**FCO SPF PROJECT EVALUATION**

Sections 1-3 to be filled out by Programme Teams / Post

1. **Project Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Number  | **GB-3-231302 CHN** |
| Project Title | **Developing a human rights approach to prison management in China** |
| Project Cost (total cost / cost to FCO if different) | **£119,640** |
| Project Start/End Dates | **June 12 – February 13** |
| Programme | **Human Rights and Democracy** |
| Country/Countries | **China** |
| Official Development Assistance Y/N | **Y** |

1. **Project Purpose** (from proposal form)

|  |
| --- |
| Improving observance of international human rights and torture conventions in the management of high security prisons in China, by developing risk assessment tools. |

1. **Project Background / Context** including what the project set out to achieve (150 words max)

|  |
| --- |
| There is extensive evidence of change in Chinese prisons in the development of categorisation, resettlement and more recently the protections that need to be given to those under segregation. This project seeks to build on this in the more under -developed western Chinese provinces, continuing to us as its main tool the FCO-sponsored handbook “A Human Rights Approach to Prison Management”. The programme will focus on the reduction in depersonalisation caused by collective approaches to risk management and introduce more consideration of individual needs and risks, thereby keeping pressure on the need for individual rights in custody. |

1. **Evaluation summary** (150 words max)

|  |
| --- |
| The project was clearly relevant to UK objectives. On the whole it was efficient and well designed, although the indicators and outputs could have been more realistic. The key value of the project was in the peer to peer exchange between the UK and Chinese prison systems and widening ICPS access to prisons in more provinces. Long term engagement over eight years has built confidence and influence in prisons in about 20 of 30 provinces in China, and both parties are keen to continue. Impact is not easy to measure from the project reporting and is difficult to verify because of the lack of transparency of official data. However, there is credible evidence that this project has influenced prison reform in China contributing to longer term improvements in prison conditions. Given the traditional secrecy over the Chinese prison system, the opening up of more prisons to international experts is a good impact in of itself. |

1. **Questions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Did the project achieve the project purpose?  | Yes, mostly. |
| Did the project come in on budget? (Y/N)If no, why and what was the difference in cost?  | Yes |
| Was the project completed on time? (Y/N)If not, why not? | Yes |
| Were the Project benefits sustained after project completion?  | Yes |

1. **Overall Red / Amber / Green rating** for project

|  |
| --- |
| Overall Rating for project (put **X** in relevant box) |
| Red |  |
| Red | Amber |  |
| Amber | Green | **x** |
| Green |  |

Guide to overall rating:

Green- project performed well under each of the evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and management

Green/Amber – project performed well under most criteria and adequately in others

Amber/Red – project performed adequately under some criteria but poorly in others

Red – project performed poorly under most criteria

1. **Top 5 Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. It’s possible to work on some of the most sensitive human rights issues in China (e.g. torture) if done through the right implementers and using professional peer to peer exchanges.
2. Need to encourage implementers to be more bold and realistic in defining their added value, even if the level of influence is relatively small, and not to oversell their potential influence and impact through unrealistic indicators and outputs.
3. Projects open up opportunities to hold constructive and more informal discussions on sensitive issues at both a technical and diplomatic level.
4. Study visits can appear expensive, but can have real impact and in the longer term offer value for money when anchored to UK technical expertise, have clear objectives and supported by sustained follow up.
5. Funding relatively small amounts of money (£100,000) to support government reforms over several years (5-10 years) may arguably offer great long term impact and value for money than more expensive (£1million) projects over shorter periods (3 years).
 |

1. **Recommendations for future projects**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. The exchange of experience between the UK and Chinese prison systems is valuable and should be continued, and expanded to more provinces. This may require efforts by China Desk to secure UK Ministry of Justice and NOMS support and funding.
2. Consider less intensive study programmes and increased focus on time for discussion on the areas of interest identified by the beneficiary.
 |