**FINAL REPORT**

**PROGRAMME**

The final report is the Danish organisation and its partners reporting to CISU. It is expected that the report is developed in close collaboration between the Danish organisation and local partner(s) and use it as an opportunity to reflect on the results of the intervention together.

The final report will be a part of the Danish organisation’s track record with CISU. The report is therefore significant to future assessments of applications from the Danish organisations with the same or other partners.

The report is uploaded into ‘Vores CISU’ through the milestone *final report* under the grant no longer than six months after the end date of the intervention.

Before the report is uploaded, you will also need to answer the following questions in ‘Vores CISU’:

- Overall, have you achieved what you wanted with the intervention? (Selection from a drop-down list)

- Number of persons who have participated in activities

- Number of persons who have been affected by the interventions’ activities (besides the persons who have participated directly)

CISU strives to send a response to the report to the Danish organisation no longer than two months after receiving the report. The content of the report will also be used for CISUs own reporting and communication of results related to the Civil Society Fund.

All text in *italics* is text to help you develop the report and can be deleted before uploading the report.

**The report must not exceed 11 pages (excluding this frontpage).**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Danish grantee(s) |  | | |
| Partner organisation(s) |  | | |
| Title of the intervention |  | | |
| Name and email of contact person |  | | |
| Reference number |  | | |
| Country(ies) |  | | |
| Period of the intervention |  | | |
| Total budget |  | Actual expenditure |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date |  | Person responsible (signature) |

Person responsible (in capital letters)

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Overall strategic reflection |

**1.1** How did your strategic approach work (cf. ToC)? What worked well? What worked less well? Did the key assumptions prove to be correct?

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Overall results and changes |

**2.1 Summary:** Summarise (in 10 lines) what changes the programme has contributed to.

**2.2 Results and changes:** Describe the results achieved for each of the programme’s outcomes. What changes did the programme contribute to? What are your key learnings?

*Remember to include results and reflections from the mid-term review or evaluations if such has been carried out.*

*Please also describe whether the programme has contributed to unforeseen results – positive and negative.*

*Please attach an annex to this report with an overview of the end of program results framework.*

**2.3 Achievement of outcomes:**

Overall, have you achieved what you wanted with the intervention? (Select one of the answers below)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Did not achieve at all | To a lesser degree than expected | Close to expected | Exactly as expected | Better than expected |
|  |  |  |  |  |

For each of your outcomes, note in the table below how close you are to fulfilling the outcomes (in percent).

*Remember that the % must correspond to your description of achievement of your outcomes in section 2.2.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Achievement in % |
| Achievement of outcome 1 |  |
| Achievement of outcome 2 |  |
| Achievement of outcome 3 |  |
| Etc. |  |

0-19 %: very low achievement

20-39 %: low achievement

40-59%: medium achievement

60-79%: high achievement

80-100%: very high achievement

**2.4 Sustainability:** What lasting, sustainable improvements for the target groups has the programme contributed to?

*Describe which elements of the programme that live on/continues after the programme has ended. Are the results still significant and have an effect after the programme has ended? In what way?*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Changes and adjustments |

* 1. Changes in the context: Describe the most significant contextual challenges, and how these have influenced the programme. How have you adjusted the programme to adapt to these challenges?
  2. Assumptions and risks: describe how you managed risks and changes in key assumptions throughout the implementation period?

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Target groups and participants |

**4.1 Please note the number of people reached through the programme:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Number |
| Number of persons who have participated in activities |  |
| Number of persons who have been affected by the program’s activities (besides the persons who have participated directly) |  |

*NB: Please copy the above data into Vores CISU when uploading the report.*

4.2 Inclusion and participation of target groups: Fill in the table below. Add your primary target groups in the left column (primary target groups are persons who have participated directly in your activities). Add or delete columns according to how many primary target groups you have had in the programme. Check the box according to what extent your primary target group(s) have been included in shaping the implementation of the programme:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Less degree of inclusion and participation  *Target groups have been informed about the content of the intervention and their opportunities for participating in activities but have not participated actively in decision-making processes.* | Medium degree of inclusion and participation  *Target groups have been consulted in decision-making processes related to the intervention.* | High degree of inclusion and participation  *Target groups have contributed directly to the further development of the intervention and made decisions in collaboration with the implementing partner(s).* | Very high degree of inclusion and participation  *Target groups have had the power and ownership to make decisions in connection with the implementation of the intervention.* |
| Target group 1 *[e.g., partner]* |  |  |  |  |
| Target group 2 *[e.g., youth entrepreneurs]* |  |  |  |  |
| Target group 3 *[e.g., farmers]* |  |  |  |  |

**4.3 Describe/explain your choice.** How have target groups been included in the implementation of the programme? Have you used any specific methods or approaches? Or why have target groups not been included?

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Partnership and organisational development** |

**5.1 Partnership and organisational setup:** describe the coordination and cooperation between the partners. How did the setup work in relation to creating synergies between programme partners? How did the setup add value to the individual partners and the partnership in general? What are the key lessons learned?

**5.2 Decisions in the partnership:** How would you assess that decisions have been made in relation to the implementation of the programme? Please fill in the table below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Decisions** | **Choose the description that best suits your partnership** | **Describe/explain your choice**  *Explain more about your relations in the partnership. How have you discussed the implementation of the programme throughout implementation, and how have you made decisions?* |
| Decisions have primarily been made by the Danish organisation and local partner(s) have been informed about the decision |  |  |
| The local partner(s) have been consulted before a decision has been made by the Danish organisation |  |  |
| Decisions have been made jointly in the partnership |  |  |
| Decisions have primarily been made by the local partner(s) |  |  |
| Decisions have been fully made by the local partner(s) |  |  |
| Other |  |  |

**5.3 Capacity building of partners:** Have the partners (incl. the Danish organisation) gained new knowledge and capacities? In what ways? And what significance have this had on the programme and the future of the partners?

**5.4 Strengthened role of partners:** describe how you have worked with local leadership and the strengthening of your partners throughout the programme (i.e., equal partnership, financial resources and support, capacity strengthening, participation, and strengthening influence in coordination mechanisms and policy fora). Please provide examples of how local leadership has been strengthened. If not, please describe why this has not happened.

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Monitoring, evaluation, and learning** |

**6.1 Programme monitoring:** How did you work with monitoring the programme? What was your approach and what methods did you use to collect data, experiences, learning, and results? What are the key lessons learned?

**6.2 Feedback from target groups**: How have you received feedback from target groups and collected experiences and results throughout the programme? Describe what methods and tools you have used. What strengths and weaknesses have these methods and approaches had?

**6.3 Status on compliance (complaint mechanism):**

Please note, in the table below, how many complaints you have received throughout the implementation of the programme. If you have not received any, please reflect on why.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No. of complaints received: |  |
| No. of complaints responded to: |  |
| No of complaints still pending: |  |

How did you deal with the complaints received?

|  |
| --- |
| **7. Intervention related information work in Denmark** |

**7.1 Results of information work:** Describe the purpose with – and results of the programme’s information work in Denmark. Remember to include what target groups have been reached and how.

|  |
| --- |
| **8. Budget and financial management** |

**8.1 Financial monitoring:** describe how the Danish organisation has monitored the programme’s finances. Which programme partners have received a financial check? Were there any recommendations or requirements for the partners? And how have you followed up?

|  |
| --- |
| **9. Follow up on external inputs** |

**9.1 Good advice and requirements that were still in process at the time of the management response:** How have you used and followed up on the good advice given in the Assessment Committee's letter of approval and/or the requirements from the external consultant/Grant Assessment Committee? If you have chosen not to follow the advice/requirements given, please explain the reasons why.

**9.2 Follow up on CISU monitoring visit:** If the programme partner(s) (incl. the Danish organisation) have had a monitoring visit from CISU, describe actions taken based on the issues raised in the monitoring visit report.

|  |
| --- |
| **Additional comments** |