



Project Completion Report and Final Evaluation Guidelines

**For Governance and Transparency Fund
Grant Holders**

Updated: 31 March 2012

Acronyms

| | |
|------|--|
| ARS | Achievement Rating Scale |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| CAR | Capability, Accountability, Responsiveness |
| DFID | (UK Government) Department for International Development |
| GTF | Governance and Transparency Fund |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| PCR | Project Completion |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |

Introduction

This document is for Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF) grant holders and is to be used as a guide for commissioning the independent Final Evaluation and completing the Project Completion Report (PCR). This document replaces the previous guidelines issued on 7 April 2009 and the subsequent addendum distributed dated 29 April 2010. It consolidates all previous reporting instructions and incorporates requirements for compliance with DFID's latest guidance in force from January 2012.

In June 2010, the UK Government introduced a new 'Aid Transparency Guarantee' to make aid fully transparent to citizens in both the UK and recipient countries. Aid transparency is critical to improving the effectiveness and value for money of aid. Making information about aid spending easier to access, use and understand means that UK taxpayers and citizens in poor countries can more easily hold DFID and recipients to account for using aid money wisely. Transparency creates better feedback from beneficiaries to donors and taxpayers, and helps us better understand what works and what doesn't. In support of these objectives, DFID is now requesting all GTF grant holders to:

- Post your PCR and Final Evaluation on your own organisation's external website.
- Provide KPMG with a corresponding web link that will be displayed on the DFID GTF web pages.

You may choose to withhold commercial or other sensitive information from the PCR posted on your website. Any commercial or sensitive information should be included in a separate annex to the annual report submitted to DFID.

When is the deadline for submitting my PCR and Final Evaluation?

Your final external evaluation must be carried out within the last six months of your programme. The end date for your programme is specified in your grant arrangement with DFID. Your final external evaluation report must be included as a nannex to your PCR. You must submit your PCR to KPMG within 3 months after the end date of your programme.

Why do I need to produce a PCR?

Your project Completion Report contributes to good project management by providing a useful record of what has been achieved by your programme. It should enable conclusions to be drawn and lessons learned which are useful for sharing with others and designing future programmes. Most of all, it should describe how your programme has contributed to the overall objectives of strengthening capability,

accountability and responsiveness to make governance work for the poor. Your PCR is also an opportunity to reflect on the judgments and recommendations made in the final external evaluation. Where necessary, you can provide your assessment or clarification on the findings.

How do I submit my PCR?

In electronic format only (in font Arial 12) using Microsoft Word by email to KPMG at: gtf@kpmg.com. Please do not use Adobe Acrobat format and ensure that your GTF number is stated within the subject box of your email.

Are there any restrictions on the size of the report submitted to KPMG?

Please ensure that the attachments to any one email do not exceed 5MB. If your email exceeds 5MB, please split your annual report submission into separate smaller emails. You may include photographs and other audio-visual materials in annexes to your annual report. Very large audio-visual annexes may be submitted on CD-ROM via regular post to KPMG.

Is there a standard format for the PCR?

Yes. The main body of your PCR should be a maximum 20 pages excluding annexes. It is important that your report focuses on the impact of what your programme achieved rather than on listing activities. Your PCR must include the following sections:

1. Programme Identification Details
2. List of Acronyms
3. Executive Summary (max 3 pages)
4. Key Findings
5. Recommendations

Required Annexes:

- Annex 1 – Final Achievement Rating Scale
- Annex 2 – Final Logical Framework
- Annex 3 – Final Financial Report
- Annex 4 – Final List of Material Produced during programme
- Annex 5 – Final Web Update
- Annex 6 – Final Evaluation
- Annex 7 – Politically sensitive information

Any audio-visual and other media for demonstrating the impact of your programme is also very welcome. Please submit this material at the same time as your PCR.

The remainder of this document sets out what is expected in each section and provides advice on how it should be completed. You will also find three appendices to these guidelines:

- Appendix I – Guidelines for the Final Evaluation consultants
- Appendix II – Suggested questions for the presentation of your learning
- Appendix III – Most updated version of the GTF global logframe

If you have any questions relating to the expected content or procedures for your PCR or Final Evaluation, please contact KPMG.

1. Programme Identification Details

| | |
|--|---|
| GTF Number | (as per your Grant Arrangement) |
| Short Title of Programme | (as per your Grant Arrangement) |
| Name of Lead Institution | (as per your Grant Arrangement) |
| Start date¹ | (dd/mm/yyyy) |
| End date: | (dd/mm/yyyy) |
| Amount of DFID Funding: | (amount in GBP) |
| Brief Summary of Programme: | Please describe the purpose and principal outcomes of your programme in no more than 150 words. This may be the same as stated in previous reports but please make modifications as necessary to reflect programme changes. |
| List all countries where activities have taken or will take place | If you have activities in more than 10 countries, you may list all of the countries in an annex. |
| List all implementing partners in each country | If you have more than 10 partners, you may wish to list in an additional annex. |
| Target groups- wider beneficiaries | Please describe and estimate the number of people who have benefited from your activities. Data should be disaggregated by gender and age, by income quintile and defined vulnerable groups where relevant. |
| Lead Contact | Name, address, telephone, email |
| Person who prepared this report (if different from Lead Contact) | Name, address, telephone, email |

2. List of Acronyms

Insert the list of all acronyms used in your report.

3. Executive Summary (max 3 pages)

3.1 Period since last annual report

For the period since your last annual report, provide a brief summary of your main activities, key results and achievements. Please draw attention to any key challenges and how they were addressed.

3.2 For the entire duration of your programme

Please provide a summary of the changes to people's lives that your programme has brought about. To assist your assessment, please consider the following questions:

- What were the main achievements and how did they make a difference in people's lives?
- How far was the purpose and intended outputs as listed in the logframe achieved?
- Were there any significant setbacks?

Please also provide a short summary of lessons and key recommendations for DFID, yourselves and others to consider in relation to future programmes.

¹ Date your grant agreement was signed.

4. Key Findings

Your PCR must include the following sections:

4.1. Management response to Final Evaluation

Please copy and paste your final evaluation conclusions and recommendations into a table below. Under the Management Response column, please indicate whether or not you agree with the findings. If you disagree with any of the findings, please state why.

| Final Evaluation Conclusions | Management Response |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. | 1. |
| 2. | 2. |
| 3. | 3. |
| Final Evaluation Recommendations | |
| 1. | 1. |
| 2. | 2. |
| 3. | 3. |

4.2. Programme Management

Please indicate if there were any significant changes in programme management during the implementation of your programme. This could include changes in key personnel responsible for day-to-day operations, financial management, or M&E functions; implementation arrangements with local partners; risk management; changes to the programme design or rationale; and/or agreed revisions to the programme logframe.

4.3. Impact on governance and transparency

The purpose of this section is to allow DFID to analyse common issues across the entire GTF portfolio. To facilitate this analysis, please briefly describe the impact your programme has had on improving **capability, accountability and/or responsiveness** (CAR) during the reporting period². Your description of impact should focus on **what** has changed, **who** has been affected from the changes, **how** the change occurred and **why**? DFID is also particularly interested to learn how your programme has incorporated strategies to account for relevant cross-cutting issues.

It is understood that your programme may not have contributed to all components of the CAR framework. However, where applicable and possible, please consider the emerging impact of your programme in the following terms:

- a) **What** has changed should be described in terms of:
- *Policy (e.g. new policies, laws, standards, political and institutional framework)*

² For working definitions of **capability, accountability, and responsiveness** see the DFID (2006) White Paper: [Making governance work for the poor](#); and Working paper 34 (2009): [Measuring Change and results in voice and accountability work](#), both available at: www.dfid.gov.uk.

- *Practice (e.g. delivery of new services and systems)*
- *Behaviour (e.g. improved capacities, engagement and actions)*
- *Changes in power relations – (e.g. including power over resources, ability to organise, ability to take collective action, etc)*

b) Who has benefited should be disaggregated in terms of visible evidence of different impacts on various relevant groups within society (i.e. gender, age, disability, HIV status, etc.) It is not expected that all groups will necessarily benefit equally from your interventions.

c) How the change occurred should be described in terms of the methods and approaches you have used.

d) Why your programme team feel the change has occurred **can** provide useful analytical insights for future lesson learning. In this regard please also consider the importance of:

- Context (e.g. socio-political-institutional). Also, if your programme is working under conflict conditions or in a fragile state, please describe how these conditions have influenced your work.
- Key success factors
- Significant obstacles that were overcome
- The sequencing of your interventions

Please also state if there were any unintended consequences, positive or negative, as a result of your programme.

DFID is also interested in the contribution your programme has made toward specific indicators in the overall GTF programme logframe. Please review the indicators listed below and indicate contributing evidence from your programme.³

| Indicator | Evidence of contribution |
|---|--------------------------|
| OC.I2. Number of communities, CSOs and CS coalitions with significant and sustainable improvements in their capacity to demand improved governance and transparency | |
| OP1.I1. Budget allocated to public services and goods for vulnerable and excluded groups | |
| OP1.I2. Number of officials trained for better management and provision of services | |
| OP2.I1. Number of key information documents available to the media and public in a timely manner throughout the budget/policy cycle | |
| OP2.I2. Number of women empowered through collective action in associations, self-help groups and increased access to knowledge, services, assets and choice | |
| OP3.I1. Number of disadvantaged and vulnerable people with understanding of | |

³ It is understood that your programme will not contribute to all of the selected indicators.

| | |
|--|--|
| human rights and ability to claim rights | |
| OP3.I2. Number of media articles, radio and television programmes covering various governance issues | |
| OP3.I3. Number of strengthened media organisations and trained journalists | |
| OP3.I4. Number of human rights abuses addressed by authorities | |
| OP4.I1. Number of corruption cases recorded by Advice and Legal Action Centres and other CSOs of particular relevance to poor people | |
| OP5.I1. Evidence of the state's ratification of relevant International Conventions affecting human rights particularly those that affect poor people | |
| OP5.I2. Number of legal or administrative pro-poor measures proposed and/or adopted in which CSOs have influenced content | |
| OP6.I1. Number of vulnerable and excluded people accessing more appropriate services and public goods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase in primary school enrolment • improved access to water and sanitation • improved HIV/AIDS, reproductive and general health services • improved judiciary system | |

4.4 Sustainability

Provide a brief assessment of the sustainability of your programme. It may be useful to divide sustainability into two types: a) sustainability of services and b) sustainability of impact. Where appropriate, please:

- Provide a brief assessment of the change in your partners' capacity in terms of skills, resources and political space to sustain the impact of your programme interventions. Will the services provided by the programme continue after GTF funding comes to an end?
- Comment on any external events that may have either a positive or negative effect on the sustainability of the outputs from your programme.
- Comment on how your programme has collaborated, networked, and influenced public opinion and how these activities may relate to the sustainability of the outputs from your programme.
- Assess the capacity of relevant national institutions in terms of skills, resources and political space to sustain the impact of your programme interventions.

- Indicate if the success of your programme is dependent on a sequence of reforms or actions by others that are beyond your immediate control.

4.5 Innovation

Do you think you have identified a new way of working that should be shared with others? For example, have you developed a new way of tackling a governance issue or an unusual alliance to bring about change? If so, please describe in this section how your programme is innovative. This may include:

- **Your experience:** How does this differ from what you and your partners used to do before? Does this involve a new approach, or a tested approach (existing good practice) in a new context?
- The **geographic** region of operation: Does this represent a new innovation for the country/region? Who are the other players in the country and what is their current practice? How does this initiative compare with others – scale, operations, and approach? How is this different from what others do?
- **Conditions of operation:** Does the approach represent an innovation for this type of operational environment? (E.g. remoteness, conflict-affected location, etc). What is the prevailing practice and how is this different and/or better from what other organisations are currently doing?
- **Technology:** Have new technologies or new applications of existing technologies been used for effective, accountable and inclusive governance?

4.6 Learning from GTF

The purpose of this section is to draw out key lessons from across the GTF portfolio, so that they can be summarised and disseminated for development partners and policy makers. The details that you should provide for each lesson should include:

- A short title for the lesson (see operational and thematic lists below)
- The audience(s) most likely to be most interested in the lesson.
- A short description (max 500 words) of the lesson.

Please consider lessons learnt from operational and thematic perspectives to assist the analysis of lessons across the GTF portfolio.

Operational lessons may include lessons on:

- Overall programme design
- Adapting your methods and approaches
- Working with partner organizations
- Risk assessment and management
- Sustainability and scaling up
- Other

Thematic lessons may include lessons on:

- *Governance in fragile states*
- *Access to justice and human rights*
- *Environmental governance*
- *Addressing corruption*

- *Public expenditure monitoring*
- *Access to public services*
- *Decentralisation*
- *Gender, social exclusion and governance*
- *Media and governance*
- *Other*

Appendix 2 to these guidelines contains additional detailed questions that you should consider when describing both operational and thematic lessons learnt.

5. Recommendations

This section should provide a brief summary of any additional key recommendations for DFID, other donors, governments and civil society to consider in relation to similar future programmes. Please be concise and state who the audience is for each recommendation.

Annex 1 - Final Achievement Rating Scale

- 1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
- 2 = largely achieved, despite a few short-comings
- 3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
- 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
- 5 = not achieved

Please complete this template to provide a uniform assessment of progress against your stated objectives. Where your logframe indicators and baselines are not fully compatible, perhaps because of modifications since inception, you will need to comment on the validity of the progress that has been made against a defined starting point.

| Objective Statement | Achievement Rating for whole programme period | Logframe Indicators | Baseline and Target for Indicators | Actual achievements demonstrated by the end of the programme | Comments on final results, including unintended impacts |
|--|---|---|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Purpose (state below, then rate and comment) | 1 to 5 | As stated in your most up to date logframe. | As stated in your logframe. | <i>Quantitative and/or qualitative evidence in relation to the indicators (final accumulated value)</i> | <i>Short narrative summarising performance, assessing achievement against the overall target. Where you failed to achieve the Purpose explain why.</i> |
| Outputs (list the main outputs and provide a rating for each) | 1 to 5 | As stated in your most up to date logframe | As stated in your logframe | <i>Quantitative and/or qualitative evidence in relation to the indicators (final accumulated value)</i> | <i>Short narrative summarising performance, assessing achievement against the overall target. Where you failed to achieve the Output explain why.</i> |
| Activities (list the main activities and provide a rating for each, then give an overall rating for all outputs.) | | | | <i>Quantitative and/or qualitative evidence in relation to the indicators (final accumulated value)</i> | <i>Short narrative summarising performance, assessing achievement against the overall target. Where you failed to complete any activities explain why.</i> |

Annex 2 - Final Logical Framework

Please include the final approved logframe for your programme. Please also include a brief summary of any approved changes that were made to your logframe and the reasons for the change

Annex 3 – Final Financial Report

Your Annual Financial Report must present actual expenditure against your agreed detailed budget (not the summary budget used for Funding Requests). Expenditure variances in excess of 10% of the agreed budget must be explained as separate notes to your financial report.

3.1 Programme Identification

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. GTF Reference No. | GTF-999 |
| 2. Organisation Name | (Short Name of your Organisation) |

3.2 – Final Reporting Period

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Start of Period | 01April 20yy |
| 2. End of Period | End Date of your programme |

3.3 – Funds received from DFID during Final Reporting Period

| Payment No. | Date Received | Amount |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------|
| Payment 1 | dd/mm/yyyy | £££,£££ |
| Payment 2 | dd/mm/yyyy | £££,£££ |
| Payment 3 | dd/mm/yyyy | £££,£££ |
| Payment 4 | dd/mm/yyyy | £££,£££ |
| Total received during Period | | £££,£££ |

3.4 – Expenditure during final Reporting Period

| Agreed Budget Lines | Agreed Budget for Period | Actual Expenditure for Period | Variance | Variance % |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Detailed budget line 1 | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| Detailed budget line 2 | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| Detailed budget line 3 | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| --- etc --- | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| Detailed budget line N | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| Total for Period | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |

3.5 – Expenditure since start of Programme

| Agreed Budget Lines | Total Agreed Programme Budget | Total Expenditure | Variance | Variance % |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------|------------|
| Detailed budget line 1 | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| Detailed budget line 2 | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| Detailed budget line 3 | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| --- etc --- | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| Detailed budget line N | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |
| Total to Date | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | £££,£££ | 99.99% |

Annex A3.6 – Value for Money

DFID has requested additional information regarding value for money from all its funding programmes. Please use this section to describe how your programme represents good value for money. You should also highlight examples of cost savings; successful price negotiations; maximizing of benefits with the resources available.

Annex A3.7 – Asset Register

In accordance with the terms of your grant arrangement, please provide an asset register using the templates below. The registers must include records of all items purchased costing £1,000 or more and items costing less than £1,000 that can be deemed to be “attractive items” such as mobile telephones (including satellite telephones), digital cameras, other electronic or electrical equipment; office furniture, etc.

A3.7.1 – Items with and initial purchase costing exceeding £ 1,000

| Item # | Description | Manufacturer and Model | Serial, registration, chassis # | Purchase Date | Purchase Cost (£) | Location | Responsible person | Date of disposal (if applicable) |
|--------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | |

A3.7.2 – Items costing less than £1,000 deemed to be “attractive items”

| Item # | Description | Manufacturer and Model | Serial, registration, chassis # | Purchase Date | Purchase Cost (£) | Location | Responsible person | Date of disposal (if applicable) |
|--------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | |

Annex 4 - List of materials produced under your GTF Programme

Please provide a detailed list of the materials produced by your programme during the reporting period. Materials may include print or other media communications. We are particularly interested in workshop or training reports, project manuals, promotional brochures, studies, evaluation reports, radio, television, and video or web productions. Where applicable, please indicate the weblink to where the information is available.

| Item | Date | Title of material | Description of material | Web link (if applicable) |
|------|------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |
| 3. | | | | |
| 4. | | | | |
| 5. | | | | |
| 6. | | | | |
| 7. | | | | |

Annex 5 – Final web update

The information that you provide in this section will be uploaded to the DFID website. It is intended to provide the public with a **brief description of what your programme has achieved throughout the duration of your programme**. Your update should be no longer than 500 words and should include the following information:

- a) A short description of the programme's purpose to give overall context.
- b) Activities and outputs to date.
- c) How these activities and outputs relate to the purpose;
- d) The impact and outcomes of these activities and outputs.
- e) What the programme intends to achieve in the coming year (if relevant).

Please ensure that you use plain language and your communication style emphasises clarity, brevity and avoids the use of acronyms or technical language.

Any photographs submitted with this section should illustrate your programme's activities and your intended beneficiaries. All photographs or other material should be sent under a separate attachment and not embedded in the PCR. Please ensure any emails and attachments do not exceed 5MB.

Annex 6 – Final Evaluation

Please attach a copy of the Final Independent Evaluation Report. Guidelines for final evaluation consultants are included in Appendix 1 to this document.

Annex 7 – Sensitive Information

There may be personal security reasons for not wanting to disclose important information about your programme to the public. We are also aware that some GTF programmes are operating in complex political environments or post-conflict settings where disclosure of specific information critical of various stakeholders could jeopardise your ability to achieve results. Please use this annex to make DFID aware of these issues and clearly state your reasons why this information should not be shared.

APPENDIX 1

GUIDELINES FOR FINAL EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

Why carry out a Final Evaluation?

The Final Evaluation is an independent assessment of whether your programme purpose has been achieved, or the extent your programme has gone toward achieving the purpose stated in your logical framework (and the reasons for this), and how this has contributed to the overall GTF objectives of strengthening capability, accountability and responsiveness to make governance work for the poor. The purpose of the Final Evaluation is to:

- Identify the impact of the programme and ways that this may be sustained
- Record and share lessons
- Account to local stakeholders for the programme's achievements
- Improve future programme design and management
- Verify funds were used effectively and efficiently to deliver results
- Enable DFID to evaluate the performance of the GTF as a whole, making sure the overall portfolio has increased accountability and responsiveness.

By the end of the programme, results may not be exactly as planned. However, there will be some impact and change, intended and unintended, positive and even in some cases negative. This information needs to be recorded in the Final Evaluation. Through an honest examination of what actually happened against the planned results, important lessons for future programmes can be learned.

Who should carry out the Final Evaluation?

You are responsible for funding and identifying appropriately qualified independent consultant(s) to carry out the Final Evaluation. DFID is expecting at least the team leader of the review to be external and independent. They should not have been involved in the design or implementation of the programme. It is expected that the programme management team and advisors involved in programme M&E will participate in the reviews, but not in the judgments being made so as to ensure impartiality.

Please note that the DAC (1991) Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance within the section on impartiality and independence state:

- The evaluation process should be impartial and independent in its function from the process concerned with the policy making, the delivery and the management of development assistance.
- Impartiality contributes to the credibility of evaluation and the avoidance of bias in findings, analyses and conclusions. Independence provides legitimacy to evaluation and reduces the potential for conflict of interest which could arise if policy makers and managers were solely responsible for evaluating their own activities.

How should I commission an external Final Evaluation?

The key to getting a fair and balanced external review that is helpful to your organisation lies in the following:

- Writing the terms of reference (TOR) that are comprehensive and clear in what is to be undertaken and reported on.
- Defining selection criteria for making the appointment of the evaluator(s) and choosing evaluators who conform to ethical standards of evaluation.
- Briefing the evaluator(s) properly and providing evidence in an open and transparent way.
- Ensuring the evaluator(s) presents his or her preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations for your feedback before finalising the report.

You should write the terms of reference for the evaluation to ensure the constructive approach you want the evaluator to take, including the evidence that they should look for. You should encourage the evaluator to look at the strengths and weaknesses in your work and to make clear and realistic recommendations to tackle the weaknesses. You can choose the evaluator(s) through a competitive process or one of direct appointment on the basis of their professional attitude and experience.

You can suggest the evidence that will be looked at and the visits, meetings and people to talk to in your terms of reference. At the initial briefing you should check that the evaluator understands the terms of reference and has all the material they need or ask for.

At the feedback session, you are entitled to challenge findings and conclusions and recommendations that you do not agree with, if the evaluator has not based these on a full examination of the evidence, or if there is additional information to explain why the recommendations would be unrealistic. A good evaluator will take these views into account, but the final report should be based on their own judgements and conclusions.

It is the responsibility of each GTF grant holder to:

- Organise key dates and deadlines for the review / evaluation process.
- Arrange interviews with the programmes' partner institutions, key stakeholders and other end users to collect information on programme outputs and achievements.

Questions to be included in the different stakeholder interviews could be specified in the TOR. For example, questions on the degree to which programmes have met their outputs and purpose (intended impact); what are the gaps; and what could have been done differently or better?

What documents should be consulted as part of the Final Evaluation?

It is important that the review team has ready access to key programme documentation. As a minimum, this should include:

- Programme proposal, logframe and budget
- Inception Report including annexes
- Annual reports
- Mid-Term Review
- Feedback provided by KPMG to all the above reports

- Other key documents identified by programme management (e.g. baseline documents, materials produced, case studies, recent research, etc)

Is there a standard format for the Final Evaluation?

Yes. Your Final Evaluation must include the following sections:

1. Title Page including Programme Identification Details
2. Table of Contents
3. Abbreviations / acronyms page
4. Executive summary (maximum 3 pages)
5. A short introduction to the programme
6. The evaluation methodology
7. Findings in relation to standard review criteria
8. Innovation and lessons learned
9. Summary of recommendations.

Annexes must include:

- Achievement Rating Scale (see Annex 1 of the PCR guidelines)
- Terms of reference for the Final Evaluation
- Evaluation schedule / timetable
- List of people met
- Documents consulted
- Detailed statistical data such as updated baseline surveys, etc.

The remainder of this document provides advice and sets out what may be included in the key sections of your Final Evaluation report. If you have any questions relating to the suggested content or procedures, please contact KPMG.

1. Programme Identification Details (based on table in annual report)

| | |
|--|--|
| GTF Number | (as per your Grant Arrangement) |
| Short Title of Programme | (as per your Grant Arrangement) |
| Name of Lead Institution | (as per your Grant Arrangement) |
| Start date⁴ | (dd/mm/yyyy) |
| End date: | (dd/mm/yyyy) |
| Amount of DFID Funding: | (amount in GBP) |
| List all countries where activities have taken or will take place | If activities occurred in more than 10 countries, you may list all of the countries in an annex. |
| List all implementing partners in each country | If more than 10 partners, you may list in an additional annex. |
| Target groups- wider beneficiaries | Please describe and estimate the number of people who benefited from the programmes |
| Lead Author | Name, address, telephone, email |
| Other people contracted to undertake the MTR / Evaluation | Name, Organisation |

2. Table of Contents

Insert the list of the main sections covered in your report.

3. Abbreviations / acronyms

Insert the list of all acronyms used in your report.

4. Executive Summary

The executive summary should provide a short introduction to the programme and briefly explain the evaluation methodology. It should also provide a brief summary of the main achievements and draw attention to positive or negative external events or unintended consequences of the interventions. The most important areas to highlight are:

- an assessment of impact
- a statement of the extent to which the impact has directly or indirectly contributed to increasing voice, accountability and responsiveness⁵ and to reducing poverty.
- Lessons and key recommendations either to DFID or the lead organisation and implementing partners.

⁴ Date the original grant agreement was signed by DFID.

⁵ For working definitions of capability, accountability, and responsiveness see the DFID (2006) White Paper: [Making governance work for the poor](#); and Working paper 34 (2009): [Measuring Change and results in voice and accountability work](#), both available at: www.dfid.gov.uk.

5. A short introduction to the programme

This section may include a short description of the purpose and principal outcomes of the programme. This may be the same as stated in previous reports but please make modifications as necessary to reflect programme changes.

6. The evaluation methodology

This section may focus on how the Final Evaluation was conducted. In some cases this may include how surveys, focus groups, key informant interviews, or other evaluation techniques were conducted.

7. Findings in relation to standard review criteria

In the Final Evaluation, the emphasis should involve a final statement of what has been achieved and what can be learnt. The standard review criteria must include:

- a) **Relevance:** Details of the programme's significance with respect to increasing voice, accountability and responsiveness within the local context.
 - How well does/did the programme relate to governance priorities at local, national or internal levels?
 - How well does/did the programme relate to DFID's country assistance plans

- b) **Impact:** Details of the broader economic, social, and political consequences of the programme and how it contributed to the overall objectives of the Governance and Transparency Fund (increased capability, accountability and responsiveness) and to poverty reduction. The articulation of the CAR framework within the GTF is through the GTF programme logframe as set out in Annex 1 of these guidelines. Section 3 of your Inception Report identified how your programme or portfolio of projects is likely to contribute to this framework. It is the progress in relation to the selected indicators which we are particularly interested in hearing about.
 - What was the programme's overall impact and how does this compare with what was expected?
 - Did the programme address the intended target group and what was the actual coverage?
 - Who were the direct and indirect/wider beneficiaries of the programme?
 - What difference has been made to the lives of those involved in the programme?

- c) **Economy:** Has economy been achieved in the implementation of programme activities
 - Could the same inputs have been purchased for less money?
 - Were salaries and other expenditures appropriate to the context?

- d) **Efficiency:** How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of outputs.

- Are there obvious links between significant expenditures and key programme outputs? How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
 - How well did the financial systems work?
 - How were local partners involved in programme management and how effective was this and what have been the benefits of or difficulties with this involvement?
 - Were the risks properly identified and well managed?
- e) Effectiveness:** Assessment of how far the intended outcomes were achieved in relation to targets set in the original logical framework.
- Have interventions achieved or are likely to achieve objectives?
 - How effective and appropriate was the programme approach?
 - With hindsight, how could it have been improved?
- f) Equity:** Discussion of social differentiation (e.g. by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic group, disability, etc) and the extent to which the programme had a positive impact on the more disadvantaged groups.
- How does/did the programme actively promote gender equality?
 - What is/was the impact of the programme on children, youth and the elderly?
 - What is/was the impact of the programme on ethnic minorities?
 - If the programme involved work with children, how are/were child protection issues addressed?
 - How are/were the needs of excluded groups, including people with disabilities and people living with HIV/AIDS addressed within the programme?
- g) Value for money:** Good value for money is the optimal use of resources to achieve the intended outcome.⁶
- Is there an optimum balance between Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness?
 - What are the costs and benefits of this programme?
 - Overall, did the programme represent good value for money?
- h) Sustainability:** Potential for the continuation of the impact achieved and of the delivery mechanisms following the withdrawal of DFID support.
- What are the prospects for the benefits of the programme being sustained after the funding stops? Did this match the intentions?
 - How has/could collaboration, networking and influencing of opinion support sustainability?

⁶ For advice on measuring value for money in governance programmes see DFID's Briefing Note (July 2011) [Indicators and VFM in Governance Programming](http://www.dfid.gov.uk), available at: www.dfid.gov.uk

- i) **Replicability:** How replicable is the process that introduced the changes/impact? Refer especially to innovative aspects which are replicable.
- What aspects of the programme are replicable elsewhere?
 - Under what circumstances and/or in what contexts would the programme be replicable?

Important Note

Specific requirement for multi-country programmes only

In addition to the report covering the overall programme, evaluations of multi-country programmes must include an additional annex with specific information for each country, even if not all implementing countries have been visited by the evaluation team. Based on the field work or information provided by the managers, the annex should include a **brief description** of what the main achievements were in each country including quantitative data if possible (maximum 2 pages per country).

8. Innovation and learning

Has the programme identified a new way of working that should be shared with others? If so, please describe in this section how the programme is innovative and/or what are the main lessons learned. (See section 4.5 and 4.6 and Appendix II of the GTF Project Completion Review guidelines for further detail on how innovation and learning may be considered).

9. Summary of Recommendations

Please provide a brief summary of the key recommendations that have emerged from the final evaluation. Recommendations should be subdivided into those related to programme design and those related to programme management and indicate clearly for whom the recommendation is intended.

APPENDIX II – SUGGESTED QUESTIONS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT FOR THE PRESENTATION OF YOUR LEARNING

- **Lessons about the overall programme design**
 - *Based on your experience of the context and implementation, what would you have done differently, what would you recommend that other similar projects should pay particular attention to?*
- **Lessons about adapting your methods and approaches**
 - *What particular methods seem to be working best in particular contexts and why?*
 - *Where you have encountered barriers, what have you learnt in trying to overcome them?*
 - *Have you learnt anything about the best way to sequence your interventions to achieve change?*
- **Lessons about working with partner organizations**
 - *What seems to work best and why?*
 - *What is preventing the smooth operation of the partnerships and why?*
 - *Are there particular ways of working together that add extra momentum to the process of change?*
- **Lessons about risk assessment and management**
 - *What have you learnt about your risk assessment capacity and risk management strategy?*
- **Lessons about sustainability and scaling up**
 - *What have you learnt about what can be done to ensure long-term sustainability of structures and processes after GTF funding ends?*
 - *Is there any advice for those aiming to scale up similar interventions?*
- **Thematic lessons:**
 - a) *Governance in fragile states*
 - *How has civil society engaged with state and non-state actors on key issues of governance and transparency within conflict and fragile states?*
 - *To what extent do you have to adapt standard approaches to engage and influence non-state actors in fragile states?*
 - *To what extent are your interventions leading to a better understanding of the root causes of conflict and fragility?*
 - *How has your programme analysed and managed risks within a fragile state?*
 - b) *Access to justice and human rights*
 - *To what extent has your programme contributed to an increase in understanding and ability claim and defends human rights? How has this strengthened governance and transparency at the local and national levels?*
 - *To what extent has your programme contributed to improvements in citizen access to justice through the formal and traditional court systems?*
 - c) *Environmental governance*
 - *How has your programme helped local communities to increase in their influence over their natural resources and led to an impact on livelihoods?*
 - *Has your programme helped CSOs combat the impact of environmental degradation?*

- d) *Addressing corruption*
 - *To what extent have any new approaches to the reduction of corruption been successful?*
 - *To what extent have anti-corruption approaches led to the improvement of access to services (e.g. health, education, water and sanitation)?*
- e) *Public expenditure monitoring*
 - *To what extent have participatory budgeting processes contributed to changes in government budget allocations to poverty-related programmes?*
 - *To what extent has advocacy around budgeting led to changes in government transparency and openness?*
 - *To what extent have your efforts to strengthen participatory budgeting and expenditure monitoring reduced the incidence of corruption at local and national levels?*
- f) *Access to public services*
 - *How have your interventions improved the relevance, quality and availability or reduced the cost of essential services for the poor?*
 - *How have governments improved their relationships with citizens at local and national levels?*
- g) *Decentralisation*
 - *What contribution has your programme made toward strengthening the decentralisation of government decision making and service delivery?*
 - *To what extent are GTF programmes contributing to a more transparent process of decentralised funding mechanisms?*
- h) *Gender, social exclusion and governance*
 - *Which intervention strategies are most influential in breaking down barriers to marginalised and discriminated voices being heard by government and other power interests at different levels?*
 - *What contribution has your programme made towards increasing the voice of marginalised groups?*
- i) *Media and governance*
 - *Does media offer a broader outreach in relation to civil society mobilisation around governance and transparency?*
 - *To what extent has the media been capable of using popular culture to create space for debate?*
 - *To what extent is the media seen as a partner and not just a tool in your programme?*
 - *Are there any innovative aspects to your media strategy?*

APPENDIX III - MOST UPDATED VERSION OF THE GTF GLOBAL LOGFRAME

| PROJECT TITLE | Governance and Transparency Fund | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|-------------|
| IMPACT | Indicator 1 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | Assumptions |
| Governments are more capable, accountable and responsive to meet the needs of poor people | WB's "Government Effectiveness" index for selected countries ⁱ | Ghana 56.7 | - | - | Evolution analysed at the end of the programme ⁱⁱ . | |
| | | Kenya 31.0 | | | | |
| | | Nepal 18.1 | | | | |
| | | Nigeria 8.6 | | | | |
| | | Peru 43.3 | | | | |
| | | Sierra Leone 10.0 | | | | |
| | South Africa 67.6 | | | | | |
| | Tanzania 39.0 | | | | | |
| | Uganda 33.8 | | | | | |
| | Zimbabwe 2.4 | | | | | |
| | Source | | | | | |
| | Worldwide Governance Indicators (World Bank) | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2 | Baseline 2008ⁱⁱⁱ | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | |
| | IBP's "Open Budget Index" for selected countries ⁱ | Ghana 50% | - | - | Evolution analysed at the end of the programme ⁱⁱ . | |
| | | Kenya 58% | | | | |
| | | Nepal 43% | | | | |
| | Nigeria 19% | | | | | |
| | Peru 67% | | | | | |
| | Sierra Leone NDA | | | | | |
| | South Africa 87% | | | | | |
| | Tanzania 36% | | | | | |
| | Uganda 51% | | | | | |
| | Zimbabwe NDA | | | | | |
| | Source | | | | | |
| | Open Budget Index (International Budget Partnership) | | | | | |

| | Indicator 3 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | |
|--|---|--|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| | TI's "Corruption Perceptions Index" for selected countries ^I | Ghana 3.9 Kenya 2.2 Nepal 2.3 Nigeria 2.5 Peru 3.7 Sierra Leone 2.2 South Africa 4.7 Tanzania 2.6 Uganda 2.5 Zimbabwe 2.2 | - | - | Evolution analysed at the end of the programme ^{II} . | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | Corruption Perceptions Index (Transparency International) | | | | |

| OUTCOME | Indicator 1 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | Assumptions |
|--|--|---|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Strengthened civil society to help citizens effectively represent their views and interests and hold governments to account for their actions at different levels in the governmental system | "Voice & Accountability" index in selected countries | Ghana 60.7 Kenya 37.4 Nepal 30.8 Nigeria 24.2 Peru 50.2 Sierra Leone 40.8 South Africa 66.4 Tanzania 43.6 Uganda 33.2 Zimbabwe 6.6 | - | - | Evolution analysed at the end of the programme ^{II} . | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Civil society is allowed to operate without restrictions that limit their performance and potential impact 2. Political stability prevails 3. Continued support of the international community to |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | Worldwide Governance Indicators (World Bank) | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Indicator 2 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | strengthen governance |
| | Number of communities, CSOs and CS coalitions with significant and sustainable improvements in their capacity to demand improved governance and transparency | 100 | 150 | 300 | > 600 | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports ^{III} . | | | | | |
| | Indicator 3 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | |
| | Number of case studies that demonstrate CS's contributions to sustainable improvements in key aspects of good governance | 0 | >25 | >50 | >100 | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| GTF stories of change (case studies) shared by Grant Holders. | | | | | | |
| INPUTS (£) | DFID (£) | Govt (£) | Other (£) | Total (£) | DFID SHARE (%) | |
| | 138 million | - | - | 138 million | 100 | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |

| OUTPUT 1 | Indicator 1 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | Assumptions |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Capability Leaders and Governments are better able to perform such functions as providing stability and personal security, setting rules, putting policies into practice, delivering social services and controlling corruption | Budget allocated to public services and goods for vulnerable and excluded groups | - | 2% | 4% | 6% | Representatives of governments are willing to engage with civil society actors |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | Numbers reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | |
| | Number of officials trained for better management and provision of services | 0 | 6,000 | 8,000 | 10,000 | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | Numbers reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports. | | | | |
| IMPACT WEIGHTING | Indicator | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | RISK RATING |
| | | | | | | |
| INPUTS (£) | DFID (£) | Govt (£) | Other (£) | Total (£) | DFID SHARE (%) | |
| | - | - | - | - | - | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |

| OUTPUT 2 | Indicator 1 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | Assumptions |
|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Accountability Increased access by citizens to the decision making processes of government, parliaments or assemblies and increased impact of citizens on said processes | Number of key information documents available to the media and public in a timely manner throughout the budget/policy cycle | 80 | 230 | 380 | 550 | 1. Representatives of governments are willing to engage with civil society actors 2. Issues of transparency and good governance are of high priority to a critical mass in society |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | |
| IMPACT WEIGHTING | Number of women empowered through collective action in associations, self-help groups and increased access to knowledge, services, assets and choice | 0 | 100,000 | 170,000 | 240,000 | RISK RATING |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports | | | | | |
| INPUTS (£) | DFID (£) | Govt (£) | Other (£) | Total (£) | DFID SHARE (%) | |
| | - | - | - | - | - | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |

| OUTPUT 3 | Indicator 1 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | Assumptions | |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Accountability Increased respect for human rights, the rule of law and a free media by governments at different levels | No. of disadvantaged and vulnerable people with understanding of human rights and ability to claim rights | 0 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 70,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Absence of violent hostilities in target countries 2. Government, policy makers and other stakeholders are willing to enable particularly poor and marginalised people to exercise their right of participation, engagement, and influence in governance 3. Issues of transparency and good governance are of high priority to a critical mass in society | |
| | Source | | Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports. | | | | |
| | Indicator 2 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | | |
| | Media coverage of governance issues | 0 | 500 | 1,000 | 2,500 | | |
| | Source | | Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports | | | | |
| | Indicator 3 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | | |
| Number of strengthened media organisations and trained journalists | 0 | 1,100 | 1,600 | 2,000 | | | |
| Source | | Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports | | | | | |
| IMPACT WEIGHTING | Indicator 4 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | RISK RATING | |
| | Number of human rights abuses addressed by authorities | 0 | 50 | 100 | 150 | | |
| Source | | Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports | | | | | |
| INPUTS (£) | DFID (£) | Govt (£) | Other (£) | Total (£) | DFID SHARE (%) | | |
| | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | | |

| OUTPUT 4 | Indicator 1 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | Assumptions |
|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Accountability Strengthened CSO engagement in the fight against corruption | Number of corruption cases recorded by Advice and Legal Action Centres and other CSOs of particular relevance to poor people | 500 | 1,000 | 2,000 | 4,000 | Political will and government capacity to act on basis of evidence provided |
| IMPACT WEIGHTING | | Source | | | | RISK RATING |
| | | Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports | | | | |
| INPUTS (£) | DFID (£) | Govt (£) | Other (£) | Total (£) | DFID SHARE (%) | |
| | - | - | - | - | - | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |

| OUTPUT 5 | Indicator 1 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | Assumptions |
|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Responsiveness Increased opportunities for people to influence and determine policy and legislation | Evidence of the state's ratification of relevant International Conventions affecting human rights particularly those that affect poor people | 0 | 4 | 8 | 13 | Representatives of governments are willing to engage with civil society actors |
| | | Source Number reported by Grant Holders in Annual reports | | | | |
| IMPACT WEIGHTING | Indicator 2 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | |
| | Number of legal or administrative pro-poor measures proposed and/or adopted in which CSOs have influenced content | 30 | 350 | 500 | >700 | |
| | | Source Numbers reported by Grant Holders in Annual Reports | | | | RISK RATING |
| INPUTS (£) | DFID (£) | Govt (£) | Other (£) | Total (£) | DFID SHARE (%) | |
| | - | - | - | - | - | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |

| OUTPUT 6 | Indicator 1 | Baseline 2009 | Milestone 1 2011 | Milestone 2 2012 | Target 2013 | Assumptions |
|---|--|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Responsiveness- Improved implementation of the policies that are designed to meet the articulated needs and provision of services and public goods for vulnerable and excluded groups | Number of vulnerable and excluded people accessing more appropriate services and public goods: 1. increase in primary school enrolment (PSE); 2. improved access to water and sanitation (W/S) 3. improved HIV/AIDS, reproductive and general health services 4. improved judiciary system | Education: 31.5 million | - | - | Education: 32.5 million | Representatives of governments are willing to engage with civil society actors |
| | | Wat/San: 0 | | | Wat/San: 332,000 | |
| | | HIV/AIDS: 2,15 million | | | HIV/AIDS: 3,61 million | |
| | | Health: 0 | | | Health: 12 million | |
| | | RHS: 0 | | | RHS: 33 million | |
| | | Judiciary: 0 | | | Judiciary: 150,000 | |
| IMPACT WEIGHTING | | Source | | | | RISK RATING |
| | | Numbers reported by Grant Holders at the end of the programme | | | | |
| INPUTS (£) | DFID (£) | Govt (£) | Other (£) | Total (£) | DFID SHARE (%) | |
| | - | - | - | - | - | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |

ⁱ Criteria used for the selection of countries: (i) number of programmes >8; and (ii) funds assigned >500K. There are three exceptions (Peru, Sierra Leone and Nepal), which have been included according to thematic or geographic interests.

ⁱⁱ Attribution is very thin. There are many other elements that influence the evolution of the index. Therefore, it is difficult to define a priori a realistic target.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Open Budget Survey is conducted biennially since 2006. Therefore, 2008 data will be used for the baseline