding 7% co-funding needed for this action.

2010.iii Women's political participation

GBCC was awarded funding for a three year programme to increase the political participation of women at the county congress level by DFID's Civil Society Challenge Fund. This work would have been worth £434,604 over three years. However, three months later DFID withdrew the funding and all the preparatory work was effectively lost.

2011-12					
Project title	Donor & Value	Objective/ outline	Partners	Key outputs/ outcomes	Key Achievements
Death penalty #3	See above			Evidence and sentencing guidelines pilot seminar to review pilot and effectiveness of judicial training, March	As per 2010 entry.
Preventing Torture in China	January 2008 – June 2012 EIDHR €991,000	See 2010 above	See 2010 above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Memo issued by Ministry of Public Security making it mandatory for pre-trial detention centres across China to instigate visits to detention centres by 'Specially invited Supervisors' -Training for 60 Chinese police trainers and (junior police officers) jointly delivered by EU and Chinese trainers on skills for interviewing criminal suspects took place in Lanzhou, Gansu in May; and in Luzhou, Sichuan - 56 police trainers from Universities in North West China participated in a three day training workshop on skills for interviewing criminal suspects. 	The memo issued by the Ministry of Public Security was a key achievement, resulting from the work to introduce monitoring based on UK's voluntary prison visitor scheme.
Promoting legal protection for the media	2011-2014 EIDHR €1,091,651	Promote greater legal protection for freedom of expression in China through reform of the legal framework for the media.	School of Government, Peking University; Law School, Renmin University; Programme for Comparative Media and Legal Procedures, University of Oxford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -UK study visit/launch week included a roundtable seminar at the House of Lords hosted by Lord Lester on defamation in the UK and Europe -Reference manual comprising key case studies and international covenants -‘Codes of Conduct for New Media in the Digital Age’ seminar, held in Beijing, December, 2011. 38 officials, academics and EU experts took part in the discussions and debate. - Workshops for 40 Chinese judges who handle Tort law cases, to identify current problems and challenges with the media law; a case study session; development of an outline of a judicial 	Improved confidence level of judges to deal with complex media cases involving the protection of journalists' rights.

				<p>manual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - first Forum with the theme: Opportunities and Challenges: Media Regulation in the Digital Age. 	
Promoting legal protection for the media	<p>2012-2013 FCO (SPF) funded</p> <p>Value: £79,850 [co-funding for EU project]</p>	To promote better protection for the Chinese media through training for legal practitioners and pilot implementation in two local courts	The Research Centre of Civil and Commercial Jurisprudence of Renmin University of China (RCCCJ)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A judicial manual to guide judges who deal with media disputes produced under an earlier project was tested and improved clause by clause. - Participating judges benefited from applying the rules in the updated manual. - The manual was distributed beyond the two pilot courts. 	A revised judicial manual is likely be adopted as a base for the Supreme People's Court to issue judicial interpretations in media related cases
Judicial Studies Training Programme	See above				
Local government budget management	SPF £134,781	Improving transparency and capacity in the management of China's local government budgets	UNIRULE	Continuation of 2010 entry above	Continuation of 2010 entry above.
Mental illness as a defence in criminal cases	FCO special project funding £33, 161	Promoting legal reform on assessing mental illness in criminal trials in China	Renmin University of China; Standing Committee of European Doctors	Knowledge exchange on how to understand current mental illness assessment procedures in criminal trials in China, and how this is approached in the UK	Seminar for 100 delegates, officials and experts
The Power of Evidence	<p>2011-2012 FCO (SPF)</p> <p>Value: £109,900</p>	Promotion of effective implementation of new evidence rules in death penalty cases		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Field research reports from 3 pilot courts analysing problems in the application of evidence rules concerning death penalty cases -Practical suggestions on how to effectively implement death penalty evidence rules -Policy and legislative recommendations based on the 3 pilots developed and 	The revised Criminal Procedure Law was adopted in March 2012. As one of the four legislation expert consultants responsible in advising the legislators in drafting and giving final expert approval of the revised criminal procedure law, GBCC's Chinese partner was able to feed the project findings immediately into the

				submitted to the Supreme People's Court and legislative bodies.	work of revising the Criminal Procedure Law.
UK-China Leadership Forum UKCLF	2011 Private sponsors: mainly BP, Barclays, Rolls Royce. 2011-2012 Income £155,000 Expenditure £152,264	UK-China Partnership for Growth and Development	International Department of the Chinese Communist Party	The fifth meeting of the UK-China Leadership Forum took place at Ditchley Park, 12-14 September 2011. Chinese participants included politicians with economic expertise. The UK team had senior members of the government and opposition as well as new MPs from all three parties. Discussions focused on the two governments' plans for the next 4-5 years, opportunities these presented for greater Sino-UK co-operation across the board, and on political party renewal and innovation.	Greater understanding between the politicians of all sides, with cross-party representation on the UK side.
UK-China Young Leaders' Roundtable, Beijing	2011 Figures as above Private sponsors: Standard Chartered, Rio Tinto	2 nd annual Young Leaders Round Table. Topics included: Innovation and Entrepreneurship; Mobility and Immigration; Africa development; G20, Global Governance.	The All-China Youth Federation (the Secretariat of the Communist Youth League)	The UK side was led by Liam Byrne, Shadow Secretary of State for Work and Pensions; the Chinese side was headed by Youth Federation President Wang Xiao. The roundtable was followed by a programme of high level calls in Beijing	The UK delegation was taken to Hohot, Inner Mongolia for two days which provided a useful insight into the development of a second-tier city. They had high level meetings including with Inner Mongolia Party Secretary Hu Chunhua.
Complaints mechanisms for victims of torture	UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture \$14,000	Training for prosecutors working at pre-trial detention centres on how to deal with detainees' complaints more effectively	Renmin University of China/ University of Maastricht	-30 Prosecutors and detention centre police trained in handling complaints:	Awareness of EU best practice and UN standards raised amongst prosecutors and police

2012-13					
Project title	Donor & Value	Objective/ outline	Partners	Key outputs/ outcomes	Key Achievements
Death penalty #3	See above	See above	See above	See above	See above
Death penalty #4	<p>2012-2015 International Death Penalty Research Centre (IDPRC), Beijing Normal University</p> <p>GBCC approx. salary: €200,000</p> <p>(Project value €1,173,479.70)</p>	<p>To reduce the use of the death penalty in China through judicial restraint by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promoting effective enforcement of current criminal policy on reducing capital punishment -Improving the use of evidence in death penalty cases -Developing better safeguards in trial procedure for capital crimes. 	The International Research Centre on Death Penalty (IDPRC) at the Beijing Normal University	Key outputs: a series of research reports, publications as well as policy recommendations and draft judicial interpretations; interactive forum on the DPRC; Series of articles in legal and academic press on key project activities and findings.	The project had its launch meeting in Beijing on 15 December 2012 followed by two field research assignments until now. Key achievement remains to be measured.
Grievance Procedure in the Chinese Textile Industry	<p>2012-2013 FCO (SPF) funded</p> <p>Value: £121,055</p>	Raising awareness and promoting implementation of the UN Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights in the Chinese textile sector	Social Resources Institute (a Chinese NGO)	<p>Produced and published the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Research report 'Research Report on Grievance and Grievance Procedure in the Chinese Textile Industry' - Advisory draft - Factory Non-Judicial Grievance Procedure (Framework) -Recommendation of the National Textile and Apparel Council Regarding the Establishment of Grievance Mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Raised the awareness and level of interest in the UN Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights in the Chinese textile industry as well as other sectors i.e. electronic and food industry -Achieved wide media publicity -The advisory draft was endorsed by the China National Textile And Apparel Council (CNTAC) and can be a blueprint for any factory from any sector that wishes to establish a grievance mechanism -CNTAC undertook to promote this recommendation at the regularly

					held joint conference between CNTAC and the All-China Federation of Trade Unions
Preventing Torture in China	January 2008 – June 2012 EIDHR See 2010 above	See 2010 above	See 2010 above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Publication and distribution of 700 copies of ‘Three Approaches to the Prevention of Torture’ to legal experts, universities and NGOs across the EU -Publication of 600 copies of parallel copy in Chinese, distributed to MPS, SPP and NPC officials; legal experts and academics -Closing seminar for c. 100 MPS, SPP, NPC officials and legal academics to disseminate the key project achievements and distribute the publication -DVD of the police training on interviewing skills of criminal suspects that took place in Luzhou, Sichuan in November edited and disseminated to police training colleges and universities across China 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Publication of high-quality comparative academic research publication in Intersentia Human Rights series in English, raising awareness of project activities to EU audiences -Parallel Chinese publication distributed to senior Chinese officials -DVD of police training disseminated to Chinese police training colleges
Promoting Legal Protection for the Media	January 2011 – January 2014 EIDHR See above	See 2011 above	See 2011 above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A second Forum, ‘Media sector organizations and self-discipline’, took place in May, focussed on the role of sector organizations in Chinese media regulation, such as the Journalists' Association, as well as the newer media industry sector associations. -Two Peking University senior researchers did a six week academic placement in Oxford to broaden their understanding of the social and political background of British and European media. 	The judges’ training provided an opportunity for the attendees to improve their understanding of the principles set out in the judicial manual: namely to recognise both the importance of the media’s role in disseminating information and the public’s right to know. Discussions were vigorous and lively: judges from the two pilot courts also challenged some of the content in the judicial manual. The two EU experts contributed to discussions by explaining how English/EU law

				-Judges' training on handling tort law cases for over 70 participants	compared with the proposals set out in the handbook, as well as some of the practical problems the EU has encountered in applying the law that need to be considered by the Chinese.
Complaining with Confidence	July 2012 – March 2013 FCO SPF £93,000	Promote best practice in investigating complaints from prisoners held in pre-trial detention centres	CCPR, Renmin University, UK Prisons and Probations Ombudsman, University of Maastricht Professor	-Extension of the GBCC pilot at the detention centre in Wuhu, Anhui province to two further cities in economically contrasting provinces -Increased awareness amongst SPP, MPS and local Procurators and Public Security officials of UK (and Dutch) best practice in the area of complaints mechanisms -UK study visit for 10 Chinese officials and academics incorporating four UK prisons (including Northern Ireland); Thames Valley Police station; Independent Police Complaints Commission; and Lay Visitors Association -Three pilots to test new procedures for improving complaints processes and trying to raise awareness amongst detainees ran for six months each in three provinces	UK study visit organised to high standard, with high quality professional visits.
EU China Civil Society Dialogue on Participatory Public Policy. Strengthening the Role of Citizens in Public Policy Making and Implementation	January 2010 – January 2014 €995,476 (of which the GBCC budget was estimated at €32,000)	Promote and establish structured dialogue and engagement between EU and Chinese civil society in eight policy areas; deepen engagement of civil society actors in	University of Nottingham, Chinese Association of NGOs. For 6 th Dialogue, associate partners: China Dialogue, China Water Risk	-6 th Dialogue on information disclosure and access to environmental information for 70 civil society actors -EU experts spoke on government transparency in the EU, the transparency of German NGOs, abuse of freedom of information, the risks of inaccurate reporting on environmental information, and on how to encourage western businesses to pursue greater	In addition to strengthening links between respective EU and Chinese NGO delegates, over the course of the three-day Dialogue participants devised four 'follow-up' actions. GBCC and other consortium members then selected the best two which were Green Banks: a project to investigate 'green' credit in 2012 to promote stronger policy in this area;

		public policy making; enhance the knowledge and understanding of relevant EU stakeholders of the Chinese civil society environment.	7 th Dialogue associate partners: UK NCVO and equivalent counterparts from Estonia, Germany, and Poland	accountability in their supply chains. -Chinese experts spoke on topics including recent urban waste incineration projects in China, and provided practical advice on how to request disclosure of information from the Chinese government. - 7 th Dialogue on Government procurement of NGO services	and Women and Environmental Information Disclosure in Inner Mongolia.
RWI China Programme evaluation	£26,000 fee earned for this consultancy	Evaluation of Raoul Wallenberg Institute's activities in China, including their many human rights projects.		Evaluation report submitted and signed off at the beginning of June.	Established GBCC as a competent independent evaluator of projects performed by others, especially in the field of rule of law development and rights protection.
UK-China Leadership Forum UKCLF	Postponed to January 2013 from November 2012 because of the 18 th Communist Party Congress. Income £135,000 Expenditure £134,149 Private sponsors: BP, Rolls-Royce, Barclays Bank	The 6th UK-China Leadership Forum – The Challenges of Governance at a time of Global Financial and Economic Crisis .	International Department of the Chinese Communist Party	Attended by a 15-strong team British politicians led by Lords Mandelson, Powell and Sassoon, and a Chinese delegation of 18, together with representatives of sponsors BP, Barclays Bank and Rolls Royce and two senior Chinese business executives.	The group discussed the policy trajectory in China after the 18th Party Congress and the appointment of the new Chinese leadership.
UK-China Young	2012	3 rd UK-China Young	All-China Youth	A delegation from the Communist Youth	The Roundtable led to a valuable

Leaders' Roundtable UKCYLRT	Figures as above for UKCLF Private sponsors: Standard Chartered, Prudential	Leaders' Roundtable - Social Welfare in Large Urban Regions	Federation (secretariat of the Communist Youth League)	League spent three days improving their understanding of democratic politics, exchanging views with MPs from three parties and shadowing UK politicians for a day and building relationships. The overall theme of the round table was Social Welfare Policies.	alumni event for a subset of the group in Beijing in January 2013
<p>2012/13 Unsuccessful bids:</p> <p><u>EU Access to Justice Programme</u></p> <p>A major effort was launched by the entire GBCC project team to design and draft a complex bid to the EU Delegation in Beijing for a 4-year project worth €4.8 million to provide training and policy guidance in the field of legal aid to Chinese lawyers and judicial workers, targeted at disadvantaged groups in China in three pilot provinces. A three-member consortium was formed with our close partners at the Renmin University Law School and the University of Maastricht. Maastricht was selected to be the lead applicant because of the strict eligibility criteria and to spread risk. At the time of writing this bid appeared to have been unsuccessful, with the GBCC coming in as runners-up to a winning consortium led by the British Council.</p> <p>Judges Training and UK-China Judiciary Exchange Projects</p> <p>GBCC made two unsuccessful attempts to bid for funding to the FCO's Emerging Powers fund for a project to revive the successful Chinese judges training scheme, and later a separate bid to launch a UK-China Judiciary Exchange project to establish an annual dialogue between the judiciaries of China and the UK, including the creation of an alumni network for UK-trained judges in China. However GBCC succeeded in agreeing a more limited form of collaboration with China's Supreme Court which made a successful bid to the FCO for funding for a project known as "Let Legal Evidence Judge: Precluding Illegally Obtained Evidence in Chinese Courts". GBCC will organise a UK study trip and training course for this SPC project under which SPC judges will travel to the UK for limited study.</p> <p>EIDHR – European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights SPF – Strategic Programme Fund</p>					