Programme Results Report

Each programme report is based on the theory of change and/or results-based thinking of the organisation, incl. results- and human rights-based principles and crosscutting objectives. The results report must include all outcome result areas, incl. development communications and global development education, if they are included in the programme.

The report should start with a 1-2 page summary, and the length of the report (incl. summary) should be max. 50 pages.

The instructions and supporting questions are advisory and may be used as reference.

| Progress and results/outcomes | • Analyse the achieved targets per outcome result area. Include an assessment of output contribution to achieving outcomes, and of outcome contribution to achieving impact. The analysis should follow the premise of the result chain and/or theory of change outlined in the results framework.
• Analyse the changes in the local context/environment, specifically changes in the civic space, which affect the achievement of programme impact/results. | • What progress was achieved in each outcome result area a) against annual target levels, b) against programme period target levels, c) against the programme's theory of change? Were there any unexpected results? Any contextual/institutional/programmatic changes that particularly contributed to the success (e.g. new legislation, funding, changes in the political scene)?
• How did the results achieved at the output level contribute to the achievement of results at the outcome level? Did the result chain assumptions hold? If not, analyse why not and indicate changes made in outputs. (Note: Output level results to be reported in the result matrix/framework)
• What evidence of progress and results do the programme indicators suggest? Analyse the reasons for the reported indicator values and explain possible changes made to the indicators.
• How are the outcome results feeding into the targeted impact? What signs of impact are evident? Describe how.
• What were the major changes in the operational context that directly affected the programme efficiency?
• Were there any changes in the civic space that affected the programme efficiency? |
| | • Ownership, accountability and transparency. | • Short analysis of the local ownership of the results per outcome area. Any best practices/tools in enhancing the participation of different target groups at the country level?
• How was the accountability and transparency in operational areas ensured? |

	• An analysis of successes, relevant challenges, and lessons learned in terms of achieving targets.	• Analysis of major successes and challenges • Did any of the above result areas benefit or produce innovation? • Major lessons learned
	• External evaluations/assessments and a statement of findings and conclusions	• How are the recommendations from programme level evaluations implemented? • Use of possible other review methods and their contribution to learning
	• Describe the risk materialisation and their impact on the programme	• Did any of the identified risks materialise? Were there other risks or external factors that could not be foreseen? • Analyse the low achieving result area/s (contextual, institutional, programmatic or other reasons) and the learning process, and describe how the challenges have been addressed?
	• An analysis of the variation of the achieved results within the programme	• Are the any differences between outcome areas of the programme when it comes to the level of achieving results? • Are the any differences in the level of achieved results with regard to the different contexts of the programme (LDC-UMIC, fragility, oppressive/conducive etc.)? • Are there any other factors influencing the level of achieved results?
	• Contribution of programme results to achieving the SDGs/Agenda 2030	• What is the programme results' contribution to achieving the SDGs? • How has the programme contributed to the goals of national plans or strategies on sustainable development in the countries of operation? Highlight key elements or significant changes to the programme implementation in this regard.
	• Linkages to Finnish political agenda and other development cooperation	• How does the programme contribute to or take into account Finland's broader political agenda (e.g. human rights, peacebuilding, trade initiatives etc.)? • What is the programme's relation to other Finnish development cooperation, esp. country programmes of long-term partner countries?