

Completing your Project Completion Report: Guidance UK Aid Match

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 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. In the PCR grant holders should seek to:

- Provide a critical analysis of the project's achievements rather than just descriptions of activities
- Provide credible, robust data to back up the achievements and challenges of the project, incorporating information from your independent evaluation in your assessment
- Share project experiences honestly – the good and the not so good
- Highlight good or promising practice
- Identify clear lessons

As well as enabling the Fund Manager to make a fair assessment of the performance of the grant, a strong PCR will help UK Aid Match to learn from grant holders' experience, share good practices and inform wider fund analysis and learning.

This document is designed to support grant holders to complete the PCR thoroughly and accurately and to help explain results with robust and credible evidence. Some real examples taken from grant holder project completion reports are provided. They are intended to act as illustrations of what information could and should be shared. They should not be directly copied.

The templates referred to in this document are available on the UK Aid Match website under the grant holder guidance section.

Links to other useful guides and resources are embedded in this document.

If you have any questions about the completion of reporting requirements, please contact your Performance and Risk Manager.

The PCR will be reviewed, alongside accompanying documentation, by the Fund Manager with the support of a technical advisor who has expert knowledge in the technical sector and/or geographical context. The review will provide an assessment of the project performance and quality of the report (as set out below), and a detailed feedback report will be shared with the grant holder.

Assessment of Performance

Project performance as detailed in the PCR will be assessed against two components:

Component	Assessment	Rating
Performance against outcomes	The extent to which the project outcome targets have been achieved	A++ to C
Performance against outputs	The extent to which the project output targets have been achieved	A++ to C

However, the final overall project score will be the score awarded for **performance against outcomes**.

How the scores are reached is explained in sections 3 and 4 in the guidance below.

Grant holders will be asked to self-assess themselves as part of the PCR and this is an essential part of the review process, to reflect honestly on progress, or the lack of it.

It is important to note that in UK Aid Match the highest performing projects are those that score A. Scores above or below may be indicative of poor planning and management, with targets either not ambitious enough or too ambitious.

Quality of Reporting

The quality of the report will also be assessed as described in the table below.

Criteria	Explanation
Completeness	All sections have been completed. All relevant documents have been updated and annexed
Content	The content is useful and provides the information needed 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 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 for improvement made previously
Accuracy	The report guidance has been adhered to Responses are accurate and the correct templates have been used Consistent data is presented throughout the report
Timeliness	The report is submitted on time.

The quality assessment will not contribute to or change the overall performance score. However, it is difficult for reviewers to accurately assess performance if the report is not completed thoroughly and correctly.

Completing the PCR narrative template – a step by step guide

This section provides a step-by-step guide for completing the narrative project completion report (PCR). Numbers used here align with the number in the [PCR template](#).

1. Grant Information

1.1-1.11: This section covers the grant overview and must be completed accurately and in full.

1.12: 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
- what strategies and activities were used to try to achieve the goal
- what the achievements actually were, in terms of numbers versus intended beneficiaries 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. You may want to use the standard summary your performance and risk manager will have developed and shared with annual review feedback as a starting point for this summary.

Example

The original goal of this £ 5.3 million, 42-month project (including a 6 month no cost extension) was to economically empower 10,000 vulnerable women through a combined approach of strengthening their literacy and numeracy, supporting village savings and loans associations, providing business skills training and business start-up support, and challenging harmful gender norms and sexual and gender-based violence in communities. By the end of the project 10,010 vulnerable women had been effectively supported in their economic and social empowerment for a total spend of £4,991,897.86 (99%).

Foundational literacy and numeracy classes were provided for 5,056 women (output 1). This was less than anticipated (8,000) but it was provided on an “as needed basis” and the original target was an estimate. These classes were really successful and not only built the confidence and self-esteem of the women but also enabled them to engage in other business and vocational training activities that increased their income and improved livelihood security.

401 Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs) were also established (against a target of 400). The VSLAs received £51 per member as initial funds and are now fully sustainable through their members' contributions and return of loan payments. All VSLA members (10,010) either received funds from the VSLAs in the form of one or more loans, or shared pay outs from the VSLAs.

Of the 10,010 women in the VSLAs, 7,866 women participated in and passed business skills training and 4,228 received vocational training (some did both) (output 3). These trainings were offered according to individual needs and prepared the women to set up their own Income Generating Activities (IGAs). This was supported by the distribution of start-up kits after successful completion of training. Now, 8,708 women report increased confidence, and 9,510 women have either expanded existing, or set up new, IGA ventures. As an adaptation to the project at the end of year 2, the project organised the VSLA's into 12 federations to provide additional oversight, support and sustainability and the collective support and solidarity created amongst members was a critical contribution to the individual progress of members.

The project also tackled harmful gender norms and SGBV to try and establish an enabling environment that allows for women to access and control economic resources. To facilitate this, 898 religious and local leaders were

trained as Gender Champions (GCs) against a project target of 853. They led community dialogues in which 16,243 men and women participated and continued to promote good gender norms through their platforms. The positive masculinities and more gender-equitable norms that were actively encouraged, induced significant support from men for female entrepreneurship (reported both by the men themselves and women's own perspectives of the support they were receiving) and contributed to reducing cases of abuse within the private and public sphere.

This combination of skills, loans, collective solidarity and supportive social environment enabled the project to see results of 9,500 women now better off economically (with an increased income or control of productive assets) against a target of 6,000. This has improved their power in household decision making and increased their economic independence with some women making longer term investments like buying land, building houses or owning livestock. All this was achieved in a context that changed significantly during the project lifetime as a result of the outbreak of COVID-19 in March 2020 and violent civil unrest in January 2021 which resulted in a state of emergency in the country. Whilst this caused periods in which activities had to be halted or significantly adapted, the project was able to adjust effectively, using digital methods and smaller group approaches to continue to support women throughout the project and keep on track with its objectives.

1.13: The project completion report is intended to reflect on the full project duration, not just the last year. However, it is important for the reviewer to know what took place in the last year, which contributed to the overall results. Use this space to summarise the key actions and results in the last year of the project. Try to comment on:

- How many unique (new beneficiaries) were reached in the final year
- Main activities completed under each output.
- Key achievements of the final year
- The main challenges faced in the final year
- Any significant changes or adaptations made and any responses to recommendations from the previous annual report

To help write this section, look back on the quarterly reports that were submitted and collate and highlight the main information.

1.14: The final total project budget (including match funding) and the final project budget funded by the FCDO should be reflected in the budget section of the template. Actual expenditure against both should also be included also.

1.15: Avoid the use of jargon and acronyms and only use them when necessary. If it is necessary, list the acronyms in this section. Your report may be difficult to comprehend if this section is not completed.

1.16: A link to the 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. We request that the link to the data on [D-portal \(opens in new tab\)](#) is provided as it 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.

2. Beneficiary Reach

The purpose of this section is to assess the extent to which the project reached the targeted number of intended beneficiaries during the life of the project.

2.1 Complete the Annual Beneficiary Data Summary sheet with the final data. This is the separate excel document, which has been used during the annual report process. Refer to the guidance tab within the excel document for further information on how to complete it.

2.2. Assess performance made against direct beneficiary reach targets during the project using the following criteria:

Criteria	
Target exceeded	10% or more above the project overall target
Target achieved	Within a 10% range of the project overall target (plus or minus)
Target underachieved	More than 10% less than the project overall target.

Provide a brief analysis of your performance. If targets have been exceeded or underachieved explain why. Look at the overall target and targets disaggregated by beneficiary group. Disaggregated beneficiary reach by sex and disability status will be analysed under the Social Inclusion section of the report.

Example

The project goal was to reach 120,000 direct beneficiaries, identified as the most vulnerable adults (90,000) and children (30,000) living in communities which face multi-dimensional poverty and high rates of water-borne diseases. The data shows that the project reached 138,267 (115%) direct beneficiaries overall. This included 89,000 (99%) adults and 49,267 children (164%). The reason that we were able to exceed our target for children so significantly is because we switched our approach from working with community centres to working directly with schools and ensuring schools had access to clean water. We assess our performance as target met because although we exceeded the overall target by more than 10% this overall result was driven by success against one beneficiary group. We slightly under performed against our targets for adults.

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.

3.1.1: Write in your indicator, overall project target and final results. Make sure to include both the overall target and results disaggregated results by sex and disability status (were relevant). When completing this section, copy indicator wording and other information directly from the approved log frame to ensure accuracy across all documents. This includes the indicator title, final target, and achieved figures.

Targets should be cumulative so make clear what the cumulative total is in the final results. If the target is not cumulative, please make that clear.

Self-assess your overall performance for the indicator using the following criteria:

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 \pm 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%

3.1.2: Results must be supported by quality and credible evidence; however, no evidence is perfect, and it is almost impossible to completely eliminate measurement error. In this section, explain what data was collected and how, but also try to identify and explain the potential sources of error and explain how it was mitigated to provide the reviewer with reasonable confidence that the *best* available evidence was collected in the *best* way. In this section explain clearly:

- What the evidence is for this indicator
- 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, and if relevant provide descriptions and explanations of sample sizes, the sampling methodology and explanations of potential sampling error
- Data collection processes: provide information on who collected the data, when it was collected, any potential non-sampling measurement errors in the data which may impact on data validity and reliability. Describe what was done to mitigate any possible bias in the data
- Any data quality and integrity measures taken to ensure that no errors were made in collating and analysing the data
- If the means of verification changed over the course of the project explain how and why.

If the information on the evidence provided is not detailed enough for the reviewer to have reasonable confidence in the results provided, scores may be revised down.

Example:

Better health was one of the overriding objectives of this project. To track progress against this objective, we collected evidence of beneficiary health status on a quarterly basis throughout the project. The data was collated to provide the annual and overall project completion data. The data collection methods and process did not change throughout the life of the project and therefore, there is a high level of comparability with final project data and baseline.

We conducted a digital survey using volunteer community health workers, who went door-to-door directly asking the questions and recording the answers. We felt this was the best way, as not all beneficiaries are functionally literate. We aimed to keep questions unambiguous and as simple as possible and to ensure they were not leading questions. All 25 community health workers were trained to ask the questions and record answers objectively without influencing responses through a two-day enumerator training and practise workshop.

Data was collected from 477 households, representing 2,518 people. These were all people that had benefitted from project activities. As we had 1500 households with 7,400 people this represents approximately 32%. The

households were chosen using clustered sampling by zone and then systematically chosen by interviewing every fifth household until the agreed sample quota was met.

We had originally planned to collect data from the same sample as used in the year two annual report to really be able to compare results. Due to restrictions on household visits during the COVID-19 lockdown and time restrictions on collecting data in time for the final evaluation once lockdown had been lifted, we were unable to do that, and the sample was about 40% different. However, we believe that this is still sufficient to make some valid comparisons at this point. The sample works on the margin of error of 5.88%, confidence level 95%.

We have to be a little cautious with the results. We know that questions related to health are not always fully answered or answered honestly as people may not always want to discuss issues of health with strangers. Further, there were cases where some household members answered on behalf of others, who were not present at the time. We worked hard to try and eliminate bias in the data wherever we can. However, it is possible that some bias is still present in the data as it relied on self-assessment and self-report. Sometimes interviewees may have told the community health volunteers what they think they wanted to hear rather than the truth.

3.1.3 It is important to demonstrate a good understanding of the results – why targets were achieved or not. In this section provide a critical analysis of the results by:

- Analysing the findings, describing any variances (differences) from targets, reflecting on the disaggregated results as well as the overall results and whether there was an under/over achievement. Also consider the trajectory of the results over each year of the project and how this may have differed from the annual milestones.
- Explaining the factors influencing any differences. Reflect on whether the strategies (interventions) used to achieve the results were the right ones. Consider unforeseen events or circumstances that may have affected results.
- Describing any changes made to interventions to achieve targets or how unforeseen events were addressed to try and achieve results.
- Clarifying what learning can be extracted as a result - what could/should have been done differently

Example:

Although in Y1 18,500 beneficiaries reported increased year-round food security (9% overachieved) this declined in Y2 (17% underachieved) and Y3 (18% underachieved) due to severe droughts in both years. In Y2 a severe drought meant that the harvest was significantly impacted, influencing both beneficiaries' access to diverse foods and income levels. Given the severity (and lengthen) of the drought, which was significantly longer than previous years, this continued to impact in Y3, where although food supplies were available the prices significantly increased, and beneficiaries were not always able to purchase required supplies.

At the start of Y3 the project was adapted to mitigate the impacts of the drought by facilitating village savings and loans groups (VSLAs) and supporting community members to diversify income generating activities. For instance, 35 VSLAs were established supporting 1,417 beneficiaries to access loans and invest in diversified income generating activities such as soap making. Following discussions with community members on suitable income generating activities, training was provided to 50 apprentices in a variety of trades to support market diversification. These activities supported over 5,424 beneficiaries to increase household income, which supplemented with the nutrient sensitive food practices training resulted in increased year-round food security.

This has taught us the importance of considering climate resilience when designing food security programmes and also the importance of adaptive management. Although droughts are common in the region, the impact

had not been fully anticipated during project design, and on reflection, it would have been valuable to incorporate elements of disaster risk reduction and coping mechanisms within the project design and scope from the outset. Despite this, we were able to adapt by incorporating VSLAs and training apprentices which was not originally planned but supported the achievement of the project outcome. This was possible through regular dialogue with community members and having the flexibility to make changes to budget lines (in discussion with the fund manager).

3.5. Overall outcome assessment

Provide an overall assessment score at outcome level using the scores A++ to C. This should be a balanced judgement based on the results and evidence reported against your outcome indicators.

Example

The project outcome was for 32 unemployed young disabled people to have secured and sustained formal or self-employment for at least 12 months. To measure how successful we were in achieving this outcome, we used three outcome indicators, which measured: (1) the number of young disabled people entering employment; (2) the number of employers who sign up to a disability awareness employment scheme; and (3) changes to the government labour policies to support inclusion of people with disabilities. As our results presented here show, by the end of the project: (1) the number of people entering employment significantly exceeded targets by 12%, scoring A+; (2) the number of employers signing up to the scheme only marginally missed the target by 2% (scoring A); and (3) the governments' engagement was off track largely due to changes in personnel, which was beyond our control (scoring B). These results were supported by evidence from our own internal final evaluation as well as the independent evaluation and individual case studies we have provided. We assess our performance with A overall, having achieved our goal. In future projects we would engage with government much earlier in the project and engage with more government personnel to ensure some succession planning.

If C was scored for any outcome indicator, the overall result should not be A or higher as a critical component of the outcome will have failed.

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 log frame. This section should be completed alongside the output scoring table (separate excel template).

It is best to complete the output scoring table first. 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 \(opens in new tab\)](#)

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.

In the tables provided in the narrative template:

- Insert the output statement wording from the approved log frame – it is important to note that the figures provided in the narrative template must align with those in the log frame.
- Select an overall score for the output based on the scores for each indicator in that output using the scoring criteria.
- Provide a brief analysis and reflection of any under or over achievement against indicator targets.
- Ensure that all indicators within each output statement are referenced and covered in the analysis.

Example			
Output 1	Women have increased knowledge in birth preparedness, complication readiness and safer birth practices.	Overall output score (Self-assessed – see guidance)	A Outputs met expectation (achieved by a range of $\pm 10\%$)
Provide a brief analysis and reflection of any under or over achievement against indicator targets for this output. Ensure all indicators are covered. [200 words]			
<p>The project was not able to train as many women as expected in birth preparedness primarily due to challenges in identifying appropriately trained staff to deliver the training; however, delays did not significantly impact the overall results as the quality of the training meant that more women demonstrated improved knowledge than originally anticipated. This was largely due to the participatory nature of the training and the engaging nature of the identified trainers. The results were also impacted by COVID-19, whereby planned face-to-face training was not conducted in the final quarter of the project. Overall, 1,800 women were trained in birth preparedness practices, rather than the originally targeted 2,000.</p> <p>Output indicator 1.1 (number of women able to accurately identify life-saving actions)</p> <p>This indicator was overachieved (by 14%) due to the dramatized and participatory nature of the training. Although it took some time to identify appropriate trainers within the region to deliver the training, which delayed the delivery of the training, this was made up by the fact that the trainers identified had significant experience in engaging local women on birth preparedness and complication. The trainers were able to explain in the local dialect the challenges faced and encouraged women to role play different scenarios to understand how to identify complications and learn the life-saving actions. This meant that the women that attended the training had better knowledge than anticipated and were able to share this with other community members who had not attended the training.</p> <p>Alongside this, having recognised that no further face-to-face training could proceed with new beneficiaries (due to COVID-19), the team focussed on enhancing knowledge retention for those already trained by sharing digital learning materials with all prior trainees. This led to improved knowledge retention in the final survey.</p> <p>Output indicator 1.2 (number of women able to identify birth preparedness actions and signs and symptoms of complication)</p> <p>This indicator was also marginally exceeded (by 5%) for similar reasons to indicator 1.1. This indicator was not overachieved as much as indicator 1.1 as the survey for birth preparedness was more complicated than the survey on life saving skills, and therefore led to slightly lower pass rates. The survey on life saving skills was more pictorial-based and this learning will be used to inform future monitoring on programmes.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.3 (number of women breastfeeding within the first hour after delivery)</p> <p>This indicator was slightly underachieved (-11%) which highlights that although those trained were able to demonstrate knowledge, these practises were not consistently implemented. The evaluation indicates that</p>			

this is due to age of those women trained, whereby the majority of women attending the training were 45 years+ whilst the average age of pregnancy in the region is between 20-35 years. Although the women attending the training shared their knowledge and understanding, this was not always applied by those giving births. It was anticipated during project design and targeting, that older women would be able to share the knowledge with younger women, however findings indicate that this is not consistently the case and future programming will therefore involve a mixture of younger and older women in the training sessions and explore alternative ways to ensure those ages 20-35 years develop knowledge of birth preparedness, complication readiness and safer birth practices.

Add or delete additional tables as necessary to ensure all output statements in the approved project log frame are reported against.

5. Challenges, Learning and Adaptation

5.1 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. Any challenge from the following categories can be selected:

- 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.

Example

One of the main contextual challenges faced by the project was the COVID-19 pandemic which affected project implementation between March and November 2020. As the country went into lockdown, early learning centres and schools were closed, and this meant that we were unable to continue to support ECD centres to provide play-based learning opportunities for pre-school children as we had originally intended. This was a completely unexpected challenge and a global pandemic had not been included in the risk register. Consequently, the project

was not prepared for such a significant challenge or how to mitigate it and had no plans in place. Unfortunately, we had to pause project activities for at least four weeks whilst we figured out what we could do to keep moving forward in such a difficult context. We explored a number of options to address the challenge, including training teachers virtually but ultimately decided to move the project activities to take place in the local community rather than the school, as this would be quickest and most effective. Although we could not have predicted a global pandemic, the experience has made us realise how dependent we are on schools being open and we should not always assume this is the case. For future projects we will consider a number of different scenarios which may mean schools have to close and consider some contingency plans so that we are able to rise to the challenge much more quickly.

5.2 Learning

Learning around specific project components should be captured throughout all sections of the project completion report. The purpose of this section is to identify and reflect on the three main lessons. Main lessons refer to those which should be shared as recommendations with UK Aid Match grant holders and the wider development community aiming to do similar things in similar contexts. Consider lessons around:

- Project development hypothesis and design: For example, lessons around which causal pathway was most/least effective or how change takes place.
- Technical or sector lessons: For example, what lessons can the project add to the evidence base about what works well and what does not, for whom, where and why.
- Context lessons: For example, who/what were the main game changers or blockers to change.
- Project operations: For example, lessons around staff recruitment, procurement, effective planning, successful or unsuccessful partnerships.
- Institutional and policy lessons: Lessons around how to engage with institutions effectively, how to advocate or influence the context.
- Monitoring, evaluation and learning: For example, how change was measured in the project and the tools or methods used.

For each lesson

- Explain what the lesson is
- How the lesson was learned
- Detail any actions taken during the project lifecycle to respond to the learnings

Example 1

One of the main lessons we learned through the project was the need to understand the forces for and against the change the project intends to bring about in the operational context and how they will be engaged as early as possible. This project aimed to economically empower women and trained and supported a number of them to set up income generating activities (IGA). We attempted to create an enabling environment by working with the spouse of the women, but we did not engage males in the wider community. Men outside of the project subsequently established an informal group named Men Against Women's Empowerment (MAWE) and destroyed some of the beehives the women had set up as part of their IGA. In response we tried to engage with the wider community to explain what we were doing and the benefits of it, but it was a little too late they already felt excluded and threatened by the change and we had limited success.

Example 2:

In terms of institutional and policy, a key lesson from the project is to ensure that enough staff and the key staff from any one institution are involved to ensure a critical mass to embed the change. During the first year, we trained 20 teachers from 10 schools (2 per school) to use the ‘teaching at the right level’ (TaRL) approach to improve student learning. After the training, we mentored and monitored teachers in the classroom to find out how they were doing. We found that only 2 of the 20 teachers were regularly using the new approach and the remaining 18 were still just using the old approach of ‘chalk, talk and a textbook’. In discussing with the teachers, they informed us that the other teachers in the school complained of the noise coming from the classroom and the school principals told them they could not use the new approach. The project strategy of training only 2 teachers per school and not involving the school principal had not worked well. The other teachers had felt jealous they had not been included and the Principal felt threatened and alienated from their staff. Once we learned this, we organised and implemented a special workshop for the ten school principals and trained them on the new approach. This worked well and most became enthusiastic. For the second year and the next cohort of teachers, we invited the school principals to attend the training with all their teachers so they could understand what the teachers are expected to do in the classrooms and can support them.

5.3 Adaptative Programming

Project plans change in light of new learning generated, challenges faced and changes in the operating context or political economy that occur after the project has started. The purpose of this section is to understand the extent to which projects were monitoring these changes, what project designs or plans needed to be adapted in light of any of these, and how the project responded to this.

5.3.1: Theory of Change: The initial theory of change set out the ‘best guess’ about the pathways to achieving the project goals at the start of the grant. This was based on what was known *at that time*. It is highly likely that the theory has changed since then as implementation progressed, new information was gathered, interventions and assumptions were tested, and learning was generated.

For this section, grant holders need to consider the extent to which the initial theory of change was valid and provide explanations on any updates you would make to the ‘reality of change’ explaining the pathways you took to generate the results that you have achieved. To do this consider updates to the following:

Problem	What more was learned about the nature or extent of the problem the project was addressing? Was it different, bigger or more complex than expected?
Context	What changes took place in the operating environment during the project that impacted on the theory of change. For instance, did any political, economic, social, and institutional factors change and how did the project adapt to these?
Key actors	Were the key actors at the end of the project the same as at the beginning? Have relationships, interests, and/or incentives changed?
Interventions	Given the changes in the context or understanding of the problem or assumptions, were any interventions or the sequencing of interventions adapted to respond to these in order to continue to achieve results?

Matching your
donations with



md mannion
daniels

Outputs Given the results of the project, did each output contribute to the outcomes as expected? Were there any new elements of change that had to be incorporated in order to reach the outcomes?

The theory of change is about the high-level pathways to change. You should not explain changes to activities but overall strategies. In writing this section try to link adaptations to the main challenges described in section 5.1 or learning described in section 5.2 or unexpected changes to the operational context, illustrating the ‘new evidence’ behind the change.

Example:

The problem the project was designed to address was lack of access to basic water and sanitation facilities for people living in extreme poverty in informal urban settlements. The nature and extent of the problem did not change. During the initial phase of the project, we invested significant time and effort in mentoring and providing support to the Area Unit (AU), a new administrative unit of city officials that work for the Mayor in the informal settlement areas and were responsible for WASH. Our initial theory was that the AU’s were the key actor in the project and engagement with them was critical to success as they could ensure interventions were carried out and the model and benefits would be sustained. Also, they would help to develop strong relationships at the Mayor’s office and provide significant learning.

Our end of year 1 evaluation revealed that all this effort was costly but was not leading towards the ultimate project outcome as anticipated. The AU did not have the power and influence that was initially assumed and were not the key partners expected. After much discussion and debate the team decided to reduce the level of investment in mentoring the AU and limit the support the project provided to developing the AU capacity to gather information for the Mayor. This strategic adjustment led to a revised focus on community mapping by the project which, in turn, resulted in the city using more concrete and sound evidence of community needs as the basis for budgeting.

Instead, in year 2 we developed a new strategy to ensure local ownership and management of the WASH facilities and set up community WASH committees and mentored them. This also worked well as shown by our results. Money was donated by the communities and was saved by the WASH Committees for future maintenance of the facilities, increasing the chance they will be sustainable.

5.3.2: Log frame: The purpose of the log frame 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 log frame will have changed. Log frames 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 log frame during the project life. This should summarise the detailed individual changes included in the log frame change log to provide the reviewer with a high-level picture of how the log frame 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%)

Example

Matching your
donations with



md mannon
daniels

There were no changes to the logical framework at outcome level during the project as we endeavoured to meet the original project objectives and targets.

The main change to the logical framework during the project was the change to output 2 and creation of output 5 at the end of year 1. As described in the theory of change section above, at the end of year 1 we revised our strategy of working with the areas units away from building their capacity to manage and maintain the WASH facilities to supporting them to collect, share and use community data on WASH. This necessitated changes to output 2 in the logical framework. The result statement was modified to measure the AU ability to collect and use data. To measure whether that result was achieved, indicator 1.1 was changed to focus on whether the training of the AU to undertake community mapping was successful or not and indicator 1.2 to measure success of analysing and sharing data with the mayor. Indicator 1.3 was deleted.

As we also changed our approach to working with the community to ensure the long-term management and maintenance of the WASH facilities, we added an additional output into the logical framework (output 5). New indicators were also created measuring how successful the training of the committees was (5.1)

5.3.3 Any other project adaptations: Use this space to explain any other major project adaptations that the project undertook that have not been covered by the previous two responses.

Explain:

- What the major adaptation was.
- Why the adaptation was made (for example, policy change, security issues, national emergencies including COVID-19)
- Use final project data to demonstrate how successful (or not) the adaptations were.

Example:

In response to school closures as a result of COVID-19, we decided to move activities to the community. We identified a pre-packaged intervention that we could use. It had been developed and tested in the same country and so was context relevant and could be mobilised quickly. Although we have not been able to meet our overall target, we feel we managed the challenge successfully as it meant that we were able to continue the forward momentum of the project and keep children engaged in learning whilst schools were closed. There have been some additional benefits as a result of the adaptation. Moving the activities to the community means that were able to raise awareness amongst community members of the importance of active and interactive play for young children. We feel that we managed the situation well.

5.4. Utilising learning and evidence

Other sections have focussed on learning that has impacted on the project. The purpose of this section is to explain whether and how any learning from this project was used outside of the immediate project.

Example

As part of our project efforts to promote disability inclusion, we engaged a disabled peoples' organisation (DPO) to conduct a study to (a) better understand the prevalence of disability in our partner communities (b) explore

how different types of disabilities impact individuals' ability to engage with the project and (c) recommend what we could practically do to ensure people with disabilities could participate and benefit from the project. As a result of the study the consultant delivered a disability inclusion training session with project staff. This led to interest within the organisation and some of the project staff have since supported our organisation to develop an equality and diversity policy and encouraged dialogue between staff on different projects on disability inclusion.

6. Beneficiary feedback and accountability

All projects should be working to strengthen beneficiary choice and control over their own development. This is achieved through project interventions, but also through project mechanisms such as the beneficiary feedback that support projects to be accountable to their beneficiaries and provide means in which beneficiaries can inform, challenge and respond to what the project is doing. The purpose of this section is to reflect on the effectiveness of the different beneficiary feedback mechanisms used throughout the project and analyse the impact of this on beneficiaries' choice and control. This could relate specifically to project accountability but may also refer to accountability with local institutions such as local government. In this section:

- Explain how the project engaged with beneficiaries and gathered their feedback, opinions and views
- How the project analysed and responded to feedback
- How the project shared that response with beneficiaries and stakeholders ('closing the feedback loop')
- Give one concrete and significant example

Example

One of the most successful feedback mechanisms we used was monthly dialogue sessions where we brought our beneficiaries together. In the first year of delivery, community members suggested in one of these sessions that the project distribute a new breed of goats (galla goats) rather than local breeds. Following consultation with technical experts, we were advised that galla goats perform well in hot and drought-ridden areas and have higher milk potential over the local breed. The project was therefore adapted offer galla goats and as a result kid mortality was reduced from four kids reported in the first three months to none. Beneficiaries also enjoyed higher milk production from one litre per day to three litres per day per goat.

When these project adaptations were fed back to community members through the monthly dialogue sessions, it was highlighted that community members felt more able to express their preferences and ideas as a result of this adaptive management based on their feedback. From this, the project team supported community members to engagement local government livestock officers in similar discussions on a quarterly basis. The project supported community members to document and record key ideas and suggestions for the local livestock officers and supported an elected community representative to visit the local government office on a quarterly basis to share this feedback. As a result, local government have included anthrax as a vaccine subsidised by the government and the community are now engaging with other villages to expand the dialogue with local government.

Matching your
donations with



md mannion
daniels

7. Sustainability

Sustainability is about whether the benefits created by a project continue beyond funding from the FCDO. All UK Aid Match grant holders will have developed and implemented strategies to ensure the results of their interventions are sustainable. This purpose of this section is for grant holders to critically analyse the extent to which the sustainability strategies worked and whether the benefits brought about by the project will continue.

7.1 Benefits are usually for individuals (direct beneficiaries). This can include benefits such as increased income or better health for example. The purpose of this section is to present the evidence generated by the project that the benefits to individual beneficiaries are likely to be sustained beyond the life of the project. Explain:

- What the benefits to individuals were
- What the strategy was to ensure the benefits will continue
- Evidence that the strategy has or will work.

Example

Through the intensive training programme, open field days, demonstration plots (field schools) and exchange learning visits, we aimed to build the knowledge and skills of project beneficiaries so they would produce and consume more nutritious foods. We planned that this practice would continue and remain in the community long beyond the life of the project. As the results presented in section 3 and 4 illustrate, we were successful in achieving that. However, there is always the danger that once the project has ended benefits generated by the project will dissipate and project beneficiaries will resort to bad habits and old ways of working. To ensure that these new practices, behaviours and attitudes are sustained, we invested in building the capacity of peer farmer trainers (PFT), community health volunteers (CHV) and local government extension workers to take on the continual knowledge and skills transfer and mentoring beyond the life of the project. There is some evidence that this will occur. Both the PFT and CHV have already formed an association for the effective coordination and monitoring of these activities. An association committee has been established and this committee has developed an annual work plan to continue to work with beneficiaries. The committee has also contacted other Non-Government Organisations implementing agricultural activities in the area in an effort to continue their own learning that they can pass on to the beneficiaries.

7.2 Project benefits can also include improvements to public services, institutions or systems (for example, better-quality education, improved water and sanitation facilities or maternal health services). The purpose of this section is to present the evidence generated by the project that these improvements will continue beyond the project. Explain:

- What the improved services/institutions/systems the project was trying to achieve were
- What the strategy to sustain these improvements beyond the project was
- The evidence that the strategy has and will work

It is important to note that detailed descriptions of what the sustainability/exit strategy was is not what is required here, but a discussion on the strengths and weakness of the strategy and evidence of how successful it was.

Example

The project aimed to improve the quality of the services provided to local farmers by the department of agriculture in provincial and district government offices. We tried to ensure sustainability of the improved services generated by the project by integrating the methodologies and tools developed and used successfully by the project into the existing government system. To achieve this, we trained and mentored 150 civil servants on the approach and how to use the project methods and tools. By the end of the project 127 (84.6%) of the trained personnel had used them in their day-to-day work outside the project activities according to the project final evaluation where we observed the civil servants at work. This was also confirmed by the independent evaluation, which also observed the civil servants at work but in addition conducted one to one interviews with them. This suggests that the improvements to the service achieved by the project have a good chance of being sustained in the long term if trained personnel remain in post or train their successor.

7.3 In this section explain:

- Explain the main challenge faced in implementing the sustainability plan
- Describe how it was dealt with and how successful this was
- What could be done differently if anything
- Explain which sustainability strategy was the most effective and why

Example 1:

The main challenge to the strategy to ensure that the improved service was sustained was the transfer of trained civil servants on an annual basis. This was a decision made by the Governor and was outside our control. In year 1 23% of trained personnel were transferred and in year 2 it was 34%. To address this challenge, in the final year of the project we made the decision to conduct succession planning and ensured that we trained more Civil Servants than needed. Whereas in year 1 and 2 we had only trained the heads of department in year 3 we also trained the deputy head of department and one other departmental staff member selected by the Vice Governor. We also held discussions with the Vice Governor to explain the importance of the trained personnel continuing in post for at least 2 years and for them to train their successor. Although this approach worked, it would have been better if we had implemented this approach from the start of the project. It is impossible to prevent the promotion and transfer of staff and we should not try, but in future would include terms in MOU's where trained staff would remain in post for the duration of the project and would be responsible for training any successor in the new tools and methodologies.

Example 2:

The most effective sustainability strategy was the process of co-construction we implemented throughout the project cycle with the local community. This involved continuous discussions with the local community to analyse the problem, determine the solutions and to reflect on whether it was working and adapt as necessary. This process ensured that the interventions were locally driven and relevant. This was also effective in empowering the local community to identify and solve any development challenge themselves in future.

8. Social Inclusion

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the extent to which project strategies to include and benefit the people most vulnerable to exclusion worked. There are three sections to complete each looking at specific vulnerable groups:

8.1: Most marginalised: As it is a UK Aid Match project, the project should have been intended to benefit a specific marginalised or vulnerable group of people in a developing country context. This will vary from project to project and could be for example:

- people living in extreme poverty,
- orphans and vulnerable children,
- ethnic groups,
- remote, disadvantaged communities

8.2: Disability: All projects should be working towards ensuring inclusion of people with disabilities.

8.3: Gender: All projects should also be working towards promoting gender equality.

In each of the three sections:

- Use the disaggregated data from the beneficiary data summary (section 2) to assess the extent any disaggregated targets were achieved. If there is no data, explain why the project did not gather disaggregated data

Criteria	
Target exceeded	10% or more above the project overall target
Target achieved	Within a 10% range of the project overall target (plus or minus)
Target underachieved	More than 10% less than the project overall target.

- Describe how the most marginalised were identified by the project
- Explain the specific strategies used to ensure vulnerable people were able to participate in and benefit from the project. Make sure to comment on:
 - ✓ Whether and how the project consulted the most marginalised groups to ensure their needs were understood and their ongoing views on the project were incorporated into project reflections.
 - ✓ How the project designed its activities and approaches to ensure they were accessible to and benefitted marginalised groups, or how activities were designed around the specific needs of these groups.
 - ✓ Whether and how the project contributed to challenging the wider discriminatory social norms or stigma these marginalised groups may face.
- Assess how well the strategies worked – citing the disaggregated reach and results data as evidence of success or not.
- What lessons have been learned about the inclusion of that marginalised group and how will they be used in moving forward.

Example

During the initial project design stages people with disabilities were not consulted which we acknowledge was a significant gap in the process. No data on disability prevalence or types of disabilities was collected during the baseline study or during the first year of implementation, which led to challenges in reporting how disability inclusive the programme has been overall. This was rectified at the end of year one in response to the feedback on the annual review. We engaged a disabled peoples' organisation (DPO) to conduct a study to understand the prevalence of disability in our partner communities, to explore how different types of disabilities impact

individuals' ability to engage with the project and to finally to recommend what we could practically do to ensure people with disabilities could benefit from the project.

Following recommendations from the study, starting in quarter 2 of the second year, we used the Washington Group questions to identify how many people with disabilities were being reached by project activities. We also consistently applied reasonable adjustments to our project implementation strategies to ensure access to activities and the benefits. For example, to ensure that people with disabilities were able to participate in our training activities, we hired a venue that was on the ground floor and therefore, accessible for people with mobility issues. We also ensured that all the meeting materials were in large print for any person with visual impairments.

Despite these efforts, few people with disabilities attended the training, less than 1%, and none of those actively participated in terms of expressing their opinions and none implemented the training.

In reflecting and evaluating on the success of this strategy, we realised that we did not do enough prior to the training to address the attitudinal barriers that exist in the community and families that hamper participation of people with disabilities. To strengthen our approach, we worked with the DPO to better understand local attitudes towards people with disabilities and the best way to proceed in changing them. In year three we conducted a series of awareness raising activities in the community and paired up people with disabilities with people without disabilities to provide support in implementing the training.

We made sure to collect feedback from people with disabilities to understand their experience of the project. Through feedback we understood that people with hearing impairments found the town hall venue particularly challenging and preferred smaller focus group discussions. As a result, the project integrated a mixture of large and small group dialogue sessions to support inclusion.

Overall, we feel that our strategies were reasonably successful. Data shows that we were able to achieve our targets for reaching people with disabilities. However, results data against indicators shows that we still have some way to go to ensure that the people with disabilities who are participating in the project, benefit to the same extent. In future projects, we would consult with people with disabilities and engage DPO much earlier.

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.

10. Value for Money (VfM)

In this section grant holders are required to conduct an analysis of the overall value for money provided by the project. This is a very important section of the project completion report and needs to be completed carefully.

A value for money analysis is when the results of the project are compared against the costs and answers the question “were the results achieved worth the costs incurred?” Evidence of both value and money is needed in this section:

- Value is evidenced by information of the actual *results* achieved by the project, considering the scale, depth and quality of those results. Value can be subjective. However, the value the project intends to deliver was agreed and was represented in the targets in the logical framework and other agreed results (for example, beneficiary reach). Evidence of results can be found throughout the project completion review and in the logical framework.
- Money is evidenced by information of the *costs* incurred by the project during the year. Evidence of costs can be found through budget and accounts. Some financial analysis is needed to complete the value for money analysis. For example, budget versus spend, the ratio of spend across the five sub-categories (such as capital expenditure versus project activities).

The results and costs should then be compared. Some ideas for this include:

- A simple cost-benefit analysis can provide evidence of efficiency. This means looking at the total amount spent during the year versus the total beneficiaries reached.
- A simple cost-effectiveness analysis can provide evidence of effectiveness. This means looking at the total number of beneficiaries reached versus the number who have made the desired changed, as demonstrated in your logical framework results, and how much this cost.

Other useful things to do are:

- Provide benchmarks wherever possible to demonstrate the value for money provided by the project. Was the final cost benefit or cost effectiveness higher or lower than expected compared against the initial project budget and design.
- Providing concrete examples of how the value for money that has been evidenced was achieved. Show that it was intentional. These examples should demonstrate the consideration of cost and value and how it was compared with other options at each step to ensure money was being spent well and wisely to achieve the results.
- Explaining and justifying when spend was more than expected demonstrating increased quality added value that value for money is not doing the cheapest thing.

The following example is very comprehensive but provides some ideas of what could be included:

Example:

The total project budget was £1,121,050.80, all of which is funded by the FCDO. Of the project budget we spent £1,020,156. That means we spent 91% of our budget to implement 99% of our work plan and in doing so reached 105% of our direct beneficiary target whilst achieving our milestones at both output (score A) and outcome level (on track).

In spending 9% less than expected we were careful in managing our resources. Our efforts at economy included applying good practice in procurement (3 quotes) and only procuring items that were absolutely necessary. For example, we initially budgeted to procure 2 containers of textbooks, but having discovered that another CSO had recently provided textbooks to some of our partner schools we only procured one. We also procured the textbooks directly from the publishers rather than a bookshop and purchased them with a 30% discount.

Using 91% of the overall budget to implement 99% of our activities suggests we also used our resources more efficiently than we expected. This was despite the much higher than expected unit costs of the training of trainers' programme (under output 3) which was 26% higher than we expected. The higher costs were largely a result of an increase in the costs of international travel and accommodation following COVID-19. These costs were deemed necessary due to the specific content and expertise the consultants brought to the training. Whilst the costs for this output were higher than planned, we do feel that this spend was proportional to need as output 3 is weighted at 50% and is, therefore, pivotal to achieving the project outcome.

We feel that if we had not spent this amount we would have achieved much less. The additional costs incurred could also be justified by the quality and effectiveness of the training, demonstrated by the fact that 28 out of the 30 trainers achieved the standards required and passed the test and have gone on to successfully rolling out the training in their schools. This is a cost effectiveness of £1,200 per trainer which compares very favourably to the Government programme of £2,000.

Our overspend on output 3 was balanced out as we significantly underspent against our other two outputs. Output 1 by 63% and output 2 by 43%. To achieve this level of efficiency under output 2 we were able to work with another CSO (the same CSO that distributed books) who agreed to advertise our program on their weekly radio program which greatly increase the awareness of the project within the community and resulted in an increase in the number of parents attending the outreach camps. For output 1 we were able to leverage support from the local community which provided the venue free of charge. Not needing to hire the venue saved us £2000 according to their prices on their website. Although we underspent on both outputs, it did not affect quality or effectiveness as we were able to achieve our expected milestones (scoring A).

More than half of our annual spend (52%) was on project activities whereas the other half comprised staff (30%), admin (15%), and MEL (3%). This ratio of spend on project activities is very positive and what we were aiming for. Whilst the individual cost per beneficiary remains high at £150 this is to be expected considering the individual learning action plans that are needed for each child and young adult. We cannot compare costs of this intervention directly with a government led intervention as the government doesn't provide a like for like service however the cost per beneficiary is similar to the other project we have implemented in country. It is also important to remember that these beneficiaries are some of the most marginalised people in society and that locating and supporting them, and their carers incurs much higher costs as a result.

We were able to reach 105% of our beneficiary target, we did so by hitting our female target of xxx which also included girls married before they were 18 and young mothers. We were able to exceed our target of males involved with the project by changing the training schedule; we condensed the training session into a weekend and combined it with a sporting activity. This change saw an 80% increase in male engagement with the project. We have reached xx people with disability making up 5% of the beneficiary total and this compares well with the % of PWD living in the community.

In summary we feel that this project has been economical, efficient and effective with resources. This has allowed us to reach some of the most marginalised in society thus contributing to FCDO leave no one behind agenda and at the same time has generated some very positive and sustainable results overall. As such we consider that the project has provided good value for money to the UK taxpayer.

11. 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:

- Stakeholder coordination. For example, meetings, round tables, steering committees and stock takes not included in outputs
- 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 or expectations 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

12. Feedback to fund manager

It is useful for the fund manager to receive grant holder feedback to strengthen the support and guidance provided. Please be honest and provide feedback, suggestions, examples, or requests to the fund management team.

13. Check list

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.

See below a full list of documentation required for submission with additional information and guidance.		
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.

Matching your
donations with



md mannion
daniels

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 risk register	Download from SMILE and update the risk register. Close out all risks in the register and provide a final update in the 'What's changed' column
7	Updated delivery chain risk map – only if any updates are needed since the last submission	Download from SMILE and update the delivery chain risk map with any relevant risks and control/mitigations since the last submission.
8	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.
9	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
10	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.
11	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.

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@mansiondaniels.com, three months after the project end date.

Do not upload these documents to SMILE.

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_042020

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.