

# Multi-Country Evaluation of NRC's Protection from Violence Core Competency

**DATES:** 01.04.2025

**BASED:** MULTI-COUNTRY

---

## 1 Background information

The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC; Norwegian: *Flyktninghjelpen*) is a humanitarian, non-governmental organisation that protects the rights of displaced people. This includes refugees and internally displaced persons who are forced to flee their homes due to conflict, human rights violations, acute violence, climate change, and natural disasters.

In 2023, NRC helped almost 10 million people across 40 countries. This included providing aid across our 6 core competencies:

1. Shelter and Settlements
2. Livelihoods and Food Security (LFS)
3. Information, counselling and legal assistance (ICLA)
4. Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)
5. Education
6. Protection from violence (PfV)

This evaluation focuses on PfV, NRC's newest core competency, which was implemented across 26 countries and reached approximately 700,000 people in 2023. The PfV core competency focuses on helping to ensure displaced people and communities are protected by preventing and responding to violence, coercion, and actions taken by others to deny them their rights.

In 2022, Protection from Violence was designated as a new core competency focused on violence prevention and response. This enables NRC to provide a more consistent and targeted protection response based on global principles and standards and linked with our protection policy work. Sida supports PfV programming in country, as well as providing support globally for method and capacity development. This approach is supported by Sida through direct country support, as well as support to methods that support the Core Competency globally. The Core Competency includes 4 programmatic areas:

- (1) Community Safety and Violence Prevention
- (2) Individual Protection Services

(3) Thought Leadership and Influence, and

(4) Site Management.

---

## 2 Purpose of the evaluation and intended use

The PfV Core Competency's programming has been growing since 2022 across all four aspects. Given the significant program development and expansion of programs, NRC believes 2025 is the right time for a global evaluation. In 2024, NRC commissioned a Formative Review to internally assess the integration of the PfV Core Competency and identify critical focus areas moving forward. One area of focus identified was the need for increased measurement of PfV programs, specifically focusing on impact. While NRC continues to expand its monitoring – including outcome monitoring, and a focus on learning exercises within PfV in 2024 – a rigorous program evaluation is a crucial additional component to its learning strategy.

This evaluation is anticipated to support NRC's continued investment into protection and inform the sector by providing evidence of outcome-oriented approaches to protection. NRC aims to focus on two specific areas of programming: Civilian-Self Protection (CSP) and Individual Protection Assistance (IPA). Each of these is a specific programmatic approach within a broader programmatic area: CSP is the flagship program in the Community Safety and Violence Prevention pillar and IPA is a core mechanism under Individual Protection Services. These have been selected because other core areas of programming, including Protection Case Management and Humanitarian Mediation, have more recently had more significant investments in learning through dedicated funding and evaluation. Evaluation of thought leadership will be embedded in this exercise as it relates to CSP and IPA, and Site Management is not currently a focus of Sida's support.

This evaluation is intended to support the scaling and prioritisation of PfV across NRC to ensure we capitalise on investments made to date. It will aim to identify success factors for programming with positive impacts and help NRC guide future programming implementation. In addition to specific contributions to PfV technical approaches, it will provide evidence for NRC's next strategy period, which begins in 2027. It will also be a public good for the wider humanitarian community, adding to the evidence base about what interventions successfully reduce protection risks on a community and individual basis.

---

## 3 Scope and lines of inquiry

### 3.1 Scope

Dates of evaluation 1 May 2025 – 31 Dec 2025

This global evaluation will collect and analyse data in 2-3 countries. Possible countries include Colombia, Afghanistan, Myanmar, Palestine, Libya, Iraq, Honduras, Ukraine, South Sudan, and Somalia. The donor and the selected consultants will make specific country selections. NRC aims for a diverse geographic spread.

This evaluation aims to cover not only SIDA projects but also other donor-funded projects (e.g., Norad, ECHO, BHA).

The balance of exploring CSP vs. IPA through this evaluation will depend on the location. In some locations, IPA and case management are closely associated and will need to be considered as part of the review. This will be unpacked during the inception phase.

## 3.2 Lines of Enquiry

### General Questions

- Did the programs target displacement-affected people with significant protection risks instead of vulnerability-based targeting? Were there groups of people who could have benefited from the programs who were not targeted?
- Were the programs designed to address specific protection risks found in protection risk analysis?
- What was the interplay between different components of PfV at the CO level?
- Did NRC adapt programming during implementation? Did this improve the programming? Should these adaptations be considered for future programming?
- To what extent do programme activities align with NRCs global ToCs? What are the main causal pathways towards achieving outcomes?
- What impacts and outcomes (intended or not) were achieved? Do they align with our global ToCs?
- What enables success, and what lessons can be drawn for future programming and the PfV strategy?
- Are we equipping our teams with right capacities?

### Specific questions

#### *Civilian-self Protection*

- What strategies did the communities targeted in CSP programs develop to reduce their protection risks? How did NRC influence or contribute to those strategies?
- Did NRC contribute to an enabling environment for communities to carry out their action plans for protection risk reduction? What more could NRC do?
- How did communities use protection risk analysis to influence their action plans and interventions? Did NRC effectively support this process?

#### *Individual Protection Assistance*

- How did NRC use protection risk analysis to identify and target people for IPA? Was that targeting effective?
- Did we use the right form of IPA?
- How did individuals use IPA to reduce their protection risks? What did NRC do to support this? What more could NRC do to improve its support to individuals and households?
- Are there examples of IPA integrated into other sectors or core competencies? How has this influenced outcomes?

---

## 4 Methodology

This evaluation will develop a rigorous methodology to unpack CSP and IPA and explore the impact of these two areas of programming across a sample of NRC country offices in line with our global ToCs. The specific countries we sample will be guided by a thorough review of existing evidence within NRC to understand where evidence gaps and/or areas of learning should be explored in more depth. This will be a utilisation-focused evaluation in which we will follow three main phases:

### **Phase 1: Inception phase (3 months)**

The evaluation will synthesise findings from our learning exercises over the last few years in this phase. This synthesis will also include a mapping of the types and forms of PfV programming being implemented. Over ten (a number are still ongoing) learning exercises have been completed globally, and they will provide a rich source of information on the scope and detail of ISP and CSP activities. We will also explore global monitoring data. In 2024, we introduced mandatory global indicators for PfV, which will give us an early insight into global results. This information will be synthesised into a single report to understand how the programme areas are being implemented in different settings, where the evidence gaps are, and what existing evidence says about how these areas contribute to impact.

Based on the findings of phase 1, NRC will identify criteria for sampling a set of countries for primary data collection. It is envisaged that 2 to 3 countries will be visited for additional data collection to explore how PfV programming contributes to longer-term/higher-level results in more depth. We are also proposing conducting remote case studies to explore 4 to 5 countries in total.

### **Phase 2: Data collection (3 to 4 months)**

Due to the level of available evidence, most significant change or outcome harvesting is suggested as the most appropriate methodology to guide data collection, but we will seek the inputs of the consultants on the final methodology design. Data collection will explicitly explore and unpack areas of the existing PfV global theory of change. It will also be important to build robust participatory components into the methodology due to the nature of the work and the fact that some results will need to be examined through qualitative data. Finally, this evaluation will be gender sensitive and explore how women and men are experiencing our PfV programming and what social-cultural barriers may exist to women and/or men benefiting from the programme areas.

### **Phase 3: Write up, use and dissemination (3 to 4 months)**

The final phase of the evaluation will focus on report writing and dissemination. A management response and communication plan will be developed in line with the NRC Evaluation Policy. Specific actions for organisational development will be developed that can be shared with SIDA.

These phases will be refined and unpacked with the selected consultants.

---

## 5 Evaluation follow-up and learning

A management response will be developed within two months of finalising the evaluation report. The Global Lead for Protection from Violence will follow up on and track this.

A dissemination plan will be developed to ensure that important learning is shared with internal and external stakeholders. This will include sharing findings more broadly within the protection sector, including with protection donors.

---

## 6 Management of the evaluation

The person responsible for ensuring that this evaluation takes place is Steering Committee chair supported by the evaluation manager. An evaluation manager has been appointed to coordinate the process internally and will be the evaluation team's main focal point.

An evaluation Steering Committee (SC) will be established by NRC.

The Steering Committee will oversee administration and overall coordination, including monitoring progress. The main functions of the Steering committee will be:

7. Establish the Terms of Reference for the evaluation
  8. Select evaluator(s)
  9. Review and comment on the inception report and approve the proposed evaluation methodology
  10. Review and comment on the draft and final evaluation report
  11. Establish a dissemination and utilization strategy.
- 

## 7 Deliverables and reporting deadlines

12. An inception report
  13. A final report
  14. Two internal presentations and one presentation to the donor (and PowerPoint slides for each audience)
  15. A 2-pager learning note on the evaluation for wider communication
  16. A 2-pager on how to build on and support more learning across PfV (Recommendations for improved learning methods)
- 

## 8 Timeframe

It is anticipated that this evaluation will last 9 to 12 months. The indicative dates are:

17. Contracting: April 2025
18. Inception Phase: April to June 2025
19. Data collection July to September 2025
20. Report finalisation and presentation: October to December 2025
21. A more specific timeframe will be agreed with the selected consultants during the inception phase.

---

## 9 Evaluation consultant team

NRC seeks expressions of interest from people with the following skills/qualifications

22. A high level of English language competency (working knowledge of French and/or Spanish would be an asset)
23. Clear and succinct presentation skills. The ability to communicate clearly with different audiences within NRC.
24. Extensive experience in managing significant complex multi-country evaluation
25. Significant experience with humanitarian evaluations with a minimum of 10 years of experience
26. Experience in conducting organizational reviews
27. Experience in using methods to measure the reduction of protection risk or the prevention of violence
28. Experience with different evaluation methodologies
29. Previous experience working with NRC would be an asset.

---

## 10 Application process and requirements

**Application Deadline:** April 22<sup>nd</sup>

**Interview dates:** April 24<sup>th</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup>

The budget available for consultancy fees is approximately 625,000 SEK. Travel costs will be covered by NRC. NRC can also cover some costs for local enumerators for data collection.

Bids must include the following:

- Proposal, including an outline of evaluation framework and methods, comments on the TOR, proposed time frame, and work plan (bids over 10 pages will be automatically excluded).
- Proposed evaluation budget
- CVs

Submit completed bids to Gregory Gleed [Gregory.gleed@nrc.no](mailto:Gregory.gleed@nrc.no)



NORWEGIAN  
REFUGEE COUNCIL

[www.nrc.no](http://www.nrc.no)

Norwegian Refugee Council  
Prinsens gate 2 Inngang,  
Fred Olsens gate,  
0152 Oslo