

CONTEST – RESULTS-BASED PROTECTION GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES

Assessment Criteria for Submissions

This document provides a framework for assessment of submissions for the “RBP Good Practice Contest”. While these criteria are not exhaustive, they are intended to communicate the types of questions InterAction’s team will be asking themselves and reflecting on when reviewing submissions. If you feel that your example is in line with Results-Based Protection, but may fall outside of the below criteria, please reach out to [Keri Baughman](#), Senior Project Coordinator at InterAction.

Winning submissions will:

- ▶ Genuinely represent one (or more) of the Three Key Elements of Results-Based Protection:
 - [Continuous, Context-Specific Protection Analysis](#)
 - [Outcome-Oriented Methods](#)
 - [Multi-Disciplinary Strategies](#)
- ▶ Support the achievement of results (e.g. intermediate changes in attitude, knowledge, behavior, practice, or policy), and ultimately, a protection outcome of reduced risk

The following questions will be used to assess whether the example genuinely represents one or more of the Three Key Elements of Results-Based Protection. However, one submission is not expected to touch on all of these points.

[Key Element #1 Continuous, Context-Specific Protection Analysis](#)

What makes it a strong example of continuous, context-specific protection analysis?

For example:

- How was the affected population engaged, or how does the example illustrate the starting point was from the perspective of the affected population?
- If the example emphasizes “contextualization”, how has this led to context-specific programming or activities that achieve results or ultimately a protection outcome?
- If the example emphasizes “continuous” or “iterative”, how is this in support of achieving results and ultimately a protection outcome?
- How are the components of risk analyzed (i.e. threat, vulnerability, capacity)? Does the example illustrate a unique or deliberate way to analyze threat, vulnerability, and/or capacity?
- How does the example demonstrate collective analysis in support of protection outcomes? Who was involved in the analysis? How were other sectors’ or disciplines’ perspectives brought into the analysis?
- How does the example overcome the gatekeepers of information to truly reflect an analysis coming from diverse perspectives/individuals?
- Does the example illustrate a cumbersome, rigorous tool/method, or is it field/user-friendly? Can it be adapted, contextualized, and implemented quickly with little hands-on support, or does it require expert skills and resources?
- Does the example demonstrate how the analysis was used for more effective decision-making? And, at what level? (Answering the question, “analysis for what?”)
- How did the donor support the use of continuous, context-specific protection analysis to achieve results and ultimately a protection outcome?

Key Element #2: Outcome-Oriented Methods

What makes it outcome-oriented?

For example:

- How is the protection outcome of reduced risk the starting point, focus throughout, and end point?
- If the example emphasizes “continuous”, “iterativeness”, “reflection”, “learning”, “adaptation”, or “flexibility”, how is this in support of achieving results and ultimately a protection outcome?
- If the example emphasizes how people are put at the center (i.e. human-centered), how is this in support of achieving results and ultimately a protection outcome?
- If the example emphasizes using forecast analysis, anticipatory strategies, or scenario planning, how is this in support of achieving results and ultimately a protection outcome?
- If the example emphasizes measurement tools (i.e. outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, other mapping tools), how do these focus on results or protection outcomes vs. outputs and project deliverables?
- If the example emphasizes relationships (i.e. mapping, stakeholder analysis, etc.), how is this in support of achieving results and ultimately a protection outcome?
- If the example emphasizes the use of a contextualized causal logic, theory of change, or multi-dimensional pathway, how does this support results and ultimately a protection outcome?
- If the example emphasizes contextualization, how has this led to results or a protection outcome?
- Is the example an overarching framework that provide guidance for undertaking a protection analysis, developing a collective strategy, or working across disciplines in support of protection outcomes? Is it in support of the Three Key Elements of Results-Based Protection?
- How did the donor support outcome-oriented ways of working to achieve results and ultimately a protection outcome?

Key Element #3: Multi-Disciplinary Strategies

What makes it a strong example of a multi-disciplinary strategy that brings together relevant actors to solve a protection issue?

For example:

- How does it overcome the complexity of working across disciplines (e.g. overcoming different priorities, different terminology, different understanding of the same issue, different structures/resources/networks, etc.)?
- How does the example emphasize complementary engagement across disciplines/sectors—what efforts were made, how are they built and sustained? How were these measured in support of results or a protection outcome?
- What efforts were made to support relationship-building, trust-building, embedding/cultivating critical skills (listening, negotiation, patience, sensitivity, diplomacy, communication, etc.) as a critical factor in support of multidisciplinary strategies for protection outcomes?
- How did the donor encourage or support efforts towards multi-disciplinary strategies?