Completing your Project Completion Narrative Report Guidance

Table of contents

Introduction

All UK Aid Match grant holders finishing their grants in March 2026 are required to submit a project completion report (PCR) no later than **2 months** after the end date of the project in line with the updated 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 with the intent to use lessons learned, whether good or bad, to support future 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 an honest and critical analysis of the project's achievements - rather than just descriptions of activities - including an 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 specific examples of project activities and 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 on previous annual reports.

Assessment: Composite scoring

Grant holders will self-assess the project's performance against each output and outcome indicators and arrive at an overall score 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 scores from 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 outcomes. 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%
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 gender equality and 7.5% for disability inclusion).	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 composite 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 the quality of data and evidence collected, and it is important to be transparent and open about this. Grant holders are strongly encouraged to revisit the Quality of Evidence webinar on Box for further guidance.

Proofread: It is recommended that sufficient levels of proofreading are done for content and form, including by 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 proofreading. The length of the responses is proportionate and word limit guidance is 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. The rest of this guide covers each section of the narrative report, with examples where relevant.

Recommended word limits: The narrative report should seek a balance between concise responses and providing sufficient detail for clarity. The report template includes guidance on word limits for each section, with most questions seeking responses ranging from 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).

Section 1: Grant Information

1:1 to 1.8

Basic grant information. Please ensure accuracy.

1.9 to 1.10: Budget

Ensure figures are accurate and have been cross checked by the project finance team. Include budget amounts broken down into Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO) and match contributions, as well as providing the total combined budget amount.

1.11 IATI

A link to the organisation's IATI data must be provided. The final set of financial/transaction data should be published shortly after the disbursement of funds following the final claim, 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 manager website for more information.

1.12: 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.

1.13 Key project achievements

Reflecting on the entire length of the project, please summarise what you consider to be the project's **three** most significant achievements. These could include examples of:

- how the project met or exceeded targets, including disaggregated participant reach targets
- particularly effective strategies used to engage with marginalised groups
- effective stakeholder engagement, including examples of how local authorities or community leaders have seen the value of and committed to supporting the project long term
- learning and adaptation where the grant holder and partners have responded well to changes in context to improve the delivery of activities

(Recommended word limit: 500)

1.14 Main project challenges
All projects face challenges but are expected to explore ways to solve them and adapt. 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 build an understanding of the context in which the results were achieved.

Reflect on the complete project cycle and identify the **three** most significant challenges the project faced. For this report, a challenge is defined as a risk that materialised and impacted the project's ability to reach its 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
- 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.

(**Recommended word limit: 500**)

Section 2: Participant reach

Complete the Beneficiary Data Summary (BDS) with updated data for the latest period and submit via Grantelope. 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 specific characteristics as relevant to the project design / targeting strategy and ensure there is accompanying trend analysis in the report. Where data collection for specific characteristics was intended but not completed, a clear explanation must be noted in the narrative report.
- **Direct and indirect participants:** Prior to submitting your report, ensure there is clarity and agreement on how direct and indirect participants are defined and counted. 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 shared by your Performance and Risk Manager (PRM) and reach out before finalising the report if unsure about this or the data contained within it. All previous data must be cleaned / confirmed as accurate with your PRM.
- **Ensure all BDS data then aligns with your reported logframe targets and results.** The BDS is likely to include higher figures (reach) while the logframe is likely to show the proportion of these people that achieved the intended impact (result). For example, 100 people trained

(reach), 90 of them improved knowledge (output result) and 70 demonstrated improved behaviours (outcome result).

2.1 Participant reach

Analyse the participant reach data for each group in the Beneficiary Data Summary (BDS) submitted separately. Provide a concise summary of the results including:

- An overview of the final year's reach for each group including explanations of any over / under achievements
- A critical reflection of participant reach across all years of the project – which groups were easier / harder to reach and which strategies were most / least effective in reaching them?
- A critical reflection of gender and disability disaggregated results and how well the project was able to meet its targets for these and any other stated marginalised groups

(Recommended word limit: 500)

Section 3: Performance against outcomes

The purpose of this section is to **evaluate** the progress made towards the expected end of project outcomes (results). This is done by assessing the extent to which end of project logframe 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 between data sets 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 / most up to date version shared by your PRM and reach out before finalising the report if unsure about which version to use.

Self-assessed 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 11 – 20%)
A	Outcomes met expectation (achieved by a range of ± 10%)
B	Outcomes moderately did not meet expectation (underachieved by between 11% and 20%)
C	Outcomes substantially did not meet expectation by more than 20%

Each indicator has four sections to complete:

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.

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 moderated downwards by the fund manager if evidence provided and/or data collection methodologies are considered not robust 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 tools and methods used, including an explanation of how various data sources were triangulated to build confidence in the results.
- **Who the evidence was collected from**: Explain the size of the population. Where relevant provide an explanation of the sampling strategy, including the confidence level the sample gave and how it was representative of geographic locations covered by the project, and of the sex and disability status of participants. Remember that oversampling of certain marginalised groups might be appropriate to ensure their voices are heard in sufficient numbers.
- **Data collection processes**: Who collected the data, and when / where was it collected? Are there potential errors or biases in the process that may have impacted data validity and reliability? What was done to mitigate any possible bias?
- **Data quality and integrity measures**: What was done to ensure that the risk of errors was minimised in collating and analysing the data?
- **Adaptations to approach**: If changes to the original data collection approach were made, please outline the reasons behind these changes and the implications for the consistency and reliability of the final result.
- **Plans to improve data quality in the future if needed**

Please ensure data sources correlate with the source information in the logframe, and any supporting indicator reference notes.

3.4 Progress

Consider factors contributing to the results. **If there are differences between milestones and actual achievements, or the project's own and external final evaluation results, 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.

Please ensure that disaggregated results are used to inform trend analysis. Your response in this section should highlight any differences in the levels of change experienced by different groups and what that might tell you about the barriers to change those groups are facing. For example, the results may indicate that women in rural areas are showing a different rate of change to those in urban areas, or out-of-school boys are attending a club in higher numbers than their female counterparts. Trend analysis encourages reflection on the data to validate (or not) Theory of Change assumptions and the effectiveness (or otherwise) of social inclusion approaches. At PCR level, trend analysis should also inform reflections on what the data indicates for adaptations to future programming.

3.5 Overall assessment of outcomes

In this section, grant holders are required to reflect on the cumulative achievement of the outcome indicators over the life of the project. Before doing this, update the 'achieved' sections completed against each outcome and indicator in the final column of the project logframe.

The high-level findings and overall score for outcomes should be summarised at the end of section 3 in the narrative reporting template. This should reflect upon the outcome achievement across each of the indicators but also how well and how thoroughly they have contributed to the achievement of the project's overall outcome statement.

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.

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 sections to complete for each indicator:

Indicator information: Enter the indicator description, self-score, milestone (target), and achievement data. Please ensure this is accurate and correlates with the logframe data, checking for any discrepancies before submission as this will impact your quality of reporting 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 11 – 20%)	
A	Outputs met expectation (achieved by a range of ± 10%)	
B	Outputs moderately did not meet expectation (underachieved by between 11% 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 and progress: 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.

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 these strategies moving forward.

Composite scoring: The fund manager will conduct a gender equality and disability inclusion assessment based on the information provided in this section, and a 15% weighting is given to this element of the composite score.

This assessment will also be considered when making a judgement on the overall value for money of the project (Equity).

5.1 Gender equality

As a condition of the Accountable Grant Arrangement (AGA), all projects should be working towards promoting gender equality. All projects have set themselves goals as to where the project should sit along the gender 'unaware' to 'transformative' continuum and outlined an approach to promoting gender equality through a set of key actions for each year of the project (GESI action plan).

In this section, grant holders should provide an update on progress towards these actions and reflect on the extent to which the project has achieved its overall gender equality goals. The response should be structured around the four dimensions used in the UK Aid Match Gender Responsiveness tool and include practical examples of actions taken and their outcomes in terms of strengthening gender-responsiveness. Evidence to prove the effectiveness of actions can be found in the disaggregated results presented in sections 2, 3 and 4 of the report, and the strongest responses will make reference to this.

(Recommended word limit: 800)

5.2 Disability inclusion

As a condition of the Accountable Grant Arrangement (AGA), all projects should be working towards ensuring meaningful inclusion of people with disabilities. All projects have set themselves goals as to where the project should sit along the disability 'unaware' to 'transformative' continuum and outlined an approach to promoting disability inclusion through a set of key actions for each year of the project (GESI action plan).

In this section, grant holders should provide an update on progress towards these actions and reflect on the extent to which the project has achieved its overall disability inclusion goals. The response should be structured around the four dimensions used in the UK Aid Match Disability Inclusion Responsiveness Tool and include practical examples of actions taken and their outcomes in terms of strengthening disability-responsiveness. Evidence to prove the effectiveness of actions can be found in the disaggregated results presented in sections 2, 3 and 4 of the report, and the strongest responses will make reference to this.

(Recommended word limit: 800)

In sections 5.1 and 5.2 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 could be done differently in future programming?

GESI continuum – Transformative: It is not realistic for all projects 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 projects should have addressed GESI as far as possible within scope and held themselves accountable to their GESI plans. At a minimum, projects should be GESI 'sensitive' across the four dimensions and if less than this, clear actions should be identified to strengthen approaches in future programming.

5.3 Broader social inclusion
Your project may have proactively engaged with other marginalised groups e.g. different racial, religious or ethnic groups, or populations from remote or rural areas that might have faced specific access issues. If this is the case, these groups should have been identified in the BDS. Use this section to explain how the project met the specific needs of these groups and reflect on the effectiveness of strategies, providing evidence where possible, as in sections 5.1 and 5.2. The strongest responses will consider the intersectionality of overlapping characteristics and how the project has sought to address multiple levels of marginalisation.

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) throughout the project lifecycle, and could be used to inform future programming.

6.1 Reflections on the Collaborative Learning Plan (CLP)
Please submit your final CLP. The Collaborative Learning Plan (CLP) was intended to ensure that learning from implementation was systematic and intentional, and that resources were dedicated to it.

In this section, reflect on:

- Whether the questions were relevant and useful in terms of strengthening project approaches
- What key learnings (if any) emerged through answering these questions
- What effect (if any) these learnings have had on: assumptions / causal pathways in the Theory of Change; logframe design; social inclusion and sustainability approaches
- Which learnings (if any) are likely to be carried forward into future programming

(Recommended word limit: 500)

6.2: Learning from independent evaluation

This section focuses on the external evaluation report submitted separately on Grantelope, along with any further independent evaluations that the project has undertaken through its lifecycle. Grant holders should summarise the **three** most significant findings from the evaluation(s), reflecting upon the following points where relevant:

- To what extent did independent evaluation findings support / enrich / diverge from the project's own findings (e.g. logframe result analysis, or wider endline data collection)?
- If independent evaluation findings differed from the project's own, what would explain the differences? To what extent were alternative data sources more or less credible sources of truth?
- Were there additional findings or recommendations from independent evaluations that have highlighted impact that fell outside of the reporting frameworks or Theory of Change (unintended positive / negative consequences)?
- Did independent evaluations validate the project's sustainability or GESI approaches? What is the evidence? If not, what could be done differently in future programming?

If the final independent evaluation results are different from the project's own, please ensure this is reflected upon critically. The fund manager assessment will consider both sets of results and make a final assessment based on what seems most credible.

(Recommended word limit: 500)

6.3 Learning from participants

Consistent interaction with, and feedback from participants should have been an important part of the project to assure relevance and accountability to the communities supported. A strong participant feedback mechanism should have involved systematic collection of feedback (including from specific marginalised groups), analysis of this feedback, clear responses to the issues raised, and communication back to participants of what action was taken to close the feedback loop.

Strong participant feedback mechanisms, particularly for different gender groups and people with disabilities, will have played an important role in strengthening 'participation and voice' within the project's GESI action plan, and links should be made between this section and sections 5.1 and 5.2.

In this section:

- Describe the mechanisms/tools used to collect feedback from participants across the project lifecycle, including details of adaptations made for specific groups (e.g. people with disabilities) where relevant
- Give specific examples of feedback received
- Explain how that feedback was analysed and used to make adaptations to project design or implementation
- Explain how participants were informed that their feedback had been used
- Reflect on how learning from participants in this project might feed into future project design

(Recommended word limit: 500)

6.4 Theory of change (TOC)

Reflect on the development hypothesis and theory of change that underpinned the project. It is important to remember that the TOC set out the 'best guess' about the most likely path to change at the start of the project and was based on understanding of the problem and its context at that time. It is likely that the TOC has developed over the project lifetime as relationships were built, new information gathered, methodologies and approaches trialled, and spaces created for reflection on what was/was not working. If you made changes to the TOC over the project lifetime, please submit the final version on Grantelope.

Using analysis of the results presented in sections 3, 4 and 5 as evidence, reflect on whether assumptions in the TOC held true. Consider the links between workplan delivery and the results in each chain (causal pathways between activities, outputs, and outcomes) and how consistent they were. To what extent was the initial logic correct, and have assumptions been proven/disproven? For example:

- If around half of the workplan was implemented, and scoring suggests a B at output level, but '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)

- If most of the workplan was implemented and outputs scored A but outcomes scored B, there may be something missing in the original assumption around how the outputs would lead to the outcomes, and new approaches may need to be considered in future programming
- If most of the workplan was implemented, and both outputs and outcomes scored A, this indicates that the assumptions were sound and evidence-based

Finally, reflect on whether learnings from this analysis of the TOC might inform adaptations in future project design.

(Recommended word limit: 500)

Section 7: Sustainability

Sustainability should have underpinned the project design and strategies should have been reviewed regularly throughout the project cycle. This section of the narrative report is an opportunity to reflect on and assess the effectiveness of the sustainability plan and strategies.

Composite scoring: The fund manager will conduct a sustainability assessment based on the information provided in this section. A 15% weighting is given to this element of the composite score.

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 have been transferred at the end of the project. Explain the strategies the project used to ensure the success of this transfer for each stakeholder group. Please ensure the plan is clear for each output / component of the project.

(Recommended word limit: 500)

7.2 Effectiveness of the sustainability plan

In this section, provide **evidence and critical analysis** of the effectiveness of the sustainability strategies outlined in the previous section. Reflect on whether the evidence suggests that benefits will be seen beyond the life of the project, with openness about challenges and transparency about factors that sit within / outside of the project's control. What adaptations and lessons have been generated through this evaluation of the sustainability approach that could inform the design of future programmes? Evidence can be gathered through a range of sources including logframe results, project monitoring reports, qualitative data collection, the final independent evaluation etc. Please revisit the Evidencing Sustainability webinar for further support in this area.

(Recommended word limit: 500)

7.3 Risks to sustainability

Use this section to describe the key risks that had the potential to impact implementation of the sustainability plan. It is important that this section focuses only on specific risks to sustainability – more general operational and delivery risks are covered in submission of the final project risk register. For each sustainability risk, explain the mitigating action/s put in place to manage it over the project lifecycle, and **evaluate** the effectiveness of the action/s. Did the risk materialise? If so, was the impact better or worse than expected? What has been learnt through this evaluation that could be integrated into future sustainability planning? It may be 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. Strong answers may also reflect on whether any unexpected sustainability risks emerged as the project moved through its lifecycle, and how the project adapted in response.

(Recommended word limit: 500)

Section 8: Value for Money

The fund manager will make an assessment of the project's overall value for money based on the information provided in this section.

Value is evidenced through the actual results and learning achieved during the project lifecycle, considering scale, depth, and quality. Value can be subjective. However, the value your project intended to deliver was agreed at the start and represented in the milestones and targets in your logframe and BDS, and the objectives in your Collaborative Learning Plan, GESI Action Plan and Sustainability Plan.

You should work closely with the project Finance team to obtain accurate information about the final costs incurred over the project lifecycle, across all budget sub-headings, and some financial analysis will be needed to complete this section.

8.1 Value for Money (VfM) analysis

Using the 4 E's as paragraph sub-headings, please provide evidence of value for money, sharing examples of specific approaches, processes and cost-analyses used to achieve the following:

- **Economy:** This element considers **how well the available project resources (staffing, time, money) were managed**. For example: What were the project's procurement processes, and how did it ensure cost-consciousness? How did it ensure that high-cost inputs / resources and key cost drivers were used strategically? Did the project consider economies of scale when purchasing inputs? What were the cost-sharing arrangements with other projects and how did this impact achievement of objectives?
- **Efficiency:** This element considers **how much of the available resources were used to achieve the output results**. For example: What was the overall output score / which outputs scored higher or lower than expected? What proportion of the budget was spent vs. the proportion of the

workplan delivered? What proportion of participants were reached vs. original targets (the BDS summary tab will show you this)? Did the project build on existing systems or utilise synergies with other stakeholders? Your response should include a **cost-benefit analysis** - this means looking at the total amount spent over the project lifecycle versus the total number of participants reached.

- **Effectiveness:** This element considers **how successfully the resources were used to achieve the expected results**. For example: What was the overall outcome score / which outcomes scored higher or lower than expected? How effectively did the project manage risk (linked to outcome results)? What evidence is there to show that the project reflected on and learned from results, and adapted effectively? Have there been any multiplier effects? How sustainable are the gains from the project? Your response should also include a simple **cost-effectiveness analysis**. This involves looking at the total amount spent on certain activities vs. the number of participants who achieved the desired result for the outcome indicator related to those activities.

- **Equity**: This element considers **whether the project reached the right people in the right way**. For example: How effectively did the project target specific marginalised groups (use disaggregated BDS data)? How did it adjust strategies and approaches to meet the specific needs of these groups? If higher cost interventions were needed to meet these needs, can they be justified? How effectively did the project implement its GESI action plan and what were the key outcomes (use disaggregated logframe results)?

When providing examples of specific costs or cost analyses, try to provide comparative benchmarks where possible to demonstrate the value for money provided by the project.

More information on approaches to value for money analysis can be found on the UK Aid Match website.

(**Recommended word limit: 500**)

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 which safeguarding activities were implemented and with whom, to help prevent incidents from occurring and ensure effective reporting and response where incidents did occur
- Explain whether and how participants and stakeholders were engaged on the approach to safeguarding, and how the project team ensured they fully understood their rights in a contextually and culturally appropriate way
- Explain any challenges in implementing these activities or approaches, and how these were overcome
- Present any wider lessons learned around safeguarding that could be used to inform future programming.

Matching your donations with

UKaid

mannion daniels

In this section, it is important to give a particular focus to the safeguarding measures implemented at **project level**, in addition to measures taken at organisational level. If implementing this project has resulted in changes in organisational safeguarding policies and procedures (either for the grant holder or for implementing partners), please include details in this response.

(**Recommended word limit: 500**)

Section 10: Other

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

- 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 strengthening for project staff and/or implementing 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. Feedback provided in this section will be fed into the fund manager's project completion report to the FCDO and used to strengthen future approaches to fund management.

Section 12: Checklist – document submission

Please check that all supporting documents have been completed before submitting the full report. The table below provides additional instructions and/or information against each item in the checklist at the end of the narrative report template.

	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	Completed Output Scoring Table (with achievements completed in	Each project will have a live / cumulative version of the output scoring table with all previous tabs locked and available to see. Please ensure you use the approved / most up to date version shared by your PRM and reach out before finalising the report if unsure about

	'project completion report' tab)	which version to use. 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.
3	Final Beneficiary Data Summary	Each project will have a live / cumulative version of the BDS with all previous tabs locked and available to see. Please ensure you use the approved / most up to date version shared by your PRM and reach out before finalising the report if unsure about which version to use.
4	Logframe (with achievements completed in 'project completion report' tab)	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 / most up to date version shared by your PRM and reach out before finalising the report if unsure about which version to use.
5	Collaborative Learning Plan	Please review your CLP and update where relevant e.g. where questions have changed or new learning emerged since the last Annual Report submission.
6	Theory of change	The final theory of change should be included as a supporting document **if** it has been updated since the last Annual Report submission.
7	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
8	Safeguarding policy	Submit an updated safeguarding policy **if** a review has been undertaken since the last Annual Review.
9	Risk Register	Submit your final risk register with all risks closed out in columns U and V.
10	Final independent evaluation report	As stipulated in the AGA, all projects must commission an independent evaluation of the project. A report must be completed and submitted as an annex to the project completion report.
11	Annual audited accounts	The most recent set of annual audited accounts must be submitted. These will be used by the fiduciary risk team to conduct the project completion financial review.

PCR submission

The fund manager will share final versions of the reporting documents with grant holders in advance of the closure of the project. Submit all documentation for the PCR (including supporting documents) on Grantelope via the Project Completion Report task. The deadline will be two months after the project end date – 31st May.

All files should be named and shared, following the convention below:
Name of document_grant holder name (or abbreviated name) _grant reference number_date (MM.YYYY)
Example: PCR Reporting Logframe_EducateAction_211_05.2026

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