



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

### **External Mid-Term Evaluation of the Framework for Risk Governance and Adaptive Programming (FRAP)**

#### **Table of Contents**

1.	List of abbreviations.....	2
2.	Contextual and background.....	3
3.	Overview of Framework for Risk Governance and Adaptive Programming (FRAP).....	3
4.	Purpose of the evaluation.....	4
5.	Objectives and scope of the evaluation.....	4
6.	Evaluation questions .....	5
7.	Suggested Methodology .....	6
8.	Deliverables .....	6
9.	Governance .....	7
10.	Timelines and Logistics .....	7
11.	Expression of interest .....	7
12.	Technical and financial proposal: should not exceed 20 pages .....	8
13.	Application process and relevant timelines .....	9
14.	Administrative information .....	9

## 1. List of abbreviations

<b>AAP</b>	: Accountability to Affected Population
<b>AVF</b>	: Africa's Voices Foundation
<b>CV</b>	: Curriculum Vitae
<b>DAC</b>	: Development Assistance Committee
<b>DTA</b>	: Double Taxation Agreements
<b>FRAP</b>	: Framework for Risk Governance and Adaptive Programming
<b>HoA</b>	: Horn of Africa
<b>INGO</b>	: International Non-Governmental Organization
<b>INSO</b>	: International NGO Safety Organization
<b>IP</b>	: Implementing partners
<b>KDP</b>	: Kulmis Digital Platform
<b>KST</b>	: Kulmis Support Team
<b>LNGO</b>	: Local Non-Governmental Organization
<b>M&amp;E</b>	: Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>NDP</b>	: National Development Plan
<b>NGO</b>	: Non-Governmental Organization
<b>NPO</b>	: National Programme Officer
<b>OECD</b>	: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
<b>POC</b>	: Point of Contact
<b>RG</b>	: Reference Group
<b>RPHoA</b>	: Swiss Regional Program Horn of Africa
<b>SDC</b>	: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
<b>SDG</b>	: Sustainable Development Goals
<b>SMS</b>	: Short Message Service
<b>SNBS</b>	: Somalia National Bureau of Statistics
<b>SWOT</b>	: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
<b>TPM</b>	: Third Party Monitoring
<b>TPME&amp;L</b>	: Third-Party Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
<b>UN</b>	: United Nations
<b>UN RMU</b>	: UN Risk Management Unit
<b>UNDP</b>	: United Nations Development Programme
<b>USD</b>	: United States Dollar
<b>VAT</b>	: Value Added Tax
<b>WHT</b>	: Withholding Tax

## 2. Contextual and background

Somalia is among the most fragile and volatile context in the world. It has been at the bottom of rankings for state fragility, corruption perception, bribery risk and global peace indices over the past two decades. A mix of corruption and collusion is one of the leading causes of fragility. Systemic political corruption and patronage politics remain a significant problem for the delivery of development assistance. Foreign aid has regularly been converted into political rewards. The aid system was particularly shaken by large-scale diversion scandals during the 2011-2012 famine and as also revealed in the recently concluded investigation on post-delivery aid diversion (PDAD) in Somalia by the UN. These challenges continue to create significant accountability concerns. Systemic marginalization of minority clans and intersectional discrimination linked to gender and people with disabilities also contribute to increased fragility in Somalia. Accountability to the most left-behind groups is therefore important. The presence of non-state actors, some of them being designated as terrorist organizations by the international community or by some key stakeholders, increase the reputational risks of fund diversion that could be interpreted as illicit terrorist financing. The lack of comprehensive statistics extends to the disaggregation of data for gender and different minorities and is exacerbating the serious marginalization they face.

Large parts of the rural areas have remained under the control of non-state actors (primarily armed groups). Field access remains extremely constrained and access is almost always paid for, further perpetuating corruption and diversion of funds. Constraints on access to South-Central Somalia increases the reliance of international implementing partners on local NGOs (LNGOs) and on the Red Crescent Movement. In 2012 and 2020, the UN/INGOs had withdrawn almost all their expatriate presence due to insecurity and COVID-19 concerns, with LNGOs left to respond. The existing power imbalance between LNGOs and their larger international counterparts (UN, INGOs), often leads to an unfair risk transfer onto national implementing partners. Zero tolerance for corruption policies by donors and international organizations often leads to a punitive, rather than corrective approach with regards to local actors. Counter-terrorism legislation further transfers risks to implementing partners, who try to manage access to areas controlled by non-state actors.

Because of the high fiduciary risks, international donors rarely enter direct partnerships with local actors – be it state authorities, LNGOs, local for-profit sector or think tanks. At the same time, the substitution of service delivery by international implementing partners and the primary reliance on international aid hamper the sustainable development of Somalia. Short-term collaboration between international and local actors creates challenges for the latter in terms of staff retention and longer-term capacity development including improved accountability systems. Increased and longer-term partnerships with local partners would represent an important element in fostering the endogenous response and service delivery capacity in Somalia. With a weak national state, non-state actors such as faith organizations, diaspora communities, traditional authorities, tribal structures, and private sector networks become more prominent and are promising though are neglected vectors for cooperation.

Given the security risks, most donor countries, including Switzerland, have had at best a limited physical presence in Somalia in the past 25 years. The security situation warrants that most donors will continue to rely on outsourcing for analysis, implementation and monitoring for the foreseeable future. Third-Party Monitoring (TPM) systems were launched over the last few years to deal with these risks, particularly for humanitarian aid delivery. This aims to resolve issues of access, but also to generate verified data on project performance.

## 3. Overview of Framework for Risk Governance and Adaptive Programming (FRAP)

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of the Swiss Cooperation Programme, Horn of Africa 2022-2025, serves three purposes: Firstly, it helps for efficient and effective use of resources and the mitigation of risks; secondly, it provides the necessary basis for learning and for evidence-based programme steering and adaptations; and thirdly, it accounts for results achieved. As one of the M&E instruments FRAP responds to the contextual and programmatic challenges by setting up Third-Party Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (TMPE&L), combined with context and security assessments, beneficiary and target population feedback mechanisms, capacity building and dedicated support to the SNBS. Implemented over a twelve-year timeframe of three phases, FRAP phase one (Mid 2021-Dec 2024) is **initially focused on Somalia (including Somaliland)** with some activities extended to Northern Kenya. Therefore, the overall objective of the FRAP programme is to improve the performance of the Swiss Horn of Africa (HoA) programme. In other words, to increase Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation's (SDC's) ability to operate in Somalia, a fragile context, requiring adaptive management and largely a remote operation. This objective was envisioned to be achieved through the following three intermediary outcomes (IOCs) / **objectives** (refer annex 1 for Theory of Change).

- a) Improved monitoring, risk governance and real-time adaptations of SDC programs
- b) Increased number and improved quality of partnerships with local actors
- c) Improved state-led National Development Plans (NDP) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) monitoring and statistical data

#### **FRAP components (see Theory of Change)**

##### **a) Support to Kulmis:**

- i. **Kulmis Support Team (KST):** Contracted through an international tender, they were selected to provide various services inter alia; Third-Party Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning and Accountability to Affected Population (TPM E&L, AAP) applied at the project, portfolio and strategy level, backed up by community feedback mechanisms to increase accountability to beneficiaries, and implementing partner risk assessments, audit field spot checks, context analysis in addition to training and capacity building of implementing partners.
- ii. **Kulmis Digital Platform (KDP):** Contracted through an international tender, they were selected to develop customized interactive digital dashboards capable of processing and visualising data. This is meant to help SDC to analyse the data, discuss with implementing partners the required project adaptations, and to inform other stakeholders on project results. The digital platform is a key instrument for data accountability (triangulation) as well as for feedback to the populations.

**b) Support to Africa's Voices Foundation (AVF):** Civic Engagement and Social Accountability: AVF is contracted to strengthen peoples' participation and inclusion in decision-making across the Swiss Portfolio. For this, AVF deploys a combination of interactive radio broadcasts, SMS and social science methods to expand the space for citizen voices to be heard and factored into decision-making. This support complements the community-feedback mechanism of Kulmis Support Team (KST).

**c) Support to International NGO Safety Organization (INSO):** Provides access to timely and reliable safety services to help NGOs to operate more safely. It is a vital stakeholder in terms of risk management and security management and preparedness capacity building support to its members, that are also SDC's partners.

**d) Support to UN Enablers III:** Support to the UN Integrated Office of the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator through UN's Enablers III programme, which consists inter alia of the UN Risk Management Unit (UN RMU) and the Accountability to Affected Population (AAP) Unit. The UN RMU plays a key role in enhancing capacities of subcontractors of the many UN agencies operating in Somalia in addition to risk advisory to the UN. SDC and other donors have also benefited from UN RMU's contributions to Partner Risk Assessments and trainings.

**e) Support to the Somalia National Bureau of Statistics (SNBS):** through United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to help enhance the capacity of the newly formed SNBS to collect, analyse and store data of Somalia in order to improve the quality and quantity of country developmental information.

#### **4. Purpose of the evaluation**

The mid-term evaluation should help FRAP achieve the results intended at the end of the intervention, by identifying lessons which can be drawn at this point in time, to inform further implementation of the current and planning of the next phase. The primary audience is SDC staff, selected implementing partners, donors and consultants, both in the region and globally. The report may also serve to inform interested stakeholders, such as potential donors. The dissemination policy will be decided at the end of the evaluation by SDC. The evaluation should therefore also identify (early signs of) unintended, positive and negative, results.

In line with the Swiss Regional Programme Horn of Africa (RPHoA) 2022-2025, Switzerland mandates the mid-term evaluation of Phase 01 of the FRAP programme to assess the progress of implementation towards meeting the set objectives and inform timely adaptations and its future phase.

#### **5. Objectives and scope of the evaluation**

The objectives of the external evaluation are to:

- a) Assess progress in implementing FRAP in view of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, factors of sustainability and of impact.
- b) Assess progress towards achievement of FRAP objectives and/or yearly benchmarks, and the contribution FRAP could make towards the next phases of SDC regional programming.
- c) Assess if interventions are sufficient to reach desired outcomes, and whether all the components are valuable or could be cut.
- d) Identify barriers and opportunities to the achievement of objectives including, uptake and use (within and outside of SDC), coordination and internal governance.
- e) Consider equity in the uptake, use and application of FRAP, considering the unequal power and economic situations of different groups in Somalia referred to in the context described above.

## 6. Evaluation questions

It is important to note that this evaluation, part of the adaptive approach of FRAP, is intended to lead to concrete findings which can be adopted by SDC toward future improvements of the programme. One important aspect concerns the adoption of new technology and new ways of working. To address this, the following evaluative questions should be addressed:

- a) **Relevance:** how well is FRAP aligned to the particularities of the Horn of Africa and Somalia in particular? Is it correctly positioned to serve accountability in the international aid architecture, as well as the monitoring and management priorities of SDC?
  - i. What elements of the Kulmis Digital Platform are or would be beneficial to steer SDC portfolio?
  - ii. How well does FRAP relate to ongoing digitization processes and evolving reporting systems at the SDC institutional level? How well positioned is FRAP to contribute to these evolutions?
  - iii. How does FRAP compare in terms of aims and scope with other comparable bilateral and multilateral initiatives for risk management and adaptive programming in Somalia? (This should consider comparable monitoring frameworks and data management tools).
  - iv. How effectively is FRAP able to mitigate existing programmatic, institutional and contextual risks in Somalia?
  - v. To what extent is FRAP, or some of its components, relevant for the other contexts /geographical areas of the RPHoA?
- b) **Effectiveness:** to what extent is FRAP progressing towards the objectives stated in the original programming document (2019), Analytical Framework (March 2020) and Mandate (October 2020)?
  - i. Which stakeholders are obtaining more information or enhanced analysis out of FRAP? In what way? How much has FRAP improved access to data for the SDC Regional Office?
  - ii. What stage of development has the Third-Party Monitoring (TPM) component of FRAP reached? (i.e., level of access to project sites, ability to identify and flag major programmatic and institutional risks, etc.).
  - iii. To what extent has KDP created the tools to support SDC and its implementing partners to refine/adapt their project management? Is FRAP proportionate to the capacity of partners to absorb more frequent reporting/analysis? Are certain components of KDP more effective at helping manage risks and reporting on results than others?
  - iv. What is the perception of Kulmis to implementing partners especially local? What results were achieved in the process of trust building with local partners? What did KST learn from the process of engaging local partners? How did KST manage expectations when it comes to training?
- c) **Efficiency:** to what extent are resources being used to achieve maximum results because of FRAP or within FRAP itself?
  - i. How well do the different components of FRAP interact with each other (i.e., is there an effective overall FRAP and are common synergies being created)? Could FRAP as a programme be simplified by omitting redundant or unproductive actions, or are the different actions combining to avoid waste and duplication?
  - ii. What are the factors enhancing or impeding the utilization of FRAP data among stakeholders? If absorption capacity remains low within SDC and within implementing partners (IPs), should components be changed or removed, and if so which ones?
  - iii. To what extent does Kulmis/FRAP permit the alignment of its digital platform with SDC's RDM platform to avoid duplication of data and of efforts for SDC and for SDC's partners? Is the alignment necessary?

- iv. To what extent does the TPM matrix include (or how could it better include) cost/benefit and/or cost-efficiency considerations? Does it enable SDC to apply such analysis especially regarding the support to local organizations?
- d) Impact:** What elements will allow FRAP to plausibly generate significant positive or negative, intended, or unintended, higher-level effects?
- i. Which elements offer the greatest potential for impact (assessed for example through a SWOT analysis for each FRAP component)?
  - ii. To what extent does SDC use the findings of the TPM component of FRAP to steer and adjust projects and/or partnerships?
  - iii. If FRAP can be analyzed in terms of workflows (from data collection to analysis to actionable decision making), what is the added value of each component and for whom is additional value created?
  - iv. Are IPs able to use additional analysis to compensate for time consumed to enter data into the platform or to host field verification and training?
- e) Sustainability:** How well is FRAP enhancing or constraining lasting changes in the reporting and the engagements that tie together SDC and its partners?
- i. What additional value has FRAP created for SDC in terms of proximity with local partners and in terms of new partnerships for SDC programming?
  - ii. Once PCM elements are shown digitally instead of solely through annual reporting, does it lead to more valuable knowledge? Is there the possibility of synergies with the existing IPs contractual reporting and other aspects of digital development in SDC?
  - iii. What factors in FRAP knowledge allow IPs to be better able to adapt their projects during the period of implementation in a way they consider useful?
  - iv. What opportunities have been created for linkages with, or for scaling up to, other SDC operations? What opportunities are there for FRAP's use as an institutional tool?

## 7. Suggested Methodology

The evaluation shall adopt a participatory approach, engaging relevant stakeholders in a systematic manner, including the FRAP partners, other relevant donors in the region, SDC implementing partners and beneficiaries. A list of relevant stakeholders will be provided by the SDC after the evaluation contract award, as well as an overview of the digital tools used by SDC.

The analysis shall adhere to recognised evaluation principles and the OECD DAC's quality standards for development evaluation in addition to the guidelines for evaluations in settings of conflict and fragility, as well as relevant guidelines from the SDC Department for Evaluation. The evaluation is expected to be undertaken with integrity and honesty and ensure inclusiveness of views. The rights, dignity, safety and security of participants in the analysis should be protected.

The collected data should be triangulated to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Secondary data shall be collected through a comprehensive desk review (stakeholder analysis, review of log frame, available documentary data), supplemented by primary data from direct observation and through remote as well as in-person interviews with the programme's target beneficiaries (implementing organizations, SDC team, communities).

The international evaluator(s) are expected to travel to Kenya (Nairobi) and Somalia (Garowe and Mogadishu). The evaluation team could consider the deployment of Somali national(s) for visits to locations inside Somalia.

An inception meeting will be organized at the beginning of the evaluation to agree on the modalities of field visits, meetings and validation of the findings.

## 8. Deliverables

The following products are expected from the evaluators:

- a) Evaluation inception report - The report should elaborate on data collection process and tools, methodologies, detailed work plan, roles and responsibilities of team members and a detailed mid-term evaluation matrix.
- b) Draft evaluation report including a PPT presentation of key findings.

- c) A comprehensive and concise final report (max. 30 pages excl. annexes) including an executive summary, analytical review and recommendations parts (including the programme logic (logframe/ToC).
- d) Annexes: including data sets (raw and refined products), data sets transcripts of qualitative data. and in an easy-to-read format for use by SDC partners and key stakeholders. In case of confidentiality concerns from external partners interviewed, the contractors shall aggregate and anonymize data per stakeholder group.

## 9. Governance

The winning bidder shall put in place security measures for their staff that are commensurate with the possibly risks during the field visits and final report presentation seminar in Kenya and Somalia. The winning bidder shall inform his/her staff of the security risks in Somalia and take appropriate measures to protect them and their belongings in the country. The winning bidder shall ensure that they can reliably always communicate with their staff during their visits to Somalia and Kenya. Evaluators must understand who to contact in the event of emergency or incident (to be reflected in the “other costs” of the financial offer).

The evaluation is managed by the SDC Regional Office in Nairobi; the progress of the evaluation will be followed by a Reference Group (RG) consisting of SDC personnel and evaluation specialists.

The main functions of the RG are:

- a) To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and SDC and external stakeholders.
- b) To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the intervention.
- c) To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are in principle compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- d) To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- e) To discuss and comment on the quality of work done by the evaluation team.
- f) To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

The communication between the Reference Group and the Evaluation Team is always channelled through the FRAP Programme Officer.

## 10. Timelines and Logistics

### Duration and Budget

The maximum time frame for this evaluation is 50 working days between April and August 2024 preferably. The allocation of working days to inception, desk review, field visits, etc. will be agreed upon based on the inception report and the decision of conducting a verification workshop.

### Reporting

The consultant(s) will report to the FRAP Programme Officer of SDC for the entire duration of the assignment. The Programme Officer will provide the consultants with the relevant documents.

## 11. Expression of interest

Bidders are expected to submit an expression of interest based on the suitability criteria below.

### a) Suitability criteria (SC)

The bidders will submit an expression of interest showing team members' competence and will be considered only to the degree that the proposed work plan indicates that they will spend sufficient time and be given appropriate roles in relevant phases of the analysis.

- i. The **Team leader's** qualifications will be assessed on the basis of:
  - Documented experience from leading multidisciplinary evaluations of similar frameworks or projects in humanitarian and development cooperation.

- Communication skills in English as demonstrated by previous evaluations, research and other forms of analytical reports and related dissemination products.

ii. The team shall **collectively** represent the following competencies:

- Postgraduate academic qualifications in the field of development, monitoring and evaluation, data management, digital technology, digital transformation or other relevant disciplines.
- Experience conducting research and evaluations in Somalia and undertaking change management (mandatory).
- Documented experience conducting field studies or evaluations of humanitarian, development, and peace efforts supported by donors in fragile countries.
- The team shall include a named quality assurer proficient in relevant social science methods, and/or academic research on topics of relevance for this evaluation.
- Demonstratable communication skills in English and Somali (at least within the team).

The bids received will be assessed according to the following award criteria.

SC	Suitability criteria	Weighting
SC1	Knowledge and experience of the applicant	80%
SC1.1	Team leader's qualifications	40%
SC1.2	Collective team academic qualifications	30%
SC1.3	Collective team experience in conducting research and evaluations fragile contexts including Somalia	30%
SC2	Financial offer/value for money for the service provided (strictly in USD)	20%
<b>SC1+SC2</b>		<b>100%</b>

### Structure and content of expression of interest

Please respect the following structure for your offer and requested documents, which is compulsory. The indicated number of pages for each section must be respected. Exceeding pages will not be taken into consideration. Font size must be no smaller than 10.

Chapter	Description	No. pages max (10 pages)	SC
0	Application letter including availability (for all team members) stating the Point of contact (PoC) of the proposed team	1	
1	Presentation of the bidder	1	
2	Knowledge and experience of the bidder	5	SC1
3	Understanding and approach to the Mandate (required but not evaluated at this stage)	2	
4	Financial proposal ( <b>strictly USD</b> )	1	SC2

## 12. Technical and financial proposal: should not exceed 20 pages

The technical and financial proposal will be evaluated based on the award criteria below;

### Award Criteria ("AC"): To be evaluated in second step

Best three (3) bids will be selected to proceed to the second step. They will be expected to submit and demonstrate the following:

#### a) Technical proposal (80%)

- A detailed and credible approach demonstrating how it will be deployed to meet the evaluations objectives.
- Demonstrated capacity to undertake participatory approach and effective consultation and verification.
- A detailed workplan.
- In order to execute evaluation effectively, the winning bidder should consider engaging a mix of local and international personnel. This engagement would be individual or organizational but must be stated. This will help the winning bidder to have the right knowledge and experience of the local context i.e., security and political environment as well as harness the available expertise internationally.



- v. CVs (max 3 pages per person including three references and documents/reports proving relevant experience) and division of responsibilities between team members; A sworn statement as to the absence of any conflict of interest of each team member. In the case a group of consultants, Embassy of Switzerland will only engage with one point of contact or person for contractual and obligations for the deliverables.
- vi. The proposal should set out any potential or perceived conflicts of interest for the team or any member of the team.

**b) Detailed financial proposal (20%)**

- i. Clarity of the proposition, full character of the cost structure, realistic estimation of the costs
- ii. The overall price for core services (excl. VAT).

**13. Application process and relevant timelines**

Complete applications to be submitted in **English**. Relevant timelines are as follows;

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Step 1: Expression of interest (including any questions)	By 22 February 2024 (2300hours CET)
Communication on first round decision	By 1st March
Step 2: Detailed proposal submission - best three (3)	by between 04th and 18 March 2024
Presentation by final 3 bidders	Between 25th March
Communication – end round (award) decision	By 28th March
Contracting	Between 02 <sup>nd</sup> April and 05th April
Proposed start date	by 08th April 2024
Inception report	15 days after the inception meeting
Draft report	by 31 <sup>st</sup> July 2024
Final report	by 30 <sup>th</sup> August 2024

All applications have to be submitted to: [nairobi@eda.admin.ch](mailto:nairobi@eda.admin.ch) under the subject line: **FRAP Evaluation**. No applications shall be accepted after the deadline. Only complete applications will be considered. Only shortlisted bids will be contacted.

**14. Administrative information**

The winning bidder shall be required to submit the following administrative information to be verified and validated before the contract is awarded.

**a) Corporate person/company**

- i. Certificate of registration/Incorporation of the company.
- ii. Latest Tax Compliance Certificate of the company.
- iii. Copies of academic certificates of proposed consultant(s).

**b) For natural persons/individuals/freelancers**

- i. Latest Tax Compliance Certificate.
- ii. Copies of academic certificates of the consultant(s).

Compliance with local law on taxation

**Withholding tax (WHT)**

Taxes, charges and social security contributions will be applicable in conformity with local legislation. The Embassy is obligated to deduct and submit Withholding Tax (WHT) to the Kenyan Revenue Authority (KRA). WHT is a percentage of the earnings and will vary depending on the country of origin of the consultant.

- i. For non-residents, the Embassy will respect existing “double taxation agreements (DTA)”. The maximum WHT rate of 20% (subject to change depending on legislation) for non-residents, will be deducted.
- ii. For residents, the maximum WHT is 5% for this type of consultancy.

More information on the applicable tax rates can be found here: <https://www.kra.go.ke/en/helping-tax-payers/faqs/more-about-withholding-tax>.

**Value Added Tax (VAT)**

The Embassy is exempt from VAT. The service is subject to VAT according to the local law, the resident corporate person will within 30 days reimburse the VAT amount to the Embassy as soon as the exemption certificate is availed by the Embassy.

**The legal status of the evaluation team**

The consultant must have valid a work permit(s) or equivalent authorization (s) before travelling, which allows such a person to live and work in the respective country.

Embassy of Switzerland (to Kenya, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda and Somalia)  
Rosslyn Green Estate, Rosslyn Green Drive, off Red Hill Road  
P.O. Box 2600, 00621 Nairobi  
Email: [nairobi@eda.admin.ch](mailto:nairobi@eda.admin.ch)  
Website: <https://www.eda.admin.ch/nairobi>  
Facebook: [@SwissEmbassyNairobi](https://www.facebook.com/SwissEmbassyNairobi)  
X: [@SwissEmbassyKE](https://twitter.com/SwissEmbassyKE)

## Annex 1: FRAP Theory of Change

