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Executive summary

Introduction

Six out of every ten young people in the world today reside in Asia and the Pacific, having come of age in a region being rapidly transformed by technological advances that offer unprecedented potential for their empowerment and engagement. Numbering roughly 700 million in 2015, young people in the region are already raising their voices and participating in actions beyond the communities in which they live, but the majority of young people have yet to be meaningfully engaged and connected to the traditional institutions and processes that determine national and regional outcomes.

Restless Development (lead agency), War Child UK (WCUK) and Youth Business International (YBI) came together to form the PPA Youth Consortium as one of the UK Department for International Development’s (DFID) programme partnership arrangement (PPA) recipients in 2010/11. The Consortium received initial funding from 2011 to 2014 and subsequently was included in the extension period to 2016.

The aim of the Consortium was to harness the energy, skills and participation of youth as an asset to ensure the delivery of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) 1 and 6, specifically in conflict-affected, fragile states and least developed countries that are off track meeting them.

During the PPA funded period, Consortium members were active in 13 countries, including Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, India, Iraq, Nepal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Syria, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Each year the Consortium received a funded amount of £2,755,439, except for FY13/14 in which the Consortium received £3,054,141. In the final financial year (DFID’s financial year 16/17) the Consortium received a lower sum of £2,073,540. As unrestricted funding, the PPA leveraged between 15 and 19% of the Consortium members’ joint income between 2011 and 2015.

The Consortium and joint working

Of the total PPA, 10% of the budget was allocated to the joint working pot. Joint working outputs were summarized in the Annual Progress Reports (APR) to have been done throughout the PPA funded period, though at various stages, lengths of time and depths. An overview of joint workings conducted by the Consortium shows that most joint working had occurred between 2014 and 2016. Of the identified joint working projects, at least 11 (57.8%) projects were outsourced and 3 (15.7%) had been fulfilled by Restless Development. There is very little indication of Consortium joint implementation, which constitutes in our opinion a missed opportunity.

The period of focus for this evaluation is from 2011 to 2016 and builds on 3 independent progress reports and external mid-term evaluations.

This final evaluation is not a DFID requirement, but was an initiative of the Consortium because its members wanted to ensure that learning from the PPA period on impact and participation was fully embedded in the relationships between the current Consortium members and taken forward into any future partnership or consortium that any of these three members might enter into. For the final evaluation, the Consortium was keen to understand the progress achieved towards the outcomes of its work across different programmatic approaches across different geographical locations as well as the strengthened capacity in monitoring and evaluation systems, under the provision of the PPA of DFID. The Consortium sought to understand:

• Outcomes (as defined log frame indicators) and the Consortium’s overall impact;
• Additionality of the Consortium approach (the significance and value of joint work and shared learning; institutional strengthening and cross-agency impact);
• Strategic/Flexible Funding (specific to this type of grant) and how well the Consortium leveraged these funds for strategic impact and internal transformation, aligned to value for money (VfM) principles.

Learning questions included:
1. How can the experiences of the Consortium – both programmatically in its impact, institutionally in the development of each agency, and as a strategic consortium – be used to guide the future direction of the Consortium and to inform broader civil societal collaboration beyond the Consortium?
2. How can the experiences of the Consortium inform and strengthen future partnership(s) and programme design committed to strengthening youth engagement and youth-led development?

The main methodology employed for this evaluation was participatory, which are in line with both consultants’ principles concerning youth engagement as well as the engagement of Consortium members and partner organisation’s staff members. By engaging children, youth, young people (henceforth referred to as youth) and all other stakeholders in a respectful way in an enabling environment that is based on their strengths, their participation became meaningful as their conclusions based on discussions and findings as well as their recommendations are included in the evaluation report. A field visit was undertaken to Uganda, where all three Consortium members had a presence or representation. In addition remote reviews of activity in Kenya, Afghanistan and Tanzania were undertaken.

Findings and analyses

Results for DFID
Measurements for success included a log frame, which focuses on programme delivery, rather than organisational building. Even though the story of Consortium members’ organisational development was captured in the APRs, the focus of that report was mostly on numbers of youth reached, with each member being responsible for different aspects of delivery against targets: Restless Development (4 outputs and 3 outcomes) was responsible for the largest part of log frame delivery, followed by WCUK (2 outputs and 1 outcome) and YBI (1 output and 1 outcome).

Consortium members over-performed on all indicators, barring a slight under-performance on indicator 1.5. The Consortium regularly reported on outcomes and effects of the PPA funding, which did not relate to the log frame. These outcomes and effects reflected a significantly more important impact of the PPA, one that is not included in the log frame targets and is heavily reliant on the strategic nature of the PPA mechanism. These outcomes and effects include the investment in the development of each member agency to increase its capacity and ability to run each organisation more effectively and efficiently and design, develop and implement programming focused on youth.

Results for Consortium members
There were significant and lasting improvements in each Consortium member. The members benefitted from the PPA investment directly rather than the Consortium as an entity in its own right. We have identified five areas where the impact of the PPA funding on Consortium members is most evident:
1. Systems and Processes
The impact of Consortium members’ systems and processes represent significant levels of capacity building in each member organisation. This is seen most clearly in institutional systems and processes as well as in improvements in project design, development and delivery.
Institutional capacity building

This area has demonstrated the most direct investment or influence of PPA funding than most other areas, which is not surprising given the strategic nature of the PPA. The areas outlined below have all been traceable through evidence provided by Consortium members.

• Fundraising

All Consortium members have invested in their capacity to improve their fundraising offer during the PPA period. Restless Development, invested directly in fundraising human resources to grow its ability to fundraise from institutional donors and leverage additional funding on the back of the PPA. The ICAI reported that Restless Development’s PPA-funded trusts and foundations coordinator had generated over £500,000 in the previous 12 months and the Uganda country programme had leveraged over £400,000 in in-country fundraising, which was partially attributable to the PPA.

WCUK used PPA investment to strengthen programme support, which allowed them to free up its reserves for a strategic investment into its fundraising capability, which was developed over time. This investment saw an increase in the fundraising staff, with a particular focus on Major Donors and Trusts and Foundations, the restoration of fundraising and communication development, which had previously been cut. Such investment represents a significant long-term investment into fundraising capability.

YBI was the last to invest in fundraising, recently putting in place senior fundraising resources to help design and develop the fundraising function for the organisation. YBI also put in place a new Programme Partnership Team, which is principally responsible for managing YBI’s donor relationship and related member delivery.

Fundraising investments have contributed to the increase of reserves that each Consortium member is able to report at the end of the PPA period: Consortium members report an overall increase in reserves between 40% and 55% between 2011 and 2015, with unrestricted reserves making up between 45% and 70% of available reserves by 2015.

• Monitoring and evaluation

There is no Consortium-level monitoring system that relates to the log frame or reporting to DFID. Yet, all Consortium members invested in improving their own MEL.

Restless Development invested human resources in its monitoring and evaluation system. Its systems at country level still appear cumbersome and overly reliant on manual data entry at field level. Its vast array of data, with apparently limited ability to prioritise or manage the data into useable files, was also a point of evaluation in the mid-term review.

WCUK invested in an M&E specialist who has been able to put in place a monitoring framework for the agency, develop data collection tools, support country-level investment into monitoring resources and oversee development of monitoring tools such as the Child Safety Report Card (CSRC) approach - a self-reported assessment of children’s perception of how safe they feel in a any given location - being rolled out across all WCUK country programmes over time and that has been used in PPA-funded research in Afghanistan as part of the country programme’s research activities.

YBI supported its members, Enterprise Uganda and KYBT Mombasa, to implement the Operations Management System (OMS) and worked with them to become more data aware, with the result that KYBT Mombasa now uses the OMS for tracking and managing the entire operation. Both KYBT and Enterprise Uganda view the OMS as a crucial part of their effectiveness in delivering, managing and reporting their programmes.
• Financial systems and capacity
Systems development is the most obvious evidence of strategic or core funding investments and is often the first area to show improvement.

Restless Development increased its financial capacity and streamlined its reporting through internal improvements. For example, the online cloud-based system improves efficiency by reducing the duplication of financial data and increases the potential to spot data quality issues more quickly. The cloud-based system enables transactions to be identified by donor, project, country and office within a country, thus making donor reporting and analyses by donor easier to deliver.

As early as January 2011, WCUK considered the implications for its financial systems of the PPA, and prioritised allocating PPA funding to financial systems, which allowed it to upgrade its systems first out of all the Consortium members. YBI’s Exchequer-based financial system did not require investment in the same way as for both WCUK and Restless Development.

Project design, development and delivery
Every member of the Consortium has reported that its ability to design, or develop, or implement projects and programmes has been influenced, affected or enhanced by the input of PPA funding. PPA funding has also been used as match funding for donors that have required it.

Restless Development, for example, has been able to undertake speculative consultation work with communities in Northern Uganda to understand their needs in order to design responses that are ready to go, should a donor be found.

The design of WCUK’s KATI intervention in Northern Uganda has been praised by institutions such as the World Bank and has led to KATI being established as a separate organisation. Similarly, WCUK worked with another partner in Uganda, TPO, to introduce Animation Therapy as part of the project they were funding in Uganda.

YBI has been able to provide strategic support to its partner in Kenya, KYBT Mombasa, to develop its strategy for expanding its services to the Kenyan South Coast and supported the programme implementation of Enterprise Uganda’s NUYEP programme.

2. Value for money
Each member of this Consortium has delivered substantial value for money for themselves, and good value for money for DFID and in YBI’s case for their network members. It is not yet clear whether value for money has been delivered for all stakeholders, especially beneficiaries. Consortium members would have to do further data collection and analysis to determine this.

It is important to note, that at a Consortium level there is no unified and articulated approach to value for money. All Consortium members take different approaches to value for money. Restless Development uses the 3E approach and YBI uses the 4E approach. While WCUK acknowledges that it does not have a written value for money policy, it is understood to use the 3E approach.

• Economy
All Consortium members have been able to improve their procurement approaches and their overall financial management approaches. Consortium members each considered procurement in relation to value for money and made adjustments to their procedures as a result. Restless Development’s approach to procurement, budgeting and understanding inputs is the most comprehensive and
should ensure the most rigorous controls. YBI includes procurement in a suite of financial documents that it reports are at the centre of its approach to value for money.

- **Efficiency**
  Each consortium member is keenly aware of its cost drivers. Each member’s main key cost driver was staff, followed by consultancy (YBI) or volunteer costs. Restless Development has been able to identify the cost per volunteer trained and deployed and activity costs in the case of WCUK.

For each Consortium member, restricted income and expenditure has risen faster and outstripped unrestricted income and expenditure. For Restless Development and YBI, the ratio of restricted to unrestricted expenditure becomes more balanced in the first part of the PPA period and then reverts to early or pre-PPA period levels. For WCUK the trend is reversed as it entered the PPA period with more unrestricted income than restricted income. This highlights the challenges that each agency faces in a post-PPA era.

- **Effectiveness**
  Restless Development builds its programming around the volunteer peer educator (VPE) model, while YBI’s model is centred on an approach to supporting young entrepreneurs that it refers to as the YBI approach: identification – selection – training – loans – mentoring – support. WCUK’s model is focused on consistent thematic areas of operations and identified pillars of intervention that frame its activities. These models are fully resourced and the agencies have utilised them over a long period, thereby increasing the effectiveness of the models through both learning and practical implementation.

- **Equity**
  None of the Consortium members measure or collect data on Equity, or the creation of value for beneficiaries. However, all three members should be able to determine value creation for their stakeholders. Although livelihoods is the easiest intervention type to generate reliable data on value, interventions such as sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR), child protection, education, etc. can all determine value using financial proxies.

3. **Shaping Policy and Practice**
   Both WCUK and Restless Development have invested PPA funding in building capacity to influence policy and practice. WCUK has increased both capacity at the London head office and capacity for shaping policy and practice at the country office level. WCUK’s Afghanistan country office has used PPA funding to increase the evidence base that informs its activities. Restless Development has also improved national and local level policy and practice influence as was demonstrated in Tanzania where Restless Development worked to contribute towards the influencing of the Tanzania government to introduce new guidelines on getting pregnant girls back into school. Restless Development has also helped to shape policy and practice on behalf of the Consortium at an international level when it delivered a series of post-2015 projects during the consultations on the Sustainable Development Goals. Although YBI does not engage in shaping policy and practice, it does consider itself a thought leader. Thus, YBI will support events such as report launches that its members might use for more policy-focused ends, as was the case in Uganda with the launch of the ‘From Rhetoric to Action’ report.

4. **Learning and intra-member learning**
   From the very start of the PPA period, Consortium members were interested in learning from each other. This was initially done through informal learning groups that focused on certain topics such as finance. The level of additional shared learning between the Consortium members at a head office level has increased and formalised since the mid-term evaluation.
In 2015 and 2016, as part of the extension period focus on learning, the Consortium set up a joint sharing platform known as the Festival of Learning. This series of events brought together London-based staff from the members to share and learn from each other about their experiences and lessons during the PPA period. Staff from all Consortium members appeared to have found these events more useful and valuable than other aspects of the Consortium.

The broad range of topics delivered in 2015 appeared more tailored to internal practical learning, whilst the 2016 events appear to be more related to continuous professional development training, which may have been a reason for its lower popularity. Members also provided strategic learning support to each other, such as WCUK’s Director of Fundraising who was seconded to YBI to support the further development of their fundraising function.

5. Joint Working
As outlined above, each year the Consortium would set a budget for joint work and Consortium members would deliver activities on behalf of the Consortium. In the first part of the Consortium, this was the dominant delivery model and the majority (78.95%) of joint working projects were delivered during the first part of the Consortium. After the mid-term review the Consortium changed its approach and developed a joint piece of work that became known as Case for Space. Case for Space was a global research and advocacy initiative that aimed to understand the trends in child and youth development and juxtapose these trends with case study stories that represented the Consortium members in specific areas: youth participation, child protection and youth livelihoods. Although jointly conceived, the delivery of the project was outsourced to Youth Policy Labs and the final output was a report called ‘From Rhetoric to Action’. Each Consortium member can point to at least one result that can be linked back to the report. Further social change or impact is yet to be determined as the report was only launched in 2015. The evaluation of this project highlighted that the process had an impact on the Consortium members and on the young researchers that worked on the project.

Results of organisational development
The previous five areas highlighted immediate or near-term changes to the Consortium members that were easily articulated and evidenced. However, none of these are ends in themselves and Consortium members also went on to reference longer-term results flowing from organisational development.

• Increased credibility
As a result of being able to improve their systems and processes, Consortium members reported that they perceived an increase in credibility. This has been evidenced through an increase in network or partnership working, where partners seek out Consortium members, such as Restless Development in Uganda, in order to work with them.

The delivery of the joint working initiative, Case for Space is also reported to have increased credibility with DFID, whilst one of WCUK’s implementation partners in Uganda, TPO, has reported an increase in the approaches from other organisations since delivering activities on WCUK’s behalf. TPO reported that the due diligence scores it received during the partnership assessment process jumped from 75% to 85%, following the capacity building and organisational development work that it did with WCUK.

• Increased or leveraged funding
All members have reported that they have been able to increase their funding or leverage funding as a result of being organisationally more robust. For example, YBI was able to leverage funding from
the BG Group to support KYBT Mombasa, while its network member, Enterprise Uganda, was able to leverage further funding on the back of the NUYEP project that it had implemented with YBI’s organisational capacity building support.

Results for youth
Youth as end-beneficiaries of Consortium member activities have also seen results or changes that can partly be attributed to the investments made with PPA funding.

Consortium member-specific outcomes for youth stem from the design of the log frame, limited joint working between Consortium members, members’ specialization within the youth programming delivery space as well as programme design, objectives and organisational developments that have taken place in London, with some effects on national offices, field offices or partner organisations in-country. As a result, the identified results for youth are due to the efforts of Consortium members rather than the influence of the Consortium itself.

1. Engaging youth
Each Consortium member engaged youth in a different way and through different channels. Such differing types and each level of engagement are valid and each channel was appreciated by all youth involved. Youth reported that channels for participation have provided them with opportunities and freedoms they had not had access to before, such as financial support and loans and hence the ability to create their own opportunities, opportunities to speak about issues they cared about in official meetings and access to education and psychosocial support.

In all cases, there was a lack of engaging youth in the design, development and evaluation of activities. For KATI, Enterprise Uganda and KYBT, youth were seen and treated as customers, though with a strong sense of purpose for strengthening the socio-economic position of youth. Only in the cases of Restless Development and WCUK’s children shuras\(^1\) in Afghanistan were youth engaged as implementation partners.

2. Activities for youth
Consortium members engaged in a broad scope of activities and a large spectrum of youth participation. Activities in which youth were engaged vary from service provision to partners in implementation and from girl groups to youth advocates, though the former again shows variations of participation evidenced specifically in the lack of participation in design, development and evaluation.

There was little overlap of activities between Consortium members. As highlighted in the discussion on the log frame, PPA-funded activities tended to be member-specific and not designed or implemented at the Consortium level. Results and outcomes of activities are mixed with youth providing mixed feedback including lowered teenage pregnancy rates in schools and decreased stigma after delivery and the seemingly extremely successful and widely appreciated KYBT model; and frustration with shortcomings of KATI and Enterprise Uganda’s mentoring model, feeling undervalued by Restless Development in terms of VPE’s leadership roles in the community.

Among implemented activities, it is clear that the topics of enterprise and livelihoods are closely linked and is the area that is consistent over all Consortium members. Livelihoods and income generation would have provided an opportunity for joint working, perhaps even joint implementation that does not appear to have been identified by the Consortium members. This

\(^1\) Shura is the Islamic tradition of assembling (parliament) and gathering to exchange opinions and make decisions.
point was also highlighted in the mid-term evaluation, but the Consortium appears to have decided not to act towards increasing its potential in this area following the mid-term findings.

Outcomes for youth were partly strengthened by the 7% cut of PPA funding allocated to country programmes. However, results could have been even stronger if Consortium members had actively sought to combine or learn from activities, youth engagement strategies and other Consortium members’ experiences of implementation.

3. Working with Youth to shape policy and practice
Unlike Restless Development and WCUK, YBI does not engage in shaping or influencing policy and practice.

In Uganda, WCUK reported they had done some policy and practice influencing activities in Agago and Pader while they had in-country presence and with children. Outcomes of this activity are unknown, as evidence of outcomes for consideration was not provided. WCUK also engages in evidence-based policy influencing in Afghanistan. This approach has seen WCUK work with local academics to generate evidence that it can use in support of its aims in Afghanistan, in this case with regard to children in conflict with the Law and alternatives to incarceration that Afghan Judges can use. WCUK conducted two research studies using this approach. Taking into account the difficult and conflict-ridden Afghan context and the short time that has passed since both researches were finalized (2013 and 2015), it is understandable that little in terms of actual policy change has been achieved in such a short time. However, children reported that they are happier now than before as they now have access to more freedoms, because of the support given through trainings as well as their direct involvement and space provided in the shuras and meetings where decisions are made.

The most substantial activity to shape policy and practice reviewed for this evaluation was done by Restless Development in Uganda and Tanzania. In Uganda, youth advocates were encouraged to conduct research in their communities. However, youth advocates did not write the research reports, thus limiting youth empowerment and undermining their role. Of the 6 research reports received, only 2 (33.33%) included recommendations, limiting the activity to mere discussion points or storytelling.

Profound social change also occurred in communities and in schools, as a result of training and policy influencing. On the topic of SRH, teachers and youth agreed that activities undertaken by VPEs and youth group members have led to a decrease in teenage pregnancies. Teachers argued the decrease in teenage pregnancy rates was because of successful promotion of abstinence in school, rather than an increase in safe sex behaviour. In-school youth neither denied nor confirmed this trend, though some youth suggested they knew where to get free condoms in town and talked about schemes for reaching those places to collect condoms for themselves and others in school.

In Tanzania, an policy influencing exercise provides evidence of the transformation that has taken place in communities, schools and households, including men and the role of the father. The exercise was done in participation with girls, young women and teachers and doubles as a Unite For Body Rights (UFBR) Alliance advocacy tool. However, the fact that such an exercise has been done shows that barriers have indeed been lowered and that girls and young mothers feel able to talk about issues that prevent them from going back to school and exercise their rights based on new bylaws.

4. Outcomes of Consortium Activities
As a result of activities and youth engagement, barriers to transition to increased independence were lowered in all cases, which inadvertently created a sense of empowerment, self-worth,
purpose and individuality for youth. All above-mentioned values and positive outcomes could be attributed to the focus on peer-to-peer support or groups, whether in trainings, as a mentored group or youth group, are an efficient and effective way of engaging youth in transition from being largely dependent to increasingly independent and adult.

However, a negative and unintended outcome was that youth advocates and VPEs reported they felt undervalued. The sense of being undervalued was due to lack of recognition for the amount and influence of their work in support of community social change. In addition, the way both KATI and Enterprise Uganda models are designed suggest a large indirect dependency from young entrepreneurs on the service provided as well as an additional sense of pressure to repay the loan. With increased pressure, young entrepreneurs seek other sources of income, such as wage labour or additional loans from friends or family, which inevitably complicates their financial situations and creates dependence in other ways.

Identified Results for Youth
Long-term outcomes for youth were not accounted for in the log frame and are therefore unintended, but are valid as they prove profound all-round positive results for youth.

Positive long-term outcomes are attributed to livelihoods and SRH trainings conducted by VPEs in communities and business skills trainings conducted by KATI, Enterprise Uganda and KYBT Mombasa. Youth iterated that skills and knowledge obtained from these trainings provided them with a basis for personal, socio-economic and socio-political well-being, which increases levels of income and affects standards of living for the youth individual, the household.

As a result of their involvement with Consortium members and partners, youth received increased credibility based on their role, their work and their added value in communities in which they work and on District and sub-county levels in Uganda and with financial institutions based on the certificates provided after training, which enabled youth to successfully apply for loans. Such increased credibility is linked to organisational relationships with local governments, financial institutions and growth in organisational credibility, but is strengthened through activities, which VPEs, youth advocates and young entrepreneurs engage in. Youth can therefore be said to be active agents of change and necessary partners for all Consortium members.

Conclusions
Conclusions for this evaluation are based on the two learning questions, which are provided above. The evaluation team has set out their conclusions in relation to these two learning questions and the DAC criteria.

Guiding the future direction of the Consortium
The PPA period has been significant for the development of each Consortium member. The first part (2011 - 2014) of the PPA was crucial to bringing the members onto an even par with each other’s capacity to deliver programming and each other’s institutional effectiveness.

Uganda was the only country where Consortium members had any presence and investigation determined little engagement between members on the ground and little appetite to do so. Youth have reported both positive and negative results in our data collection. On the positive side, the Consortium’s interventions have resulted in personal, socio-economic and community growth for young people and their communities. While on the negative side there are still some high dependency rates observed amongst some beneficiary groups and some communities, specifically on services provided by consortium members, partners or roles provided by consortium members to youth.
What has been less evident during this evaluation and from the documents reviewed and key informants interviewed is what experience at a Consortium level can be taken forward to inform any future direction. Institutional results and results for youth are all member-specific, although there is significant shared learning and sharing of experience and solutions so that each member can improve its operational and programmatic ability. Rather than resulting in Consortium-level or shared impact, the evaluation team suggests changes and impact have happened in tandem within each Consortium member and their sphere of influence.

The increased level of cooperation and learning between the consortium members since the mid-term review is a positive and welcome development and the feedback from young researchers that participated in the Case for Space research suggested that a view of Restless Development, WCUK and YBI speaking with one voice was beginning to emerge.

Despite the positive influence of the PPA on Consortium members, the Consortium as a mechanism does not appear to be a necessary structural delivery device. A formal network approach would have better suited the delivery model that this Consortium ultimately employed. This approach may also have better supported the development of a youth sector or youth space as a tangible concept sooner than has been the case.

**Informing and strengthening future partnership(s) and programme design**

From the perspective of the final evaluation the evaluation team believes the relationship between the Consortium members is more complex than what was proposed in the mid-term evaluation. Each member has a main focus of operation that is different, yet, complementary to the others’, operating at different levels of intervention: micro, meso and macro-level.

Having identified its niche in child protection in fragile contexts, WCUK’s activities tend to focus at the micro level, or individual/household level. Whereas Restless Development’s VPE model is located in a community and works with the community and young people to deliver results for young people at the community, or meso level. YBI’s support for its network members is placed at the macro level due to its global view of its network.

In addition, youth-led and youth-focused organisations need to understand how their work and vision enables them to be conforming, sensitive or transforming organisations that encourage youth participation, support youth engagement or the youth policy and funding environment. Understanding each Consortium member’s operating focus will be useful when considering how to strengthen youth-led development and youth engagement.

**Reflecting on the DAC criteria**

The evaluation team reviewed their findings and evidence in line with the DAC criteria. The DAC criteria are referred to in short below:

**On relevance**

The Consortium’s activities delivered high relevance for youth. All beneficiaries enjoyed increased access to services, freedoms and increased abilities and capabilities for creating their own realities, an increased sense of well-being, independence and purpose, in addition to an increased ability to influence realities of peers in communities. Case for Space is also recognized as a relevant project in which all Consortium members played a role. Case for Space research results, were finalized only recently and linking this to actual outcomes is not possible. Internally, the sub-working groups, cross-member learning and the Festivals of Learning have been the most relevant outcomes for Consortium members.
On effectiveness
The greatest effect has been on internal and institutional mechanisms, such as growing abilities to write proposals, improved or instated MEL systems or team members and fundraising abilities. The consortium members have used the opportunity of the PPA to implement innovative, mostly incremental innovation, solutions such as the CSRCs and the OMS to support and enhance effective project design, delivery and management.

Such increased capacity provided increased security and growth in types and amount of funding received, which in turn supported field offices and network members in countries of operation. All Consortium members have increased the quality of their programme designs, introducing a greater degree of evidence-based programming as a result of improved systems, processes and increased skills and capabilities.

On efficiency
The different members of the Consortium operate in very different ways and different contexts, which means that efficiency looks very different in each organisation. Before the mid-term evaluation, PPA funding was used to strengthen institutional mechanisms, which helped increase efficiencies in each organisation. Consortium members are clear on their own cost drivers and reported on these to DFID together rather than attempting to identify collective cost drivers, which did not exist due to the nature of implementation.

Value for money approaches are mixed: Restless Development and WCUK use the 3E approach and YBI uses the 4E approach. WCUK does not articulate its approach to value for money in a policy document. Consortium members have, however, delivered substantial value for money for their own organisations and good value for money for DFID.

On impact
The impact of the PPA has been most significant on Consortium members in London, though it has provided some leverage and financial freedom in countries of operation. Post-intervention impact has also been demonstrated, with some young entrepreneurs benefitting significantly and for a longer period, together with long-term impacts of girls being able to return to school or children being reintegrated into their families. While each Consortium member has been able to report and demonstrate its impact annually, at a Consortium level, the Consortium has not been able to demonstrate its own impact.

On sustainability
Consortium members have been able to improve their immediate financial sustainability during the PPA period, with all three members demonstrating increased reserves and increased unrestricted reserves particularly by the end of the PPA. Financial sustainability follows on from the investments in fundraising that have been made to increase member effectiveness. Although no organisation is over reliant on one donor, the limitations attached to restricted income and expenditure, despite Restless Development’s full cost recovery approach, suggest that more needs to be done to secure longer term (> five years) sustainability through increased unrestricted income or additional strategic funding partnerships.

At a national level amongst Consortium members’ partners and members, the sustainability aspect is reflected most in capacity building through trainings, guarantee of financial support for a given period or programme streamlining for best support of youth. For youth directly engaged or affected by activities sustainability of the impacts that they have experienced is linked to their sense of
purpose, with the knowledge and skills obtained through the Consortium members’ interventions being retained as a basis for further learning and development.

**Recommendations and way forward**

1. The ability to respond to the learning questions and consider the performance of the Consortium to date requires further consideration of the shape and function of a consortium. This Consortium should carefully consider the options open to it for structure, member responsibility and participation, etc. before considering whether this Consortium should continue in its current form, take another form, expand or contract.
   a. Using a combination of checklists, such as a checklist for capabilities and mechanisms for measuring results and added value, Consortium members should be able to confirm their continuation as a consortium. In each case, a consortium should be separate from the Consortium’s individual members.

2. There are various levels of engagement of children, youth and young people, including engaging them as beneficiaries, leaders or partners. Consortium members should be clear about which level of engagement is appropriate and needed for their work and how that translates into relationships with youth in development.

3. Restless Development should acknowledge that its key position on the meso operational level is key to developing the youth space. However, more crucially, Restless Development must change the conversation around youth and move away from traditional development approaches if it is to be successful at growing and leading a youth space.
   a. Such a change in conversation includes a shift from responding to tenders and donors’ priorities to relationships with donors based on a high degree of synergy and support for Restless Development’s long-term objectives and vision.

4. WCUK should clarify and distinguish the work that it does at the micro and meso levels and ensure linkages between them that support impact at the micro level.
   a. WCUK should consider publishing an (annual) positioning paper in which they draw on existing indexes, such as psychosocial well-being, access to education and children in conflict to become the go-to report on child vulnerabilities. Examples of similar reports include the annual State of the World’s Girls report and the annual or biennial Global Nutrition Index.

5. YBI should include shaping policy and practice at a national and international level to advance their cause for supporting and creating enabling environments for young entrepreneurs through network members.
1 Evaluation parameters, structure and organization

1.1 Background of the evaluation

Since April 2011, UK’s Department for International Development (DFID) has provided Programme Partnership Arrangement (PPA) funding for Restless Development, War Child UK (WCUK) and Youth Business International (YBI), henceforth referred to as the Consortium. Activities supported by DFID in specific countries are focused around youth livelihood development, adolescent sexual and reproductive health, youth civic participation and child protection.

The Consortium was keen to understand the progress achieved towards the outcomes of its work across different programmatic approaches across different geographical locations as well as the strengthened capacity in monitoring and evaluation systems, under the provision of the PPA of DFID. The Consortium sought to understand:

- Outcomes (as defined log frame indicators) and the Consortium’s overall impact;
- Additionality of the Consortium approach (the significance and value of joint work and shared learning; institutional strengthening and cross-agency impact);
- Strategic/Flexible Funding (specific to this type of grant) and how well the Consortium leveraged these funds for strategic impact and internal transformation, aligned to value for money (VfM) principles.2

This evaluation followed 3 external evaluations, including the mid-term PPA independent progress review (2012)3, PPA mid-term evaluation report (2013)4 and an external evaluation of the PPA Consortium (2014)5 as well as member-specific Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) outputs and outcomes as presented in each Annual Programme Report (APR). This final evaluation of the PPA focuses on the period from April 2014 till May 2016, though ultimately presenting a 5-year overview of the Consortium’s performance and incorporating findings from previous external evaluations.

1.2 Introducing the Consortium

The Consortium is made up of 3 members, which include (in alphabetical order) Restless Development, WCUK and YBI who jointly applied for the PPA. Each Consortium member is introduced below:

**Restless Development** is a youth-led development agency committed to mobilising young people as an effective human resource in social development efforts, and in empowering young people to take up a leadership role in addressing the most urgent issues facing them, at community, national and global levels. For the majority of the PPA period Restless Development’s global strategy had 3 primary goals all focused on young people, namely civic participation, sexual and reproductive health (SRH) and livelihoods and employment.6 In August 2016 Restless Development launched a new strategy that has built on the previous strategy and includes goals for working in communities with young people’s ultimate goals, promoting a Restless Model, transforming Restless into a global agency, and launching a Youth Collective. Restless Development is the lead member for the Consortium.

---
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3 van Eekelen W. and Edbrooke J. (2012) *The Mid-Term PPA Independent Progress Review For the Consortium of Restless Development (lead agency), War Child and Youth Business International*. 
6 Restless Development report and financial statements for the year ended 30 September 2015
War Child UK is a charitable company that aims to support and improve the protection and care of children and young people who live with a combination of insecurity, poverty and exclusion in some of the worst conflict-affected places. WCUK aims to accomplish this through their recovery; they are a specialist organisation focused on high impact and sustainable interventions; they champion the voices of children and mobilise others to take action in support of them; their values define their actions and drive WCUK to continually improve their work and systems; they are part of an effective global family. By standing these principles, WCUK aims to empower children to overcome the devastating impact of armed conflict.7

Youth Business International is one of the world’s leading providers of support to young entrepreneurs. They are a global network of over 45 independent initiatives dedicated to providing young people aged 18-35 with the tools they need, both financial and non-financial, to start and grow their own business. The YBI network is made up of local organisations, which deliver support to young people. The network team coordinates the activity and their remit is to facilitate and enable members to grow and reach more young entrepreneurs.8

1.3 Definitions
The Consortium members work with a wide range of ages of youth. The evaluation team has set out below two crucial definitions that will help the reader to understand the scope of the work that is under review and the evaluation’s expectations and understanding of key concepts that have been tested.

Youth
Each Consortium member works with distinct groups of children, youth or young people. During the inception period the Consortium members outlined their various definitions of what they understood by the various terms children, youth, young people.

As shown in figure 1 below, there are differing understandings and terminology for some of the same age groups amongst Consortium members. For the purposes of this evaluation, the evaluation team will only refer to youth, which will include an automatic assumption that we are also including children and young people, unless we specifically refer to either group.

![Figure 1](image)

Consortium
The PPA Youth Consortium refers to itself as a ‘strategic consortium’. The evaluation team could not find an independently verified definition of a strategic consortium and how this differs from a normal consortium. The PPA Youth Consortium has not provided further detail on what it means by the term ‘strategic consortium’ other than the aims and goals in its proposals to DFID.

---

7 War Child Trustee’s Report for the year ended 31 December 2015
8 Youth Business International report and financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2015
Thus the evaluation team has set out their understanding of what a consortium is and therefore what they would expect to see within the activities and operations of this Consortium. For the evaluation questions (see below), the evaluation team has included aspects of this definition to determine the degree to which this Consortium is fully operational.

In considering how the evaluation team would define the term for the purposes of this evaluation they considered the definitions of consortium, partnership, coalition, etc., with specific reference given to Jared Raynor’s Framework for assessing consortiums, namely:

That at its simplest form, a consortium is a unique entity of its own accord, comprised of other actors (institutional or otherwise) working together.

As such a consortium exhibits properties of a standard organisation (leadership, management, adaptability and technical skills) as well as standard group dynamics. At more complex levels consortia are about relationships and understanding how they function in pursuit of specific goals. This definition is consistent with the definition of a consortium set out in the Farm Africa document included in the Festival of Learning.

1.4 Purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation

The Consortium proposed a multi-country evaluation against PPA outcome indicators. The proposed evaluation aimed to externally verify the Consortium’s achievements and performance against all relevant outcomes and to form an evidenced narrative around the added value that the Consortium has had in achieving these outcomes. The assessment should inform Consortium members of performance assessment criteria adapted to relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency and results, which are currently used in DFID’s evaluation strategy for the PPA.

In addition to above-mentioned focus, 2 learning questions were provided for specific focus. These learning questions were:

1. How can the experiences of the Consortium - both programmatically in its impact, institutionally in the development of each agency [member], and as a strategic consortium - be used to guide the future direction of the Consortium and to inform broader civil societal collaboration beyond the Consortium?
2. How can the experiences of the Consortium inform and strengthen future partnership(s) and programme design committed to strengthening youth engagement and youth-led development?

In addition to above-mentioned learning questions, 10 evaluation questions were devised with Consortium members. These evaluation questions were:

1. What was/were the effect(s) of the design process at the start of the PPA on consortium working and delivery of results?
2. What are the (direct, indirect, intentional and unintentional) child, youth and young people oriented outcomes and impact as a result of working as a consortium?
3. How has consortium members’ approach working with youth changed during the PPA period and is this as a result of the PPA funding or working in a consortium?

---
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4. To what extent has the consortium generated engaging environments for youth, that enable beneficiaries to fully participate in setting and delivering the consortium’s objectives; and to what extent are other stakeholders and partners aware of ongoing or past processes?
5. To what extent have activities implemented by the consortium reflected the value for money (4E approach) of PPA funding, as based on specific case studies?
6. To what extent has PPA funding allowed the consortium to shape policy and practice in the UK, in-programme country and international levels and how have these activities helped the consortium reach PPA aims?
7. How have the members of the consortium contributed to and benefited from being in the consortium and how effective was the consortium as a (strategic) mechanism for achieving its aims?
8. What have some of the unintended positive by-products, such as positive externalities, of the consortium been?
9. In what way(s) has each consortium member grown in in organisational policy and practice, research and learning as a result of PPA funding and to what extent has this led to sustainable and pragmatic changes within and for each consortium member?
10. Has the PPA funding provided the leverage needed for other sustainable funding streams post-PPA?

1.5 Approach and methodology of the evaluation

The main methodology employed for this evaluation was participatory, which are in line with both consultant’s principles concerning youth engagement as well as the engagement of Consortium members and partner organisation’s staff members. By engaging youth and all other stakeholders in a respectful way in an enabling environment that is based on their strengths, their participation became meaningful as their conclusions based on discussions and findings as well as their recommendations are included in this evaluation report.

The Consortium chose to appoint two evaluators with complimentary skills and experience to ensure a strong focus on both the organisational development aspect and to bring youth participation and voice to the fore in the final assessment of the PPA period.

To assess and evaluate the Consortium’s experiences, both evaluation team members visited Uganda, as this was the only country where all Consortium members were active at the time of the evaluation. In addition, 3 countries were assessed and evaluated remotely. The countries for which the evaluation team conducted remote assessment and evaluation were Afghanistan for WCUK, Kenya for YBI and Tanzania for Restless Development. Each country included in the evaluation had a specific and specialised focus, which fell in line with each Consortium members’ programmatic and organisational focus and had a clear established link with the PPA.

In Afghanistan the focus was on funding in research and what the outcomes have been, whilst in Kenya, assessment and evaluation focused on the creation of an enabling environment for young entrepreneurs. In Tanzania, the focus was on gender and efforts for increasing gender equality. In Uganda the focus was 2-fold, namely SRH and enterprise. Each country focus related to determining efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of PPA and consortium outcomes.

The methodology incorporated various methods, which included:
- Document review of both internal and external documents that relate to the Consortium and its programme content. Consortium members mostly provided documents, though some were obtained from partners in the focus countries. All documentation provided was taken at face value, as the evaluation team were unable to verify their validity and test their accuracy. The
evaluation team also sourced third party documents, as were required and necessary for verifying hypotheses independently.

- **An inception workshop** allowed key representatives from the Consortium to explore what the hypotheses for the overall PPA period looked like. In total, 3 questions were considered, which included ‘What had to be in place for the PPA to happen?’, ‘What happened internally and externally?’ and ‘What impacts or changes have been observed?’. During this workshop a hypothesis was put together, which formed the basis for investigations during the final evaluation period.

- **Key Informant Interviews (KII)** took place with a range of stakeholder representatives from each Consortium member, either face-to-face or on Skype, as required. Questions and topics put forward were based on learning questions, evaluation questions and hypotheses. All KII participants were encouraged to put forward any issues or topics they found relevant to the PPA, related activities or relationships.

- **Outcome harvesting questionnaires** were sent to country teams and relevant staff members in Afghanistan, Kenya and Tanzania. The focus of the outcome harvesting questionnaires was to identify, formulate and verify outcomes related to organisation’s contributions.

- **Working sessions with youth** were conducted in Afghanistan and Uganda. WCUK staff members were coached online and during a Skype call on the focus, methodology and method for the session with children. In Uganda, a member of the evaluation team facilitated working sessions with youth on relevant topics. In the working sessions, youth were encouraged to become evaluators themselves. Each working session with a particular stakeholder group built on the former working session whilst creating an opportunity to test and double-check findings from previous sessions.

- **Peer-to-peer evaluation** was conducted with a group of youth in Moroto in Uganda. Short surveys were compiled by youth participants based on what they wanted to know from peers who had become beneficiaries of activities implemented by them. Outcomes of the surveys were analysed by youth participants and conclusions were drawn during the session.

- **Focus Group Discussions (FGD)** were held remotely with youth in Kenya. Other FGDs were conducted in-country and were facilitated by Consortium member or partner organisation staff members who had received written and verbal instructions and coaching from the evaluation team.

- **The Value for Money** approach used in this evaluation was based on the 4Es, namely economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity. The UK Independent Commission on Aid Impact (ICAI) definitions for the 4Es were useful in understanding how these concepts were applied (see Appendix 6.1 figure 2). A value for money matrix was used for the case study approach. The 3 evaluation stages within the matrix are: Managing, Demonstrating and Comparing with the majority of enquiry focused at the managerial level.

In total, 135 consortium member staff, partner staff, youth and other stakeholders provided their input, shared their insights and ideas with the evaluation team for this final evaluation.

### 1.6 Management of the evaluation

This evaluation was managed through regular communication between the evaluation team and the Consortium, represented by Restless Development through Carron Basu Ray, Acting Director of Programmes. Weekly Skype follow-ups and meetings with the evaluation team fed into a fixed weekly conference call between representatives of the Consortium members. Regular group emails complemented fixed calls and anything urgent was reported or discussed as soon as the issue arose, not waiting for the next fixed call.

The evaluation team was led by Robin Brady and supported by Lise Paaskesen. Both consultants work as independent consultants, specialised in enabling social impact and youth participation,
respectively. Though both consultants had originally sent in separate proposals, the Consortium suggested the consultants work together to strengthen each other and for generating the best possible learning outcomes for the Consortium, its members and partners. The evaluation team was given a total of 34.5 days to finish the evaluation. In total, 25.5 days (Robin) and 16.5 days (Lise) were set aside for data collection and analyses.

1.7 The final evaluation report

1.7.1 Report structure
This final evaluation report is structured in such a way that it allows the reader to easily distinguish between evidence-based findings and the evaluation team’s reflections and conclusions. The evaluation team’s reflections and conclusions are supported by recommendations, which can be found in chapter 5 of this report. The executive summary provides a short overview of the main points put forward in this report, related to the key learning and evaluation questions. This report is structured in sections as follows:

Chapter one: Evaluation parameters, structure and organization
Chapter two: PPA background and basics
Chapter three: Findings and analyses
Chapter four: Conclusions
Chapter five: Recommendations and way forward

The title of the report represents the use of strategic funding by the Consortium and as a way of booking and getting results. ‘The oil that makes the machine run’ was an expression used by a key informant for this evaluation, which the evaluation team thought fitting to this evaluation, its outcomes and its arguments.

1.7.2 Narrative data representation
Data on which this report and its insights are based were derived from a wide variety of sources. The evaluation team generated some of the data, whilst other sources of data were derived from other external and independent evaluations, reports and documents produced by Consortium members, partners and youth or other internally produced monitoring data.

Quotes or narratives are used to represent the majority view. When a quote or narrative is used because it represents a minority view, it is noted as such. All quotes and narratives are anonymized to suit the evaluation team’s ethical convictions. All photographs used have already been made public and are the property of the Consortium members.

1.7.3 Limitations of the evaluation
Data collected for the final evaluation is complex and reflects the breadth and depth of the PPA. Data collection was constrained by several limitations, which include:

- **High turnover of staff** in all Consortium members, partners and network members influenced institutional memory. This meant that there were few of the key informants who could provide a narrative for the whole PPA period, and more who had good knowledge of the last two years of the PPA period.
- **Key informant interviews**: The evaluation team had requested to speak to key staff members deemed relevant to the final evaluation. However, some staff members were prevented from speaking to the evaluation team. No clear reasons were provided to the evaluation team.
- **Documentation for desk study**: There was an overflow of documents and secondary data, especially from Restless Development, some of which was relevant to the final evaluation, but most irrelevant. The abundance of desk study documents, which fell outside of the documents
requested by the evaluation team, proved time-consuming and an ineffective and inefficient use of time for the evaluation team.

- **Joint working in Uganda:** During the inception workshop it was explained to the evaluation team that there was joint work in Uganda that was important to see, and this was the main reason for prioritising Uganda for the validation visit. The connections between each Consortium member were assumed to be adequate for assessment, so that the evaluation could focus on Consortium efforts in-country. In reality in-country Consortium relationships were weak to non-existent and so the limited time agreed was insufficient to assess and evaluate each Consortium member and partner activities’ outcomes independently.

- **Remote evaluation** was done around the same time as the country visit. Such a compiled, hectic and trying period for evaluation was not conducive to the evaluation process. Despite constant efforts and follow-up from the evaluation team, outcomes of the remote evaluations were mixed, where some fell short in their delivery.
2 PPA background and basics

2.1 Genesis and establishment

Six out of every ten youth in the world today reside in Asia and the Pacific, having come of age in a region being rapidly transformed by technological advances that offer unprecedented potential for their empowerment and engagement. Numbering roughly 700 million in 2015, youth in the region are already raising their voices and participating in actions beyond the communities in which they live, but the majority of youth have yet to be meaningfully engaged and connected to the traditional institutions and processes that determine national and regional outcomes.

With half of the world under the age of 30, and youth constituting a growing demographic majority, it is important that the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) place youth at the forefront of change and development. The SDGs assert that “no one must be left behind”, recognising that society cannot reach its potential if youth are excluded from participating in, contributing to, and benefiting from development. This important juncture calls to examine the conditions and environments that affect youth development, to ensure that youth can take on the duty of being torchbearers and leaders towards 2030, and beyond.12

On the basis of an initial concept note and narrative proposal, the PPA funding was granted to the Consortium for a 3-year period, from 2011 to the end of 2013. The period of funding was granted an extension twice; once at the end of the initial 3-year funding period based on the PPA extension application and once in mid-2016. Each year (see appendix 6.2, table 1) the Consortium received a funded amount of £2,755,439, except for FY13/14 in which the Consortium received £3,054,141. In the final financial year (DFID’s financial year 16/17) the Consortium received a lower sum of £2,073,540.13 As unrestricted funding, the PPA leveraged between 15 and 19% of the Consortium members’ joint income between 2011 and 2015 (see Appendix 6.2, table 1).

2.2 PPA goals and aims

The PPA was one of DFID’s principal funding mechanisms. The goal of the Consortium for the first 3 years was to develop and codify Consortium programmes across the 3 log frame priority areas to contribute to good practice in their sectors (on quality), embed a system that takes the Consortium’s impact evaluations (effectiveness) and measures them against relative cost (economy) as well as the relationship of inputs to outputs (efficiency) to enhance results and inform organisational policy and practice (efficiency) and as individual organisations [members] and collectively, to significantly increase the number of beneficiaries the Consortium reaches, both directly and indirectly, through development of a more formal youth sector and influencing relevant policy and practice.14

The aim of the Consortium was to harness the energy, skills and participation of youth as an asset to ensure the delivery of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) 1 and 6, specifically in conflict-affected, fragile states and least developed countries that are off track meeting them.15 This final evaluation is not a DFID requirement, but was an initiative of the Consortium because its members wanted to ensure that learning from the PPA period on impact and participation was fully embedded in the relationships between the current Consortium members and taken forward into any future

---

12 Roundtable discussion - Youth at the heart of the 2030 agenda: The Case for Space (30 November - 2 December 2016, UNCC Bangkok
13 https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-202545/transactions (Accessed 13 November 2016) The Consortium members and DFID have different financial years, which means that the published amounts on DFID’s DevTracker site will not match up to the published amounts in the Consortium members’ annual accounts.
14 Year 1 APR additionality report
15 PPA submission 144 Restless Dev WC YBI Narrative
partnership or consortium that any of these three agencies might enter into. The Consortium members also understood that the current political climate and results-based agenda demanded a rigorous assessment of the effectiveness of funds disbursed to ensure effectiveness, efficiency and results.16

2.3 Consortium governing bodies and operations
The Consortium is supported by Learning Partnerships, which were set up by DFID and led by a steering committee. By engaging as part of the PPA Learning Partnership, Consortium members contributed towards achieving the MDGs. Strengthening strategic partnership across the sector and increasing the quality of programmes and relevance of policy leads to better impact and results for beneficiaries.17 Like all PPA holders, the Consortium participated in a number of the Learning Groups, including Gender and Institutional Effectiveness, and took the chair of the Steering Committee for the Learning Partnership during the third year of the PPA period.

This impact is a result of strengthened relationships between PPA holders, between PPA holders and DFID and between broader civil society and development partners. Regular communication, deeper network building and the development of greater trust and accountability in the Learning Groups strengthen relationships. The Learning Partnership also generates learning products and tools, as well as workshops, events and training. These built the capacity of Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and DFID, reflected a stronger civil society, which shares best practices and materials to increased quality of programmes and relevance of policy.18 The Learning Partnership Theory of Change defines the path towards change.19

In addition, a Consortium level steering group, working group, joint working group and sub-working groups hold Consortium members accountable. A fourth member, independent from her/his role as one of the Consortium members’ staff, took on the role of the 4th Entity, with responsibility for holding all group members to account.

2.4 The Consortium and joint working
The PPA log frame indicates 4 outputs (see Appendix 6.2, table 2) and 3 outcomes (see Appendix 6.2, table 3) relating to civic participation, protection and livelihoods, with 20 indicators in total. Annual Progress Reporting (APR) show adjustments have been made on 5 accounts; following the Ebola crisis20 in West Africa funding adjustments were made, 1 outcome for stakeholder engagement on youth issues was added21 and several output levels were revised upwards.22 The cited reason for revising output levels upwards was “to demonstrate its [Consortium] ability to achieve increased ambition” and were in line with feedback provided by DFID in year 2 of the PPA funded period.23

Of the total PPA, 10% of the budget was allocated to the joint working pot. Joint working outputs were summarized in the APRs to have been done throughout the PPA funded period, though at various stages, lengths of time and depths. Appendix 6.2, table 3 provides an overview of joint workings conducted by the Consortium and shows that most joint working had occurred between 2014 and 2016. Of the identified joint working projects, at least 11 (57.8%) projects were outsourced

16 Draft terms of reference for the evaluation of PPA Consortium performance and impact: Request for proposals
17 Year 2 APR
18 Learning partnership theory of change: Short narrative
19 Final theory of change learning partnership (April 14)
20 Year 4 Annual Progress Report
21 Year 3 Annual Progress Report
22 Year 2 Annual Progress Report, Year 3 Annual Progress Report and Year 5 Annual Progress Report
23 Youth Consortium PPA Annual Review feedback 2012-13
and 3 (15.7%) had been fulfilled by Restless Development. For the remaining joint working projects, it remains unclear which Consortium members worked jointly on the project. Further email requests to Consortium members did not provide clarity on this issue.

2.5 Outcomes of PPA, field offices and partners

During the PPA funded period, Consortium members were active in 13 countries, including Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, India, Iraq, Nepal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Syria, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe. Uganda was the only country, in which all Consortium members had in-country presence at the time of the final evaluation.

During the PPA funded period, Restless Development operated in-country in all PPA-related countries through established field offices. WCUK generally worked through established field offices, except in Uganda where WCUK financially supported KATI in providing financial resources for young entrepreneurs and TPO for providing psychosocial support and well-being to children. YBI is a tier 2 network organisation, supporting network members in-country in providing training, mentoring and general support to young entrepreneurs. For the purposes of the PPA, YBI reported on results from network members in India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Kenya and Uganda.

Though the APRs provide a good overview of outputs and outcomes achieved, they also argue that outcomes have included organisational and institutional strengthening, such as institutional capacity building that can be linked to PPA funding. This improved capacity building is demonstrated in fundraising, monitoring and evaluation, financial management and financial systems, organisational policies put in place, increased technical capacity in programme teams and internal and intra-member learning and support.

As will be argued later in this report, institutional capacity building and development is only half the story and does not cover the institutional gains nor outcomes for youth in countries who are the main beneficiaries of Consortium members’ efforts and activities.

---

Annual Progress Report Year 3
3 Findings and Analysis

In this section the evaluation team presents the findings and its analysis in terms of the results that have been generated for DFID, for the Consortium members and for youth.

The PPA funding has been a positive input, and contributed to the development of Restless Development, WCUK and YBI over the past six years. While the PPA has contributed to results for youth, PPA funding and its influence has not always reached the end-beneficiary, providing mixed results for youth. At a Consortium-level less evidence has been provided. While a joint working budget was put in place annually, this did not necessarily result in joint implementation, which is due to the approach taken to this Consortium by its members. Some of the activities funded through the joint working budget have been significant however, and point to the potential of this Consortium should it choose to engage in more joint implementation.

3.1 Results for DFID

It is important to remember that like other PPA-funded organisations, this Consortium reported annually to DFID on its progress against an agreed log frame and additional issues. Like most other grantees, the Consortium’s log frame focused on programme delivery, rather than organisational capacity building.\(^{25}\)

Even though the story of the Consortium members’ organisational development was captured in the Annual Progress Reports (APR), the focus of that reporting was on the log frame results. Which, in the case of the Consortium, focused mostly on numbers of youth reached, with each member being responsible for different aspects of delivery against targets.

The Consortium agreed a formula for determining progress against each indicator target that was based on evaluations representative of the Consortium’s target populations and not on the monitoring and tracking of each targeted individual’s performance.\(^{26}\) Consortium members over-performed on all indicators (see Appendix 6.1, table 2), barring a slight under-performance on indicator 1.5 and was recognized by DFID in their official feedback to the Consortium.\(^{27}\) In some cases some members were wholly responsible for certain targets, while in other cases, two or three members would contribute towards a target. In which case, a percentage allocation approach would be used to determine the numbers each member had to achieve and report against.

Appendix 6.1, table 3 shows the log frame in short and which Consortium member was responsible or shared responsibility for each outcome. From this table, it is clear that Restless Development carried the largest responsibility for reaching set objectives and outcomes. Of log frame outputs, Restless Development was solely responsible for 4 (33.33%) outputs 3 (25%) outcomes, and co-responsible for 6 (50%) outputs and 4 (33.33%) outcomes. The Consortium member who was responsible for the least number of outputs and outcomes was YBI; 1 (8.33%) output and 1 (11.11%) outcome, plus shared 4 (33.33%) outputs and 2 (22.22%) outcomes. WCUK’s efforts covered 2 (16.67%) outputs and 1 (11.11%) outcome and shared 5 (41.67%) outputs and 2 (22.22%) outcomes.

---

\(^{25}\) There are instances in the PPA where organisations have included organisational development and capacity building in their log frames. These have received a mixed response from DFID and generally been poorly measured or tracked, as systems for measuring capacity building effectively have not been in place (see Brady, R. The Independent Evaluation of Plan International UK’s Application of PPA Funding for Organisational Effectiveness, due for publication 2016)

\(^{26}\) Log Frames for years 1 - 5

\(^{27}\) Year 2 final letter youth consortium
The Consortium also regularly reported on outcomes and effects of the PPA funding, which did not relate to the log frame. These outcomes and effects reflected a significantly more important impact of the PPA, one that is not included in the log frame targets, and heavily reliant on the strategic nature of the PPA funding mechanism; i.e. the investment in the development of each member agency to increase its capacity and ability to run each organisation more effectively and efficiently and design, develop and implement programming focused on youth.

This important impact of the PPA is taken up in more detail in the next section. The Consortium’s log frame related performance is important to note as it represents the focus of each member’s long-term goal.

3.2 Results for Consortium Members

Documentary evidence, supported by key informant interviews confirmed that there were significant and lasting improvements in each Consortium member and that for this Consortium it is true that the members benefitted from the PPA investment rather than the Consortium as an entity in its own right.  

The evaluation team has identified five specific areas where the impact of the PPA funding on Consortium members is most clearly demonstrated.

3.2.1 Systems and Processes

The impact on Consortium members’ systems and processes has been in line with that of other PPA recipients and represents significant levels of capacity building in each member organisation. This has been seen in both the institutional systems and processes as well as in improvements in programme design, development and delivery.

3.2.1.1 Institutional Capacity Building

This area has demonstrated the most direct investment or influence of PPA funding than most other areas, which is not surprising given the strategic nature of the PPA. The areas outlined below have all been traceable through evidence provided by Consortium members. The hypothesis developed during the inception workshop has defined our inquiry, however due to the nature of unrestricted funding; there may be elements of institutional capacity building that are not identified.

3.2.1.1.1 Fundraising

All Consortium members have invested in their capacity to improve their fundraising offer over the period of the PPA. Not all investment was directly from PPA, but as WCUK has demonstrated using PPA funding to invest in programme support allowed the organisation to free up its reserves for a strategic investment into its fundraising capability, which was developed over time. WCUK’s April 2011 board papers show that the organisation targeted fundraising investment totalling just over £300,000 right from the start of the PPA period. This investment saw an increase in the fundraising staff, with a particular focus on Major Donors and Trusts and Foundations, the restoration of fundraising and communication development spend that had been previously cut. This represents a significant long-term investment into fundraising capability.

---

28 Key informants were able to clearly articulate the benefits of being in the Consortium for each member, while what each member contributed to the Consortium was considerably more difficult to articulate. Documents provided for analysis, including the APRs, focused on the benefits to each member rather than the Consortium, something DFID also picked up on in its annual response letters to the Consortium.

29 Fundraising was allocated 14.1% (est.) of PPA funding each year (Annual Progress Report Year 3)

30 War Child UK Board Papers April 2011
Restless Development, on the other hand, directly invested in fundraising human resources to grow its ability to fundraise from institutional donors and leverage additional funding on the back of the PPA. The ICAI used Restless Development and the Consortium as one of its case studies in its 2013 report on the PPA funding stream. The ICAI reported that Restless Development’s PPA-funded trusts and foundations coordinator had generated over £500,000 in the previous 12 months and the Uganda country programme had leveraged over £400,000 in in-country fundraising, which was partially attributable to the PPA.  

Whilst YBI (who had already reconfigured its organisational structure) was the last to invest in fundraising, recently putting in place senior fundraising resources to help design and develop the fundraising function for the organisation. Additionally, YBI put in place a new Programme Partnership Team, which is principally responsible for managing YBI’s donor relationships and related member delivery. This relationship also includes sourcing potential funding and participating in the fundraising process with the newly expanded fundraising team.

We have been able to hugely increase philanthropist funding income because of PPA unrestricted funding. 
Director of fundraising WCUK, remote KII 05.10.2016

Additionally, WCUK has separated the institutional fundraising function from the individual, major donor, corporate and trust and foundation fundraising and located institutional fundraising in the programme team. This allows the technical specialists that WCUK has invested PPA funding to work closely with the programme team to develop high quality, technically evidenced funding proposals. This interconnectedness of institutional funding and programme management is seen in other NGOs and is, to a degree reflected in the investment in institutional fundraising at country office level in Restless Development’s offices as a result of the PPA funding.

This fundraising investment has contributed to the increase of reserves that each Consortium member is able to report at the end of the PPA period. The Consortium members report an overall increase in reserves of between 40% and 55% between 2011 and 2015, with unrestricted reserves making up between 45% and 70% of available reserves by 2015.

3.2.1.1.2 Monitoring and Evaluation
All three members invested in improving their MEL. YBI’s Operations Management System (OMS) system was extensively reviewed at the mid-term. Since then its integration into members’ systems has continued, delivering improved results and efficiencies in members such as Enterprise Uganda and Kenya Youth Business Trust (KYBT) Mombasa. Enterprise Uganda trialled the OMS as part of its NUYEP project (supported by YBI in part through PPA funding). The implementation of the OMS in Enterprise Uganda did have some initial challenges, but now the organisation is using the OMS for all of its programme management and monitoring. The organisation reports increased confidence in the quality of its data, which is

31 ICAI (2013) DFID’s Support for Civil Society Organisations through Programme Partnership Arrangements, ICAI
reflected in the feedback that it receives from other organisations that request youth entrepreneurship data from Enterprise Uganda.\textsuperscript{34}

YBI has also supported KYBT Mombasa to implement the OMS system. Initially there were similar data quality issues as reported by Enterprise Uganda, however the YBI team worked with the KYBT Mombasa team to become more data aware, with the result that KYBT Mombasa now uses the OMS for tracking and managing the entire operation, not just the YBI-related activities. Both network members view the OMS as a crucial part of their effectiveness in delivering, managing and reporting on their programmes.

WCUK invested in an M&E specialist who has been able to put in place a monitoring framework for the agency, develop data collection tools, support country-level investment into monitoring resources and oversee the Child Safety Report Card (CSRC) approach being rolled out across all WCUK country programmes over time. The CSRC, based on Community Score Cards, is a self-reported assessment of children’s perception of how safe they feel in any given location. This significant development was initiated in 2009 and benefitted from the PPA through funding made available to pilot it in programmes such as WCUK’s Northern Uganda programme. This small pilot led to a large-scale pilot with funding leveraged from UNICEF and in partnership with War Child Canada and War Child Holland.\textsuperscript{35} The CSRC has also been used in PPA-funded research in Afghanistan as part of the country programme’s research activities.

By contrast, however, although Restless Development has invested in its monitoring and evaluation (mostly additional human resources), its systems at country level still appear cumbersome and overly reliant on manual data entry at field level.\textsuperscript{36} The organisation collects a vast array of data, with apparently limited ability to prioritise or manage the data into useable files. The mid-term review also reflected on this point and highlighted Restless Development’s monitoring processes in the process-tracing map below left (figure 1). This evaluation also considered the data flow of monitoring information as reported in Restless Development Uganda (figure 2).

---

\textsuperscript{34} Email from International Monetary Fund, 3 September 2015
\textsuperscript{35} Mason, C. (2014) \textit{We Don’t Feel Safe: Learnings from War Child UK’s Implementation of Child Safety Report Cards in Northern Uganda}, War Child UK
\textsuperscript{36} Restless Development Draft Internal Audit Workbook 2016
It is clear from the two maps above that the volunteer and staff effort that goes into producing the monthly progress / project report is significant and reviewing or assessing each report from each location is time consuming. This process has not changed much since the mid-term review and it remains a concern that Restless Development’s M&E processes appear to be overworked and resource heavy.

Restless Development has identified that online file storage and a sharing solution suit its needs and currently uses Google Drive, where previously it had used Dropbox. While there are benefits and limitations to both solutions, neither solution appears to have enabled Restless Development to codify and make accessible the voluminous data collection and documents that it produces, in a meaningful way.

Although all three systems have some degree of feedback mechanism within the organisations, feedback of monitoring data to beneficiaries is less effective and in some cases not done in a meaningful manner, if at all.

There is no Consortium-level monitoring system that relates to the log frame or reporting to DFID. There is however, a quarterly reporting process whereby Consortium members report data to the Working Group and Steering Group as a way of ensuring each member is on track. This reporting is drawn from each member’s existing M&E databases or processes. Each year the annual report was
compiled by Restless Development based on quarterly and annual reporting from YBI and WCUK and from Restless Development country and programme staff. Numerical performance against targets was determined using a percentage approach based on the performance of those projects that were eligible and that had benefitted from the influence or direct investment of PPA funding. This approach is not unreasonable, given the absence of joint implementation activities and the complexities of the consortium set up and the requirement of different members to deliver against different targets (or parts of different targets).

3.2.1.1.3 Financial Systems and Capacity
Systems development is the most obvious evidence of strategic or core funding investment and is often the first area to show improvement.

While YBI’s Exchequer-based financial system did not require investment in the same way as for both WCUK and Restless Development, financial system investment commenced early on in the PPA period. As early as January 2011 WCUK considered the implications for its financial systems of the PPA, and prioritised allocating PPA funding to financial systems, which allows it to upgrade its systems first out of all the Consortium members.\(^{37}\) While Restless Development also upgraded its chart of accounts (though not its software) in 2011, making it activity-based so cost and programmatic data was aligned to enable VfM assessment.\(^{38}\) WCUK’s Global Finance Manual was initiated in January 2014 following extensive development over a two-year period to ensure it was fit for purpose. WCUK also provided training on the new manual in September 2014 for its country programme financial staff.\(^{39}\) WCUK also prioritised hiring finance managers in the country offices in order to increase field financial skills and improve quality, efficiency and effectiveness.

Restless Development increased its financial capacity and streamlined its reporting through internal improvements, including the introduction of a web-based system and updated Chart of Accounts that is shared across all its country programmes. The online cloud-based system improves efficiency by reducing the duplication of financial data and increases the potential to spot data quality issues more quickly. The cloud-based system enables transactions to be identified by donor, project, country and office (within a country), thus making donor reporting and analyses by donor easier to deliver.\(^{40}\)

Restless Development leveraged support from KPMG to develop its internal audit capability further - a process considered central to managing the financial performance of the dispersed country programmes. The internal audit process enabled the capacity building of financial staff in country offices to deliver audit processes on other country offices. This approach encouraged internal cross-fertilisation of good practice and ensured that finance staff had the appropriate skills.\(^{41}\)

Financial improvements and capacity building at each member was regularly discussed at the Consortium Finance Working Group and learning was shared amongst the members. For example, the internal audit process that Restless Development developed with KPMG formed the basis of WCUK’s internal audit processes.\(^{42}\)

\(^{37}\) War Child UK Finance Sub-Committee Minutes January 2011; War Child UK Board Papers April 2011
\(^{38}\) Year 1 Annual Progress Report
\(^{39}\) War Child UK Global Finance Manual Training Presentation, September 2014
\(^{40}\) Feedback from Restless Development Finance Director, 9 November 2016
\(^{41}\) Restless Development Internal Audit Workbook 2016; Restless Development Internal Audit General Guidance, 2016
\(^{42}\) Feedback from Restless Development Finance Director, 9 November 2016
3.2.1.2 Project Design, Development and Delivery

Every member of the Consortium has reported that its ability to design, or develop, or implement projects and programmes has been influenced, affected or enhanced by the input of PPA funding. Restless Development, for example, has been able to undertake speculative consultation work with communities in Northern Uganda to understand their needs in order to design responses that are ready to go should a donor be found. Similarly, WCUK has been able to fund research in Afghanistan and Democratic Republic of Congo in order to identify new or additional areas of work with their core constituencies.

The design of WCUK’s KATI intervention in Northern Uganda has been praised by institutions such as the World Bank and has led to KATI being established as a separate organisation. Similarly, WCUK worked with another partner in Uganda, TPO, to introduce Animation Therapy as part of the project they were funding in Uganda. This addition to TPO’s programme design and delivery has since caught the attention of UNICEF, who have agreed to fund similar work with TPO. YBI has been able to provide strategic support to its partner in Kenya, KYBT Mombasa, to develop its strategy for expanding its services to the Kenyan South Coast and supported the programme implementation of Enterprise Uganda’s NUYEP programme.

PPA funding has also been used as match funding for donors that have required it, such as WCUK’s European Commission (EC) funded project in Afghanistan.

3.2.2 Value for Money

For each Consortium member a separate value for money case study has been completed and can be located in Appendix 6.5. The summary below considers the results of these case studies and considers whether it is possible to determine value for money at a Consortium level. It is important to note, however, that at a Consortium level there is no unified and articulated approach to value for money.

All three members take different approaches to value for money. Restless Development uses the 3E approach, whilst YBI uses the 4E approach. While WCUK acknowledges that it does not have a written value for money policy, it has confirmed it uses the 3E approach. The case studies used the 4E approach and acknowledged limitations where Consortium members’ approach differed.

3.2.2.1 Economy

All three members have been able to improve their procurement approaches and their overall financial management approaches. The members have each considered procurement in relation to value for money and made adjustments to their procedures as a result. Restless Development’s approach to procurement, budgeting and understanding inputs is the most comprehensive and should ensure the most rigorous controls. YBI includes procurement in a suite of financial documents that it reports are at the centre of its approach to value for money.

Each agency received a fixed percentage allocation of PPA funding, based on forecasted income at the start of the period (see table below). PPA funds were further allocated to either central functions or the PPA target countries based on a percentage allocation. It is fair to say that the purpose of the PPA is not to be performance-related in the same sense as other core funding might be. The PPA is used to invest in increasing capacity and capability, which can have a different point of return on investment depending on context, external influences and internal performance.
3.2.2.2 Efficiency

Each consortium member is keenly aware of its cost drivers. Although the members vary considerably between each other, their main key cost driver was staff, followed by consultancy (YBI) or volunteer costs, where Restless Development has also been able to identify the cost per volunteer trained and deployed and activity costs in the case of WCUK. Those members with country programmes had different focuses on maintaining that in-country presence, while YBI’s focused on its own performance as well as that of its members. Of all members, YBI has been able to most fully articulate and present its financial cycles and the responsibilities for maintaining those cycles. YBI has also tested efficiency spreadsheets for reporting from its network members, but this does not yet appear to be functional.

In each Consortium member restricted income and expenditure has risen faster and outstripped unrestricted income and expenditure. For Restless Development and YBI, the ratio of restricted to unrestricted expenditure improves (becomes more balanced) in the first part of the PPA period and then reverts to early or pre-PPA period levels. For WCUK the trend is reversed as it entered the PPA period with more unrestricted income than restricted income. By 2015 WCUK’s unrestricted income was once again higher than its restricted income. This highlights the challenges that each agency faces in a post-PPA era, although WCUK and YBI have been able to demonstrate that their unrestricted reserves are above the level set in their reserves policies.

3.2.2.3 Effectiveness

Effectiveness is focused on the operational models that the Consortium members have put in place. For example, Restless Development builds its programming around the volunteer peer educator (VPE) model, while YBI’s model is centred on an approach to supporting young entrepreneurs that it refers to as the YBI approach: identification – selection – training – loans⁴⁴ – mentoring – support. WCUK’s model is focused on consistent thematic areas of operations and identified pillars of intervention that frame its activities. These models are fully resourced and the agencies have utilised them over a long period, thereby increasing the effectiveness of the models through both learning and practical implementation.

WCUK and YBI both have well-articulated MEL frameworks and systems, with YBI’s OMS being one of the most sophisticated online management and monitoring platforms observed in evaluations of this kind. In addition, YBI have provided evidence of an understanding of the cost contribution of staff time and expertise to help deliver improved effectiveness on the ground. This contribution is funded through unrestricted funds, which as YBI is mostly made up of PPA funding.

---

⁴³ War Child UK Board Papers April 2011
⁴⁴ Not every network member directly provides loans, sometimes arrangements with banking institutions replaces direct loan management by the network member.
Fundraising, particularly accessing restricted funds, has benefitted from PPA investment, with all three agencies able to report increased access to funding by the end of the PPA period. WCUK took the decision early on to allocate PPA funding to support programming, thereby releasing its own reserves to be investing in fundraising development, which has supported its rapid growth over the PPA period.

Restless Development also includes value for money in its internal audit process, which does include guidance for collecting evidence of effectiveness, although effectiveness under value for money is not actually assessed as part of the internal audit. Restless Development shared its internal audit process with WCUK, who has apparently adopted it, but this has not been verified.

3.2.2.4 Equity
None of the Consortium members measure or collect data on Equity, or the creation of value for beneficiaries. Restless Development is able to calculate the cost of reaching an individual, which they also consider a measure of efficiency, and this has reduced between 2010 and 2014 by approximately £6 per person (as a global figure).\(^45\) WCUK has also been able to calculate the cost per beneficiary over time and has seen this fall from £217 in 2010 to £94 in 2013, which is a significant drop in costs, despite the fact that WCUK did not increase the number of countries that it was working in during that period, preferring to focus on depth of intervention. YBI is investigating how to determine cost per beneficiary through its network members, although this will only ever be partly attributed to YBI regardless of whether the agency participated in a partnership to deliver activities or not.

However, all three members should be able to determine value creation for their stakeholders. Although livelihoods is the easiest intervention type to generate reliable data on value, interventions such as SRHR, child protection, education, etc. can all determine value using financial proxies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Restless Development</th>
<th>YBI</th>
<th>War Child UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted young people employed or setting up a successful business who are able to contribute to household income</td>
<td>16,895</td>
<td>16,415</td>
<td>3,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Targeted young people using condoms at last high risk sex</td>
<td>186,880</td>
<td>249,345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Targeted young people participating in development, implementation or monitoring of local/national/global-level policies, development plans and budgets</td>
<td>91,344</td>
<td>69,564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Targeted children with protection cases resolved</td>
<td>5,011</td>
<td>6,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reached</td>
<td>295,119</td>
<td>335,324</td>
<td>3,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 Consortium Member Performance against the Indicators for Outcome 1, for Years 4 & 5*

In the PPA log frame, the Consortium includes a series of indicators that measure the outcomes for youth as a result of the Consortium’s work, including:

\(^45\) In the face of considerable cost inflation in Restless Development’s countries of operation.
• Youth employed or setting up a business that are able to contribute to the household income
• Youth using condoms in their last high risk sexual encounter
• Youth participating in developing, implementing or monitoring policies plans and budgets
• Children whose protection cases have been resolved

Each agency has contributed to the performance against different indicators.

Overall, for Outcome 1 the Consortium reached 985,088 individuals cumulatively over the PPA reporting period for these four indicators. Table 2 above highlights that each agency’s performance relates to their particular stakeholder focus and the thematic or stakeholder area and operational level (micro, meso, macro) in which they can potentially generate the most value for their stakeholders.

The results for the same two years for Outcome 2 in table 3 below highlight that the Consortium does not only generate results and value for youth, but also civil society organisations, national and local governments and donors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Restless</th>
<th>YBI</th>
<th>War Child</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Target youth-led and youth-focused civil society organisations meeting established minimum standards in operations and programme delivery</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Target youth-led and youth-focused civil society organisations securing partnerships with public-, private-sector organisations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Targeted national and local government institutions and departments consulting with young people in their strategies, operational plans or budgets affecting wealth creation and livelihoods, sexual and reproductive health practices (in particular the prevention of HIV) and Civic Engagement (in particular good governance and accountability)</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Targeted bi- and multi-lateral aid agencies successfully consulting and making provision for youth in their global strategies, country assistance plans, operations or budgets affecting wealth creation and livelihoods, sexual and reproductive health practices (in particular the prevention of HIV) and Civic Engagement (in particular good governance and accountability)</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3 Consortium Members’ Performance against Indicators for Outcome 2, for Years 4 & 5*

3.2.2.5 Overall Value for Money Opinion

DFID’s reporting requirements on value for money have enabled the Consortium members to track their increased efficiency and effectiveness better than they possibly would have done otherwise. All
Consortium members have demonstrated significant improvements and advances in value for money.

Each member of this Consortium has delivered substantial value for money for themselves, and good value for money for DFID and in YBI’s case for their network members. It is not yet clear whether value for money has been delivered for all stakeholders, especially beneficiaries. Consortium members would have to do further data collection and analysis to determine this.

At a Consortium level, however, value for money is not possible to determine. Whilst the festival of learning, the learning groups and the informal sharing between Consortium members probably does begin to demonstrate value for money at a Consortium level, there is insufficient evidence to take a formal opinion.

3.2.3 Shaping Policy and Practice

Influencing policy and practice is an area that has seen some expansion during the PPA period. Both WCUK and Restless Development invested in capacity to shape policy and practice. WCUK has increased the organisational capacity to deliver policy influencing at the London head office, whilst also increasing capacity in-country. Before it withdrew from Uganda, WCUK had set up a significant policy influencing operation to influence both the national and district administration. Restless Development attempts to influencing policy and practice at both a national and international level. Whilst the post-2015 policy influencing activities that Restless Development did on behalf of the Consortium were reviewed in the mid-term report (see Appendix 6.6), it has enjoyed similar success at a national level, such as influencing the Tanzanian government to introduce new guidelines on getting pregnant girls back into school.

The Tanzanian example also highlights how PPA funding was used to identify the initial policy shaping opportunity through internal research, after which Restless Development took the research findings to a broader audience, eventually working through the Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Alliance to access the National Government Ministries. Although the change of government in Tanzania has stalled the roll out of the guidelines on getting pregnant girls back into school, Restless Development used its already extensive connections at a district and local government level to get district bylaws put in place that can facilitate the implementation of awareness raising and sensitisation of school teachers and parents while they wait for the national guidelines to come into force.

Because of Restless Development and the SRHR Alliance’s efforts, girls and young women have said there is increased knowledge about sexuality, rights and prevention of family planning, there is increased willingness of girls and young women to return to school and that stigma has reduced and support has increased.

Tanzania Case Study

As a result of the influencing activities of WCUK and its partner Afghanistan Human Rights Organisation (AHRO), the Ministry of Justice has committed to reviewing the Juvenile Justice Code. In addition, at the provincial level prosecutors and judges in Herat are aware that they can use alternatives to detention and there is evidence that some have started to give warnings for petty crimes (such as mobile phone theft) and requiring close supervision by the parents rather than automatically using detention as a punishment.

Afghanistan Outcome Harvesting Statement

It is important to note that YBI does not consider itself an organisation with a remit to shape policy and practice. It does, however, consider itself a thought leader. So while it is unlikely to engage in national level influencing, it will support report launches that its members might use for more policy-

46 Outcome Harvesting Statement on Using PPA Funding for Shaping Policy and Practice in Tanzania, October 2016
focused ends, as was the case in Uganda with the launch of the ‘From Rhetoric to Action’ report, that its member Enterprise Uganda used as a basis to engage both government and youth in a dialogue about entrepreneurship in Uganda and how it relates to youth.

3.2.4 Learning and Intra-Member Learning

From the very start of the PPA period the Consortium members were interested in learning from each other. This was initially done through informal learning groups that focused on certain topics such as finance. The level of additional shared learning between the Consortium members at a head office level has increased and formalised since the mid-term evaluation. The intra-organisation thematic working groups appear to have become more formalised, with key informants suggesting that these would continue in some shape or form even without the PPA funding relationship that might have required closer working.

In 2015 and 2016, as part of the extension period focus on learning, the Consortium set up a joint sharing platform known as the Festival of Learning. This series of events brought together London-based staff from the members to share and learn from each other about their experiences and lessons during the PPA period. In 2015 the topics that were discussed and profiled included:

- Learning
- Programmes and Policy
- Performance and Accountability
- Investments and Partnerships
- Strategy Development
- Technology
- Governance and Risk

Consortium members hosted these sessions jointly and internal documents were shared as appropriate.

In 2016 the Festival of Learning was tailored more towards the topics included in Result 5 of the Year 6 Action Plan, including:

- Gender
- Disability
- Transparency
- Environment

These events also included external speakers as a departure from the internal focus of the 2015 events.

Unexpectedly perhaps, staff from all three agencies appeared to have found these events more useful and valuable than other aspects of the Consortium and appeared to consider the festivals of learning to be a key feature of what it meant to be part of this consortium. KIs reported that the 2016 events were less popular than the previous year and this may be due to the scope of the topics used each year. The broader range of topics delivered in 2015 appear more tailored to internal practical learning, whilst the 2016 events appear to be more related to continuous professional development training. The festival of learning appears to have added to the Consortium’s effectiveness and delivered real added value to Consortium members.

Members have also provided strategic learning support to each other. For example, WCUK’s Director of Fundraising was seconded to YBI to support the further development of their fundraising function. Whilst WCUK have learned from Restless Development’s approach to value for money and
internal audit processes and YBI’s use of Salesforce influenced Restless Development’s decision to adopt the platform.

3.2.5 Joint Working

This section highlights the joint working activities that the Consortium undertook during the PPA period. Although this is, financially speaking, a small element of the PPA period (10%), the work of the PPA is noticeable for the absence of joint implementation activities in order to deliver the aims of the Consortium. Table 3 in Appendix 6.2 provides a complete list of the 19 joint work projects that was funded under the joint working budget, which is based on the narratives of the APRs of 5 years of the PPA funded period. A written follow-up with Consortium members did not produce additional joint work outputs.

Each year the Consortium agreed a budget and sometimes a defined scope of work to be supported through the fund. Sometimes, however, the scope of work was not agreed ahead of time, but defined during the funding year. Table 3 highlights the range of work that was funded, which includes 11 types of joint working. It is also clear upon review that all joint working was carried out either by a Consortium member on behalf of the Consortium (at least 26.32%), which was often based on specific areas of interest, or by a contracted third party (47.82%). This suggests that joint work was not delivered jointly, as might be implied by the phrase ‘joint working’. Rather, joint working is defined as such by the Consortium as being funded by the ‘joint working pot’.

A positive change is that after the mid-term review in 2014, Consortium members began to change the way that joint working was considered. Hence, in 2015 the Steering Committee brainstormed for a piece of work that could be considered jointly designed, although implementation was still delivered by a third party organisation in a contractual relationship. This project was titled ‘Case for Space’. Case for Space was a global research and advocacy initiative that aimed to understand the trends in child and youth development and juxtapose these trends with case study stories that represented the 3 Consortium members in three specific areas: youth participation, child protection and youth livelihoods. The output of Case for Space was a report called ‘From Rhetoric to Action’.

The central research question focused on the enabling environment, including the necessary conditions and structures, that would ensure that youth could access their rights, influence decisions and have improved livelihoods. Apart from influencing the strategies, programmes and practice of the Consortium members, this research was intended to stimulate discussion and action by decision-makers and youth.

The delivery of this initiative was awarded to Youth Policy Labs who then went on to work with the Consortium members and 20 young researchers to develop and implement the research parameters and data collection. The Consortium members were then able to use the resulting report for their own policy influencing activities, which are additional outputs for the Case for Space project. The process-tracing map on the next page (figure 3) outlines the key activities and actions that led to and resulted from the report.

---

As the map above shows, each agency can point to at least one result that can be linked back to the report. For WCUK, producing the report enabled it to prove a programme design and approach called ‘VoiceMore’ that it had been trialling in Africa. YBI took the opportunity to do a launch of the report in Uganda, with Enterprise Uganda. Government officials, civil society and youth attended the launch. Restless Development facilitated a workshop of youth responding to the report as part of the NYWG, whilst Enterprise Uganda developed a localised version of the report that considered what the implications of ‘From Rhetoric to Action’ were for Uganda. WCUK was able to send its two implementing partners in Uganda to the launch. Restless Development also facilitated a launch of the report in New York, where it connected with UNDP and subsequently a workshop on Case for Space is being planned for Asia at the end of 2016.

The research report was launched in 2015, hence it is too early to consider whether any changes or transformations can be attributed to it, barring perhaps for the impact the process has had on individual Consortium Members and on the young researchers. The July 2016 evaluation of Case for Space highlighted that the process had influenced how Restless Development thought about research, how YBI thought about advocacy and how WCUK thought about youth participation.

Although the challenges of the Case for Space process were outlined in the evaluation, the report concluded that the benefits to the Consortium were greater than the challenges of the process. These benefits included learning from working on the report with other Consortium members, increased credibility with DFID, and access to each other’s networks. Importantly, the evaluation also concluded that effective joint working does require certain conditions, which include a commitment from each organisation, dedicated funded and staff commitment as well as time. Although outsourced, it is clear that the Consortium members have determined that staff time and engagement is crucial to joint working.

Perhaps more importantly, the 20 young researchers reported that they highly valued their participation in the Case for Space research. They had been able to set their own research topics and gain new skills. Importantly the young researchers reported in the final evaluation that they were able to build their careers or CVs as a result and that having an important international report in English was a “big deal”.

It is clear, that although the Consortium did most (78.95%) of joint work prior to the Mid-term Evaluation (2014), most of these projects seemed ad hoc and were not really joint work in terms of implementation. Such joint work does not constitute adequate indication nor evidence of consortium working, which was also highlighted in the mid-term evaluation reports. Although it is evident that the Consortium has learned from these mid-term evaluations and that it has made an increased effort to do more and better joint working, joint working is still weak on various accounts, as mentioned above. As one key informant reported: It was good that the Consortium had learned the lessons of joint working, but that it was a pity that it had not learned these lessons earlier on in the process.

3.2.6 Results of Organisational Development

The previous five areas highlighted immediate or near-term changes to the Consortium members that were easily articulated and evidenced. However, none of these are ends in themselves and the Consortium members also went on to reference longer-term results flowing from organisational development.

3.2.6.1 Increased credibility
As a result of being able to improve their systems and processes, Consortium members reported that they perceived an increase in their credibility. This has been evidenced through an increase in network or partnership working, where partners seek out Consortium members, such as Restless Development in Uganda, in order to work with them. The delivery of the joint working initiative, Case for Space (see below) is also reported to have increased credibility with DFID, whilst one of WCUK’s implementation partners in Uganda, TPO, has reported an increase in the approaches from other organisations since delivering activities on WCUK’s behalf. TPO also reports that the due diligence scores it receives during the partnership assessment process has jumped from 75% to 85% following the capacity building and organisational development work that it did with WCUK.

3.2.6.2 Increased or Leveraged Funding
All members have reported that they have been able to increase their funding or leverage funding as a result of being organisationally more robust. For example, YBI was able to leverage funding from the BG Group to support KYBT Mombasa, while its network member in Uganda, Enterprise Uganda, was able to leverage further funding on the back of the NUYEP project that it had implemented with YBI’s organisational capacity building support WCUK’s implementing partner TPO has also been able to leverage additional project funding due to WCUK working with TPO to put in place Animation Therapy in its work in northern Uganda.

3.3 Results for Youth
Along with results generated for DFID and the results enjoyed by each Consortium member, youth as end-beneficiaries of activities have also seen results or changes that can partly be attributed to the investments made with PPA funding.

Consortium member-specific outcomes for youth stem from the design of the log frame, limited joint working (see more in section ‘joint working’) between Consortium members, members’ specialization within the youth programming delivery space as well as programme design, objectives and organisational developments that have taken place in London, with some effects on national offices, field offices or partner organisations in-country.

Evidence provided to the evaluation team and evaluation efforts in the 4 focus countries in support of Consortium members’ performance, did not add up to those of a Consortium in terms of joint working or joint implementation. Therefore, it cannot be said that results for youth are due to the influence of the Consortium: Outcomes for youth are linked to individual Consortium members, only.

The above argument does not mean positive results for youth should be underestimated, as results have been profound (see short and long-term outcomes for youth in the section below). Rather, Consortium members’ over performance on almost all log frame outputs and outcomes should be celebrated. The pretence, however, is that joint working and joint implementation would have delivered better results for youth, as there is an economic and social benefit to combining specialties and increase diversity in that the scope and capabilities are multiplied.51

This section is divided into sections taking into consideration design, activities, shaping policy and practice and outcomes as (non-)results of organisational strengthening and linked to PPA impact at

---

the beneficiary or participant level. Similar to the section above, outcomes consider country and Consortium members, which have been included in the scope of this evaluation.

3.3.1 Engaging Youth

Each Consortium member shares a focus on beneficiaries. Combined, Consortium members have been able to reach an increasing and large number of youth in countries in which they operate, as is evidenced in the PPA log frame (see Appendix 6.1, table 2). Each Consortium member implements directly in the country of operation, though YBI focuses mainly on strengthening capacities of their network members. As a result of the strengthened capacities, YBI members are able to provide better services and support to youth.

Each Consortium member engaged youth in a different way and through different channels. Such differing types and each level of engagement are valid and each channel was appreciated by all youth involved. Youth pointed out, as is reiterated later on in this report, that channels for participation have provided youth with opportunities and freedoms they had not had access to before. All Consortium members were able to attract (see below) enough youth to enable the Consortium to reach their goals and targets. Though more could be done for ensuring meaningful or more profound youth participation, even at the service-oriented organisations, such as KATI, Enterprise Uganda and KYBT.

For example, in all cases, there was a lack of engaging youth in the design, development and evaluation of activities. For KATI, Enterprise Uganda and KYBT, youth were seen and treated as customers, though with a strong sense of purpose for strengthening the socio-economic position of youth. Only in the cases of Restless Development and children shuras in Afghanistan were youth engaged as implementation partners.

Restless Development

Two types of roles were given to youth in communities; VPE and youth advocate. Both roles were appreciated by youth and youth were proud to have been given these roles and responsibilities. VPEs and youth advocates were engaged to strengthen the socio-economic and socio-political position of youth in the Districts of Kotido, Moroto and Napak in the Karamoja region. For a 3-year programme, Restless Development Uganda engaged 96 unique VPEs for youth-led community strengthening, of which 30 (37.5%) were active in Moroto and 45 (56.25%) in Napak Districts for the ‘Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights for Karamoja Youth’ programme.

Youth advocates, of which 16 were engaged for the ‘Sustainable Livelihoods for Karamojong Youth’ programme by Restless Development Uganda, were recruited based on a rigorous application and selection process for specific roles linked to programmes. In addition, school-going youth and youth in the communities were reached. Under leadership of VPEs, youth groups were established in communities. In total, 28 youth groups and 40 youth groups were formed in 2015 and 2016, respectively.

War Child UK

Though children participated in children shuras in Afghanistan and for policy and practice influencing purposes, children were relatively less engaged, specifically in research. Children’s limited participation may have been a consequence of the difficult context in which the WCUK Afghanistan

52 Unfortunately, the evaluation team did not receive adequate data from KATI to allow for an analysis of beneficiaries
53 Shura is the Islamic tradition of assembling (parliament) and gathering to exchange opinions and make decisions.
54 Youth group membership summary sheet 2015 and 2016
office operates. Though children’s voices were incorporated, research teams may have been constricted by their perceptions of children in conflict with the law and hence their possible added value in the research process.

**Youth Business International**  
Enterprise Uganda engaged 8,409 young entrepreneurs under the Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Project (NUYPEP), which is related to YBI organisational strengthening linked to the PPA. In total, young entrepreneurs in 35 Northern Districts were represented, of which most (11.80%) beneficiaries reached are based in Amuria, followed by Dokolo (9.67%) and Agago (7.74%). Additional details are provided in Appendix 6.3, graph 2. Beneficiaries received training and were mentored by experienced entrepreneurs.

3.3.2 **Activities for Youth**  
All activities outlined below show a broad scope of activities and a large spectrum of youth participation. Therefore, outcomes based on activities are likely to be mixed, though therefore not less worthy. Activities in which youth were engaged vary from service provision to partners in implementation and from girl groups to advocates, though the former again shows variations of participation evidenced specifically in the lack of participation in design, development and evaluation.

As evidenced in the overview of activities provided below there is little overlap of activities. Activities reported in the log frame are member-specific, only, and not designed or implemented at the Consortium-level, or rooted in Consortium joint working or joint implementation. Results and outcomes of activities are mixed in relation to the DAC criteria with mixed feedback from youth (see following sub-sections). Outcomes for youth were, however, partly strengthened by the 7% cut of PPA funding allocated to country programmes. Results could have been stronger if Consortium members had actively sought to combine or learn from activities and other Consortium members’ experiences of implementation.

In the overview of activities, it is clear that the topics of enterprise and livelihoods are very closely linked and is the area that is consistent over all three Consortium members. It is clear that there was a missed opportunity for joint working, perhaps even joint implementation. This point was also highlighted in the mid-term evaluation, which begs to question why the Consortium did not act towards increasing its potential following the mid-term evaluation. Joint work or joint implementation initiatives could have provided clearer and stronger results for youth in all countries of operation and programme operation. Specific activities for youth are outlined below and are presented by topic:

**Awareness raising**  
Restless Development in Uganda advocated for change, partly through youth advocates who had been trained in livelihoods, SRHR and research (see more about youth advocates in the next section). Girl groups in Tanzania, and with support of Restless Development Tanzania, narrated that they are now more able and capable of advocating for their rights in the household, in communities as well as in community meetings (see case study on Tanzania in appendix 6.4).

The ability and capability of girls to speak out, seems to have developed and evolved based on support provided by Restless Development, their growth in
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It is not easy for us to make out voices heard and to speak in community meeting, but Restless Development is helping us make our voices heard. We are giving our views and ideas in local community meetings.  
Focus group discussion participant, Tanzania

---
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expertise in youth participation and as based on previous experiences gained from previous programmes.

Children in Afghanistan were involved in awareness raising activities in communities, such as theatre performances, awareness raising, circus activities, radio programs, trainings for children, referring the cases to child help line, family visits. Discussions in children shuras and follow-up discussions with Parliamentarians and local authorities for discussing topics already introduced in the shuras were also done by children. Topics discussed in shuras and meetings were early marriage, forced marriage, selling girls, hard labour, beating children, exploitation, sadness, lack of access to education and communication.

For more on awareness raising and shaping policy and practice done by youth and Consortium members, see point 3 below.

**Sexual and reproductive health and rights**

All Ugandan youth beneficiaries in-school and out-of school were trained in livelihoods, including life skills, business skills and others, and SRH, including safe sex, bodily hygiene and family planning.

All youth were expected to volunteer at the youth corner at the health centre or regional hospital, where youth provided peer-to-peer counselling concerning SRH. These youth corners were narrated (see related quote) by youth to be a safe space where they could go, socialize, play games and avoid feeling stigmatized if they had tested positive for HIV. In addition to VPEs training in-school and out-of school youth on topics and based on a work plan, health care workers and teachers were trained in providing youth-friendly services and in identifying and supporting youth in matters concerning SRH.

With Restless Development Tanzania (see case study on Tanzania), girls were engaged in trainings and family planning activities as well as income generating activities. Though Tanzanian activities cannot be linked or attributed to lessons learned in Uganda or vice versa, activities and objectives seem similar. This may signify some learning or sharing between country field offices.

**Livelihoods**

In addition to the youth groups set up by VPEs in communities in the Kotido, Moroto and Napak Districts, youth were encouraged to set up group Income Generating Activities (IGA) for which Restless Development issued funding based on a group proposal. Registered youth groups were also able to send proposals for funding to the District, but it is unclear how many groups were successful in obtaining such funds. Youth group members narrated mixed results for groups IGAs, mostly citing the high risks associated with farming and animal herding in the dry and arid context in which they lived as well as difficulties associated with decision-making in groups.

Main sources of income were individual enterprises or wage labour, which had been already argued and was proved in a previous research. Though a group approach may support large-scale and efficient social strengthening, the challenges encountered begged to question whether this specific activity provided an added value, or was even relevant.

**Enterprise and entrepreneurship**

---
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Each Consortium member implemented specialised activities, which are based on their specialties and mandates. Chapter one, section 2 provides an introduction to each Consortium member.

Youth in Uganda through KATI and Enterprise Uganda and Kenya through KYBT had access to business training and follow-up trainings in the case of Enterprise Uganda. KATI and KYBT beneficiaries received a loan at the end of a successful process of writing a business plan and completing a presentation in defence of their business plan. Enterprise Uganda beneficiaries did not receive a loan, but received a certificate at the end of the training, that could enable them to negotiate an appropriate loan from a banking partner to Enterprise Uganda. The beneficiaries were also due to receive a grant from the Ugandan government under the government Youth Livelihood Programme, which has dedicated UGX 400 million (£ 94,547.22) to support young entrepreneurs. All young entrepreneurs received mentoring under organisation-specific mentorship models.

Mentoring for KATI beneficiaries took the form of peer-to-peer mentoring, whereby young entrepreneurs were expected, not facilitated, to support and provide each other advice. KATI beneficiaries were adamant that this mentoring model was insufficient and therefore did not add value to their experiences and business nor personal growth. The most valuable components of the KATI model were expressed to be the initial training and the loan, which did not require collateral and was provided at a lower interest rate than loans provided by commercial banks, i.e. at 25% p.a. and had to be repaid in full within a maximum of 2 years.

Not all beneficiaries of Enterprise Uganda had received support from a mentor and those who had argued that their experiences were mixed. Youth articulated that shortcomings of the Enterprise Uganda mentorship model were that (i) mentors were inadequately supported by Enterprise Uganda, (ii) young entrepreneurs received mentoring in pairs and (iii) young entrepreneurs were partnered with random mentors who did not necessarily have knowledge of the specific enterprise run by the young entrepreneurs. In most cases, young entrepreneurs stressed they had had a mentor, but were no longer in contact with them because the model was not effective and not adequately facilitated. These shortcomings of the mentorship model were identified already at the YBI Global Summit in 2013\(^\text{57}\) and clearly require further attention and focus.

Only at KYBT were all three components mentioned above collated. Though young entrepreneurs at KYBT paid a small contribution fee, they received training, mentoring in-group, based on materials provided by YBI\(^\text{58}\) and from experienced entrepreneurs as well as a loan in return. This loan was provided at 0% interest, was capped at KES 100,000 (£ 806.70) and repayment deadline was set at 12 months after receipt of the loan. This mechanism seemed to be the most well-liked combination of services provided as young entrepreneurs in Kenya were the most positive about their experiences and support received from KYBT.

In comparison to KATI and Enterprise Uganda, KYBT offered an environment that enabled all-round support and may therefore have most successful outcomes. However, the creation of the enabling environment is not an output of the Consortium and is unrelated to organisational strengthening done at institutional level: It is only partly attributed to YBI. Further attribution is linked to KYBT as an independent organisation. The positive experience could have been a learning opportunity for KATI and Enterprise Uganda, if the opportunity to share and learn had been provided or facilitated, and could have led to more mainstreamed results for young entrepreneurs in Uganda.

---

57 For more information, see http://www.youthbusiness.org/day-1-at-the-ybi-global-summit/
58 Outcome harvesting questionnaire
3.3.3 Working with Youth to Shape Policy and Practice

YBI does not engage in influencing policy and practice. Therefore, they may seem under-represented in this section.

**War Child UK**

In Afghanistan WCUK base policy influencing on research. For the purpose of this final evaluation, 2 research topics were considered, namely alternatives to detention for children in conflict with the law\(^59\) and child labour.\(^60\) These researches were completed between 2013 and 2015 by external research institutions. Taking into account the difficult and conflict-ridden context, it is understandable that little in terms of actual policy change has been achieved in such a short time (for more information, see section Results for youth, point 3).

However, outcomes of the creative methods with children from shuras in Afghanistan suggested that the work done with WCUK has improved the lives of children. Children reported that they are happier now than before as they now have access to more freedoms, such as education, play and feel more empowered to stand up for their rights through radio programs, because of the support given through trainings as well as their direct involvement and space provided in the shuras and meetings where decisions are made.

WCUK reported on paper that they had done some work to influence policy in Agago and Pader (Uganda) while they had in-country presence, including with District departments and the Police department. By being involved in implementation of activities for increased security for children, they supported and worked with relevant departments and institutions as well as supported them financially. Children were also involved in influencing policy; they presented issues affecting them on radio and stakeholders were urged to respond.\(^61\) What the outcomes of this activity was and how often this activity was realized, is unknown as WCUK did not talk about these activities during KILs, nor did they provide evidence of outcomes for consideration.

**Restless Development**

The most substantial activity for shaping policy and practice was done by Restless Development in Uganda and Tanzania. In Uganda, for example, youth advocates were encouraged to conduct research in their communities, which provided evidence for arguments for policy change presented in sub-county and District level meetings. Of the 6 research reports received, only 2 (33.33%) included recommendations. It is therefore a less effective tool in bringing about policy change by youth, limiting the activity to mere discussion points or storytelling.

---


\(^{60}\) GoodWeave International (2015) *The situation of child workers in Kabul’s informal carpet industry,* War Child UK

\(^{61}\) Policy & Practice evidence from Uganda (1)
In addition, research reports, youth advocates reported, were not written by youth advocates themselves; youth advocates were used to hand in their research outlined in templates provided by Restless Development Uganda field office without engaging youth in data analyses. Such shortcomings may affect and limit youth empowerment as well as youth’s roles as advocates, asserting them as tokens for youth participation in the frame of the programme whilst relying on policy change being taken forward by government officials and other participants of the meeting.

Though no evidence was provided on policies influenced by youth advocates, youth advocates said some changes have been brought about, including the banning of a traditional and seemingly provocative dance near schools so as to prevent in-school youth from being tempted to join and finding themselves in vulnerable positions. The most profound change brought about was that the predominant opinion in communities and institutions that youth add little to no value has been challenged. Communities and District members now see the value of youth and appreciate their power to change social realities.

The District Youth Working Group (DYWG) was re-activated based on recommendations developed under the Big Idea⁶² and built on national policy for its set-up. The DYWG is linked to the National Youth Working Group (NYWG), also referred to as the National Youth Council. Both the DYWG and NYWG do not include youth as official members and are bodies that serve as a forum for (i) harnessing and coordinating youth interventions in the District, (ii) sharing and disseminating best practices in youth development, generally enhancing the effectiveness and cohesion of the youth development sector and (iii) developing a strategic plan for youth empowerment with clear priority areas for youth to inform District and NGO plans.⁶³ The link between the DYWG and NYWG is weak as they are based solely on sharing written reports; barring the launch of the research ‘From rhetoric to action’ research in Kampala.

Profound social change also occurred in communities and in schools. On the topic of SRH, teachers and youth agreed that activities undertaken by VPEs and youth group members have led to a decrease in teenage pregnancies. Teachers argued it was because of successful promotion of abstinence in school, rather than an increase in safe sex behaviour. In-school youth denied nor confirmed this trend, though some suggested they knew where to get free condoms in town and talked about schemes to leave school and reach those places to collect condoms for themselves and others in school. A decrease in teenage pregnancy, however, proves effectiveness of interventions and training on SRH.

A negative outcome of SRH training in school and promotion of safe sex is that students who are caught having sex, even safe sex, in school are expelled, as having sex goes against school policy. However, the evaluation team would like to commend youth in Karamoja for being able to influence sexual behaviour change, even when Ugandan government policy prevents official promotion of condom use in favour of abstinence, in government institutions, such as health centres and schools.

---

⁶² The Big Idea is programme based on the idea that if young people are equipped and empowered with the skills to use, analyse and generate data on key issues that affect their lives, they will take the lead in exercising accountability over their governments – particularly accountability over the new Sustainable Development Goals, agreed in 2015.

⁶³ Moroto youth working group presentation, March 16
In Tanzania, a PhotoVoice exercise and 44-page publication provides evidence of the transformation that has taken place in communities, schools and households, including men and the role of the father. The exercise was done in participation with young girls and teachers and doubles as a Unite For Body Rights (UFBR) Alliance advocacy tool. However, the fact that such an exercise has been done shows that barriers have indeed been lowered and that girls and young mothers feel able to talk about issues that prevent them from going back to school and exercise their rights based on new bylaws, as discussed in section ‘Learning and intra-member learning’ point 3. Such a change inevitably proves that there has been a change in gender perceptions and gender roles in communities where Restless Development Tanzania with the UFBR Alliance are active.

3.3.4 Outcomes of Consortium Activities for youth

Various activities and levels of youth engagement have resulted in mixed outcomes for youth, such as few results for policy change based on research in Afghanistan, positive outcomes from SRH trainings in school and various levels of success reported by youth on enterprise service-provisions. The following two sections outline short and long-term outcomes for youth, bundled to create an overall view of outcomes for youth as individuals. This section focuses on short-term outcomes, which are outcomes that relate to opportunities provided to youth, which youth may use and benefit from.

Some positive outcomes for youth can be attributed to organisational and institutional strengthening linked to the PPA. Short-term outcomes for youth are access to finance and loans through KATI and KYBT for setting up or expanding their enterprise thus allowing youth to create their own jobs and opportunities. Youth gain increased protection through psychosocial support as well as increased access to education through TPO Uganda for overall reduced vulnerability. Overall, access to education and psychosocial support should result in better socio-political position and increased psychosocial well-being, respectively.

As a result of activities and youth engagement, barriers to transition to increased independence were lowered in all cases, which inadvertently created a sense of empowerment, self-worth, purpose and individuality for youth. All above-mentioned values and positive outcomes could be attributed to the focus on peer-to-peer support or groups, whether in trainings, as a mentored group or youth group, are an efficient and effective way of engaging youth in transition from being largely dependent to increasingly independent and adult.

However, a negative and unintended outcome was that youth advocates and VPEs reported that they felt undervalued. The sense of being undervalued was not due to lack of financial compensation, though, youth advocates stressed, that can always be more, but was due to lack of recognition for the amount and influence of their work in support of community social change. In addition, the way both KATI and Enterprise Uganda models are designed suggest a large indirect dependency from young entrepreneurs on the service provided as well as an additional sense of pressure to repay the loan. With increased pressure, young entrepreneurs seek other sources of income, such as wage labour or additional loans from friends or family, which inevitably complicates their financial situations and creates dependence in other ways.

---

64 Experience and result: Pumoja Tunaweza Alliance 2015
3.3.5 Identified Results for youth
This section considers medium to long-term outcomes, which are considered to be a result of short-term outcomes. As a result of the activities, engagement with youth and the outcomes discussed above positive medium to long-term outcomes for youth, and possibly the most sustainable outcomes of Consortium member activities, are an increased and individual sense of independence and well-being. These outcomes were not accounted for in the log frame and are therefore unintended, but are valid outcomes as they prove profound all-round positive results for youth.

Such positive outcomes are attributed to livelihoods and SRH trainings conducted by Restless Development Uganda and VPEs in communities and business skills trainings conducted by KATI, Enterprise Uganda and KYBT. Youth iterated that skills and knowledge obtained from these trainings have provided them with a basis for personal, socio-economic and socio-political well-being, which increases levels of income and affects standards of living for the youth individual, the household. The evaluation team suspects such positive outcomes for youth should ultimately lead to community growth.

As a result of their involvement with Consortium members and partners, youth received increased credibility based on their role, their work and their added value in communities in which they work. Local governments were reported to have shown interest in and been impressed by youth groups and their activities. As such, though only qualitative evidence to prove this was provided, credibility seems to have increased at District and sub-county levels in Uganda and with financial institutions based on the certificates provided after training, which enabled youth to successfully apply for loans.

Such increased credibility is linked to organisational relationships with local governments (see section ‘the result of organisational development’, point ‘credibility’), financial institutions and growth in organisational credibility, but is strengthened through activities, which VPEs, youth advocates and young entrepreneurs engage in. Youth can therefore be said to be active agents of change and necessary partners to all Consortium members.
4 Conclusions
The evaluation team started off this investigation with a view of the PPA Youth Consortium’s journey as described during the inception period (see Appendix 6.1, Figure 1) and considered the two learning questions that had been set by the Consortium members:
1. How can the experiences of the Consortium – both programmatically in its impact, institutionally in the development of each agency, and as a strategic consortium – be used to guide the future direction of the Consortium and to inform broader civil societal collaboration beyond the Consortium?
2. How can the experiences of the Consortium inform and strengthen future partnership(s) and programme design committed to strengthening youth engagement and youth-led development?

The evaluation team has set out our conclusions in relation to these two learning questions and the DAC criteria.

4.1 Guiding the future direction of the Consortium
The PPA period has been significant for the development of each Consortium member. At the start of the PPA in 2011 there was significant discrepancy in the capacity and capabilities of each member. The first part (2011 – 2014) of the PPA was crucial to bringing the members onto an even par with each other’s capacity to deliver programming and each other’s institutional effectiveness. This process of growth, improvement and sharing of learning continued throughout the PPA period. The three key institutional capabilities that benefitted most from PPA investment, financial systems, M&E and fundraising, are crucial to successful partnership working and joint initiatives.

Each member has also demonstrated that their programme design and development work has been influenced by the PPA funding. Each member can point to programmes that innovate, such as WCUK’s VoiceMore, extend reach and depth of the intervention, such as YBI’s assistance of KYBT Mombasa’s South Coast expansion, and enable youth to access their rights and core services such as education and healthcare, under Restless Development Tanzania’s work to get pregnant girls back into school, for example.

Uganda was the only country where the three members had any presence and investigation determined little engagement between members on the ground and little appetite to do so. The different results and levels of successful outcomes for youth across member activity mean that when considered together, the results for youth are mixed. Youth have reported both positive and negative results in our data collection. On the positive side, the Consortium’s interventions have resulted in personal, socio-economic and community growth for youth and their communities. While on the negative side there are still some high dependency rates observed amongst some beneficiary groups and some communities, specifically on services provided by consortium members, partners or roles provided by consortium members to youth.

Neither the positive or the negative results reported by youth affect the Consortium’s log frame performance, however, which is the only place where a Consortium level view is taken. This presents a challenge to the Consortium to understand why some beneficiary groups have reported negative impacts and others positive impacts. As Restless Development Uganda discovered, such learning could influence future programme design and potentially improve results across the consortium or partnership that has been agreed.

Overall, the improvements in programming reported by Consortium members can be used to inform future strategic planning at a member level, as Restless Development demonstrated in its new strategic plan, with a focus on youth engagement at every level.
What has been less evident during this evaluation, from the documents reviewed and key informants interviewed is what experience at a Consortium level can be taken forward to inform any future direction. Institutional results and results for youth are all member-specific, although there is significant shared learning and sharing of experience and solutions so that each member can improve its operational and programmatic ability.

This means that the evaluation has helped both prove and challenge parts of the original attribution hypothesis. Rather than resulting in Consortium-level or shared impact, the evaluation team suggests in figure 5 below that the changes and impact that have been observed have happened in tandem within each Consortium member and their sphere of influence.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 5 Revised Hypothesis of the PPA Youth Consortium, following evaluation*

The Consortium chose not to employ a Consortium-level project manager or team that would manage the day-to-day activities and delivery of the Consortium, which means that the main view at a Consortium level is held by the Steering Group, which is operated from within the Consortium members, rather than separately from them, as would be the case in a standard consortium set up. The Steering Group is populated mainly by the chief executives of the Consortium members, which
implies that the Consortium is part of its members, rather than the members being part of a consortium.

The core of the Consortium story lies in the organisational development and the intra-agency mechanisms put in place to facilitate cooperation and communication, including the sub-working groups such as the Finance Group, the Festivals of Learning and sharing of documents, approaches and informal learning from each other. This has resulted in stronger organisations in London and more competent national organisations that can deliver results independently.

Despite the positive influence of the PPA on the Consortium members, the Consortium as a mechanism does not appear to be a necessary structural delivery device. Jared Raynor has set out a continuum of inter-organisational relationship options that might have better suited three organisations coming together to access strategic funding.

Of the options shown in figure 6 above, it is likely that a formal network would have better suited the delivery model that this Consortium ultimately employed. This approach may also have better supported the development of a youth sector or youth space as a tangible concept sooner than has been the case. There is a question over whether DFID would have funded a formal network through the PPA. Having called itself a consortium, however, DFID continually challenged the PPA Youth Consortium on its consortium-level reporting. Delivering joint working projects through individual members on behalf of the Consortium or outsourcing this work to third parties presented a
challenge to the notion of consortium working that was picked up by DFID and the external evaluators during the PPA period.

The increased level of cooperation and learning between the consortium members since the mid-term review is a positive and welcome development and the feedback from young researchers that participated in the Case for Space research suggested that a view of Restless Development, WCUK and YBI speaking with one voice was beginning to emerge. Yet as a consortium, the PPA Youth Consortium does not yet operate in the way that the evaluation team would expect to see: making use of shared resources, seeing member issues and priorities as part of a wider set of priorities, speaking with one voice, sharing power and credit, using the Consortium to plug programme delivery gaps and to leverage resources to fulfil its mission, etc.

Learning from other consortium experience such as that of Restless Development Uganda will highlight the benefits of designing both joint implementation and single agency implementation within a Consortium as a way of delivering both the Consortium and organisation’s aims.

Finally the Consortium needs to clarify what it means by the phrase ‘strategic consortium’ - a definition for which we could not find in official documentation - and consider how it as a single entity might be able to engage with other civil society actors.

4.2 Informing and strengthening future partnership(s) and programme design
The mid-term evaluation determined that the partnership between the Consortium members could best be described in terms of a continuum, a direction of travel from conflict / post-conflict to long-term development that could identify points at which an individual beneficiary was more likely to encounter each Consortium member. This interpretation of the Consortium allowed for the potential for overlap between members and therefore potential for future collaboration or joint implementation. This never happened in reality.

The evaluation team returned to this concept to consider whether it was still a valid way of describing how this partnership did and could work. From the perspective of the final evaluation the evaluation team now believes the relationship between the Consortium members is more complex. Each member has a main focus of operation that is different and complementary to the others’, operating at different levels of intervention: micro, meso and macro-level, that could be useful to understand when considering how to strengthen youth-led development and youth engagement.
Each organisation works at one or more levels of intervention as described in figure 7 above. Most organisations, however, tend to focus on one level of intervention over the others. For example, having identified its niche in child protection in fragile contexts, WCUK’s activities tend to focus at the micro level, or individual / household level. Whereas Restless Development’s VPE model is located in a community and works with the community and youth to deliver results for youth in the community, or meso level. While YBI’s support for its network members is placed at the macro level due to its global view of its network.

This model could be further extended by including different operating models to reflect that different approaches to development can also affect how an organisation might work at different levels of intervention and on different thematic areas.

To further understand how organisations at each level could be understood more generally in terms of being youth-led we have applied a tool and a measurement for situating consortium members’ levels of intervention, culture and attitude to programme implementation. The measurements are both 3-leveled and clarify a vision of complementarity between Consortium members, their approaches and overall position within the youth sector or space.

Each level of intervention has its strengths and potential benefits for youth: Each level creates focus and specialized interventions to support each Consortium member’s vision, mission and objectives. An organisation located on the micro-level will focus on being sensitive to beneficiaries’ needs and aim to increase beneficiaries’ individual well-being. They will be sensitive to change over time in the sector and contexts in which they work. As such, they will be likely to reflect an accurate reflection of overall short and long-term practice changes.

Organisations located on the macro-level should aim to be conforming, based on their umbrella view of the larger group of the beneficiaries. Because they work in a range of contexts at the same time and must provide a service that is appropriate to all partner and members’ needs, they must conform to existing norms and understanding of dominating understanding for their area of expertise and work.
Organisations on the meso-level, however, should aim to be transforming: They should aim to link all levels of intervention, support cooperation for the well-being of all beneficiaries, which Consortium members aim to affect. Changing perspectives based on learning derived and adopted from popular purposes, beliefs, judgements and feelings of others will enable them to change the dominant discourse on youth and the youth sector or youth speca’s norms. Facilitating and leading such changes in understandings is the cardinal goal of transformation. It will require courage, the ability and willingness to critically reflect on underlying premises and to create a new understanding of the youth sector or youth space.

Most observable change will happen at the meso-level. Situated on the meso level, Restless Development confirms the organisations’ place as the logical lead agency for the Consortium. Table 5 below provides a short overview of each Consortium member’s levels of intervention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium Member</th>
<th>Level of intervention</th>
<th>Focus of intervention</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WCUK</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>Sensitive - conforming</td>
<td>WCUK interventions and policy influencing are focused at the individual level, with results for individuals and households. While communities and District level results are also possible, these are not the main focus for the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restless Development</td>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>Conforming - transforming</td>
<td>While Restless Development does deliver results for individuals, its focus is on the youth sector and providing leadership and shaping policy and practice for the sector, based on evidence provided through interventions. They have the potential to transform the youth sector or space, but have not yet been able to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBI</td>
<td>Macro</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>YBI is a tier 2 organisation that provides support to member organisations, who ultimately deliver the interventions. This provides it with a global view of its network. It responds globally and are therefore conforming to youth’s needs and shortcomings of the youth sector or space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5 Consortium members’ levels and focus of intervention*

Understanding the micro-, meso-, macro-contexts of the different members before the Consortium was designed could have resulted in different types of interventions and more profound joint working during the PPA period, with possibly more enhanced results for youth.

It is clear that entering into consortia, partnerships, alliances, etc. requires each member to understand not only what they will get out of such membership (benefit) but also what they are bringing to the membership (offer). Working together in consortia and programmes is not only about working alongside other NGOs, but about working with other NGOs in an integrated manner for strategically reaching a shared goal.

4.3 Reflecting on the DAC criteria
The evaluation team has also reviewed findings and evidence in line with the DAC criteria and has come to the following conclusions:
4.3.1 On relevance:
Case for Space is recognized as a relevant project in which all Consortium members played a role. The ‘From rhetoric to action’ research produced various Consortium member-specific actions for follow-up. The research and Case for Space, however, were finalized too recent to suggest actual linked outcomes. Internally, the sub-working groups, cross-member learning and the Festivals of Learning have been the biggest and most obvious and relevant outcomes for the Consortium as well as its members. These learning opportunities are likely to have had an indirect effect on youth.

The Consortium’s activities also delivered high relevance for youth. All beneficiaries enjoyed increased access to services, freedoms and increased abilities and capabilities for creating their own realities, an increased sense of well-being, independence and purpose, in addition to an increased ability to influence realities of peers in communities.

4.3.2 On effectiveness:
The greatest effect has been on internal and institutional mechanisms, such as growing abilities to write proposals, improved or instated MEL systems or team members and fundraising abilities. The consortium members have used the opportunity of the PPA to implement innovative, mostly incremental innovation, solutions such as the CSRCs and the OMS to support and enhance effective project design, delivery and management. Such increased capacity provided increased security and growth in types and amount of funding received, which in turn supported field offices and network members in countries of operation. All Consortium members have increased the quality of their programme designs, introducing a greater degree of evidence-based programming as a result of improved systems, processes and increased skills and capabilities.

4.3.3 On efficiency:
The different members of the Consortium operate in very different ways and different contexts, which means that efficiency looks very different in each organisation. Before the mid-term evaluation, PPA funding was used to strengthen institutional mechanisms, such as financial systems, review processes such as procurement and risk, which helped increase efficiencies in each organisation. Consortium members are clear on their own cost drivers and reported on these together rather than attempting to identify collective cost drivers, which did not exist due the nature of implementation. Each member has been able to demonstrate good cost management and oversight and risk management.

Value for money approaches are mixed: Restless Development uses the 3E approach, YBI uses the 4E approach and WCUK does not yet have an articulated value for money policy. Consortium members have, however, delivered substantial value for money for their own organisations and good value for money for DFID. Value creation for beneficiaries is not measured.

4.3.4 On impact:
The impact of the PPA has been most significant on Consortium members in London, though it has provided some leverage and financial freedom in countries of operation. Consortium members have been able to prove their own programmatic impact linked to the performance against the log frame and each has been able to reference examples of impact at the micro level, specifically WCUK in Afghanistan improving the options for children in conflict with the law and supporting an implementing partner in Uganda to introduce Animation Therapy to its programme, the meso level, specifically Restless Development in Tanzania successfully influencing district government to implement bylaws to return pregnant girls to school, and the macro level, specifically YBI supporting network members in Kenya and Uganda to grow their organisations, interventions and offers using a global implementation model, systems and tools.
Post-intervention impact has also been demonstrated, with some young entrepreneurs benefitting significantly and for a longer period, together with the long-term impact of girls being able to return to school or children being reintegrated into their families. Permanent impacts in the perception of youth’s roles in communities have been demonstrated, while reductions in vulnerability and increased food security have also been reported. While each Consortium member has been able to report and demonstrate its impact annually, at a Consortium level, the Consortium has not been able to demonstrate its impact.

The impact of having funding available to invest in institutional strengthening meant that the Consortium members spent most of the first part of the PPA period scaling up their capacity and capabilities to be at an equal level to the other members. As a measure of Consortium-level activity, joint working finds its best expression in the Case for Space initiative in the final two years of the PPA, before that time these joint working projects were less about joint activity and more about shared funding. This suggests that the Consortium members did not necessarily need the structure of the Consortium to deliver the defined programme of work.

4.3.5 On sustainability: Consortium members have been able to improve their immediate financial sustainability during the PPA period, with all three members demonstrating increased reserves and increased unrestricted reserves particularly by the end of the PPA. This follows on from the investments in fundraising that have been made to increase member effectiveness. However, sustainability is more nuanced than simply an increase in reserves. Each agency has seen its restricted income and expenditure increase during this period too. Although no organisation is over reliant on one donor, the limitations attached to restricted income and expenditure, despite Restless Development’s full cost recovery approach, suggest that more needs to be done to secure longer term (> five years) sustainability through increased unrestricted income or additional strategic funding partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Final Evaluation</th>
<th>Mid-Term</th>
<th>Coffey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Distinct Offering</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning: Organisational Capacity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning: Contextual Knowledge</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning: Sharing with others</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation: Incremental</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation: Radical</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership Approach</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEL Impact &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65 In the meta-evaluation the category of ‘Distinct Offering’ was changed to ‘Added Value’, which is a slightly different concept
### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Against the Log frame</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Lives</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Civil Society</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Comparing DAC criteria*

At a national level amongst Consortium members’ partners and members, the sustainability aspect is reflected most in capacity building through trainings, guarantee of financial support for a given period or programme streamlining for best support of youth. For youth directly engaged or affected by activities sustainability of the impacts that they have experienced is linked to their sense of purpose, with the knowledge and skills obtained through the Consortium members’ interventions being retained as a basis for further learning and development.

The above assessment of the DAC criteria has enabled the evaluation team to compare results of this final evaluation with the results delivered by both the mid-term evaluation in 2014 and the Coffey assessment commissioned by DFID. Table 4 above shows that the Consortium members’ performance against the Coffey indicators has mostly improved over time. We base this opinion on the primary evidence that we have collected and the secondary evidence that the Consortium has shared with us. Importantly this assessment is made considering the Consortium members individually, and not as an overall Consortium.

#### 4.4 Overall Conclusions

The PPA Youth Consortium has been able to use the PPA funding from DFID to deliver significant institutional change that has also resulted in change for the Consortium’s beneficiaries. The combination of capacity building and capability enhancements within each member over the whole period of the PPA has enabled Consortium members to design, develop and deliver increasingly relevant and sustainable programming for youth. While some of the results for youth might have been achieved without the PPA funding it is clear that the institutional development is unlikely to have happened, or if it did, it would have happened much more slowly. There are a number of learnings about consortium working and Consortium members that the evaluation team has based their recommendations in the next section on. That we remain unsure that this Consortium qualifies as a consortium does not take away from the performance and results reported to DIFD and the overall results achieved for youth.
5 Recommendations and way forward

These recommendations consider responses to the learning questions, improving results for youth and then specific core recommendations for each Consortium member.

5.1 Future Shape of the Consortium

The ability to respond to the learning questions and consider the performance of the Consortium to date requires further consideration of the shape and function of a consortium. This Consortium should carefully consider the options open to it for structure, member responsibility, participation, etc. before considering whether this Consortium should continue in its current form, take another form, expand or contract. To support such consideration the evaluation team has set out below three checklists that consortia and their members should review before embarking what could be richly rewarding work.

There is no defined shape for a Consortium, but various funding institutions and academics have put forward checklists for what they believe are the key elements of consortia that they would recognize. Some focus on what should be in the consortium agreement that would be the legal framework for participation between members, while Raynor (2010) focuses on the strategic and practical implementation of consortium working as well as other forms of relationships and participation, including networks, coalitions, partnerships, etc. In distilling a lot of the research that had gone before, Raynor developed two checklists for effective consortia; one that focuses on the members and one that focuses on the consortium itself.

As a starting point for ensuring that this Consortium and its members is as effective as possible going forward, these checklists provide a useful framework that this Consortium can use in guiding future changes in the Consortium’s design and set-up:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Skills/knowledge to work collaboratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does each member demonstrate appropriate skills / knowledge that encourages collaborative working with other organisations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Commitment to the consortium in action as well as name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How prepared is each member to demonstrate its commitment to the consortium: allocation of staff, time and resources to the consortium and its overarching goals and objectives as well as shared programme implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Member’s ability to articulate what they bring to the table (e.g., time, resources, access, relationships, reputation, expertise, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What does each member bring to the consortium and how does this either enhance other members’ abilities or plug gaps with in the consortium’s abilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Member’s ability to articulate what they want from the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How clear is each member on what membership of this consortium will bring them and why joining this consortium will help the organisation to achieve its long-term goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>Ability to weigh the value of consortium membership against scarce resource expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why should members contribute the resources, skills and knowledge available (see 3 above) to participate in this consortium? Over and above the benefits articulated in 4 above, what added value does the consortium provide each member (see check list 3 below)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>Willingness to share resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does each member demonstrate actively sharing resources to ensure shared goals and objectives can be achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>Willingness to openly identify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Does each member have a clear sense of its own goals and
conflicts between the individual organization and the consortium have processes in place to mitigate the effect of consortium priorities, when these do not match the goals of the consortium (although overlap between consortium and member should be higher than 90%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Willingness to share power and credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can each member articulate its ability and preparedness to share the credit for work with other consortium members and does it have a track record of (or state its willingness to) sharing power with other organisations both at a head office level and at a field level?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the consortium itself, Raynor has identified four areas of capacity that need to be addressed if the consortium is to be effective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Capacities</th>
<th>Adaptive Capacities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Capacities</td>
<td>Technical Capacities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each area of capacity is expanded below:

**Leadership Capacities:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shared purpose and vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the consortium clearly articulated its purpose and vision and do the members all sign up to that purpose and vision above and beyond their own long-term goals? Do the members understand and articulate how meeting the consortium’s vision will advance their own?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Common goal destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the consortium established a goal that it believes the members can sign up to and has it consulted on this goal appropriately? Do all members agree on the long-term or medium-term goals for the consortium as articulated in the consortium’s strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear value proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the consortium clearly articulate what its offer to members is and what its offer to its sector and other stakeholders/donors is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Formalized set of rules/procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the consortium established its own procedures and systems separate from those of members that service the consortium goal and vision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A “core” leadership team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is a leadership team in place that can guide the consortium as required? Are they sufficiently independent from consortium members such that members will recognize consortium leadership as different from members?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A commitment to action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the consortium’s strategic framework commit it and its members to deliver tangible results? Is it more than a talking shop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Transparent decision-making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the consortium leadership open itself up to scrutiny and provide minutes to meetings and rationales for decision-making in accordance with IATI and in any event in a timely and open manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strategically developed and engaged membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the consortium identified and attracted members that can support its own development and the delivery of its strategic framework? Has the consortium contributed to the organisational development of the membership in order to promote the advancement of the consortium’s vision and goals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Adaptive Capacities:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ability to monitor the policy &amp; development environment</td>
<td>Does the consortium have the skills and capacity to monitor and track changes in policy or development practice and to identify opportunities for itself to progress its vision and goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Effective and action-oriented planning</td>
<td>Does the consortium engage in adaptive project management to deliver real change in pursuit of its vision and goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Does the consortium have an M&amp;E plan above and beyond that of its members, relating exclusively to its vision and goals and is the plan implemented appropriately?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Measures of goal destination</td>
<td>Does the consortium adequately measure indicators relating to its goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Measures of value proposition</td>
<td>Does the consortium adequately measure indicators relating to its added value?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Measures of “positive externalities”</td>
<td>Does the consortium adequately measure indicators relating to its unintended positive outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Membership assessment</td>
<td>Does the consortium regularly (annually or longer as required) assess the performance of members, especially relating to consortium-funded activities and consortium-funded capacity building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Procurement of resources (both in-kind and financial from consortium members and external sources)</td>
<td>Has the consortium been able to increase the value and range of resources required to deliver its goals and vision, independent of the performance of its members?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Foster inter-member non-consortium collaboration</td>
<td>Does the consortium encourage and promote members working together outside of the consortium’s remit, vision and goals as appropriate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management Capacities:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frequent and productive communications</td>
<td>Does the consortium have a well articulated communication plan for both member and external communications that is independent of its members? Is the plan effectively implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Facilitate language differences (e.g., translation, definitions, etc.)</td>
<td>Does the consortium ensure that consortium-level documents (communication to and about members, minutes of consortium meetings, consortium reports, research, etc.) are produced in all the relevant languages of members of the consortium and key stakeholders / donors and as a minimum English, Spanish and French?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Managing member participation</td>
<td>Does consortium management ensure that all members of the consortium are fully contributing to the activities, goals and vision of the consortium?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deliver on reciprocity/expectations</td>
<td>Does the consortium ensure that it and its members deliver the activities that it has agreed with donors, members and other key stakeholders? Does the consortium ensure that it delivers those activities that have been allocated to it as part of the consortium strategic framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clear task and goal assignments</td>
<td>Does the annual plan clearly articulate task and activity assignment and is the delivery of these tasks and activities appropriately monitored?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarity around member and staff roles</td>
<td>Are staff role descriptions for consortium staff well articulated, clear and shared with all members? Are the staff role descriptions for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage conflict</td>
<td>Has the consortium put in place appropriate procedures to deal with conflict between members? Has the consortium put in place appropriate procedures to deal with conflict between itself and its members?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful record-keeping</td>
<td>Are consortium activities, governance meetings, strategies, frameworks, activity plans, M&amp;E plans, etc. well articulated, logged and stored? Are member communications with the consortium appropriately managed, recorded, assigned and addressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Capacities:**

| 1  | Appropriately diverse membership                                      | Has the consortium fully assessed the role and contribution of each member to ensure the best possible ‘fit’ between the consortium and each member? |
| 2  | Consortium staffing (as strategically deemed appropriate)             | Have all appropriate consortium roles been filled? Have the consortium roles been filled with candidates that exhibit the full range of desirable skills? |
| 3  | Communication skills                                                 | Does the consortium (i.e. Its staff) have appropriate skills to communicate to both the members and other stakeholders? |
| 4  | Policy & practice/ development sector expertise                       | Does the consortium have appropriate and skilled expertise in policy & practice or the development sector / focus relevant for the consortium? |
| 5  | Tangible non-human resources (e.g., space, equipment, funding, etc.)  | Can the consortium use or hire member resources such as space and equipment and does the consortium have sufficient funding (through member subscriptions and funding opportunities won) to deliver its vision and goals? |
| 6  | Resource development skills                                           | Does the consortium dedicate sufficient resources (human or otherwise) to developing resource skills (funding, capacity building, programme development, policy, etc.) at a consortium level? |

The distinct focus of this framework is that the consortium is considered separate from the individual members, with its own resourcing requirements.

In terms of any added value of consortium working, Raynor puts forward the following indicators that could help monitor and measure results for added value:

<p>| 1  | Increased consortium capacity (e.g. clarity of vision; ability to manage/raise resources; better policy analysis; etc.) | At a consortium-level are there more resources? Better support for members? Clarity and efficiency around shared processes and systems? Does the consortium attract funding? |
| 2  | Increased visibility of consortium                                     | Is the consortium logo known and referenced? Is the consortium a regular part of key strategic meetings, consultations and other fora? |
| 3  | Increased membership                                                  | Do other organisations want to become members? How many other organisations have become members since the founding consortium members? |
| 4  | Increased quality/prestige/engagement of membership                   | Is the consortium’s engagement of its members both for membership issues and support and for consortium priorities improved and demonstrating |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>leadership qualities?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Increased collaboration between consortium members outside the consortium</td>
<td>Do consortium members work together independently of the consortium and how often does this happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Merging/strategic relationship with other consortia / partnerships / coalitions / etc.</td>
<td>Does this consortium have strategic relationships with other consortia, networks, coalitions, etc. Has this consortium merged with other consortia, networks, coalitions, etc. since formation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> More rapid and organized ability to respond</td>
<td>Has the consortium been able to develop systems and processes to respond to policy and/or programme/humanitarian opportunities /crises above and beyond those of its members, do the members agree and understand the consortium approach separate from their own?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Number of different 'faces' that the consortium could credibly put forward to advance the issue</td>
<td>How clear is the consortium's external engagement policy? Does the consortium have clear communication processes and are these used? Do the members recognize when the consortium 'speaks' and how often do they agree with consortium communications?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Used together, these frameworks provide a robust checklist for considering when to enter a consortium (or any other partnership), how to manage and measure the consortium for effectiveness, efficiency and impact.

**5.2 Strengthening engagement of youth**

It is of vital importance to include youth - either directly or through network members - for organisational effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Organisations that advocate for involvement and participation of youth should set an example by being the first to do so. Meaningful inclusion of youth, however, is largely dependent on youth’s relationship with the implementing organisation who will have a say about the final decision.

This section is therefore split up into 2 sections, including (i) generating participation of youth and (ii) recommendations for the Consortium and individual organisation for strengthening the youth sector or youth space.

**5.2.1 Generating meaningful participation**

Though each Consortium member already engages or works with youth to various degrees, recommendations below should provide additional guidance for when Consortium members set up or engage in consortia. Prior to commencing participation of youth, the Consortium should consider whether full participation is right for them, i.e. whether they seek youth as partners. Alternatives could be supporting youth as leaders or approaching them as beneficiaries of programme and organisational activities.

Either option constitutes participation, but requires different approaches. In any engagement effort, however, youth must be involved in design and decision-making from the beginning: It is the continuation of the process and participation levels that will define the difference between each option of participation.
5.2.1.1 Supporting youth leaders

1. In line with youth participation and engaging youth as leaders, the Consortium and individual organisations should be clear about the plan for implementation, purpose, long-term outcome and expectations. This will create clarity for all parties involved in the governing and decision-making structures as well as create buy-in and credibility of participation.

2. An important consideration when designing any youth engagement initiative is to create an inclusive environment that recruits youth of different genders and ethnicities, possibly disabilities and those from disadvantaged backgrounds. While it is important to approach these types of initiatives systematically, no standardized template exists as they vary in context and therefore format. Creating effective channels of cooperation and information exchange among youth, their national Governments and other decision makers is crucial.

3. Encourage and promote youth leaders and the important role they play in supporting civic engagement and capacity building as well as providing them with non-formal education through financial and technical support.

4. Be conscious of engaging a diverse range of youth as diversity enables the Consortium or individual organisations to reach a broader range of youth through youth leaders.

5. For youth leaders to feel secure in their role and about what is expected of them, the Consortium or individual organisation must create an enabling environment for youth, which supports the individual leader, her/his interests and respects her/his strengths as well as limitations. As such, training should be provided at the beginning of and throughout the process in which youth leaders are engaged.

6. The relationship between youth leaders and the Consortium or individual organisations must be set up in such a way that there is full transparency and dialogue is free and open for all parties involved. The relationship will only add value to all parties if it is based on honesty and respect and the contributions of youth leaders are adequately compensated for.

7. Youth leaders may be engaged in a number of ways and in partnership with the Consortium or individual organisations, including conducting a needs assessment, writing a grant proposal, raise funds, design a program, train new staff, deliver services, implement ideas and projects, oversee a program, collect data, evaluate activities’ effectiveness, improve unsuccessful aspects of a program, and replicate successful programs. These activities are purposeful and diverse enough so that all youth leaders may find and develop specialised expertise.

8. Though change of youth leaders is vital, it is a benefit to the relationship if there is some overlap between new and old groups of youth leaders. This way experienced youth leaders can provide support to the new youth leaders, suggesting a peer-to-peer support mechanism.

5.2.1.2 Engaging youth as partners

1. To engage youth as partners, the Consortium or individual organisation may consider incorporating a child or youth council in their governance and decision-making structures. Such groups can help set policy, collect information on the needs of youth, and provide solutions for programming challenges.

2. Prior to commencing the process for participation of youth as partners, the Consortium or individual organisations may consider evaluating their readiness and absorption capacity for participation. A simple tool based on the Consortium’s views and vision for participation may prove adequate for evaluating the Consortium or individual organisation’s readiness for partnering with youth as well as their structural shortcomings for participation.

3. For success, the Consortium or individual organisations should consider and be realistic about youth’s abilities and capabilities. Therefore, competent and friendly staff should support youth and provide training if and when necessary.

4. In line with youth participation, the Consortium and individual organisations should be clear about the plan for implementation, purpose and expectations. This will create clarity for all
parties involved in the governing and decision-making structures as well as create buy-in and credibility of participation.

5. An important consideration when designing any youth engagement initiative is to create an inclusive environment that recruits youth of different genders and ethnicities, possibly disabilities, and those from disadvantaged backgrounds. While it is important to approach this type of initiative systematically, no standardized template exists as they vary in context and format. It is therefore important that the Consortium or individual organisation focuses on their needs, competencies and vision.

5.3 Measuring value created for beneficiaries and stakeholders
The Consortium members should develop quantitative and qualitative metrics for measuring Equity that take account of value creation for direct and indirect beneficiaries.

Below we have also provided a key recommendation for each Consortium member. The recommendations provided are linked to each Consortium member’s specialized level of intervention.

5.4 War Child UK
WCUK should start by determining the work it does on the micro and meso levels, with clear distinctions between both. Based on this definition, WCUK should aim to create a link between both levels of intervention, whilst retaining its sensitive nature towards vulnerable children and children in conflict. WCUK may then think about publishing an (annual) positioning paper in which it draws on existing indexes, such as psychosocial well-being, access to education and children in conflict. Such a positioning paper could have the potential to become a go-to report on child vulnerabilities and as a comprehensive identifying and/or measuring tool for other organisations. Examples that we would point to would include the annual State of the World’s Girls report and the annual (or biennial) Global Nutrition Index. Both reports started as a product of one agency and because the data and research was so good (War Child UK now has this capacity), the reports have expanded beyond that and are often quoted as the ‘go-to’ reports for their subjects.

5.5 Restless Development
Restless Development is ideally situated between the micro and the macro levels of interventions, but it will not be able to become the lead of the youth sector unless it makes efforts towards changing the conversation in the youth sector or space, with donors and partners. Changing the conversation need not mean large changes in existing approaches, but requires some shifts.

Necessary shifts include a change from the reference to the youth sector to the youth space. The concept of space is free from boundaries and therefore easier to apply to the diversity of youth as well as organisations who work with youth. Another required shift is the shift from responding to tenders and donors’ priorities to relationships with donors based on a high degree of synergy and support for Restless Development’s long-term objectives and vision. In addition, Restless Development should focus its effort on coordinating and managing (strategic) partners and Consortia so that it may become an effective and efficient leader of the youth space.

5.6 Youth Business International
Youth Business International should include shaping policy and practice at a national and international level to advance its cause for supporting and creating enabling environments for young entrepreneurs through network members. Policy and practice measures could add to its cause by strengthening support and buy-in for increased and youth-friendly overall support and structural
support in network countries. Efforts and MEL data from network members provide adequate evidence for policy and practice activities on the global and regional levels.
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