

Girl Hub: a DFID and Nike Foundation initiative



Independent
Commission
for Aid Impact

Contents

Executive Summary	page 1
1 Introduction	page 2
2 Findings	page 4
Objectives	page 4
Delivery	page 6
Impact	page 10
Learning	page 13
3 Conclusions and Recommendations	page 16
Annex	page 18

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.

	Green: The programme meets all or almost all of the criteria for effectiveness and value for money and is performing strongly. Very few or no improvements are needed.
	Green-Amber: The programme meets most of the criteria for effectiveness and value for money and is performing well. Some improvements should be made.
	Amber-Red: The programme meets some of the criteria for effectiveness and value for money but is not performing well. Significant improvements should be made.
	Red: The programme meets few of the criteria for effectiveness and value for money. It is performing poorly. Immediate and major changes need to be made.

Executive Summary

This is a review of Girl Hub, a joint initiative between DFID and Nike Foundation. Girl Hub was established in February 2010 to help decision-makers and donors do more to address the needs and rights of adolescent girls. Girl Hub aims to be a catalyst. It intends to combine DFID's development expertise and global reach with Nike Foundation's experience working in the field of adolescent girls, its communications skills and its approach to business planning and innovation to empower girls and to influence donors and governments.

The purpose of the review was to examine how effectively and efficiently the Girl Hub partnership is delivering impact and whether it should be used as a model for future partnerships.

Overall *Assessment: Amber-Red*

Girl Hub is widely seen as playing a useful role in getting adolescent girls more firmly onto the development agenda. It has been operating for two years and has spent £2.9 million of its £15.6 million budget. Whilst still in its early stages, we found a lack of clarity about: what Girl Hub should focus on; how it is going to achieve its big picture goals; its accountability, financial management and planning; its governance and policies; how impact should be achieved and demonstrated; and how lessons are going to be learned. Girl Hub has begun to address some of these issues. This is a good time for DFID to re-evaluate whether and, if so, how this model should be continued and made sustainable.

Objectives *Assessment: Amber-Red*

Girl Hub's objectives were: to influence and support DFID and other donors and decision-makers to take girl-focussed programming to scale; and to work with girls to learn how best to meet their needs. At a high level, the objectives were appropriate and long-term measures were set. At a more detailed level, there was ambiguity and lack of a clear plan against which the early phase of Girl Hub could be measured. In particular, there was no way to assess those aspects that make Girl Hub different. Insufficient thought was given to how to choose amongst opportunities to make best use of resources.

Delivery *Assessment: Amber-Red*

Girl Hub has made good progress in terms of supporting DFID. Progress against the other objectives has been slower, although Girl Hub has successfully launched in Rwanda and Nigeria and plans are well advanced in Ethiopia. It does not have a process to decide how best to allocate resources and there are serious deficiencies in governance. These derive, at least in part, from how Girl Hub was set up. Insufficient pre-grant due diligence was conducted on Nike Foundation. Policies, including for child protection, processes and financial management, are either absent or need improving. There

are mechanisms to prevent funds from being misspent but there was a lack of information available to help to assess whether value for money is being achieved.

Impact *Assessment: Green-Amber*

There have been some positive impacts, particularly on DFID's strategy and programming, which, if carried through to implementation and sustained by partner governments, could lead to significant impacts for girls. Girl Hub's measurable impact on girls to date is limited, although a number of pilots have been started and several are being scaled up with DFID support. Improvements to short- and medium-term measures in the logical framework (logframe) would help to ensure the programme is on track and to assess progress.

Learning *Assessment: Amber-Red*

Experimentation and innovation are essential to learning and to developing solutions to meet DFID's objectives. Experiments, however, need to be clearly defined, controlled and measured. Our interviews showed that Girl Hub staff and those involved in DFID and Nike Foundation have learned a considerable amount. This learning is to some extent being incorporated through a strategic review. Learning, however, has not been systematically planned for, documented or shared. More should have been done to incorporate learning into Girl Hub from the outset.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Girl Hub should be reconfigured to focus more sharply on how it will make a difference to girls, with detailed country and programme plans. It needs to measure both the success of each programme and how effectively programmes are linked to each other and to wider initiatives.

Recommendation 2: Girl Hub should implement comprehensive and robust risk, governance, financial and performance management policies and processes. Girl Hub, DFID and Nike Foundation should ensure that their messaging is clear and consistent and that the roles and influences of each organisation are transparent and accountable.

Recommendation 3: DFID should assess the options for Girl Hub's future in the light of the evidence to date.

Recommendation 4: DFID should reflect on the Girl Hub experience and the findings of this report in order to learn how it can promote innovation internally in a way that manages risk, including how partnerships with the private sector and private foundations should be implemented. DFID should implement more thorough pre-grant due diligence for all potential partners.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This is a review of Girl Hub, a joint initiative between the Department for International Development (DFID) and Nike Foundation. Girl Hub was established in February 2010 to help decision-makers and donors do more to address the needs and rights of adolescent girls. We have chosen to look at this project on the basis that it is innovative and experimental and that it constitutes a new kind of partnership for DFID. We are reviewing Girl Hub at an early stage so as to examine how effectively and efficiently it is delivering impact and what can be learned for future partnerships.
- 1.2 Nike Foundation is a non-profit organisation supported by Nike Inc. Nike Foundation was relaunched in 2004 with a focus on adolescent girls in the developing world.

Background to the set-up of Girl Hub

- 1.3 In 2006, DFID commissioned an evaluation of its policy and practice on gender equality and women's empowerment. This concluded that 'DFID needs to do more to develop understanding among staff and partners of gender equality and how it contributes to economic and social development and to DFID's overall objectives'. The evaluation found that DFID's gender activities were often pursued 'in isolation', 'as an add-on' or 'not addressed at all'.¹ In response, DFID introduced a Gender Equality Action Plan and gender targets for all of its personnel in 2007.²
- 1.4 Many other organisations were coming to similar conclusions at the same time: gender issues were too often peripheral to mainstream development programming even though the evidence suggested that they should be central. Initiatives including the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative were established. The benefits of investing more in adolescent girls are well researched and widely accepted. They are summarised in Figure 1.

- 1.5 Within this context, Nike Foundation had funded a number of girl-focussed programmes and applied the marketing skills and approaches of Nike Inc. to help communicate the case for investing in girls. One result was Nike Foundation's *Girl Effect* concept. The Girl Effect is Nike Foundation's presentation of the case for investing in girls to achieve wider development impacts.³

Figure 1: The case for investing in girls

'...we know that investing in girls and young women has a disproportionately beneficial effect in alleviating poverty for everyone; not only the girls themselves but their families, communities and entire countries. Everyone benefits, including boys and men.'⁴

The 600 million adolescent girls living in developing countries face enormous challenges. These include exploitation, sexual abuse, child marriage, early childbirth and diseases such as HIV. Girls often do not have proper access to healthcare and education, even in countries where these are provided free of charge.⁵

These issues have negative consequences for girls and also for the communities and countries in which they live. For example, there are impacts on population growth and HIV. The loss of human capital has significant implications for the global economy: the cost of failing to educate girls to the same standard as boys in poor countries is estimated to be £60 billion in lost growth each year.⁶ That is eight times the UK's aid budget for 2010-11.

Research has shown what girls need from an early age to tackle these issues. This includes safe access to education and healthcare, knowledge of their rights, protection from child marriage and exploitation, financial literacy and the ability to save money. Girls also need friendship and support networks and older girls and women as role models.⁷

³ See www.girleffect.org.

⁴ Plan International, 2011, <http://plan-international.org/girls/campaign/why-girls.php>.

⁵ Chaaban and Cunningham, *Measuring the Economic Gain of Investing in Girls: the girl effect dividend*, World Bank, August 2011, http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer?WDSPIB/2011/08/08/000158349_20110808092702/Rendered/PDF/WPS5753.pdf.

⁶ *Paying the Price: the economic cost of failing to educate girls*, Plan International, 2008, http://plan-international.org/files/global/publications/education/girls_education_economics.pdf

⁷ For further research on how issues of adolescent girls need to be addressed see: *Girl-Centered Program Design: a toolkit to develop, strengthen & expand adolescent girls programs*, Population Council (Nike Foundation funded), 2010, http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/2010PGY_AdolGirlToolkitComplete.pdf. Lloyd, Cynthia B., *New Lessons: the power of educating adolescent girls*, Population Council, 2009, http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/2009PGY_NewLessons.pdf.

Bruce and Hallman, *Reaching the Girls Left Behind*, Gender & Development Vol. 16, No. 2, Routledge, July 2008, http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/JournalArticles/GD_16_2.pdf.

¹ Jensen et al., *Evaluation of DFID's Policy and Practice in Support of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment*, DFID, August 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications/1/evaluation/ev669-summary-report.pdf>.

² *Gender Equality Action Plan 2007-2009: making faster progress to gender equality*, DFID, February 2007, <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~gehwmc/documents/DFID-Gender-equality-plan-2007.pdf>.

1 Introduction

- 1.6 Nike Foundation was looking for ways to make a greater impact on a bigger scale. DFID also wanted to go further in designing mainstream programmes to address the needs and rights of girls. Following a series of discussions between DFID and Nike Foundation during 2009, the idea for Girl Hub emerged, using the concept behind Nike Foundation's Girl Effect as its theory of change.⁸ Girl Hub would 'provide advisory services...support advocacy and involve girls themselves in the design and implementation of policies that affect them'.⁹
- 1.7 Girl Hub was established on 25 February 2010 with a three-year grant from DFID to Nike Foundation and a commitment from Nike Foundation. The total DFID grant is for £11.6 million, with an additional £1.2 million of in-kind support.¹⁰ Around half is budgeted for Girl Hubs in four or five developing countries. Nike Foundation has committed to contribute funding of £0.8 million, plus £2 million of in-kind support. Expenditure to date is £2.9 million, of which £1.3 million is on developing country activities.
- 1.8 Girl Hub has supported DFID country offices to ensure their programmes have a focus on girls in three countries. DFID Rwanda has allocated £3 million to scale up pilot girl-focussed programmes. DFID Nigeria has allocated £4 million to help girls benefit from mainstream programmes. DFID Ethiopia has allocated £10 million for girl-focussed programmes and a further £14 million for Girl Hub Ethiopia.

Girl Hub's approach, structure and activities

- 1.9 Girl Hub's approach comprises two mutually reinforcing elements. The first element is top-down: to work with donors, governments and other decision-makers to encourage and help them to consider girls' needs. The second element is bottom-up: to involve girls and their communities in programme design to learn how better to meet their needs.

⁸ A theory of change defines the chain of activities required to bring about a given long-term goal.

⁹ *Girl Hub: helping decision-makers do more for girls, better - Project Memorandum*, DFID, November 2009.

¹⁰ This excludes approximately £100,000 spent by DFID on scoping the project during 2009. In-kind funding refers to the estimated value of non-cash contributions such as staff time.

- 1.10 DFID saw Nike Foundation's communication expertise as an important part of Girl Hub's role 'to enable girls and their advocates to network better, in real time, and to engage with decision-makers'.¹¹ Girl Hub's head office, based at DFID's London headquarters, is staffed jointly by Nike Foundation staff, DFID secondees and direct recruits. There are currently two Girl Hubs in developing countries – Rwanda and Nigeria – with plans also well advanced in Ethiopia. There is likely to be further expansion to India by 2013.
- 1.11 Girl Hub aims to be a catalyst and convenor, so does not generally implement programmes. There are some exceptions, such as a magazine and radio programme in Rwanda, which are intended to support Girl Hub's goal of empowering girls and influencing decision-makers. A list of Girl Hub's reported activities and achievements to date is given in the Annex.

Methodology

- 1.12 Our review (which ran from November 2011 to March 2012) focussed on:
- the establishment of Girl Hub, the alternative options considered and the structure of the partnership adopted;
 - governance and financial management;
 - how Girl Hub designs its programme to ensure value for money and effectiveness; and
 - Girl Hub's monitoring and evaluation framework.
- 1.13 We reviewed DFID and Girl Hub documentation (including DFID's first annual review of Girl Hub's operation) and documentation from Nike Foundation and local partners. We interviewed DFID staff, including those on secondment to Girl Hub, policy staff and those with management responsibility for Girl Hub. We also interviewed staff from Girl Hub, Nike Foundation and a number of non-governmental organisations (NGOs).
- 1.14 We visited Rwanda where the first developing country Girl Hub was established. We interviewed government officials and local NGOs, as well as DFID and Girl Hub staff and intended beneficiaries.

¹¹ *Girl Hub: helping decision-makers do more for girls, better - Project Memorandum*, DFID, November 2009.

2 Findings

Objectives

Assessment: Amber-Red 

- 2.1 Girl Hub was established to support and energise decision-makers and donors to address the needs and rights of girls. At the high level, objectives are appropriate. Beneath this, however, there is ambiguity and insufficient evidence of a clear plan against which Girl Hub's contribution can be measured, particularly in the early stages of implementation.
- 2.2 Clear criteria to help Girl Hub choose between opportunities were not established. These are essential to employ limited resources effectively and to ensure that decisions are accountable. Similarly, insufficient documentation was available to show how financial expenditure would be linked to performance to assess value for money.

Objectives of Girl Hub

- 2.3 Girl Hub was established to take the concept behind Nike Foundation's Girl Effect to scale for the benefit of girls and their communities and countries. Although the way in which Girl Hub has articulated its purpose and approach has evolved, the underlying elements have remained broadly constant. For this review, we have used these elements as Girl Hub's objectives:
- to influence donors and other decision-makers to consider girls' needs in programming; and
 - to work with girls to learn how best to meet their needs.
- 2.4 The documentation does not state explicitly that DFID would be a primary focus of the first objective. From our discussions and Girl Hub's subsequent activities, however, it is clear that DFID intended to use Girl Hub as one of its tools for helping to integrate girls' needs into its mainstream programming. We have therefore considered the following as an additional objective of Girl Hub:
- to help DFID integrate girls' needs into its mainstream programming and strategy.
- 2.5 The benefits for girls and their communities of DFID considering girls' needs in its mainstream programming are potentially significant. Given the level of Girl Hub's engagement with DFID,

however, we would have expected discussion of this implicit additional objective to have been documented and goals and parameters set.

Evolution of the objectives

- 2.6 DFID's formal planning documentation set out the overall plan in November 2009. At a high level, the programme had clear objectives that were relevant and focussed on the desired impact. The stated purpose of Girl Hub was to help 'world decision-makers and donors do more for girls better'. The ultimate goal was 'improvement in the financial, physical and social assets of girls resulting in empowerment and the realisation of rights of girls aged 15-19'.¹²
- 2.7 DFID considered how the initiative would complement the work of others and avoid duplication. Girl Hub would provide services to others, specifically: 'advisory services and tools for government officials and girl advocates'; and services to '[connect] girls and experts on girls locally and globally, and [provide] the tools they need'.¹² Examples of the types of services were given. Criteria for what could be done were included but no way of weighing up different opportunities was established.
- 2.8 The planning documents include a logical framework (the planned outputs for the programme known as the logframe) which is the starting point for measuring impact. Since Girl Hub started in February 2010, there have been two revisions of the logframe. As Girl Hub's first phase was to determine with what and where to engage, some evolution in objectives is expected. The changes, however, suggest a lack of clarity about Girl Hub's role.
- 2.9 Revisions have focussed the logframe better on areas where Girl Hub has more direct control. At the same time, the logframe has become less quantitative and, to some extent, less ambitious. The measure of scaling up was defined in the original logframe as: 'by 2011, one national scale country programme in each project country specifies additional investment in girls' and 'by

¹² *Girl Hub: helping decision-makers do more for girls, better - Project Memorandum*, DFID, November 2009.

2 Findings

2011 one global scale partner programme document specifies additional investment in girls'. This target was postponed by one year to 2012 in the May 2011 revision of the logframe. In the December 2011 redraft, this concrete target for mobilising resources was dropped in favour of more qualitative indicators around communications, inspiration and self-perceptions.

- 2.10 In December 2011, Girl Hub was discussing with its donors plans to revise its methodology and structure based on its experience in the first two years. Figure 2 shows a draft of the revised plans.
- 2.11 Understanding the complexities of the processes of social change and translating them into definable stages of an aid intervention are essential. This is a central feature of what Girl Hub is attempting to do. It is important, however, that Girl Hub does not lose sight of the more concrete actions that are also necessary, such as the commitment of resources by other donors and by governments.
- 2.12 Girl Hub's model for how it will make a difference relies on individual activities combining to generate a process of wider social change. It is not always clear whether and how this is being done. There is a risk that Girl Hub could end up initiating many individual projects that do not link together to bring real, substantial change for girls.
- 2.13 Different communications also present the objectives in different ways. Girl Hub's website states that its vision is to 'create an environment that enables girls to build their capacity and aspiration so they can break the cycle of intergenerational poverty'.¹³ The latest strategy document states that 'Girl Hub catalyzes real change at scale with and for girls by leveraging all our systems and together moving the whole development industry'.¹⁴ Whilst these statements are not necessarily inconsistent, confusion over the role and purpose of Girl Hub has resulted, in particular, over whether the emphasis is on empowering girls to defeat poverty or on considering girls' needs in programming.

Figure 2: Girl Hub's draft revised theory of change¹⁵

1. Activities:

- Support DFID country teams to develop more and better programmes for girls and make girls visible and influential in policy
- Facilitate interaction between girls and DFID/other partners' staff
- Game-changing communications elevate girls' voice
- Girl-centred participatory research
- Age and sex disaggregated evidence

2. Outputs:

- Increased investment by government, DFID and other donors, and private sector in girls' programmes
- Partner programmes and policies are informed by girls' experiences and perspectives
- Girls are more aware of other girls' perspectives and adults listen to their voices
- Growing alliance of girl champions

3. Short-term outcomes (beliefs):

- Girls have more self-belief and higher aspirations
- Boys and men have more positive views of girls
- Society members have more positive views of girls

4. Intermediate outcomes (behaviour):

- Girls act with more confidence
- Boys and men treat girls with more respect
- Society members help girls fulfil their potential

5. Long-term impact:

- Improved conditions of adolescent girls:
 - not married
 - no children
 - more years in school
 - more equipped to earn future income
 - healthy and safe
 - influences decisions about her own life
- Lateral impact – benefits spread to families and communities
- Longitudinal impact – benefits spread to next generation
- Poverty reduced

- 2.14 Girl Hub is sensitive to criticisms of the phrase 'invest in a girl and she will do the rest' used in Nike Foundation's Girl Effect communications. Critics express concern that this fails to reflect the complex social context and puts undue pressure on vulnerable girls. DFID identified this as a risk in its planning documentation. Figure 2 shows that Girl Hub's underlying theory of change does take into account the wider context. Girl Hub appears to have struggled, however, to reconcile the power of a simple message with its efforts to tackle a complex social problem. This has contributed to the lack of clarity about Girl Hub's role and aims.

¹³ Girl Hub, <http://girlhub.org>.

¹⁴ DFID and Nike Foundation Action Plan, DFID, December 2011.

¹⁵ From DFID and Nike Foundation Action Plan, DFID, December 2011.

2 Findings

Weaknesses in planning

2.15 There were two further weaknesses in the planning. DFID established measures to monitor how girls would benefit from Girl Hub's activities in the long term. Less thought went into how to measure the specific contribution of Girl Hub and how to capture learning. Learning about the effectiveness of Girl Hub's theory of change and how to apply it should be the key area of focus. In addition, the following attributes were seen by DFID as strengths of Girl Hub but were not measured:

- **Opportunistic:** Girl Hub aimed to be 'savvy and opportunistic' in seeking out and supporting decision-makers. It does not set out how to choose between opportunities to ensure it will focus its energy in the right places;
- **Catalyst:** although a key attribute, no mechanisms were built upfront to assess the success with which DFID (or others) use Girl Hub as a tool to drive change;
- **Media expertise:** Nike Foundation's experience and expertise in communication and media were given as key reasons for DFID partnering with the Foundation. The way in which Nike Foundation's contribution would be assessed was not set out clearly in the plans;¹⁶ and
- **Experimentation:** Girl Hub aimed to learn how best to reach girls but no clear learning plan was developed to capture and share this learning.

2.16 Insufficient documentation was available to show how financial expenditure would be linked to performance to assess value for money. Similarly, most of the measures were long term, with insufficient milestones to show that objectives were being delivered in the short to medium term.

2.17 These weaknesses in planning meant that Girl Hub (and its donors) could not easily see the progress it was making. Having a clear plan and measures in

place from the outset might have saved time and effort later on and could have resulted in more valuable learning for the future.

2.18 We were told that revising the logframe had taken a considerable amount of time and that it did not encourage opportunism or experimentation. This is because the logframe does not focus on these attributes. Opportunism and experimentation require more planning, not less. The example of venture capitalism may be useful. Venture capital involves choosing between opportunities and taking calculated risks that can always be supported and justified. Although more qualitative in nature, DFID and Girl Hub should have clear criteria to help decide amongst opportunities. These are essential to employ limited resources effectively and to ensure that decisions are accountable.

Delivery

Assessment: Amber-Red 

2.19 The idea for Girl Hub was proposed by Nike Foundation. The concept was developed during 2009, although there is limited documentation of this or of how each donor's contributions were agreed. Girl Hub was established as a Nike Foundation programme. In September 2011, Girl Hub became a company limited by guarantee and a registered charity in the UK.

2.20 Girl Hub has made achievements in a relatively short space of time, albeit with a larger-than-planned focus on DFID. It does not, however, have a clear and documented process to decide how best to allocate resources.

2.21 There are serious deficiencies in governance processes and procedures. These include the absence of Girl Hub-specific risk management procedures and policies for child protection and anti-corruption. Although good accounting procedural controls are in place, Girl Hub has poor budgeting and financial monitoring.

2.22 Insufficient pre-grant due diligence was conducted on Nike Foundation and Girl Hub policies, procedures and plans. Had this been done, many of the deficiencies could have been identified and addressed.

¹⁶ Through the anecdotal evidence that we did obtain, it does appear that Nike Foundation skills and thinking have contributed to Girl Hub in a number of ways, including: helping to communicate DFID's gender strategy; developing ways of engaging with girls to influence programming; and developing the magazine and radio programmes.

2 Findings

Set-up of Girl Hub

2.23 DFID has processes in place to enter into strategic partnerships. It has used these in the past for partnerships with organisations including the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy and the British Medical Association. DFID followed its standard procedures to establish Girl Hub.

2.24 The idea for Girl Hub was developed through informal discussions between senior DFID and Nike Foundation personnel. We could not find any documentation covering the nature of the discussions. Girl Hub and DFID staff told us that there was extensive consultation with gender advisors, other DFID teams in the UK and developing countries, the World Bank and NGOs such as the Population Council.

2.25 Girl Hub planned to have a website where 'experts on girls from round the world will collaborate and share insights'.¹⁷ A website has been established but is underdeveloped, difficult to find and largely references Nike Foundation's more prominent Girl Effect website. This adds to the confusion about the role of Girl Hub. The website could also be a good way of transparently showing how funds are spent but this is not done.

2.26 DFID set up Girl Hub with an accountable grant to Nike Foundation.¹⁸ The assessment of funding and delivery options appeared tokenistic. The Project Memorandum states: 'we considered, and rejected, various alternatives' and lists the following:

- 'a single global hub';
- 'support only to decision-makers, and not to organisations working with girls';
- 'expanding funding to existing INGOs' (international NGOs); and
- 'tendering a contract for the Hub, rather than using an Accountable Grant to Nike Foundation'.

¹⁷ *Girl Hub: helping decision-makers do more for girls, better - Project Memorandum*, DFID, November 2009.

¹⁸ An accountable grant is the normal way in which DFID contracts with civil society and other organisations. An accountable grant involves DFID and a third party signing a grant agreement which sets out how the third party may use DFID's funds and reporting requirements for the third party to enable DFID to monitor the implementation of the grant.

2.27 A short list of pros and cons is given but there is insufficient evidence of a serious discussion of alternatives.

Funding

2.28 The split of funding for the current grant agreement is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Current funding split for Girl Hub¹⁹



2.29 There is no documentation of the decision for this split. We were told by all parties that it was because Nike Foundation's assets (£23 million in 2010) were much smaller than DFID's annual budget (approximately £8 billion²⁰). Whilst this is true, it is not necessarily the most appropriate basis for the decision. We would have expected a more compelling, documented rationale for the decision, including consideration of the potential benefit to Nike Inc. of Nike Foundation's involvement with Girl Hub.

2.30 DFID has disbursed £3.2 million to Girl Hub to date. Total expenditure by Girl Hub to the end of August 2011 was £2.9 million, £140,000 of which was from Nike Foundation's contribution, leaving Girl Hub with approximately £250,000 of reserves.

2.31 Girl Hub has leveraged funding in DFID country offices in Rwanda, Nigeria and Ethiopia. £3 million, £4 million and £24 million have been budgeted respectively. The Rwandan and Nigerian amounts and £10 million in Ethiopia are for girl-focussed DFID programmes. The remaining £14 million is planned for Girl Hub Ethiopia activities, of which operational costs are estimated at 7%.

¹⁹ *Girl Hub Financial Year 2012-13 Budget*, November 2011.

²⁰ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/news/latest-news/2010/spending-review-2010/>.

2 Findings

2.32 The total cost of establishing Girl Hubs in developing countries compared to other options (such as internal DFID initiatives) does not appear to have been assessed. In addition, there are no projections of what the total cost to DFID might be if country offices are also providing additional funding.

Design and roll-out of country Girl Hubs

2.33 DFID's planning documents set out criteria for deciding in which developing countries to operate. The criteria appear to have been applied, although there is no formal documentation of this. Where possible, Girl Hub is established in a country as a separate entity to DFID. Where this is not possible for legal or practical reasons, Girl Hub has been set up within DFID. An example is in Ethiopia where setting up new internationally-funded charities is not permitted. Figure 4 summarises the status and longer-term staffing plans of each country office.

2.34 We were told by Girl Hub staff that a degree of separation is beneficial as it can assist with local ownership and engagement independent of DFID and Nike Foundation. DFID also said that this helps it to hold Nike Foundation responsible through the accountable grant model. We would expect, however, a cost-benefit analysis to have been conducted in each country structure. This had not been done, although we note that it is planned for Ethiopia.

2.35 The initial plan was for four country programmes to be established over the three years of the grant. Kenya and Nigeria were selected as initial target countries. Owing to corruption concerns in Kenya's Ministry of Education, DFID stopped funding through this ministry which put Girl Hub's plans there on hold. With support from Nike Foundation's President and DFID's Rwanda office, Girl Hub instead began discussions with the Rwandan Government on setting up a Girl Hub in Rwanda. This was established in August 2010. Ethiopia was selected for a third Girl Hub following a request from DFID in Ethiopia.

2.36 There are plans to assess India for a Girl Hub and to implement a Kenyan Girl Hub once corruption risks can be appropriately managed.

Figure 4: Girl Hub offices

	UK	Rwanda	Nigeria	Ethiopia
Legal status	Separate legal entity	Separate legal entity	Separate legal entity	Part of DFID Ethiopia
Offices	Uses DFID office space	Own office	DFID office (due to security)	Temporarily co-located in British Embassy compound**
Total staff and long-term contractors*	1 from DFID (DFID in-kind funding) 3 from Nike Foundation (funded by Nike Foundation) 5 direct recruits (funded by DFID's central grant)	1 from DFID (DFID in-kind funding) 2 direct recruits (funded by DFID's central grant) 8 long-term contractors (funded by DFID's central grant)	2 from DFID (funded by DFID's central grant) 2 direct recruits (funded by DFID's central grant) 3 long-term contractors (funded by DFID's central grant)	2 from DFID (funded by DFID Ethiopia) 2 direct recruits (funded by DFID Ethiopia) 1 long-term contractor (funded by Nike Foundation)

*Approved roles are included although some positions are not yet filled. Long-term contractors are those contracted for over three months; there are plans for some of these to be converted into Girl Hub employees. Although timesheets are not used, Nike Foundation estimates that over half of the time worked by its 40 employees is dedicated to fulfilling the Girl Hub strategy.

**Girl Hub Ethiopia is planning to move to its own premises although will legally remain part of DFID Ethiopia.

2.37 Plans for each country office set out the theory of change but do not clearly show how activities will work together to achieve change against country-specific objectives. We note that the most recent business case, for the Ethiopia Girl Hub, gives better consideration to how the theory of change will work. The detailed plans, however, are key to achieving this.

Country Hub approach

2.38 Girl Hub's approach is to try to understand the specific needs of its intended beneficiaries in each country. In Rwanda, it has prepared a *State of Girls in Rwanda* report²¹ to determine what sort of

²¹ *Girl Hub: State of Girls in Rwanda*, Restless Development and Bell & Payne Consulting, January 2011, www.restlessdevelopment.org/file/girlhub-01062011-pdf.

2 Findings

activities should be targeted. This includes video stories from girls, adding a personal dimension. The agencies commissioned to undertake the research trained local girls in research methods. This meant that these girls could carry out the necessary discussions, speaking directly to other girls in their native language. The research in Rwanda was used to help shape interventions. Girl Hub plans to roll out this approach in Nigeria and Ethiopia.

- 2.39 Not everyone we spoke to viewed this as positive. Some NGOs raised concerns that girls were unpaid and of potential unintended social consequences of an 'elite' group of girls interviewing poorer girls. Girl Hub should ensure that these issues and perceptions are properly considered and risks managed.

Governance structure

2.40 Nike Foundation is formally responsible for the grant, which is managed as a Nike Foundation project. Nike Foundation staff are formally employed by Nike Inc. and subject to its policies and procedures. DFID employees working for Girl Hub are seconded to Nike Foundation. Girl Hub was initially a programme within Nike Foundation and evolved to have three country offices.

2.41 In September 2011, Girl Hub became a company limited by guarantee (controlled by Nike Foundation) and a registered charity in the UK with its own Board of Trustees.

2.42 The Board of Trustees for the new entity consists of the President of Nike Foundation, current and past employees of Nike Inc. and independent trustees. Some Girl Hub documentation describes Girl Hub as a 'joint venture'. This is not legally the case, however, and this language is not formally used by DFID. Moreover, there are no DFID representatives on the Board. This is intentional to facilitate DFID's ability to hold Nike Foundation responsible for the accountable grant. As the principal donor, however, DFID has ultimate control as it can stop funding if grant terms are breached.

2.43 DFID has been continually involved in the strategic oversight of Girl Hub. In the proposed new

structure the following teams have been established to formalise and further embed this:

- a Collaborative Team consisting of the Head of DFID's Governance and Fragile States Department, key policy leads for DFID's Strategic Vision for Girls and Women and Girl Hub and Nike Foundation staff. This group is scheduled to meet quarterly to facilitate close working between DFID and Nike Foundation; and
- a Senior Advisory Team, consisting primarily of senior staff from DFID, including a small number of directors and senior staff from Nike Foundation. This group is scheduled to meet twice a year to provide technical input and help generate buy-in for considering how DFID can better address girls' needs.

2.44 Our interviews within and outside DFID revealed a lack of understanding over where the boundaries lie between Nike Inc., Nike Foundation, Girl Hub and DFID. Most people we spoke to in DFID saw Girl Hub as a private sector engagement. The Private Sector Department, however, has not been involved to date as Nike Foundation is a non-profit organisation. Girl Hub was often referred to as 'Nike Girl Hub' even though Girl Hub is careful not to use the Nike brand. Some NGOs expressed concern that Nike Foundation may be able unduly to influence DFID policy. Senior Nike Foundation staff have been involved in developing DFID's strategy. There is no evidence, however, to suggest undue influence; it is clear that DFID identified a need to bring girls into mainstream programming and that Girl Hub is one of the tools to help that.

Policies and risk management

2.45 Girl Hub has been operating without many key policies and procedures since its inception. Staff are technically subject to Nike Inc. policies. These are not, however, used in practice and do not take into account the specific risks and activities of Girl Hub. In particular, we noted that:

- there is no child protection policy. This is a serious omission given the contact staff may have with adolescent girls, which includes

2 Findings

making videos of girls and taking girls on international trips to meet policy-makers;

- there are some references to anti-bribery in Nike Inc.'s policies but Girl Hub staff had not seen them. This is an important omission, particularly since the UK Bribery Act came into force in July 2011; and
- risk management processes have not been directly set up for Girl Hub. Nike Foundation does have high-level risk management processes but there is no specific Girl Hub risk register. Girl Hub should clearly document and articulate the risks to each individual project in which it is involved.

2.46 We did not see any evidence of mismanagement or abuse but without these policies the risk is significantly increased.

Financial systems

2.47 There are appropriate processes to help ensure that funds are spent on legitimate activities. Expenditure documentation is reviewed by Girl Hub and Nike Foundation staff. We noted the following issues:

- provision of financial information and monitoring are poor. A breakdown of spending to date was not readily available and required manual calculation by ICAI personnel;
- we saw evidence of budget monitoring only as part of Nike Foundation/Girl Hub's quarterly submission to DFID on expenditure and funding required for the next quarter. Forecasting does not extend beyond the next quarter. Financial information relating to individual projects was not readily available. Management did monitor overall expenditure, which is within budget. Without detailed financial information, however, Girl Hub cannot determine whether its choices of interventions deliver the best value for money; and
- Girl Hub receives in-kind funding (such as staff and other resources) from DFID and Nike Foundation. It is unable to identify how much of this it has received. Both organisations say that they have provided more in-kind support than

their budgets show. As a result, Girl Hub cannot identify the full cost of delivering initiatives and DFID and Nike Foundation cannot properly assess whether this is the best use of their staff's limited time.

Grant management processes

2.48 DFID's accountable grant includes conditions that Nike Foundation must follow to help ensure accountability. DFID has not formally monitored compliance with these conditions. Most of the conditions have been complied with in practice. We noted two instances of non-compliance: Nike Foundation has not provided a separate audited disclosure relating to DFID funding in their financial statements; and a report required on air travel and environmental actions taken has not been provided.

2.49 Although DFID considered the reputational risks of being associated with Nike Inc., due diligence was inadequate. A thorough pre-grant due diligence process (looking at a grant recipient's governance, policies, systems and processes and how it proposes to manage the grant) would usually identify many of the concerns raised in this report. No such process was carried out on Nike Foundation; neither is it required by DFID procedures. It is insufficient simply to rely on an entity's legal or charitable status. More thorough pre-grant due diligence checks are required, such as those DFID is beginning to introduce for civil society organisations.

Impact

Assessment: Green-Amber 

2.50 We have examined Girl Hub's impact through consideration of:

- the feedback from the stakeholders whom we interviewed;
- the impact of Girl Hub on and through DFID, including the funding that DFID has committed;
- the wider influence it has exerted;
- the impact on girls in developing countries; and
- longer-term prospects and sustainability.

2 Findings

2.51 Girl Hub's main impact to date has been in helping DFID to integrate girls' needs into its mainstream programming and strategy. This impact primarily relates to the third objective we have considered (see paragraph 2.4) rather than to the two elements underlying Girl Hub's documented purpose (see paragraph 2.3). This is because the focus on DFID consumed a lot of resource, so less focus was initially given to the other areas than planned. This was identified in DFID's annual review process and Girl Hub responded.

2.52 Girl Hub has been launched in Rwanda and Nigeria and plans are well advanced in Ethiopia. It has begun to influence partner governments and DFID's strategy and programming in these countries. If carried through to implementation, this influence could lead to significant positive impacts for girls but the shortcomings of country plans make this hard to assess.

2.53 Girl Hub's measurable impact on girls to date is limited, although a number of pilots have been started. Improvements to short- and medium-term measures in the logframe would help to show progress. Apart from participatory and girl-centred monitoring and evaluation, the logframe does not disaggregate the contribution of Girl Hub from what others are doing in the same area. Evidence from our discussions with Girl Hub, DFID and other stakeholders suggests that Girl Hub's contributions so far, such as research, specialist expertise and technical assistance, are positive and meaningful but these are difficult to assess and attribute.

Feedback from stakeholders

2.54 We were told that Girl Hub (and Nike Foundation) has been very successful at energising people to consider girls' needs better. In Rwanda, where we visited Girl Hub and various partners within government, local NGOs and DFID, we found genuine enthusiasm for and appreciation of Girl Hub's work. We were told that it brought new ideas and approaches and that 'it is lively and fun...Girl Hub has the heartbeat of a young girl'.²²

2.55 Girl Hub has increased focus on operating in the field by collaborating, complementing and catalysing others.

Impact on and through DFID

2.56 Girl Hub's main impact to date is in relation to the objective to help DFID integrate girls' needs into its mainstream programming and strategy. Girl Hub is one of the tools used by DFID to drive the agenda of girls through the organisation. It is difficult to specify how much of the change within DFID can be attributed to Girl Hub as there are multiple influences. For example, the DFID team working on maternal health and girls' education has been promoting girls for some time. Even in these sectors, however, we were told that Girl Hub had helped to bring energy and expertise to efforts to reach younger girls.

2.57 Girl Hub was involved in developing and communicating DFID's new strategic vision for girls and women. More than 17 DFID country offices are scaling up programming in family planning, safe abortion and maternal health services, 'with a growing number focusing on girls, and on early marriage and pregnancy'.²³ We heard anecdotally that, although some of the programming would have occurred anyway, Girl Hub was an important influence.

2.58 The changes that Girl Hub is helping to bring about within DFID should contribute to improved programming and increased amounts of aid for young girls. This will be better understood when there is more age- and gender-disaggregated data available.

2.59 There are also specific examples of how Girl Hub is beginning to leverage funding and in-kind support through DFID in-country:²⁴

- **Ethiopia:** £14 million has been budgeted for an Ethiopian Girl Hub, with a further £10 million agreed to scale up the End Child Marriage Programme;

²² ICAI Review Team, interviews with non-governmental organisations in Rwanda.

²³ A New Strategic Vision for Girls and Women: stopping poverty before it starts, DFID, 2011, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/strategic-vision-girls-women.pdf>.

²⁴ ICAI Review Team, interviews with DFID advisors.

2 Findings

- **Rwanda:** DFID has allocated £3 million for up-scaling a girls' health programme pilot called 12+; and
- **Nigeria:** DFID has approved £4 million for the inclusion of Girls' Safe Spaces in an existing immunisation programme.²⁵

Wider influence on donors and decision-makers

- 2.60 It is more difficult to understand Girl Hub's impact in relation to its objective to influence donors and other decision-makers to consider girls' needs in programming. Gender in general and girls in particular are currently key themes in development so Girl Hub is only one of the many voices in this area. Its main focus appears to have been on DFID rather than on other donors. Nike Foundation, however, has been significantly impacted by Girl Hub and by its interactions with DFID. It has reorganised itself to align with Girl Hub's strategy.
- 2.61 Girl Hub Rwanda has brought people around the table to act on long-standing objectives to promote adolescent girls in Rwanda. The Ministry of Health in Rwanda told us that Girl Hub had helped it to think through how to go about realising its aim of reaching adolescent girls. Population Services International Rwanda, a well-established international NGO and implementing partner for the 12+ pilot, told us that 'Girl Hub is more present than other donors...they share their ideas....The organic growth is incredible. It is generating a lot of ownership.'²⁶
- 2.62 Girl Hub and Nike Foundation have been active at a senior level with important global players in development such as the World Bank. The Annex shows Girl Hub's reported activities and achievements to date: many of these relate to its influencing activity with both DFID and other organisations.
- 2.63 We heard a wide range of views about the extent to which Girl Hub was responsible for generating the momentum around girls in development. It is clear that the role of girls in development and the

importance of early intervention was understood and promoted before the creation of Girl Hub, not least by Nike Foundation. The influence of other actors in this space makes it difficult to isolate Girl Hub's influence.

- 2.64 Whilst better ways of measuring attribution should be explored, we conclude that, in addition to its influence on DFID, Girl Hub can be reasonably attributed a degree of impact in energising and promoting a focus on girls.

Impact on girls in developing countries

- 2.65 Despite a slow start, Girl Hub has begun to make an impact in influencing in-country decision-makers and in working with girls to learn how best to meet their needs. We were told by DFID country office staff in Rwanda and Ethiopia that discussions are underway within these governments to scale up programmes targeted at adolescent girls at a national level. Government plans are still at early stages of development and no firm budget commitments appear to have been made. This is to be expected, since both Rwanda and Ethiopia are only in the first year of their latest five-year development strategies. We would expect, however, to see milestones for progressive implementation of these major activities in Girl Hub's logframe. Instead, improvements in adolescent girls' self-belief, aspiration and behaviour are to be measured by perceptions surveys in each Girl Hub country. Again, no shorter-term milestones have yet been set.
- 2.66 The Rwandan Girl Hub was established in August 2010. The Hub worked to support the Ministry of Health to design and implement girl-friendly programmes and to create a network of organisations working on gender issues. It launched a six-month pilot of the 12+ Programme in July 2011. Funded by Nike Foundation, this involved working with 600 girls to test a programme of peer-to-peer mentoring and information on life-skills. Following the success of the pilot, DFID Rwanda committed to a phased scale-up of the programme, commencing in 2012. The free-of-charge *Ni Nyampinga* magazine was launched in November 2011. The initial print run aims to reach 45,000 girls, 10% of the target

²⁵ 'Safe Spaces' are seen as critical in enabling girls to benefit from key assets and services and refer to a physical and social environment where girls are protected from trauma, excessive stress, violence (or fear of violence) or abuse.

²⁶ ICAI Review Team, interview with PSI Rwanda staff.

2 Findings

group. Girls that we met who had seen the magazine told us that their first impressions were positive – although the test will be whether initial interest is maintained in subsequent issues. The magazines will be of little use for those they do not reach, who cannot read or do not have safe places to engage with peers to discuss issues. We note that the first two concerns will be mitigated to some extent by Girl Hub's radio programmes, although access issues may still exist. This is discussed in the learning section below.

- 2.67 The Nigerian Girl Hub was set up in October 2010. It is based in the DFID offices, partly due to security concerns in the area. Girl Hub Nigeria did not receive the same level of political support as in Rwanda and progress has been slower. In July 2011, a 13-part radio programme was completed. DFID also approved £4 million to include Girls' Safe Spaces in its existing immunisation programme and has used Girl Hub expertise in the design of two large mainstream development programmes.²⁷
- 2.68 The Ethiopia office is in the process of being established. DFID Ethiopia has approved £14 million in principle for this purpose.
- 2.69 It is too early to tell whether Girl Hub is having a transformational, positive and lasting impact on the lives of the intended beneficiaries. In the context of an innovative and evolving approach, the progress achieved so far is reasonable. In hindsight, if Girl Hub had been clearer about what it was trying to achieve sooner and how, then progress might have been more rapid.

Longer-term prospects and sustainability

- 2.70 Planning for Girl Hub did not include sufficient planning for long-term sustainability or an exit strategy. The idea of Girl Hub becoming income-generating through consultancy services was proposed in the planning documentation but does not appear to have been developed. The current grant allows for up to five country Girl Hubs. We heard differing views about whether more Girl Hubs would be established in the longer term. The

option of DFID country offices or other donors funding additional Girl Hubs has not been ruled out; neither does it appear to be actively sought.

- 2.71 We also heard differing views about Girl Hub's long-term structure: should it be spun off as a separate entity; should it be franchised out to other donors; should it be wound down; or should it be brought within DFID? The implementation of a new structure of governance provides an opportunity for DFID to consider the options for Girl Hub's future.

Learning

Assessment: Amber-Red 

- 2.72 Evidence from our meetings showed that Girl Hub staff and those involved in DFID and Nike Foundation have learned a considerable amount personally. We have also seen evidence recently that lessons have been learned and applied to the proposed new structure of Girl Hub. Learning, however, has not been sufficiently planned for, documented or shared. Much more should have been done, from the outset, to incorporate learning into Girl Hub.

Planning to learn

- 2.73 There is much potential to learn from the Girl Hub experience. Potential learning about the effectiveness of Girl Hub's theory of change and how to apply it should be the key area of focus. DFID should take the opportunity to learn about how to be innovative in an accountable way.
- 2.74 Girl Hub did not adequately build learning into the original programme design and logframe. The logframe is the primary tool for measuring and evaluating the progress of a project and getting this right is key to learning lessons that can assist future aid delivery.
- 2.75 Success at the country level will also rely on country-level learning plans being established. Country-level activities offer significant opportunity to build a strong practice-led knowledge base which would help to inform donors and implementing partners. Much has been done by Girl Hub and others to advocate for girls but this knowledge risks being lost without effective sharing mechanisms.

²⁷ These programmes, each worth over £20 million, are entitled: Mobilisation for the Millennium Development Goals; and Voices for Change: Empowering Adolescent Girls and Women.

2 Findings

Review and evaluation

2.76 DFID undertook the first annual review of Girl Hub in February 2011.²⁸ This was undertaken by members of DFID's Governance and Social Development Department. DFID followed procedures and some pertinent recommendations were raised. The review process was not fully independent as some of those undertaking the review knew DFID secondees to Girl Hub personally. The assumption that Girl Hub was an appropriate and strategic collaboration was not assessed. The need to update the logframe was the key recommendation from the review. The review did not, however, identify the lack of measures for the particular attributes of Girl Hub (opportunistic; catalytic; media expertise; and experimental) or the lack of focus on achievable outcomes in the logframe. In addition, the review did not identify the issues with financial management and governance highlighted in this report.

2.77 Processes to capture and share learning have not been effective to date. There are significant opportunities for these to happen in the future. Indeed, there is evidence that learning from the last two years has influenced the design of the new structure. Some efforts that are already underway and which could have a significant benefit include:

- disaggregation of mainstream programme data by age as well as gender (to measure whether girls are reached);
- application of monitoring and evaluation software called SenseMaker™ to give a better understanding of the complexities of empowering girls and of development in general,²⁹ and
- gaining from skills and experience obtained by DFID staff seconded to Girl Hub.

2.78 Time commitments for different activities, especially the implementation of SenseMaker™, should also be measured and monitored to ensure

that limited resources are focussed on the highest priority activities.

Innovation

2.79 DFID has no means of properly assessing Girl Hub's catalytic impact or the value of Nike Foundation's communications expertise. The aspects of Girl Hub that make it innovative and ambitious, therefore, cannot be easily monitored.

2.80 The experience and commitment of Girl Hub, DFID and Nike Foundation staff have helped to mitigate this. Current discussions on the future structure of Girl Hub and the role of the Collaborative and Senior Advisory Teams are seeking to learn from the experience of the programme so far and to structure learning better.

2.81 More widely, there may be opportunities for DFID to apply some of Nike Foundation/Girl Hub's communications concepts to other aspects of its work. Understanding how DFID can best foster innovation in a way that manages risk and how future strategic partnerships should be implemented will also be of great use. DFID sees significant potential in increasing its engagement with the private sector to deliver development outcomes.³⁰ Nike Foundation has strong corporate characteristics so there is an opportunity for the Private Sector Department to engage and learn from this engagement. In particular, this is potentially relevant in terms of how best to partner with the private sector and to understand the relationships that foundations have with the private sector companies that sponsor them.

Findings relevant to previous reports to Parliament

2.82 The House of Commons International Development Committee published a report on private foundations in January 2012.³¹ The report commends DFID and Nike Foundation for their focus on girls and education.

²⁸ Annual Review of Girl Hub Project, DFID, February 2011.

²⁹ SenseMaker™ is commercial software designed to help understand complex social environments in large populations.

³⁰ *The Engine of Development: the private sector and prosperity for poor people*, DFID, May 2011, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/Private-sector-approach-paper-May2011.pdf>.

³¹ *Private Foundations*, International Development Committee, January 2012, <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/international-development-committee/news/publication-of-private-foundations-report/>.

2 Findings

- 2.83 The report mentions generic concerns about foundations. It highlights the risks of focussing on a single issue in isolation. This is similar to the risk that Girl Hub messaging implies there is one solution to a complex set of problems. The report warns of the risk of non-development specialists making development decisions. This is also something Girl Hub needs to recognise.
- 2.84 The report states that DFID should engage more with a wider range of foundations. Whilst Girl Hub-style partnerships cannot be replicated on a large scale due to the high level of staff involvement, there are useful lessons for DFID in considering this recommendation.
- 2.85 The report specifically suggests expanding the Rwandan Girl Hub to cover the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We propose that Girl Hub should develop criteria for assessing opportunities before considering further expansion.

3 Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

- 3.1 The idea of Girl Hub is ambitious. It aims to bring new ways of thinking into DFID. It aims to forge a close, collaborative partnership between two very different organisations. It aims to drive fundamental change through DFID and other key players. Ultimately, it aims to reduce poverty by tackling the specific challenges of adolescent girls by empowering them and by harnessing the resources of donors and governments.
- 3.2 Girl Hub was intended to be different from DFID's existing initiatives. The logframe, however, failed to consider those factors which could make Girl Hub unique or valuable. There were insufficient short-term milestones to help to ensure that progress was on track. This has been mitigated to some degree by the expertise and experience of Girl Hub, DFID and Nike Foundation staff who have made efforts to ensure that Girl Hub is making a valid contribution.
- 3.3 Girl Hub highlights some of the reasons why innovation is important for DFID. It also suggests that DFID's approach to innovation should be reviewed to maximise the benefits and minimise the risks. Experimentation and innovation are essential to learning and to developing solutions to meet DFID's objectives. Experiments, however, need to be clearly defined, controlled and measured. Similarly, opportunism can be valuable but it also needs to be accountable. Venture capital, for example, is opportunistic whilst always being able to show why decisions were made.
- 3.4 In establishing Girl Hub, DFID did not ensure that all the appropriate risk, governance and financial management policies and processes were put in place. It is unacceptable for Girl Hub not to have a child protection policy. Nike Foundation is accountable to DFID for the grant. DFID has been heavily involved in strategic oversight but could have done more to ensure proper governance.
- 3.5 Girl Hub has secured a number of specific achievements in line with its model of how it will operate and make a difference, such as DFID Ethiopia's commitment to scale up the End Child Marriage Programme in Ethiopia. It has had some influence on girl-focussed programming, both

within DFID and in developing countries, such as the 12+ Programme in Rwanda and providing input into mainstream programming in Nigeria. In addition, it has developed communication tools such as its girls' magazine, aimed at empowering girls.

- 3.6 To be successful, Girl Hub must clearly link its top-down programming focus with its communication tools, such as its radio programme and magazine in Rwanda. It also needs to decide what to do with its website to make it relevant and clarify its role. Based on the research underpinning Girl Hub's model of how it will make a difference, it will be important to ensure that safe and supportive environments are created where girls can access and benefit from these tools.
- 3.7 Girl Hub has helped to energise key players on the issue of girls. Better planning would have helped it to manage its efforts and to measure and communicate its impacts. DFID must now assess whether to continue the Girl Hub model and, if so, more clearly define and focus its role and purpose.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Girl Hub should be reconfigured to focus more sharply on how it will make a difference to girls, with detailed country and programme plans. It needs to measure both the success of each programme and how effectively programmes are linked to each other and to wider initiatives.

- 3.8 The logframe should be adjusted to incorporate milestones and short-term measures on all aspects of Girl Hub's activities. Having made good progress in supporting DFID to integrate girls' needs into its mainstream programming and strategy, Girl Hub needs to focus on making more progress against its other objectives. To achieve this, detailed country and programme level plans are needed with a focus on beneficiary-led objectives. The new structure should ensure that Girl Hub is driven by development specialists with the support of media experts and not the other way around. Although Girl Hub should reduce its focus on influencing DFID internally, the logframe should also include measures relating to the take-up of its

3 Conclusions and Recommendations

tools within DFID and by other donors. Learning about the effectiveness of Girl Hub's theory of change and how to apply it should be the key area of focus. These measures should be included in the ongoing strategy revision process and completed within six months.

Recommendation 2: Girl Hub should implement comprehensive and robust risk, governance and performance management policies and processes. Girl Hub, DFID and Nike Foundation should ensure that their messaging is clear and consistent and that the roles and influences of each organisation are transparent and accountable.

3.9 Now that Girl Hub has been established as a legal entity, clear and comprehensive policies and procedures should be implemented. This should be included in the ongoing strategy revision process and completed within six months. Child protection, risk management and anti-bribery policies and procedures should be prioritised. DFID should consider how to make the annual review process more independent where there are DFID secondees. Criteria should be developed for future Girl Hubs and other similar ventures. More detailed financial information should be collected and linked to programmatic performance. This should be regularly reviewed and assessed against value for money measures. DFID should implement processes to ensure that this is done before extending the application of the Girl Hub model and entering into future partnerships.

Recommendation 3: DFID should assess the options for Girl Hub's future in the light of the evidence to date.

3.10 DFID should form a clear and agreed forward plan within the next six months. For example, should Girl Hub be spun off as a separate entity, franchised out to other donors, brought within DFID or wound down? This plan should also include an assessment of whether and on what basis further national Girl Hubs should be established.

Recommendation 4: DFID should reflect on the Girl Hub experience and the findings of this report in order to learn how it can promote innovation internally in a way that manages risk, including how partnerships with the private sector and private foundations should be implemented. DFID should implement more thorough pre-grant due diligence for all potential partners.

3.11 DFID should evaluate its accountable grant processes to see how to facilitate innovation more effectively and accountably within the next six months. It should also consider alternative delivery models that may be more appropriate for specific types of collaboration. The Private Sector Department should be included in this process and other engagements with corporate foundations. Where innovation and experimentation are clear objectives, logframes and measurement tools should focus on measuring these attributes. Different processes may be appropriate for different types and levels of investment but there should be clarity about what these are. DFID should ensure that programmes are designed in a transparent, accountable and constructive way before specific requests for proposals are made.

Annex

This annex shows Girl Hub's summary of its main activities and deliverables for each of its four key outputs. This information comes from Girl Hub's December 2011 logframe and subsequent material provided to us by Girl Hub.

Figure A1: Girl Hub's reported activities and achievements to date

<p>Game-changing communications activated to inspire behaviour change in adolescent girls and society</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Using radio and magazine print, Girl Hub aims to give girls a voice, providing a platform to share stories and promote their well-being. ■ Girl Hub Rwanda set up a six-month pilot of the 12+ Programme in July 2011, involving 600 girls, with peer-on-peer mentoring and information on life skills. ■ In Rwanda, the Ni Nyampinga magazine was launched in November 2011 and the initial print run aims to reach 45,000 girls. ■ In July 2011, DFID Nigeria completed a 13-part radio programme. ■ Radio Amina is one of a series of short films commissioned by Girl Hub about inspiring young women in Nigeria.
<p>Global and national systems inspired and activated to deliver effectively for adolescent girls</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Girl Hub is involved in developing and communicating DFID's New Strategic Vision for Women and Girls, shifting the focus to adolescent girls. ■ Girl Hub analysis of a sample of 24 Bilateral Aid Review bids for spending over 2011-12 to 2014-15 found good examples where adolescent girls are particularly targeted providing evidence that girls are being put on the agenda. ■ Girl Hub organises regular seminars for DFID staff for capacity development of global and country teams and subject-area specialists. ■ Advice to DFID policy teams on design of initiatives, for example, DFID's reproductive health policy. ■ Influencing design of DFID's research programmes to focus on adolescent girls and proof of the concept behind Nike Foundation's Girl Effect. ■ DFID and NGO personnel said that Girl Hub had played an important role in getting adolescent girls on to the development agenda and in promoting new tools and methods with which to take that agenda forward. ■ DFID and Girl Hub/Nike Foundation working together on strategic communications with other international donors and influencers such as the Clinton Global Initiative and the Center for Global Development. ■ Influencing champions to create political space at national and global levels for girl-centred dialogue. ■ Girl Hub-facilitated workshops with girls have demonstrated to Rwandan decision-makers that girls have meaningful opinions that make a relevant contribution to consultation on new national programming. ■ High-level discussion with World Bank senior management, to reinforce existing goal of girl-centred International Development Assistance commitments (DFID contributes \$2.8 billion). ■ Girl Hub, DFID and European Commission collaborated to host a high-level panel on gender equality at the 2011 European Development Days in Brussels to raise awareness of the concept behind Nike Foundation's Girl Effect. European Development Days was attended by 7,000 delegates from European member states. Invited speakers included 15-year-old Doris Ofori from Ghana, President Paul Kagame of Rwanda, UK Secretary of State for Development Andrew Mitchell, Maria Eitel (President of Nike Foundation) and European Commissioner Kristalina Georgieva. ■ Girl Hub Direct Assets to Girls Incubator was launched in October 2011. The incubator will identify, fund and monitor innovative programmes to learn how to meet girls' needs more effectively. The aim is to fill current research gaps and test and learn from different ways of getting assets to girls to develop scalable solutions. ■ Ni Nyampinga recently sent two Rwandan girls to the G20 summit in Paris, France. They talked about what it takes to become a Nyampinga – a well-rounded girl who dreams big, accomplishes her dreams and unleashes the benefits of the theory of change encapsulated by Nike Foundation's Girl Effect.

Annex

Partners innovate and deliver results for adolescent girls at scale

- DFID Ethiopia commits £10 million to scale up End Child Marriage Programme.
- DFID Rwanda commits £3 million to scale up 12+ Programme to deliver peer-to-peer reproductive health education to young girls.
- Rwanda Adolescent Reproductive and Sexual Health Strategy is shaped and the implementation plan strengthened following Girl Hub advice.
- DFID Nigeria commits £4 million to include girls' Safe Spaces in an existing immunisation programme.
- Girl Hub expertise assisted with the design of two programmes in Nigeria: 'Mobilisation for the MDGs' and 'Voices for Change: Empowering Adolescent Girls and Women'. Girl Hub was involved in developing the concept with a strong communication component.
- PSI (a major international health NGO) is influenced by Girl Hub Rwanda to expand its own community education programmes to include additional gender empowerment components.

Research and girl-centred participatory monitoring and evaluation generates real-time, robust evidence and insight that gets used in communications, systems, investments and policies

- State of Girls in Rwanda report sets out to identify what activities should be targeted. This includes video stories from girls themselves. This has provided useful evidence of what is important to girls and Girl Hub plans to use this method in Nigeria and Ethiopia.
- Girl-led Journeys – DFID country office staff in Ethiopia shadowed girls to gain real insight into the life of adolescent girls. This is also planned for Rwanda.
- Incremental progress towards goal of age- and sex-disaggregated data within DFID and in the World Bank.
- Girl Hub plans to develop SenseMaker™ as part of its monitoring and evaluation strategy. The SenseMaker™ pilot is a digital collation of qualitative evidence and learning.

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This report was prepared by ICAI with the assistance of KPMG LLP, Agulhas Applied Knowledge, Center of Evaluation for Global Action (CEGA) and the Swedish Institute for Public Administration (SIPU International).

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at enquiries@icai.independent.gov.uk.