

**Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)**

**Girl Hub: a DFID and Nike Foundation initiative**

**Inception report**

Contents

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Background.....	2
3. Purpose .....	3
4. Relationships to other initiatives and evaluations .....	3
5. Methodology .....	5
6. Roles and responsibilities.....	14
7. Management and reporting .....	15
8. Expected outputs and time frame .....	15
9. Risks and mitigation .....	16
10. How will this review make a difference?.....	16

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) is the independent body responsible for scrutinising UK aid. We focus on maximising the effectiveness of the UK aid budget for intended beneficiaries and on delivering value for money for UK taxpayers. We carry out independent reviews of aid programmes and of issues affecting the delivery of UK aid. We publish transparent, impartial and objective reports to provide evidence and clear recommendations to support UK Government decision-making and to strengthen the accountability of the aid programme. Our reports are written to be accessible to a general readership and we use a simple 'traffic light' system to report our judgement on each programme or topic we review.
- 1.2. We will assess Girl Hub, a partnership between the Department for International Development (DFID) and Nike Foundation, examining how the partnership was conceived, appraised and is delivering positive impacts for adolescent girls in developing countries. This Inception Report builds on the Terms of Reference to outline the purpose of the investigation and identifies the detailed areas of assessment.

## 2. Background

- 2.1. Nike Foundation is a charitable arm of Nike Inc. which was re-launched in 2004 with a focus on adolescent girls in the developing world. Nike Foundation launched the Girl Effect campaign and film in May 2008. It is already involved in working with girls, with a presence in South America, Africa and Asia. Examples of programmes to which Nike Foundation gives financial and other support are:<sup>1</sup>
  - **Protection:** protecting vulnerable women through, for example, the Safe Spaces that have been created in Kibera, Kenya for girls living in an urban slum;
  - **Education:** ensuring that women can access education in difficult circumstances, for example, if a family member is sick or injured. In Uganda, British charity Opportunity International has created micro-insurance products focussed on providing payouts for healthcare and education for those that need them;
  - **Microfinance for older girls:** after creating a Safe Space programme for girls in rural Bangladesh, Bangladeshi development organisation BRAC introduced micro-loans for its older girl participants. The aim of these loans was to allow girls to start small businesses – for example, growing tomatoes, selling fabric or raising chickens – while still attending school; and
  - **Helping rural girls to access education:** CAMFED, which specialises in the education of girls in rural Sub-Saharan Africa, in this case helps rural girls in Zambia to access education.
- 2.2. The focus of this ICAI investigation is Girl Hub, a partnership between DFID and Nike Foundation. It is DFID's first arrangement of this kind with a private, non-profit foundation, set up in February 2010. It aims 'to drive the Girl Effect at a scale', where the Girl Effect is defined as 'the unique potential of 600 million adolescent girls to end poverty for themselves and the world'.<sup>2</sup> This partnership is in line with the objectives of the Girl Effect campaign that Nike Foundation has been involved in developing, which is highlighting the benefits of investing in girls to improve living standards. The aim of the partnership is to harness Nike Foundation's focus on girls and communications expertise with DFID's reach, scale and knowledge.
- 2.3. DFID has committed £12.9 million of funding to Girl Hub up to the end of the 2013-14 financial year.<sup>3</sup> Nike Foundation is providing £870,000 of direct funding, with a further £1.5 million of in-kind funding. Girl Hub established its first national centre in Rwanda in August 2010 followed by a Girl Hub in Nigeria in October 2010. DFID Ethiopia is also planning to contribute £14 million from 2011-12 to 2014-15 to establish and fund operations of Girl Hub Ethiopia. Girl Hub currently has a team of 16 staff – nine in London and seven in-country. Its central office is located within the DFID Palace Street office in London.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.nikefoundation.org/what\\_we\\_do.html](http://www.nikefoundation.org/what_we_do.html).

<sup>2</sup> <http://girlhub.org/about-us/>.

<sup>3</sup> <http://projects.dfid.gov.uk/project.aspx?Project=201086> (accessed November 2011).

2.4. Girl Hub is not directly involved in service delivery but aims to be a catalyst and convenor with a range of partner organisations. Examples of specific Girl Hub projects are:

- **Ni Nyampinga:** a communications platform being developed in Rwanda that includes a national radio station and girls' magazine intended to elevate girls' voices and self-esteem and to rebrand teenage girls as valued citizens. It has the support of the Rwandan presidency;
- **12+:** pilot of an innovative girls' health programme co-designed with the Rwandan Ministry of Health and a team of girls. The Ministry of Health now plans to scale this programme up nationally and DFID has committed to support this;
- **Influencing the UN General Assembly on adolescent girls' health:** following communications with President Kagame and the Rwandan Government, adolescent girls' health issues were put on the agenda at the September 2010 Millennium Development Goals (MDG) summit;
- **End child marriage programme:** starting in August 2011, this initiative will scale up a programme aiming to eliminate child marriage in the Amhara region of Ethiopia, where half of girls are married by the age of 15. The programme is intended to reach 200,000 girls in three years;
- **Influencing DFID's work:** Girl Hub participated in the creation of a new gender strategy. It also reviewed 27 country bids as part of the Bilateral Aid Review and advised on the impact for girls; and
- **SenseMaker™ pilot:** SenseMaker™ is commercial software designed to help understand complex social environments in large populations. Girl Hub plans to develop SenseMaker™ as a key part of its monitoring, evaluation and learning strategy.

### 3. Purpose

3.1. To examine how effectively and efficiently the Girl Hub partnership is delivering impact and whether this venture should be used as a model for future partnerships.

### 4. Relationships to other initiatives and evaluations

#### *Studies on investing in girls*

4.1. Girl Hub has been created on the back of evidence from statistical analysis of the positive effects of empowering women and girls - specifically through education. For example, the Council on Foreign Relations produced a report<sup>4</sup> on the theme of girls' education in 2004. The overall conclusion was very straightforward: educating girls brings substantial returns. The benefits include, but are not limited to, faster economic growth, reduced likelihood of contracting HIV, fostering democracy and improving women's political participation.

4.2. There is a strong evidence base that investing in girls is beneficial not only to individuals and communities but also to overall economic growth and development. Examples of influential studies illustrating this thinking include those carried out as part of the World Bank's initiative *Giving Women Economic Opportunity*<sup>5</sup> and the Population Council's report *New Lessons: The power of educating adolescent girls*.<sup>6</sup>

4.3. A literature review carried out by DFID in 2010 in collaboration with DFID's Chief Economist's Office, Girl Hub and DFID Ethiopia looked at the economic returns of investing in adolescent girls. While commenting on the 'distinct lack of evidence on returns to investing in adolescent girls',<sup>7</sup> the report analysed a small number of studies it considered to be relevant and robust. It concluded that 'the evidence does suggest that a number of interventions in adolescent girls specifically will deliver

<sup>4</sup> Herz, Barbara and Sperling, Gene B, *What Works in Girls' Education Evidence and Policies from the Developing World*, Council on Foreign Relations, 2004,

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTGENDER/0,,contentMDK:21914520-menuPK:336910-pagePK:64020865-piPK:51164185-theSitePK:336868,00.html>

<sup>5</sup> *Giving Women Economic Opportunity: World Bank Initiatives*, The World Bank,

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTGENDER/0,,contentMDK:22857230-menuPK:8111539-pagePK:210058-piPK:210062-theSitePK:336868,00.html>

<sup>6</sup> *New Lessons: The power of education adolescent girls*, Population Council, 2009, [http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/2009PGY\\_NewLessons.pdf](http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/2009PGY_NewLessons.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Hlanze, L., *Economic returns to investment in adolescent girls: Making the case for DFID Ethiopia*, DFID, December 2010.

significant development benefits on a cost effective basis'. Notable areas were education and skills, social protection, health and physical capital.

- 4.4. The World Bank's 2011 paper *Measuring the economic gain of investing in girls*, which was supported by Nike Foundation, calculated the opportunity costs of girls' exclusion from productive employment, 'which measure the losses in terms of potential productivity gains and income young girls could have achieved if they were employed, if they had delayed pregnancy, or if they had attained higher educational levels'. The report concluded that 'marginal investments in girls can have a substantial impact on GDP growth and well-being'. It presented three policy recommendations:<sup>8</sup>
- increasing funding targeted at adolescent girls, including in the areas of education, labour market engagement and health;
  - counting girls in a country's systems (for example via birth certificates) and ensuring that programmes are monitored in terms of their success at reaching adolescent girls; and
  - improving advocacy for girls at government level, by making the law work better for girls and mobilising communities, families, men and boys to support adolescent girls.

#### *Review of Girl Hub*

- 4.5. Girl Hub is a relatively new partnership which has not previously been externally evaluated.
- 4.6. DFID carried out an internal annual review of Girl Hub in February 2011. The review describes DFID's conclusions on Girl Hub's overall successes and areas where change is necessary, for example, a more comprehensive logframe. The following analysis of Girl Hub's *initial logical theory*, taken from internal documentation dated February 2011, explains its innovation within girls' education and empowerment, although we understand that this has evolved over time as Girl Hub has developed its understanding:

'The *initial logical theory* is that change for girls and young women will be achieved by helping people who have power over resources to include girls' opinions in their decision-making, helping girls and champions of girls influence those power-holders and making sure anyone who wants up-to-the-minute knowledge can get it. Achieving these three changes will result in developing country decision-makers doing more for girls and doing it better. This will help girls have more assets (in the widest sense), being empowered and realising their rights.'

#### *Other initiatives*

- 4.7. There are many different organisations and programmes with a specific focus on girls, for example the United Nations Girls Education Initiative (UNGEI), the World Bank's Adolescent Girls Initiative and ONE's Africa's Future is Female campaign. DFID has demonstrated through the majority of its operational plans across all countries that it is giving a focus to girls, specifically in health and education. For example, DFID's Girls' Education Challenge (GEC) is a programme focussed on girls' primary and secondary education, with a projected budget of £355 million until 2015.
- 4.8. The work by UNGEI was launched after the World Education Forum in Dakar in April 2000. UNGEI is committed to narrowing the gap between boys and girls through primary and secondary education and is committed to the 2015 Millennium Development Goal of free universal education for all.<sup>9</sup> Other major development initiatives to promote gender include:

##### 4.8.1 The Adolescent Girls Initiative (AGI)

AGI is a current programme under the World Bank. It 'promotes the transition of adolescent girls from school to productive employment through interventions that are tested and then scaled-up or replicated if successful'.<sup>10</sup> The initiative is currently being implemented in the following seven

<sup>8</sup> J Chaaban and W Cunningham, *Measuring the Economic Gain of Investing in Girls*, World Bank policy research working paper 5753, August 2011, [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servertime/main?menuPK=64187510&pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&entityID=000158349\\_20110808092702](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servertime/main?menuPK=64187510&pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&entityID=000158349_20110808092702).

<sup>9</sup> United Nations Girls Education Initiative (UNGEI), <http://www.ungei.org/whatisungei/index.html>.

<sup>10</sup> *AGI at a glance – where we are*, The Adolescent Girls Initiative, World Bank, 2010, <http://go.worldbank.org/ET4S6TEXY0>.

countries: Afghanistan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Jordan, Liberia, Nepal, Rwanda and South Sudan.

AGI was launched in October 2008 as part of the World Bank Group's Gender Action Plan – *Gender Equality as Smart Economics* – to help to increase women's economic opportunities by improving their access to the labour market, agricultural land and technology, credit and infrastructure services.<sup>11</sup> AGI partners with Nike Foundation.

#### 4.8.2 DFID initiatives with bodies linked to the private sector

In January 2011, DFID set up a new Private Sector Department (PSD) with the aim to 'recast DFID as a government department that understands the private sector and brings the wealth, knowledge and creativity of the world of business to support the UK's development efforts.'<sup>12</sup> DFID aims to 'prompt and encourage new ways of working with the private sector across DFID – and help develop instruments and information that lend force and direction to these endeavours.....PSD aims to prompt and support a DFID-wide culture change whereby DFID becomes more effective at achieving its objectives by virtue of greater openness and capability to engage with private enterprise....' One of DFID's key aims is to 'promote the economic empowerment of women and girls through jobs and access to financial services.' It has also undertaken to 'only engage with business with a view to achieve identified outcomes...[to] stop open-ended general engagements [and to] reduce our time spent managing central programmes that are not closely linked up with DFID country offices.'<sup>13</sup>

## **5. Methodology**

- 5.1. Since Girl Hub is a relatively new organisation, this review will be an interim investigation into the delivery of its programme, with a focus on impact and results to date. The study will examine the relationship between DFID and Girl Hub in depth. We will explore how the origins and purpose of this partnership fit with the new DFID private sector strategy and the ways of working of the new PSD, which was set up shortly after Girl Hub was established. We will assess how far it could be a model for future partnerships with the private sector and if these results could not have been achieved without it.
- 5.2. The review will focus on:
  - the establishment of Girl Hub including the alternative options considered and the structure of the partnership and Nike Foundation as the preferred approach and partner respectively;
  - the governance and financial management structures;
  - how Girl Hub designs its programme to ensure value for money and effectiveness; and
  - Girl Hub's monitoring and evaluation framework.
- 5.3. The review will include both UK-based work and a visit to Girl Hub in Rwanda. The review will draw conclusions and derive lessons specifically for Girl Hub but with a view to these being applicable to other similar innovative aid programmes and partnerships.

### *Evaluation Framework*

- 5.4. The evaluation framework for this review is set out in the table below. This has as its basis the standard ICAI guiding criteria and evaluation framework, which are focussed on four areas: objectives, delivery, impact and learning. It also incorporates other pertinent questions we want to investigate in this review. The questions which are highlighted in bold are those on which we will focus in particular. In this review, we will focus particularly on the governance and learning aspects of the ICAI framework.

<sup>11</sup> *The Adolescent Girls Initiative*, the World Bank, <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTGENDER/0..contentMDK:21914520-menuPK:336910-pagePK:64020865-piPK:51164185-theSitePK:336868,00.html>.

<sup>12</sup> Press Release by Andrew Mitchell, Secretary of State for International Development, DFID, October 2011 [www.dfid.gov.uk/news/latest-news/2010/mitchell-private-sector-holds-the-key-to-tackling-global-poverty/](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/news/latest-news/2010/mitchell-private-sector-holds-the-key-to-tackling-global-poverty/).

<sup>13</sup> *Private Sector Department Operational Plan 2011-15*, DFID, May 2011, [www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/op/priv-sect-dept-2011.pdf](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/op/priv-sect-dept-2011.pdf).

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<b>Objectives: what is the programme trying to achieve?</b>			
<p>Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (1.1)</p> <p>Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)</p>	<p><b>What was the process and strategy for the set up of Girl Hub? (ToR 6.1.1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Were other options / organisations considered? On what basis was the legal entity established and share of funding determined?</i></li> <li>• <i>How were the risks and opportunities for the partnership assessed?</i></li> </ul> <p><b>What is the theory of change for Girl Hub and what is the evidence for this? (ToR 6.1.2)</b></p> <p><b>How rigorous were the initial objectives? (ToR 6.1.3)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that risk assessment processes are required prior to entering into the partnership</li> <li>• Evidence that there is a clear rationale in relation to the need/demand for Girl Hub</li> <li>• Evidence of robust appraisal and consultation with other potential partners and options for delivery considered – clear identification of costs and benefits of this structure and particularly working with Nike Foundation documented</li> <li>• Evidence of compliance with DFID procurement processes</li> <li>• Evidence that the preferred option would best deliver the objectives</li> <li>• Understanding of other bodies and how they operate in promoting welfare of girls and the models of delivery they operate</li> <li>• Evidence of robust SMART objectives set. Milestones set at regular intervals to demonstrate achievement</li> <li>• Existence of a logframe or other monitoring and evaluation tool</li> <li>• Evidence of baselines established for the start of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of DFID strategy</li> <li>• Review of DFID files to confirm processes undertaken and contracts signed</li> <li>• Interviews with Girl Hub staff</li> <li>• Interviews with key DFID staff including Gender and Education teams</li> <li>• Interview with Nike Foundation staff</li> <li>• Minutes of meetings where key decisions were taken</li> <li>• Interviews with other Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and multilaterals to understand delivery models and activities</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Review of logframe</li> <li>• Interview with DFID/Girl Hub staff</li> <li>• Interview with DFID annual review team</li> <li>• Interviews with NGOs</li> </ul>

<p>Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)</p> <p>Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)</p>	<p>Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)</p> <p><b>How are neutrality and independence achieved? (ToR 6.1.4)</b></p> <p>Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of engagement with government, other aid providers and stakeholders in programme design and implementation</li> <li>• Evidence of safeguards put in place to protect DFID's objectivity from Nike involvement in Girl Hub</li> <li>• Evidence of clear links in to the objectives of the Education and Gender teams and meetings held to discuss progress and opportunities</li> <li>• Evidence that Girl Hub is held to account for performance by DFID sponsors</li> <li>• Evidence that Nike Foundation maintains independence from Nike commercial operations</li> <li>• Evidence of safeguards in place to protect reputation of Girl Hub and DFID</li> <li>• Evidence that the programme objectives have been built on solid and comprehensive evidence and have taken context into account (including gender and development issues)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with government officials in Rwanda and other aid providers/stakeholders in the UK and Rwanda</li> <li>• Interview with DFID's Education and Gender teams</li> <li>• Interview with Girl Hub staff</li> <li>• Interview with Nike Foundation staff</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Risk registers</li> <li>• Supporting research</li> <li>• Interviews with specialists in DFID/Girl Hub/civil society in UK and Rwanda</li> </ul>
---	---	--	--

Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?			
<p>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)</p>	<p>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1) <b>(see also ToR 6.1.1 above)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How are interventions and countries selected? How does Girl Hub decide the need for country offices, separate from DFID's existing offices?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of assessment of options for delivery and choice based on clear rationale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID / Girl Hub staff</li> <li>• Review of project plans/options appraisals</li> <li>• Review of similar programmes/private sector engagement</li> </ul>
<p>Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)</p>	<p>Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of accountability and transparency to intended beneficiaries and civil society groups representing them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publicly-available reporting and other information</li> <li>• Communication with girls about Girl Hub's strategy, purpose, activities, budgets, etc</li> </ul>
<p>Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)</p> <p>Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)</p>	<p><b>What is the process for ensuring sound financial management? (ToR 6.2.1 part 1)</b></p> <p><b>How effective are the governance structures at all levels? (ToR 6.2.3)</b></p> <p>Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures in place to make decisions in an appropriate way and that they are appropriate and fit for purpose</li> <li>• Evidence of the policies and procedures being adhered to and of decisions being escalated to an appropriate level</li> <li>• Evidence that the governance structure is inclusive of stakeholders</li> <li>• Evidence of separation between parties</li> <li>• Evidence of risks being considered and managed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of policies and procedures</li> <li>• Interview with Girl Hub staff / other key civil society actors in this space</li> <li>• Review of key decisions made and policies complied with</li> <li>• Risk registers and reports</li> </ul>



<p>Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (2.5)</p> <p>Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)</p>	<p>Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (2.5)</p> <p><b>What has the money been spent on and is this sufficiently monitored? (ToR 6.2.1 part 2)</b></p> <p><b>How does DFID ensure sufficient transparency and accountability in terms of the specific contribution and added value which Girl Hub brings to this field? (ToR 6.2.2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How does Girl Hub maintain separation from Nike commercial operations and reputation?</i></li> <li>• <i>On what basis was the legal entity established and share of funding determined?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes disaggregated from service/partner contribution</li> <li>• Evidence of budget monitoring processes in place and documentation maintained of expenditure</li> <li>• Evidence of individuals being responsible for spending within budgets with scrutiny over reasons for expenditure</li> <li>• Action plans put in place to rectify any overspending and progress monitored</li> <li>• Evidence of all spending to date</li> <li>• Evidence money is spent on related activities</li> <li>• Summaries and monitoring provided on a routine basis</li> <li>• Evidence of communicating key information to intended beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview with Girl Hub / DFID staff</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Review of budget reports and action plans where over/underspending identified</li> <li>• Financial records</li> <li>• Publicly-available reporting and other information</li> <li>• Communication material to girls</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--

<p>Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)</p> <p>Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)</p> <p>Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)</p>	<p>Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)</p> <p><b>Have stated objectives been delivered within the timeframe agreed? (ToR 6.2.4)</b></p> <p>Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the impact of Girl Hub's programmes can be attributed to the outcomes or the plans to measure outcomes (if too early)</li> <li>• Evidence in the logframe of achievements to date and actions delivered on time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview with Girl Hub / DFID staff</li> <li>• Review of logframe</li> </ul>
<p><b>Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?</b></p>			
<p>Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)</p>	<p><b>What benefit is there to the intended beneficiaries over and above other programmes in this area? (ToR 6.3.1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What impacts can be measured and attributed to Girl Hub?</i></li> <li>• <i>How does DFID judge Girl Hub's catalytic effect (value-added)?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of intended benefits from selected projects</li> <li>• Evidence of increased government spending on girls</li> <li>• Evidence of involvement of girls and other gender NGOs in the countries where the funding is available. If projects are not progressed enough, consider Girl Hub's plan to engage girls</li> <li>• Evidence that girls are involved at appropriate stages of the interventions</li> <li>• Evidence of feedback being received on benefits seen</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Analysis of government policies and budgets in Girl Hub countries</li> <li>• Interview with DFID / Girl Hub staff</li> <li>• Review of files to support involvement</li> </ul>

<p>Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)</p>	<p><b>Does sufficient complementarity exist with existing institutions and programmes within DFID and externally and is duplication avoided? (ToR 6.3.2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What is the relationship with DFID's existing Education and Gender teams?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of other partners being identified for projects, in particular local organisations that may have more local influence</li> <li>• Evidence of pooling of resources and collaborations being established</li> <li>• Evidence that the work of Girl Hub complements but does not duplicate the work of others</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview with Girl Hub staff</li> <li>• Interview with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with NGOs and multilaterals to obtain external views</li> </ul>
<p>Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)</p> <p>Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)</p> <p>Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)</p>	<p><b>Is the project sustainable? (ToR 6.3.3)</b></p> <p>Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)</p> <p>Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of forward planning being undertaken in terms of finances and outcomes</li> <li>• Evidence that Girl Hub has delivered on budgets and targets to date</li> <li>• Evidence of support from DFID and other bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial and operational plans</li> <li>• Interview with Girl Hub management</li> <li>• Interview with DFID</li> <li>• Outcomes and performance reports</li> </ul>

Learning: what works and what needs improvement?			
<p>Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (4.1)</p>	<p><b>How robust is the review and evaluation process? (ToR 6.4.2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How does DFID oversee Girl Hub and how effective is this oversight of Girl Hub's work?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of routine reporting against the objectives of Girl Hub</li> <li>• Evidence of rigorous evaluation against original objectives</li> <li>• Inputs, outputs and outcomes measured and tracked</li> <li>• Evidence of actions being identified by DFID and followed up routinely to ensure achievement of objectives</li> <li>• Evidence of the robustness of the annual review process. Evidence maintained on files to demonstrate extent of review and work undertaken to form conclusions</li> <li>• Recommendations and actions agreed with management at Girl Hub</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logistical Framework</li> <li>• Budget tracking programme area</li> <li>• Interview with DFID staff including the Annual Review Team</li> <li>• Review of files and reports on Girl Hub</li> <li>• Committee / management structure for oversight</li> <li>• Review of Aide Memoire for first review and the findings from the annual review</li> </ul>
<p>Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)</p>	<p><b>Is Girl Hub innovative in its approach? If so, in what way is it different to other similar interventions? (ToR 6.4.1)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of innovation either in terms of approach or delivery relative to the way in which DFID or other organisations operate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview with DFID / Girl Hub staff</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Review of relevant meeting minutes</li> </ul>

<p>Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)</p> <p>Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)</p>	<p>Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)</p> <p><b>What lessons have been learned? (ToR 6.4.3)</b></p> <p><b>Is this an appropriate model for DFID to use in the future? (ToR 6.4.4)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of lessons learned in Girl Hub being reported and shared</li> <li>• Evidence of DFID sharing lessons learned with Girl Hub</li> <li>• Evidence of regular and routine sharing of lessons learned</li> <li>• Evidence that this model (with private sector partner) of delivery demonstrates value for money. Evidence that benefits have reflected investments made by DFID and Nike Foundation</li> <li>• Evidence of benefits to DFID in Girl Hub projects is clear. Knowledge of DFID's contribution among key stakeholders</li> <li>• Evidence of this model being considered elsewhere for delivery</li> <li>• Evidence of risks (including perceived and reputation risks) adequately mitigated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of files and reports on projects to demonstrate lessons learned and benefits</li> <li>• Review of communications between Girl Hub and DFID</li> <li>• Interview with Girl Hub / DFID staff to understand innovation</li> <li>• Interviews with Girl Hub management</li> <li>• Interviews with other NGOs and multilaterals operating in this area</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

5.5. The evaluation will consist of:

**Phase 1: Preliminary Assessment**

- i). A preliminary review of literature, including:
  - a. previous evaluation reports of Girl Hub and the first annual review;
  - b. DFID programme documentation; and
  - c. documentation from partners (Nike Foundation and local organisations).
- ii). Interviews, either in person or by phone, with:
  - a. Girl Hub staff;
  - b. DFID staff;
  - c. Nike Foundation staff; and
  - d. other NGOs – Plan, Save the Children, Womankind, Camfed, Care International, Oxfam, Interact, ActionAid, Water Aid and local NGOs.

This phase will be used to refine the evaluation framework if necessary.

**Phase 2: Field Work, including site visit to Rwanda**

- i). A series of semi-structured and informal interviews with:
  - a. intended beneficiaries;
  - b. partners in government (education departments);
  - c. donor partners (Nike Foundation, others);
  - d. DFID staff currently in-country;
  - e. previous DFID staff; and
  - f. others as required, including other NGOs and multilaterals working in this area.

The full list of interviewees will be drawn up in discussion with DFID in Rwanda and Ethiopia and other key informants. We may look to hold meetings with certain groups in workshops if feasible.

- ii). Further review of documentation in-country as required, specifically looking through DFID's operational files.
- iii). Evidence-gathering from local sources as practicable, specifically from the Governments of Rwanda and Ethiopia.
- iv). Gathering evidence of the impact of innovative interventions, in particular social communications.

**Phase 3: Final Analysis**

Presentation of analysis to Commissioners, then drafting of final report based on evidence gathered and Commissioner views and guidance.

**6. Roles and responsibilities**

- 6.1. KPMG will provide oversight of this review under the overall leadership of the ICAI Project Director.
- 6.2. It is proposed that this evaluation is undertaken by a core team of four, with supplementary peer review if deemed necessary. While lead responsibility for answering sections of the framework is shown, all will contribute to the analysis supporting the findings for each section.

Team member	Role
Team leader	KPMG Director leading the team
Team member 1	Governance and finance lead
Team member 2	Programme design lead
Team member 3	Impact lead (and link with Education in East Africa study)

### Team leader

She is Head of Charities at KPMG in the UK and leads all grant due diligence and evaluation work undertaken in the UK and has extensive experience of working with major NGOs and foundations as well as donor reporting work to the EU, the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and similar government bodies.

She will lead the team and have overall responsibility for the review and the report.

### Team member 1

He is part of KPMG's Public Sector Audit and Assurance team and has significant experience of delivering value for money reviews across healthcare and government. In addition, he has experience of working with charitable bodies in various assurance roles and has delivered risk management and governance reviews across the public sector.

He has been with KPMG for over seven years now and will be leading the work on financial governance and risk management.

### Team member 2

He is part of KPMG's International Development Services team. In addition to being a Chartered Accountant, he has a background in human rights law and has over eight years' experience in evaluation of corporate sustainability and philanthropic grant-making programmes. He has extensively reviewed the design and financial and impact performance of grants (not least for DFID), in particular working with philanthropic foundations and corporate CSR programmes.

He will lead the programme design work.

### Team member 3

She is a Senior Associate of Agulhas Applied Knowledge. She is an economist specialising in health, education and labour market economics. She has over 25 years' experience in all aspects of international development from strategy development to evaluation. She has worked extensively with gender and social development programmes.

She will lead on the measurement and monitoring of impact and provide the link to the Education in East Africa study.

## 7. Management and reporting

- 7.1. We will produce a first draft report for review by the ICAI Secretariat and Commissioners by 19 December 2011, with time for subsequent revision and review prior to completion and sign off in February 2012.

## 8. Expected outputs and time frame

- 8.1. The following timetable is based on the assumption that the report will need to be finalised in Q1 2012, to meet ICAI's requirements.

Phase	Timetable
<b>Planning</b> Finalising methodology Drafting Inception Report	13 October 2011 10 November 2011
<b>Phase 1: Field Work</b> UK fieldwork Rwanda in-country case study	November 2011 21-25 November 2011
<b>Phase 2: Analysis and write-up</b> Roundtable with Commissioners Draft main report Report to ICAI for sign-off	5 December 2011 19 December 2011 w/c 23 January 2012

## 9. Risks and mitigation

9.1. The following sets out the key risks and mitigating actions for this evaluation:

Risk	Level of risk	Specific Issues	Mitigation
Inability to access key information	Medium	Unable to access partner files (Nike Foundation, local bodies)  Unable to have full access to partner systems  Unable to have access to full financial information for costing	Ensure clear authorisation given at start-up  DFID to assist with Nike Foundation if necessary and with local bodies through headquarters
No outcome data available on impact of programmes	Medium	Programme too early in lifecycle to identify outputs or outcomes  Impact data weak or incomplete	Focus on clear progress on planned rollout and trajectory  Use third-party data sources in Rwanda / Ethiopia  Ensure full spectrum of impact data is obtained, particularly with respect to economic impact
Intended beneficiary voices not heard	Medium	Girl Hub / DFID / Governments' presentation of intended beneficiary voices e.g. presentation of voices is managed so that real voice is not heard  Not able to identify intended beneficiaries due to communication infrastructure within developing countries and rural settings	Have sufficient time in field  Seek to gain at least three different routes through partners to access contact with intended beneficiaries  Understand how Girl Hub communicates with individuals and find out the best places to meet intended beneficiaries
Safety and Security	Medium/High	Risk of terrorism  Risk to the person	Operate within Foreign and Commonwealth Office guidance  Use experienced local guides and drivers

## 10. How will this review make a difference?

10.1. This ICAI review will identify whether Girl Hub is having the desired impact within its current remit and whether this partnership between DFID and Nike Foundation works effectively. We recognise that complex issues require innovative solutions - we will test whether Girl Hub is harnessing innovation effectively to achieve its aims. The need to foster innovation is vital, for example, to identify new methods of improving girls' access to education and the workplace. We will consider how these new methods are identified and shared with other partners. We will seek to draw out conclusions and lessons that are applicable not only to Girl Hub but also to other ventures or partnerships where DFID is considering new arrangements to drive innovation.