3ie GRANTEE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Terminology and overview

*Technical Pre-requisites:* the comments for response document is a statement of issues raised by internal and external reviewers regarding the design and implementation of the evaluation. A satisfactory written response to these issues is always a condition for first tranche release. Comments for response documents may be issued during implementation at the discretion of 3ie.

*Budget comments for response:* an assessment of the line items of the proposed budget.

*Policy Influence Plan (PIP):* a detailed plan for engaging in two-way communication and, where appropriate, collaboration with key stakeholders throughout the evaluation in order to ensure maximum policy impact. The PIP must be written and submitted before the first tranche payment as a separate document according to the template provided below.

*Deliverables and disbursements schedule:* The deliverables and disbursements schedule is an element of the grant agreement and sets out the reporting and technical deliverables requirements of the grant along with the tranche payment shares and schedule. The template for the deliverables and disbursements schedule is provided below. Once the grant agreement is signed, the deliverables and disbursements schedule can only be changed with the prior agreement of 3ie through a letter of variation.

*Tranche payments:* tranche payments are shares of the total grant amount paid against deliverables.

*Progress report:* the progress report is the standard administrative reporting document that is required for each tranche payment as well as at intervals of not more than 12 months (outline provided below). That is, the grantee must submit a progress report independent of technical deliverables in cases where a) the scheduled time between tranche payments is greater than 12 months and b) the technical deliverables for a tranche payment are delayed such that 12 months have passed since the last progress report was submitted.

*Reporting period:* the reporting period is the period since the last report, or since the start of the project for the first progress report.

*Letter of Support:* a letter signed by a key stakeholder that: indicates ongoing knowledge of evaluation activities; describes collaboration and dialogue that occurred during the reporting period; and states continued support of the evaluation. The key stakeholder must be one that is identified in the approved PIP. Note that for the final tranche payment, the grantee must submit a letter from each of the key stakeholders, and those letters should specifically state how the
stakeholder has used or plans to use the findings and recommendations from the study.

**Final report:** the final project report is a comprehensive paper describing all elements of the evaluation. A detailed description of the final report is provided below.

**Policy Influence Plan**

The plan identifies at least three key stakeholders who have the potential to influence policy on the basis of the evaluation. The plan outlines the nature of the planned interaction between the principal investigators and other project staff and these key stakeholders. The policy influence plan must be submitted for first tranche payment. Please see template provided in Annex 1.

**Deliverables and disbursements schedule template**

| Date reports and Tranche payment share of | Reports and deliverables to be submitted to, and approved by, GDN-3ie prior to disbursements by GDN |
| dd/mm/year | 30-50%² | (i) Original signed agreement and 3ie grant letter agreement to GDN; (ii) Satisfactory written responses to conditions document (iii) Satisfactory written responses to VFM report (iv) Policy Influence Plan (in 3ie template) |
| dd/mm/year | 10-20% | (i) Supporting letter from at least one key stakeholder (ii) Baseline study or other mid-evaluation technical deliverable, including survey questionnaire (if applicable) |
| dd/mm/year | 0% | (i) Progress report (in cases where there are more than 12 months between tranche payments) (in 3ie format) (ii) Supporting letter from at least one key stakeholder |
| dd/mm/year | 10-20% | (i) Progress report (in 3ie format) (ii) Supporting letter from at least one key stakeholder; (iii) Preliminary results, mixed methods analysis, or other mid-evaluation technical deliverable, including survey questionnaire (if applicable) |
| dd/mm/year | 20% | (i) Progress report (in 3ie format) (ii) Draft final report (in 3ie format) |

¹ The actual number of tranches will depend on the evaluation design.
² Initial tranche payment will be based on surveying requirements.
Progress report

The title page of the progress report should list: the study code, the study title, the name of the principal investigator(s), the name of the person who prepared the report, the date of the report, and the reporting period covered. The body of the progress report should conform to the following format:

I. Activities report
   a. Activities during the reporting period
   b. Progress against project objectives and/or work plan
   c. Problems encountered and solutions implemented or planned
   d. Communications activities (including submission of any communications tools, e.g. website, stories, blogs, pictures, press clippings, policy briefs…) produced during the reporting period
   e. Planned activities for the next reporting period
   f. Anticipated problems or risks and proposed solutions

II. PIP report (see template in Annex 2)
   a. Activities and interactions related to the PIP during the reporting period
   b. Progress against PIP objectives; reporting specifically against intermediate and final outcome indicators determined in the PIP
   c. Feedback received from key stakeholders and incorporation of feedback
   d. Challenges in policy-stakeholder engagement
   e. Planned interactions for the next reporting period

III. Financial report (see template in Annex 3)
   a. Reconciliation of actual expenditures against budgeted expenditures
   b. Planned expenditures for next reporting period
   c. Cost notes, including explanations for more than +/- 10% deviations from grant agreement budget
IV. Grantee feedback (this section is only required for the final progress report)
   a. Comments on quality assurance services provided by 3ie staff
   b. Comments on quality assurance services provided by the External Project Advisor
   c. Recommendations for improvement

Any departures from the activities or evaluation design laid out in the application should be explicitly noted and explained.

Any major departures from the evaluation design or activities proposed in the original application, such as a change in the nature of the intervention, change in study location, change in any of the principal investigators, or adding or dropping planned data collection must be requested in a separate document and must be approved by 3ie before changes take effect. 3ie has approved the grant on the basis of the submitted application. There is no guarantee that the grant will be continued should there be major departures from the initial study design.

Final report

The final report is a comprehensive report on the evaluation which will be published on the 3ie website. The main report should be succinct with a strong narrative constructed around the causal chain (underlying program theory). The early sections of the main report will cover the intervention, its context, and the program theory. The next sections will describe process aspects of implementation, documenting outputs and outcomes that can be attributed to the project. The analysis should present and explain both average treatment effects and heterogeneity in those impacts. The report should end with clear and actionable recommendations based on the evidence presented in the report. As a checklist, the report should include information on the following aspects, much of which will be contained in Annexes:

(i) Intervention, evaluation questions, and policy relevance
(ii) Literature review
(iii) Theory of change
(iv) Evaluation design
(v) Sampling design and power calculations
(vi) Data collection
(vii) Baseline findings/Descriptive statistics
(viii) Mixed-method analysis (quantitative and qualitative)
(ix) Policy implications and recommendation
POLICY INFLUENCE PLAN

The policy influence plan (PIP) outlines the context for, and approach to, policy influence to be adopted for the study. It must identify a policy focal point within the grantee team and should be submitted and approved for first tranche payment to be released.

We recommend that the team engages with stakeholders throughout the evaluation. The plan requires to identify at least three key stakeholders who have the potential to influence policy or programme design on the basis of the evaluation findings. For each reporting cycle, grantees are requested to report on their policy influence activities (as per the guidelines in Annex 2), which includes evidence of stakeholder engagement, such as minutes of meetings, a letter of endorsement, partnership agreement, email from stakeholders, participants' list and other related documentation.

Like any work plan, this is a living document and an active strategy. Policy context is dynamic and opportunities for engagement emerge all the time, therefore, the strategy will need to be fine-tuned or revised throughout the implementation of the evaluation. We recognize that some of the details requested here may not be known at the study design stage.

Examples and detailed guidelines are available in 3ie’s online PIP tutorial: http://policyimpacttoolkit.squarespace.com/introduction/
**CONTEXT**

What are the knowledge or evidence gaps that the study is hoping to address? Is there a culture of the use of evidence (e.g. studies cited in media or parliament), and some formal system for doing so? Is there demand from policymakers for the kind of evidence the evaluation will provide?

**GUIDELINES**

What is the current use of evidence in policy making in the country in general, and in the sector of your study, and the concerned implementing agency, in particular. This section should consider political economy and other social or cultural factors which may affect the chance to influence policy. It could also include a knowledge gap map.

**Possible resources include:**
RISKS

What are the expected risks associated with the dissemination and policy influence of your evaluation? (e.g. Massaging/screening of findings and recommendations to suit political purposes, high political turnover, limited freedom of press, upcoming election or change of administration, existing opposition from other actors working or influencing the sector, or limited capacity to influence policy etc.). The team should provide a mitigation strategy to address the risks.

GUIDELINES

Describe, assess the level of risks and identify mitigation strategies.
POLICY OBJECTIVES

What are your policy influence objectives? What changes to policy or programmes do you hope to achieve? Your objective could be to enact/eliminate/change a specific legislation, but could also be about changing people’s behaviour, reframing the policy debate, influencing strategy and resource allocations within organisations or building an alliance/network around a specific policy recommendation.

GUIDELINES

Your objective should be SMART: Specific – do the objectives specify what is to be achieved? Measurable – can data be collected that will test whether the objective has been met? Achievable – is it realistic to test this objective? Can the necessary data be collected within the time and budget constraints? Relevant – are the objectives relevant to the project? Time-bound – have you set objectives that can be measured within the timeframe of the project?

Possible resources/tools listed Vanessa Weyrauch and Gala Diaz Langou “Sound expectation: from impact evaluations to policy change”, 3ie working paper 12.
GUIDELINES

There are many tools available to help choose who the best audiences might be. The most obvious audiences might not be the most strategic. Try to highlight around six key primary audiences where attention can be focused.

Think about who may influence policy, considering professional associations and trade unions, other CSOs, opposition parties, religious groups and the media, in addition to 'official' policy makers in the areas of interest.

Avoid broad categories such as the "general public" or "Policy makers" and try to highlight around six key primary audiences where more attention can be focused, even if you have a longer list. Whenever possible identify individuals or key influencers.

Possible resources/tools listed


CIPPEC toolkit -Who should we work with? Define actors and alliances http://www.vippal.cippec.org/media/publicaciones/biblioteca/guia05_ingles_cippec_planificaciondelincidencia.pdf

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Identify key individuals and groups that will be essential to your policy influence as well as groups that may hinder your policy influencing efforts (detractors). Provide analysis of how and why these 'actors' will be beneficial and how you plan on engaging with them.
KEY INFLUENCERS

Identify at least three stakeholders with the potential to influence policy in the area addressed by your evaluation and justify your selection. Policy influencers include various groups that influence policy, such as policymakers, media, civil society organizations, professional associations and trade unions, religious groups and so on. Not all contacts should be at the project level. You may add additional contacts if you wish in separate sheets. As part of every progress report, you will be requested to report on the feedback provided by one of the key influencers listed below or stakeholders listed above on the study design, findings, and any follow-up actions prompted by the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name:</th>
<th>Name of organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Website:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts: (email/tel. number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of organization:** (Government agency (central/regional/local); Civil Society Organisations; International organization; Research organization/Think tanks; Development agencies; Media and others)

**Relevance/Level of influence:** Why is his/her participation important? What role do they play in the policy making process? How much influence/leverage are they expected to have? What is their perceived interest in the evaluation process? Are they part of a particular network (e.g. policy network, policy committees/advisory boards, research community, etc.)?

Have your organization had previous experiences with this stakeholder. If so, please describe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Name:</th>
<th>Name of organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts: (email/tel. number)</td>
<td>Website:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of organization: (Government agency (central/regional/local); Civil Society Organisations; International organization; Research organization/Think tanks; Development agencies; Media and others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance/Level of influence: Why is his/her participation important? What role do they play in the policy making process? How much influence/leverage are they expected to have? What is their perceived interest in the evaluation process? Are they part of a particular network (e.g. policy network, policy committees/advisory boards, research community, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your organization had previous experiences with this stakeholder. If so, please describe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Name:</th>
<th>Name of organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts: (email/tel. number)</td>
<td>Website:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of organization:** (Government agency (central/regional/local); Civil Society Organisations; International organization; Research organization/Think tanks; Development agencies; Media and others)

**Relevance/Level of influence:** Why is his/her participation important? What role do they play in the policy making process? How much influence/leverage are they expected to have? What is their perceived interest in the evaluation process? Are they part of a particular network (e.g. policy network, policy committees/advisory boards, research community, etc.)?

Have your organization had previous experiences with this stakeholder. If so, please describe.
THEORY OF CHANGE

Map out the pathway of change to influence policy in your project. Draw a flow chart which illustrates the path from your results to reach the policy objective and how your research will be used to influence policy or programme design and practice. This process will help test your policy engagement strategy by unpacking the assumptions and articulating the intermediate outcomes that should lead to your policy objective or impact.

GUIDELINES

Recommended steps to develop your theory of change:

Step 1: Describe the policy question(s) that your evaluation is trying to address

Step 2: Identify the needs of the policy influencers you are targeting, and the leverage and entry points you have with them

Step 3: Identify your desired results or vision of success in the near and longer term (outputs, intermediate outcomes, policy impact/objective)

Step 4: Specify the factors (e.g. protective or risk factors, existing policy environment) you believe will influence change.

Step 5: List the engagement strategies you believe will lead to change

Step 6: Articulate assumptions about how these changes might happen. This will allow you to check whether the activities and outputs are appropriate for influencing change in the desired direction in this particular context.

See examples of theories of change compiled by DfID:
http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/pdf/outputs/mis_sp/Appendix_3_ToC_Examples.pdf

Additional resources: Review of the use of theory of change:

Theory of change community of practice:
http://www.theoryofchange.org/
**STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN**

Please provide a detailed plan for engaging relevant stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. The Plan should clearly identify the roles of each stakeholder in policymaking or influencing, action plan for specific activities, as well as expected results and long-term outcomes. You will be requested to report progress on those activities and provide supporting documents including list of participants, key takeaways or follow-up plans from meetings, presentations, blogs, articles, policy briefs, memos and other related knowledge products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline/Key milestones</th>
<th>Objectives and dimension of the engagement</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Channels and Frequency</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Monitoring/ Learning and influencing Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Specify estimated dates or approximate timelines within each evaluation stages. * | *Highlight the kind of engagements and policy influence objectives (Awareness raising/Knowledge sharing/Policy influencing)* | *Identify key stakeholders based on the policy objectives set out in the plan and aligned to the stakeholder analysis in the previous section* | *Specify the channels used for each stakeholder or group of stakeholders such as:*  
  - Meeting  
  - Design workshop  
  - Training workshop  
  - Dissemination workshop  
  - Partnership with key intermediaries/allies  
  - Participation / contribution to discussion (online forums/working groups)  
  - Media interviews/briefings/opinion pieces/social media/blogging  
  - Focus group/town hall meeting  
  - Presentation at national and international conferences  
  - Providing study outputs such as briefing notes and videos  
  And frequency? (monthly/quarterly/annually…) | *Name the person or people in the team responsible to carry out this engagement* | *Identify and quantify output level key indicators from the ones listed below which the project will track and report to 3ie, such as:*  
  - # meetings/workshops/presentations done to share study design/progress/findings  
  - # participants in those events  
  - # of policymakers present (estimate)  
  - # of knowledge products (blogs/policy brief or memo/working papers..)  
  - # of media clippings, interviews and opeds |

This is important as 3ie would be interested in potentially documenting, promoting and participating in those events and activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tranche 2</th>
<th>Identify sectoral events where study design could be presented and where the team could get feedback from stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tranche 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranche 4</td>
<td>Identify sectoral/policy events where findings could be presented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Final tranche (Adoption of recommendations) | - # of stakeholders and policymakers present at the launch/dissemination workshop  
- Feedback from policymakers on the study findings  
- # of actionable policy recommendations  
- # articles and policy brief downloads.  
- # policymakers invitations to present the findings  
- # citation in government/donor agency strategy documents  
- Documented cases of policy changes consistent with recommendations  
- Interest from the implementing partner to further conduct an impact evaluation |
EVALUATION AND LEARNING

Do you have a systematic approach to monitor whether your policy influence strategy is on track and you are progressing towards your policy objectives? What would be your key indicators to measure the success of your policy influence activities? What tools will you use to systematically collect this information?

GUIDELINES

Note 3ie requires that you submit information on the number of people reached by different dissemination activities, and documentation of adoption of study recommendations. This information is part of 3ie’s own reporting to its donors, and so helps ensure future funding for studies.

You can use your Theory of Change to help frame your indicators by looking at the interventions and activities that will help bring about the change you are proposing. So, if you say media engagement will play an important role as part of your overall strategy you should have indicators set that monitor your level of media engagement and coverage (i.e. media clippings/citations). Look at the interventions/activities across your Theory of Change and see if you can assign SMART indicators to them.

The team should identify:

Level 1. Research dissemination (e.g. publishing, media coverage, web downloads, knowledge sharing/dissemination events, # of people reached/consulted, # of high level policy makers engaged etc)

Level 2. Research communication or evidence that people are not just downloading the study but that the study is catalysing a debate (e.g citation indices, people reporting they have been influenced by the study, feedback ratings etc.)

Level 3. Research uptake or evidence of practical use (e.g. adopted legislation, behavioural changes in practices on the ground etc).

Level 4 - Research impact or practical evidence of use of research, change in behaviour of policy. This will be difficult to attribute and track in the lifetime of the project.

Possible resources listed below

ODI Background note “A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence”

Presentation by John Young on “Monitoring and evaluation of influence”

www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/2426.pdf
BUDGET

How much time, financial and human resources are expected to be allocated for the implementation of the engagement plan? How much will be allocated for the policy influencing and engagement activities as a percentage of the overall budget, and if available, for each major communication and engagement output (i.e. Dissemination/Engagement workshops, Media engagement, external communications consultants/expertise)?

GUIDELINES

3ie is increasing its focus on policy influencing and is recommending applicants to budget for at least 10% to 20% of their overall budget on policy engagement and research communications. This is a practice also endorsed by DfID and other donors.

The requested budget information is meant to be a programme budget (i.e. specific allocations) from within the existing grant budget, not an additional budget. No additional funds will be awarded unless the team submits a formal request for variation. As with any request for variation, the request would be subject to careful review and may or may not be granted based on the justification and the availability of funds.

The main budget items to consider are: staff time; travel costs for presentations/dissemination events; media outreach, publication, translation and dissemination costs. We encourage you to think medium to long-term for your engagement plan.
Annex 2
POLICY INFLUENCE REPORT
The progress report of the PIP should include the following supporting documents for the activities carried out during the reporting period: Copy of the presentations made; feedback received and key takeaways from the event; list of participants; meeting minutes, website links describing the project and related blogs, pdfs on media coverage/opeds, web statistics, and copy of policy documents and related knowledge products (policy notes, briefs, memos, articles). The team will be required to have a policy focal point to liaise with the 3ie policy team, and address questions and issues raised during the reviews of the progress reports. You can also provide reflections (relating to policy) by team members on any conferences or workshops that they attended.

1. Activities and interactions related to the policy influence plan during the reporting period and upcoming activities: List the # of stakeholder engagement meetings and activities. Highlight some of the main outcomes or discussion points emerging from the meetings and activities listed, and include participants list (with name of organizations and position) for major dissemination workshops or event in annex. Please specify any upcoming activities and events planned and highlight any changes, if any, that you have made to planned interactions since submitting your policy influence plan.

GUIDELINES
Focus on activities that are policy relevant and not at operational level (e.g. survey being conducted; completion of baseline..). Explain why it was relevant and spell out the policy implications/take aways or action point/follow-up planned. Provide list of participants in annex.

List upcoming events planned.
2. **Output and intermediate indicators**: Include specific indicators selected in your PIP for level 1 and 2 monitoring including: # of knowledge sharing/dissemination events, # of people reached, # of high level policy makers engaged, feedback from stakeholders, # of media clippings, # of citations, web metrics data,….

3. **Outcome and Impact measurement tools and indicators**: Indicate the measurement tools and indicators identified to report on policy influencing. This section is to provide an update on the measurement tools that the team would have finally selected and report on any refinements or change of uptake and impact level indicators as the project progresses.

**GUIDELINES**
Use the PIP indicators as reference and build on to it to reflect the changing context. Most common indicators will include: # of events at which material related to study presented; # of participants in those events; # of participants who are policy makers (estimate); # media clippings; # Knowledge products (e.g. policy notes, briefs, memo, articles, working papers…). Please provide copies in annex.

**GUIDELINES**
How should success look like? # actionable-evidence based policy recommendations; policy change consistent with study recommendations. Is the implementing agency planning to commission further rigorous impact evaluations of its programmes?
4. **Case studies/Stories/Testimonials from the field:** The stories will be used by the 3ie communication team to write some projects in focus features which will be posted on the 3ie website and in the newsletter.

5. **Feedback and quotes from key policy influencers or stakeholders:** We request the teams to document the feedback received from one (anyone) of the key influencers or stakeholders identified in your PIPs for each tranche payment. This can be in the form of letter of endorsement or support from stakeholders, partnership agreement, email from stakeholders, minutes of meetings/working group meetings where the study would have been presented (to be included in Annex), or other documentation.
6. **Political context and challenges in stakeholder engagement:** Describe any changes in the policy context and identify the challenges faced with stakeholder engagement and dissemination, and draw lessons learned and mitigations strategies from those which will help you plan the next activities. This could include changes relating to the socio-political context such as change of administration, upcoming elections, policy influencers moved to another department not relevant to the project, changes in policies, laws or regulations or specific changes relating to the implementing agency (policies or operations).
Annex 3

Financial Report

Name of Organization:

Duration of Project:

Study Code:

Reporting Period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Actual Exp. for the reporting period (US$)</th>
<th>Actual Expense of previous reporting period(s) (US$)</th>
<th>Projections (US$)</th>
<th>Balance (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the staff &amp; Designation to be mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|             |              |                                            |                                                     |                  |              |
|             |              |                                            |                                                     |                  |              |

C/o Global Development Network - 2nd Floor, West Wing, ISID Complex, Vasant Kunj Institutional Area, New Delhi - 110 070 INDIA
T +91 11 4323 9494 / 2613 6885 F +91 11 2613 6893
www.gdnet.org / www.3ieimpact.org
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey costs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List down the activities as per the budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Survey Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In case any equipment is purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other direct costs</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Other Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indirect costs summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Total Indirect Cost</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cost notes** *(including explanations for more than +/- 10% deviations from grant agreement budget):*

**Cash Received Till Date**

**Actual Expenses Till Date**

**Cash in Hand**