Completing your Project Completion Narrative Report Guidance

Table of contents

Introduction

All UK Aid Match grant holders are required to submit a project completion report (PCR) no later than **3 months** after the end date of the project in line with the terms of the Accountable Grant Arrangement (AGA).

The purpose of the project completion report is to assess the performance of the project over the complete project cycle. Although the report is retrospective, it is also intended to look to the future

Matching your
donations with

mannion
daniels

UKaid

with the intent to use lessons learned to support programming. As well as detailing project successes and achievements, therefore, the PCR should also examine what did not go so well and why, and how to move forward using any lessons learnt. The PCR should seek to:

- Provide a critical analysis of the project's achievements - rather than just descriptions of activities, including in-depth evaluation of impact and outcomes
- Provide credible, robust data to back up the achievements and challenges of the project, incorporating information from the independent evaluation and other reliable sources to strengthen the assessment's validity
- Share project experiences honestly – the good and the not so good
- Highlight good or promising practice and identify clear lessons
- Build on successive reporting and feedback from the fund manager from previous annual reports.

It is important to present an honest account of the project's experiences, highlighting both the positive aspects and the challenges faced. By sharing these insights transparently, the report can provide a balanced view of the project's journey. Additionally, the report should emphasise examples of good or promising practices that emerged during the project, showcasing what worked well and why. Finally, it is crucial to identify clear lessons learned from the project. These lessons can offer valuable insights for future initiatives, helping to improve planning and execution in similar contexts.

Assessment: Composite scoring

Grant holders will self-assess against each output and outcome indicator, and overall, for those sections. The fund manager will review these self-assessments, considering progress and quality of evidence, and will make a final moderated assessment.

The output and outcome assessment will be combined with two other impact areas (social inclusion and sustainability) to give an overall weighted composite score.

Annual Review to PCR weighting shift: Note that in annual reporting, outputs have the greater weighting, while at PCR, this shifts to outcome. This aligns with an anticipated trajectory of deepened outcome achievement in the final phase of a project.

Assessment area	Assessment weighting
Progress against Outcomes: The changes which come from the new conditions (outputs) which ideally relate to longer term / sustained changes in behaviour.	50%
Progress against Outputs: The immediate changes (conditions) resulting from inputs and activities.	20%

Matching your donations with

UKaid

mannion daniels

Social inclusion (gender and disability): How the project is impacting the most vulnerable and marginalised groups, including women, girls, and people with disabilities. (7.5% for disability and 7.5% for gender).	15%
Sustainability: How the project ensures benefits will last beyond the life of the project.	15%

Quality Scores

The quality of the report will also be assessed using the below criteria. This assessment does not form part of the overall score, however there is likely to be a correlation.

Quality of evidence is a key aspect of output and outcome assessment, and this will impact overall scores. Therefore, it is important to ensure all evidence / data is accurate and robust. This includes reflection and analysis where there have been issues with data and evidence, and it is important to be transparent and open about this. This is a common area where reports fall short on communicating a project impacts and achievements. Grant holders are strongly encouraged to revisit the Quality of Evidence webinar on Box for further guidance.

Proof read: It is recommended that sufficient levels of proofing are done for content and form, including someone less directly connected to the project, who can give a critical review from an external position. Often what might seem obvious / self-explanatory or implicit to the team writing the report is not so clear to outside reviewers (including the fund manager).

Criteria	Quality description
Completeness	All sections of the report have been completed. All relevant documents have been updated and shared.
Content	The content is useful / relevant. There is a good balance between description and analysis. Good quality, credible data and evidence is provided to prove results.
Clarity	The report is concise, clear, well written and easy to read. It has had sufficient layers of proofing. The length of the responses is proportionate (word limits are followed where relevant).
Relevance	The responses focus on the main issues. The report responds directly to the questions asked.
Responsiveness	The report has addressed comments/ recommendations made in previous feedback / reviews / discussions.
Accuracy	Consistent data is presented throughout the report and supporting documents.
Timeliness	The report is submitted on time. Any extension / change is agreed in advance.

Completing the project completion report – a step-by-step guide

This guidance is designed to support grant holders to complete the project completion report accurately, with robust and credible evidence provided to help explain results. Real examples are provided from grant holder reviews as a guide to indicate level of detail and what to focus on. The rest of this guide covers each section of the narrative report, with examples where relevant.

Word counts: The report template does not have word count limits, however as a guide, most questions should have responses ranging 300 – 500 words. This might vary depending on the type of question, and whether a point has already been made elsewhere in the report (no need for lots of repetition, just clear signposting to relevant detail). Please write responses as relevant for sufficient detail.

Section 1: Grant Information

1:1 to 1.9

Basic grant information. Please ensure accuracy.

1.10 to 1.11: Budget / actual

Ensure this is accurate, has been cross checked by the project finance team. Include figures by the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), UK Aid Match and combined.

1.12 IATI

A link to the final published IATI data must be provided. The final set of financial/transaction data should be published, and the status of the activity file changed from 'implementation' to 'completion' as part of the project completion process. This link provides a user-friendly representation of the raw IATI data. The search function on the platform's homepage can be used to locate the project data on this repository by searching for the publishing organisation name. See IATI guidance on the fund website for more detail.

1.13: Acronyms

For ease of external review, avoid the use of jargon and acronyms and only use them when necessary. If it is necessary, list the acronyms. The report will be difficult to review if this section is not completed fully and may negatively affect the quality score.

1.14 Overall project summary

Reflecting on the entire length of the grant, provide a summary of the project presenting a clear picture of:

- What the overall project purpose was (its original goal and aims and any amendments to this)
- What strategies and activities were used to try to achieve the goal
- What the achievements were, in terms of numbers versus intended participants and other key successes of the project
- Any major challenges the project had to overcome.

This is best written after completing the rest of the report to allow for thorough and holistic reflection of the project. It may be useful to look back at the most recent annual report feedback from the fund manager which has a summary which you can then develop.

Section 2: Participant (beneficiary) reach

2.1

Complete the Beneficiary Data Summary (BDS) with updated data for the latest period. Refer to the guidance tab within the excel document for further information on how to complete it. Ensure the following:

- **Disaggregation** Ensure participant reach data is disaggregated by sex and disability at a minimum
- **Characteristics:** Include these only where the project has identified as relevant and ensure there is accompanying trend analysis in the report (The purpose of data at these disaggregated levels is trend analysis). Where characteristics were intended but not collected, clear justification must be noted
- **Direct and indirect participants:** Ensure there is clarity and agreement on who and how primary and secondary participants are counted defined. This should be clear and consistent across all reporting documents. The guidance tab of the BDS template has explanations for these terms
- **BDS Version:** Each project will have a live / cumulative version of the BDS. Ensure you use the approved / most up to date version and reach out to your Performance and Risk Manager (PRM) before finalising the report if unsure about this or the data contained within it. All previous entries / tabs must be data cleaned / confirmed as accurate (with your PRM)
- **Ensure all BDS data then aligns with your reported logframe targets and actuals.** The BDS should have the higher figures (Reach) while the logframe should have a portion of these for reported impact. For example, 100 people trained (reach), 90 of them improved skills (output) and 70 improved behaviours (outcome).

Speak to your PRM before finalising the report if unsure about any of this.

2.2 Analysis of beneficiary reach

This is important to understand the extent to which the project has reached its planned targets, both in terms of numbers and characteristics.

Section 3: Performance against outcomes

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the progress made towards achieving the expected end of project outcomes (results). This is done by assessing the extent to which end of project targets have been met for each indicator. Before doing this, update the 'achieved' sections against each outcome indicator in the final column of the project logframe. Ensure these figures are accurate in the report and other places. Ensure the correlation / flow is clear, from reach to output to outcome.

There are three outcome spaces in the template (for three outcome indicators). When completing, add or delete as necessary to ensure all outcome indicators in your approved project logframe are reported against.

Logframe version: Each project will have a live / cumulative version of the logframe with all previous tabs locked and available to see. Please ensure you use the approved version and reach out to your PRM before finalising the report if unsure about which version to use.

Self-scores should be made on the following basis:

Score	Outcome description
A++	Outcome substantially exceeded expectation (exceeded by a range of 20%+)
A+	Outcomes moderately exceeded expectation (exceeded by a range of 10 – 20%)
A	Outcomes met expectation (achieved by a range of ± 10%)
B	Outcomes moderately did not meet expectation (underachieved by between 10% and 20%)
C	Outcomes substantially did not meet expectation by more than 20%

Each indicator has four question areas to cover:

3.1 Indicator information

Enter the indicator description, self-score, milestone (target), and achievement data. Please ensure this is accurate and correlates with the logframe data.

3.2 Disaggregated results

All relevant milestones and achievements should be disaggregated at a minimum by sex and disability. Please ensure disaggregated figures are accurate and correlate with the logframe and BDS data. Please ensure that across all outcomes and outputs, disaggregated data is used to inform trend analysis. This should provide insight into the project's performance in relation to those characteristics (whether disability status, sex, or other). Your response should highlight any differences in the levels of change being experienced by different groups and what that might tell you about the barriers to change those groups are facing. For example, the data may indicate that women in rural areas are showing a different rate of change to those in urban areas, or male youths living with a disability are showing higher engagement levels than older participants, or out-of-school boys are attending a club in higher numbers than their female counterparts. Trend analysis encourages reflection on the data, to further explain the project's progress, Theory of Change (TOC) assumptions, and challenges. At PCR level, what does the trend analysis of the data indicate for adaptation and learning for future programming?

3.3 Evidence

Results must be supported by good quality, credible evidence. For more information on quality of evidence - see Quality of evidence webinar.

Scores will be revised downwards by the fund manager if evidence provided and/or data collection methodologies are considered not good enough to verify results or no evidence is provided.

Critical reflection: No evidence is perfect, and it is almost impossible to eliminate measurement error. In the report, identify and explain the potential sources of error for each indicator and explain how these were mitigated to provide reasonable confidence that the best available evidence was collected in the best way. In this section explain clearly:

- How the evidence was collected: Provide details on the instruments and methods used
- Who the evidence was collected from: Explain the size of the population, if relevant provide descriptions and explanations of sample sizes, the sampling methodology and explanations of potential sampling error
- Data collection processes: Who collected the data, when was it collected, are there potential errors or issues with sample sizes / confidence levels which may impact on data validity and reliability? What was done to mitigate any possible bias in the data?
- Data quality and integrity measures taken describe what was done to ensure that no errors were made in collating and analysing the data
- Plans to improve evidence quality next time if needed
- Please ensure this correlates with the source information in the logframe, and any supporting indicator reference notes. Where necessary, please update these (using red text to allow for ease of reference).

3.4 Progress

Consider factors contributing to the results. If there are differences between milestones and actual achievements, it is important to analyse these and reflect on why they have arisen. This is applicable for both over and under achievements. Reflect on strategies that have worked well and those that have not and explain why. Milestones in the approved logframe should be cumulative, unless otherwise specified, so make clear whether the milestone is cumulative or unique for the reporting period.

3.5 Overall assessment of outcomes

In this section, grant holders are required to reflect on the cumulative achievement of outputs over the life of the project. Before doing this, update the 'achieved' sections completed against each output and indicator in the final column of the project logframe. This section should be completed alongside the output scoring table (separate excel template).

It is best to complete the output scoring table last. Refer to the guidance tab within the excel document for further information. Alongside this, a webinar on 'How to complete the Output Scoring Table' is available on the UK Aid Match website.

The high-level findings and score for each output statement should be summarised in the narrative reporting template. The same self-assessment scoring criteria used for the outcome indicators (see section 2 above) should be used to provide the most appropriate score per output.

Section 4: Performance against outputs

In this section, grant holders are required to reflect on the cumulative achievement of outputs over the life of the project. Before doing this, update the 'achieved' sections completed against each

output and indicator in the final column of the project logframe. This section should be completed alongside the output scoring table (separate excel template).

There are three spaces for output reporting in the template (each with space for three output indicators). When completing, add or delete as necessary to ensure all outputs and output indicators in the approved project logframe are reported against.

As with outcomes, there are four question areas for each indicator:

Indicator information: Enter the indicator description, milestone and achievement data. Please ensure this is accurate and correlates with the logframe data, checking for any data discrepancies before submission as this will impact your quality of report assessment.

Self-assessed score: For each indicator, provide a self-assessed score using the below guidance.

Score	Standard	Additional considerations
A++	Outputs substantially exceeded expectation (exceeded by a range of 20%+)	Supported by credible evidence
A+	Outputs moderately exceeded expectation (exceeded by a range of 10 – 20%)	
A	Outputs met expectation (achieved by a range of ± 10%)	
B	Outputs moderately did not meet expectation (underachieved by between 10% and 20%)	No evidence OR evidence lacking credibility
C	Outputs substantially did not meet expectation by more than 20%	

Disaggregated results: Follow the guidance for outcomes above, ensuring that the same level of trend analysis and reflection is conducted at output level.

Evidence, progress, adaptation: Answer the next set of questions using the same guidance that was provided in the outcome section and repeat the process for each indicator under output one. Repeat for each output.

Overall output performance: Once complete for all indicators within output one, assess overall performance against the output. This should be a balanced judgement based on findings across each indicator. Repeat for each output.

Output scoring table: Section 4 should be completed alongside the Output Scoring Table (separate Excel template) shared by your Performance and Risk Manager.

- Reach out to your PRM before finalising the report if any of the pre-populated information is missing or incorrect

- Once the overall performance for each output has been scored, input this data into the Output Scoring Table
- Refer to the guidance tab within the excel document for further information.

'A' score is the goal: At output level, strong performing projects are usually those that score A. Scores above or below may be indicative of poor planning and management, where milestones were either not ambitious enough or were too ambitious, and not connected to baseline data or understandings of context. Scores may also reflect unforeseen events or circumstances, and it is important to explain this in the narrative report, so that it can be considered in the review. Where overachievement is the result of extra efforts, additional inputs and activities or an unforeseen causal pathway, this should be noted and celebrated – and examined as part of learning for future programming.

Section 5.0 Social Inclusion

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the extent to which project strategies to include and benefit people vulnerable to exclusion have worked and whether any changes are needed to strengthen them in moving forward. There are three sections to complete, each looking at specific vulnerable groups.

5.1 Overall targeting approach

This UK Aid Match project will be benefitting a specific marginalised or vulnerable group of people in a developing country context. This may be women and girls with a particular vulnerability, people living with disabilities, people living in extreme poverty, orphans and vulnerable children, marginalised ethnic groups, or remote, disadvantaged communities and will vary from project to project. Characteristics should be evident from the Beneficiary Data Summary.

This question is asking for a clear understanding of the targeting approach, using data and evidence, and a critical interrogation of how effective this has been. Ideally this should build on what has already been explained through specific indicator analysis questions (rather than repeat). This may also have been well established by the point of PCR, and the emphasis would then be on effectiveness / learning.

5.2 Gender equality

As a condition of the Accountable Grant Arrangement (AGA), all projects should be working towards promoting gender equality. All projects have outlined an approach to promoting gender equality, with a set of key actions and goals for each year and end of the project (GESI action plans). Grant holders should refer to their action plans, providing an update on progress towards the actions and goals set for the project lifecycle, providing practical examples and making specific reference to each of the four dimensions used in the UK Aid Match Gender Equality Responsiveness Tool.

5.3 Disability inclusion

As a condition of the Accountable Grant Arrangement (AGA), all projects should be working towards ensuring inclusion of people with disabilities. All projects have outlined an approach to promoting disability inclusion, with a set of key actions and goals for each year of the project and end of the project (GESI action plans). Grant holders should refer to their action plans, providing an update on

progress towards the actions and goals set for the project lifecycle, providing practical examples and making specific reference to each of the four dimensions used in the UK Aid Match Disability Inclusion Responsiveness Tool.

In each section explain the specific strategies used to ensure vulnerable people were able to participate in and benefit from the project. It is important to consider:

- How the project has designed its activities and approaches to ensure they are at the least accessible to marginalised groups, or how activities have been designed around the specific needs of these groups. Please note that access does not only refer to physical access for individuals with mobility challenges; it is important to consider all forms of marginalisation (project design and implementation)
- To what extent the project has contributed to challenging the wider discriminatory social norms or stigma that these marginalised and vulnerable groups may face (project design and implementation)
- How the project has consulted the most marginalised and vulnerable groups to ensure their needs are understood and their ongoing views on the project have been incorporated into project design, implementation and review (participation and voice).
- How the project has identified who is most marginalised and vulnerable, and how it tracks that these groups have been reached by the project and that they have benefited from the project interventions (results measurement)
- How the project has utilised its data or consultations with marginalised groups to adapt activities or interventions to ensure they respond to the needs of vulnerable and marginalised populations and have benefited those groups (learning and adaptation).

Use data and specifically the disaggregated data from sections 2, 3 and 4 to indicate whether the strategies were successful or not.

- If milestones were met it would suggest the strategies are working
- If milestones were not met, what improvements were made, and will need to be made for future programming
- If there is no data, what has been learned for future programming?

Composite scoring: The fund manager will conduct a gender equality and disability inclusion assessment based on the information provided in this section. Detailed feedback on this will be given, and a 15% weighting is given to form your overall score.

GESI scales – Transformative: It is not realistic for all grant holders to be gender or disability transformative, and we would only expect a few projects with gender equality or disability inclusion as their primary focus to be assessed as being at this level. However, all grant holders should be addressing GESI as far as possible within the existing scope for their project and holding themselves accountable to GESI plans. At a minimum, projects should be GESI 'sensitive' across the four dimensions and if less than this, clear actions should form part of the action plans to get there within the life of the project.

For more general information on gender equality and disability inclusion, <u>see the external Box folder</u>. Please email your Performance and Risk Manager (PRM) and Grants Officer for any access issues.

Section 6: Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

The purpose of this section is to reflect on and evaluate the extent to which the monitoring, evaluation and learning system has generated credible information and how well it was used for performance management (project improvement, adaptation, innovation, and accountability) in the past year.

6.1 Logical framework

Submit updated version.

6.2: Changes to the logframe

The purpose of the logframe is to show how the results illustrated in the theory of change are measured. As the theory of change and project approach is adapted it is likely the logframe will have changed. Logframes also change as a result of learning as projects find out what change is realistic in the context or discover what evidence is and is not available or what can reasonably be collected in the context. The purpose of this section is to reflect on and provide a high-level summary of any large-scale changes to the logframe during the project life. This should summarise the detailed individual changes included in the logframe change log to provide the reviewer with a high-level picture of how the logframe may have changed over the course of the project. Large-scale changes include:

- Any changes at outcome level (for example, changes in milestones, targets or indicators)
- Significant changes at output level (for example, new/elimination of outputs, new/elimination of indicators, changes to milestones and targets of more than 10%).

These changes should also be evident in the logframe, through the change tab, and/or past tabs which we all be locked by your PRM for audit purposes.

<u>Find out more about logical frameworks, including a quality assurance checklist for assessing your logical framework</u>.

6.3 Main project challenges

The purpose of this section is to reflect on the main challenges that the project faced over its lifetime and how they were managed. This helps to provide a context in which the results were achieved. For this report, a challenge is defined as something that has happened – a risk that materialised and impacted on the project's ability to reach the project objectives. All projects face challenges but are expected to explore ways to solve them and adapt.

Reflect on the complete project cycle and identify the three which are considered the most significant in that they had the biggest impact on your ability to deliver against objectives. These would come under the risk categories:

- Contextual
- Project delivery

- Safeguarding
- Operational
- Fiduciary.

For each challenge, explain:

- What the challenge was
- Whether the challenge was anticipated (was it in the risk register, for example)
- The impact on the project – why this has been chosen as one of the main challenges
- How the challenge was managed and how successful this was
- What has been learned about how to address or mitigate this type of challenge in the future.

6.4 Theory of change

Reflect on the development hypothesis and theory of change (TOC) that underpins the project. It is important to remember that the TOC sets out the 'best guess' about the most likely path to change and is based on understanding the problem and its context at that time. The TOC is likely to develop over time as relationships are built, new information gathered, methodologies trialled, and there is space for reflection on what is working and what is not.

Using the results presented as evidence, reflect on whether the theory of change is holding true. Consider the links between the results in each chain (causal pathways between activities, outputs, and outcomes) and how consistent they are. To what extent is the initial logic correct, and have assumptions been proven/disproven?

- For example, if around half of the workplan has been implemented, and scoring suggests a 'B' at output level, and 'on track' at outcome level, this suggests that there is some disconnect in the theory of change logic (i.e you can get to the outcome without the output, or at a different pace / or with less or different resources / input)
- Alternatively, if most of the workplan has been implemented and output level achieved an A, but the outcome is off track, there may be something missing in the original understanding of how the outputs would lead to the outcomes, and new approaches may need to be considered
- If most of the workplan has been implemented, output level achieved an A and the outcome is on track, this indicates that the theory of change remains sound.

	Since last working with your Theory of change
Problem	What more have you learned about the nature or extent of the problem you are addressing?
Context	Consider what changes have taken place in the operating context during the reporting period and reflect on whether the theory of change remains valid. For instance, consider whether any political, economic, social, and institutional factors have changed
Key actors	Who are the key actors now, and how have their relationships, interests, and/or incentives changed?
Interventions	Given the changes in the context or your understanding of the problem, do you need to change approaches? Is there new information or recent changes in key dynamics that impact the sequencing of strategies?
Outputs	Given the changes to the context or to the strategies, are any changes to the outputs (pre-conditions for achieving the outcome) needed.

6.5 Learning and adapting

The fund manager supports adaptive programming and understands that plans change in the light of challenges faced, new learning generated and changes in the operating context.

Use the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning sections to describe any adaptations made to the project based on information revealed through monitoring, evaluation and/or learning processes that has not been described in previous sections. This could be changes to the:

- Nature of the activities or approaches
- Timing of the activities
- Number and type of people involved.

Explain why the changes were made. What were the changes in the country context or the political economy that prompted shifts in programming (for example policy change, security issues, national emergencies)? Use any data that you have to explain how successful (or not) the adaptations were.

6.6 Collaborative Learning Plan (CLP)

Please submit your final CLP. **Note**: CLP changes do not need formal approval by your PRM, and the evidence collected towards answering the questions will be reviewed through the learning section of the report.

6.7

The Collaborative Learning Plan (CLP) is intended to ensure that learning is systematic, intentional and resources are dedicated to it. For full guidance on Collaborative Learning Plans, see the external Box folder.

In the learning section of the report, reflect on:

- Whether the questions were relevant and useful,
- What you can answer about the questions at the end of the project
- Any challenges you have experienced in the quality of evidence you have collected to answer these

- How well the theory of change reflects the learnings you have gathered through the logframe and CLP.

6.8 Learning from research and evaluations (if applicable)

This section focuses on the more structured and formal learning activity that may have been carried out during the lifetime of your project, which can include any of the following:

- Baseline surveys (applicable for year one reports)
- Annual evaluations
- Responsive evaluations and research conducted as a reaction to learning generated through monitoring and evaluation.
- Planned research or learning activities. Explain the headline findings from the research and outline what actions were taken, or will be taken, to improve or adapt the project.

6.9 Learning from beneficiaries

Consistent interaction with, and feedback from, beneficiaries is an important part of the project to assure relevance and accountability to the beneficiaries. A full beneficiary feedback mechanism should involve systematic collection of feedback (including from identified marginalised groups), analysis of this feedback, clear responses to the issues raised, communication back to the beneficiaries of what action is being taken to 'close the feedback loop', and whether the actions taken meet their needs.

In this section:

- Describe the mechanisms/tools used to collect feedback from beneficiaries in the past year
- Give specific examples of the feedback received
- Explain how that feedback has been analysed and used
- Explain how beneficiaries were informed that their feedback had been used.

Section 7: Sustainability

Sustainability is about how a project will achieve impacts that will continue beyond funding from the FCDO (either for project participants, or for sustained service improvements or approaches developed by the project). Sustainability should underpin the project design and be reflected upon regularly through the project cycle. This section of the narrative report is an opportunity to reflect on and assess three key areas:

7.1 The sustainability plan

Use this section to explain the project's sustainability plan. Clearly outline the local and institutional stakeholders to whom ownership and responsibility for project activities and ongoing benefits will be transferred over time. Explain the strategies the project has used to ensure this transfer. Please ensure the plan is clear for each output / component of the project.

7.2 Effectiveness of the sustainability plan

In this section, provide evidence that the sustainability strategies outlined in the previous section have worked and reflect on whether the evidence suggests that benefits will be seen beyond the life of the project. What adaptations and lessons have been generated through this? Evidence can be

gathered through a range of sources including logframe results, project monitoring reports, qualitative data collection etc. Please revisit the Evidencing Sustainability webinar for further support in this area.

7.3 Risks to sustainability

By PCR time, risks to sustainability should be well established and understood with strong mitigations. Use this section to review these risks and how they materialised (or not) over the last period and overall. It is helpful to consider who the key stakeholders have been, and what influences have affected their ability to assume responsibility for the continuation of activities/benefits once the project ends. For each risk identified, explain the mitigating action and, where possible, provide evidence that it has been managed effectively.

Composite scoring: The fund manager will conduct a sustainability assessment based on the information provided in this section. Detailed feedback on this will be given, and a 15% weighting will be added to the overall score.

Section 8: Value for Money

This is a very important section of the project completion report and needs to be completed carefully. A value for money analysis is when you compare the results of the project against the costs and answer the question ''were the results achieved worth the costs incurred?''

8.1 Value for Money (VfM) analysis

Please provide evidence of value for money and examples of your approach to value for money.

- Value is evidenced by information of the actual results achieved by the project during the project lifecycle, considering the scale, depth, and quality of those results. Value can be subjective. However, the value your project intends to deliver has been agreed and is represented in the milestones and targets in your logframe and other agreed results (for example beneficiary reach). Evidence of results can be found throughout your project completion report and in your logical framework
- Money is evidenced by information of the costs incurred by the project during the project. Evidence of costs can be found through your budget and accounts. Some financial analysis is needed to complete the value for money analysis. The following are some suggestions for what evidence you could use:

  When creating your VFM analysis please consider the 4 Es these E's are:

  - **Efficiency:** How well do your organisation or your agents convert inputs into outputs? Outputs are results delivered by us, or our agents, to an external party. The organisation or our agents exercise strong control over the quality and quantity of outputs
  - **Economy:** Are we or our agents buying inputs of the appropriate quality at the right price? Inputs are things such as staff, consultants, raw materials and capital that are used to produce outputs

- o **Equity**: How closely does your project align with the primary focus of UK Aid Match, which is to benefit the most vulnerable and marginalised populations, particularly girls and women? If your project includes other beneficiaries outside of this target group, you will need to clearly present and justify why these additional groups are also included. This explanation should detail the reasons for their inclusion, demonstrating how their involvement contributes to the overall goals of the project, and how it still aligns with the core objectives of UK Aid Match
  - o **Effectiveness:** How well are the outputs from an intervention achieving the desired outcome on poverty reduction? In contrast to outputs, we, or our agents, do not exercise direct control over outcomes. Cost-effectiveness must also be explored. Think about the impact on poverty reduction an intervention achieves relative to the inputs that we or our agents invest in it?
  - o

Your response should include a **cost-benefit analysis** to provide evidence of efficiency. This means looking at the total amount spent during the year versus the total beneficiaries reached.
Your assessment should also go further to look at the quality of the benefits / depth of impact. Therefore, your response should also include a simple **cost-effectiveness** analysis. This involves looking at the total number of beneficiaries reached versus the number who have made the desired change, as demonstrated in your logframe results, and how much this cost.

Try to provide benchmarks wherever possible to demonstrate the value for money provided by the project. In your analysis you also need to provide concrete examples of how you achieved the value for money that you have evidenced. These examples should demonstrate the consideration of cost and value and how it was compared with other options at each step to select the best. You need to make sure that you explain and justify any decisions made. More information on approaches to value for money can be found on the UK Aid Match website.

Section 9: Safeguarding

In this section, reflect on the approach to safeguarding taken by the project, including an assessment on the overall effectiveness of the safeguarding measures and how these were strengthened throughout the project lifecycle. In this section:

- Outline what safeguarding activities were implemented and with whom during the project lifecycle to help prevent incidents from occurring and ensure effective reporting and response where incidents did occur
- Explain whether and how beneficiaries and stakeholders were engaged on the approach to safeguarding, and how the project team ensured their rights were fully understood
- Explain any challenges in implementing any of these activities or approaches
- Present any wider lessons learned around safeguarding through project implementation.

Consider whether there are any aspects to the safeguarding approach that would change when delivering future projects. It is important to focus on the safeguarding measures implemented at project level and not reflect on organisational policies; only reflect changes in safeguarding policies and procedures if these resulted in a direct change at project level, for example updates to policies to

require focal persons at each field office which resulted in more dialogue with communities and increased reporting.

Section 10: Other

Use this section to provide any further information or upload any other documents that have not been covered elsewhere in the report. For instance, write about any of the following where relevant:

- Any changes to enhanced safeguarding approach not shared through the quarterly report process (for example updated safeguarding policy)
- Stakeholder coordination. For example, meetings, round tables, steering committees, and stock takes not included in outputs or sustainability sections
- Advocacy or lobbying activities not included in outputs
- Wider engagement that the project has undertaken; for example, with other CSOs or programmes in the region
- Unexpected activities or benefits outside the project plan not mentioned in the value for money section
- Coordination or knowledge sharing with other UK Aid Match projects or others
- Capacity building for project staff and/or downstream partners
- Visits to the project by the fund manager or others, including remote monitoring visits.

Section 11: Feedback to the fund manager

Use this space to provide feedback, suggestions, or requests to the fund management team.

Process:

- Project completion report guidance available on the UK Aid Match website
- Project Performance and Risk Manager (PRM) will share project specific templates with grant holders
- Project PRM is available for a PCR support call if requested
- Actions to be followed up in writing along with any changes to key documents, such as logframe and GESI action plan.

Section 12: Checklist – document submission

There is a checklist table at the end of the narrative template report, also available below. Complete the 'Submitted?' column in the table, checking that all supporting documents are included, before submitting the full report. The table below provides additional instructions and/or information against each item in the check list.

	Checklist element	Instructions / information
1	Completed narrative report	The narrative report template is available under the grant holder resources section of the UK Aid Match website. The narrative report

		template must be submitted with all sections completed. Revisions may be requested if the information is inadequate or incomplete.
2	Final beneficiary data summary	Grant holders will have been providing updated beneficiary data summaries at the annual reporting stages of the project. The final year's data should be added into beneficiary data summary from the previous annual report and submitted with this PCR, providing a full picture of the project beneficiary reach.
3	Completed Output Scoring Table (with achievements completed in 'project completion report' tab)	Refer to the guidance tab within the excel document for further information. Alongside this, a webinar on 'How to complete the Output Scoring Table' is available on YouTube.
4	Theory of change	The final theory of change should be included as a supporting document.
5	Logframe (with achievements completed in 'project completion report' tab)	In the approved logframe update the final target column with the results achieved. This should reflect the data submitted under the 'performance against outcomes' and 'performance against outputs' sections in the narrative report alongside the beneficiary data submitted in the 'beneficiary data summary'.
6	Updated delivery chain risk map – only if any updates are needed since the last submission	Download from Grantelope and update the delivery chain risk map with any relevant risks and control/mitigations since the last submission.
7	Safeguarding policy – only if updated since the last annual review	Submit an updated safeguarding policy if a review has been undertaken since the last Annual Review.
8	Research and evaluations	If your project has undertaken any specific pieces of research or evaluation (beyond the final independent evaluation) please submit them alongside the PCR
9	Final independent evaluation	As stipulated in the AGA, all projects must commission an independent evaluation of the project. This must be completed and submitted as an annex to the project completion report.
10	Annual audited accounts	The most recent set of annual audit accounts must be submitted. These will be used by the fiduciary risk team to conduct the project completion financial review.

Note: The risk register is expected to be submitted with your last quarterly report via grantelope and not with your project completion documents.

PCR submission

Submit all documentation for the PCR (including supporting documents) through e-mail to your Performance and Risk Manager and Grants Officer, copying in ukaidmatch@manniondaniels.com. The deadline (unless agreed separately with your PRM) will be three months after the project end date.

Do not upload these documents to Grantelope.

All files should be named and shared, following the convention below:
Grant holder name (or abbreviated name) _name of document_grant reference number_date (MMYYYY)

Example: EducateAction_Logframe_205210-211_042024

Do not PDF any submitted documents. It is important that files are submitted in the same format that they were originally are shared with grant holders.