NAKURU COUNTY VIOLENCE PREVENTION POLICY

COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF NAKURU
MINISTRY OF PUBLIC SERVICE, TRAINING AND DEVOLUTION
JUNE 2019

Table of Contents

List of acronyms

CIPEV	**Commission of Inquiry into the Post-Election Violence**
CPA	**County Policing Authority**
CPC	**Community Policing Committee**
CPF	**Community Policing Forum**
CSO	**Civil Society Organization**
FGM	**Female Genital Mutilation**
GPI	**Global Peace Index**
MDG	**Millennium Development Goal**
NGO	**Non-Governmental Organization**
NLC	**National Land Commission**
NPS	**National Police Service**
PEV	**Post-Election Violence**
SDG	**Sustainable Development Goal**
UN	**United Nations**
UN-HABITAT	**United Nations Human Settlements Programme**
VAWG	**Violence Against Women and Girls**
WHO	**World Health Organization**
P/CVE	**PREVENTING AND COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM**

Foreword

The Nakuru County Violence Prevention Policy gives direction on how violence will be managed in Nakuru County through inter-sectoral dialogue and collaborations; promotion of trust between the citizens and the police; improvements in data collection, analysis and sharing among stakeholders as well as the response mechanisms. The policy is aligned with the Constitution of Kenya 2010, the County Intergrated Development Plan, Vision 2030, Sustainable Development Goals and national legislations. It demonstrates the collective commitment of Nakuru County to ensure that the county attains the highest possible standards of safety and security in a manner responsive to the needs of the population.

This policy is designed to be comprehensive and focuses on the vision of creating a safe and secure environment for all people and investments. The broad objective of this policy is to enhance the safety and security in Nakuru County through inter-sectoral collaboration and a multi-dimensional approach to violence prevention. This will be done through the following specific policy objectives; - to challenge the culture of violence ; to sustainably reduce organized violence ; to strengthen institutions for violence prevention ; to rebuild community trust ; to prevent and manage political violence ; to deepen violence prevention in land reforms and finally to enhance reporting of violence and data use in Nakuru County. It focuses on ensuring equity, people centeredness and a participatory approach, efficiency, a multi-sectoral approach, and social accountability in the delivery of violence prevention services.

The policy takes into account the functional responsibilities between the two levels of government (county and national) with their respective accountability, reporting, and management lines. It proposes a comprehensive and innovative approach to harness and synergise service delivery at all levels and engaging all actors, signalling a radical departure from past silo approaches in addressing the security agenda.

This policy was developed through an inclusive and participatory process involving all key stakeholders in the security sector and related sectors and it is envisaged that the stakeholders will continue to raise awareness and ensure that the objectives of this policy are understood and fully owned by the various stakeholders and implementing partners.

It is my sincere hope that all the actors in the security sector and related sectors in Nakuru County will rally around these policy directions to ensure that we all progressively move towards the realisation of the collective prevention of violence in Nakuru County.

MWANGANGI MWANIA
COUNTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER
PUBLIC SERVICE,TRAINING & DEVOLUTION

1   Policy Overview

Violence is the key developmental constraint for many developing countries in and around Africa, more particularly in Kenya and with special focus to Nakuru county. During the 2007 -2008 post election violence, Nakuru county in particular lost hundreds of lives and many more have been lost since then due to violence in the county. The devolution process which was necessitated by the new constitutional dispensation in 2010 has taken what was formally Nakuru municipality and the larger rift valley province through a metamorphosis and transformed it into a leading destination for investors in Kenya and as such a leading contributor to the GDP of Kenya.

This metamorphosis though welcomed, has also given rise to vises that now affect Nakuru county as violence in and around Nakuru county has increased gradually over the years. Nakuru county has seen an increase in organized crimes, land related violence, sexual violence, armed robberies and last but ceretainly not the least election related violence.

In the year 2016 Nakuru county came fourth out of 47 counties in the rank of most crime prone counties with 4,133 crimes recorded at 6% nationally with Kiambu county leading with 6006 cases accounting for 8% of all cases reported across the country (NPS Crime Annual Report, 2016). According to data from the Nakuru Level Five Hospital data on Sexual assault cases reported, in 2011 (169 cases), in 2012 (285 cases), in 2013 (1114 cases) in 2014 (1823 cases), in 2015 (2126 cases) and in 2016 (3188 cases). These sexual assaults included violations of children between 0 and 18 years.

In response to the growing threat of armed robbery, organized violence, sexual violence and the inability of the police to provide adequate protection, relatively well-to-do individuals and many businesses are engaging private security firms for protection all around the County. Across the 11 sub-counties, citizens are organizing themselves into neighborhood self-protection groups, and in extreme cases, as vigilantes. These vigilante groups and private security firms sometimes replace the law and authority of government agencies at the ward and sub-counties levels. In addition to the direct effects of insecurity

on people, violence and insecurity hamper new investments and expansion of existing businesses. In order for Nakuru county to be able to attract new investments and retain existing businesses, it is imperative that violence be combated, and overall safety and public security be restored. While this is agreeable among stakeholders working on violence prevention, their ability to work together in complementing each other's efforts is weak. This presents the need for strengthening inter-sectoral collaborations in violence prevention.

1.1 Scope of the Policy

This policy gives direction on how violence will be managed in Nakuru County through inter-sectoral dialogue and collaborations; promotion of trust between the citizens and the police; improvements in data collection, analysis and sharing among stakeholders as well as the response mechanisms. Over the years, violence in the county has been more lethal, more variable and less detectable, in and around the 11 sub counties. In general, the counties complexity and issue of violence; among other factors, socio-economic inequalities, disorder, and volatility complicate the process of monitoring and evaluating rates and trends of violence. Thus the simultaneous growth of the county and violence therefore calls for more concerted efforts to promote sustainable development as well as effective violence reduction and prevention policies. Moreover, bearing in mind that police officers are not very familiar with the historical, social and geographical areas they are operating in and inherent drivers of violence due to frequent transfers, addressing violence becomes more difficult if there is no effective collaboration between themselves and the communities they serve.

This policy adopts a definition of violence by World Health Organization (WHO) as "the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation."

The policy from time to time will be reviewed by the following key stakeholders in the County:

The   Nakuru County Government,The office of Nakuru County Commissioner,National police service,Community policing Commitees,Civil society Organizations,Religiuos leaders and National Land Commision .

1.2   Rationale of the Policy

Violence has a huge cost. The economic impact of violence accrues from what is mostly government spending on the military and internal security. This shows that significant amounts of government expenditure are tied up to this end. In a perfectly peaceful society, these huge resources could be directed in health, education, economic development and in the fight against poverty, unemployment and inequality.

Security in Kenya is a key determinant of the overall achievement of sustainable economic, social and political pillars in the Kenya Vision 2030. The three Kenya Vision 2030 pillars are anchored on among other foundations; security and public sector reforms. The role of security, maintenance of law and order for the safety and security of all citizens and protection of property in promoting competitiveness remains a key factor in determining the success of the Vision 2030 strategy implementation. The recently adopted United Nations' 2030 agenda on Sustainable Development Goals (SGDs), particularly SDG goal 16, tackles omissions of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), that of governance, inclusion, participation, rights and security. The Goal's aim is to "*Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.* The SDGs aim to significantly reduce all forms of violence, and work with governments and communities to find lasting solutions to conflict and insecurity. The Global Violence Reduction Conference 2014, where strategies to reduce violence by 50% in 30 years were identified (WHO 2015); namely:

   i.   Focus on low- and middle-income countries, hot spots and top violent cities;
  ii.   Disseminate, adapt and replicate best practices globally;
 iii.   Develop data scope, access and standards;
  iv.   Promote access to executive leadership training in violence prevention;

v. Improve leadership for violence prevention by reinforcing self-legitimacy and self-control in leaders;

vi. Integrate violence prevention considerations in existing public policies not directly related to violence itself (e.g. health policies, socio-economic policies, security and social control polces, education policies);

vii. Implement penal policies that reduce violent offending by introducing swift and fair sentencing (rather than harsh and long punishments) and granting the right to offender treatement;

viii. Promote good governance for violence prevention through locally-driven and locally-owned reform by political elites;

ix. Strengthen the capacity of institution of violence prevention by deepening the ongoing police service reforms, encouraging accountability and the rule of law.

x. Control situational triggers for violence such as easy access to alcohol and guns;

xi. Prevent organised crime by directly targeting illegal markets and organizational hubs/nodes with policies based on international cooperation and network analysis;

xii. Focus on children, youth and women.

Nakuru County has continued to experience recurrent violence especially before, during and after general elections since 1992 multiparty elections resulting in an increase in criminal violence; domestic violence and violence against women and girls (VAWG). In addition to politically instigated violence, Nakuru and Naivasha municipalities and towns within Nakuru County are faced with high levels of organized urban violence.

According to the 2015 global peace index (GPI), Kenya is rated as 133 out of 162 countries. Its 2015 GPI score of 2342 is lower than that of 2014 and ranks it amongst the bottom 21 percent of countries. Negative peace as described by GPI has been enjoyed by Kenya compared to other African countries except for the cycles of political violence that erupt during general elections. The worst political violence was experienced in 2007–08 with Nakuru County recording the highest number of fatalities, raising concern about the country's capacity to deal with such high levels of violence and the effectiveness of its early warning and response, mediation, and security deployment. The Commission of Inquiry into the Post-Election Violence (CIPEV) report indicated that out of the 1133

people who died due to the PEV, 213 deaths occurred in Nakuru. Of the 3561 injuries documented during the PEV majorly as a result of sharp pointed objects, 1341 occurred in Nakuru.[1] There are sporadic ethnic and political tensions within Nakuru County that potent relapse to repeat violence. Violence over natural resources like land is real; there are heightened political tensions during elections that disenfranchise groups who feel insecure during elections and have to relocate to 'safer' areas; we have an history of political impunity as politicians incite and sponsor violence yet none has ever been held accountable by the justice system. Prevalence of organized illegal gangs like *Mungiki* that are widespread and entrenched presenting a threat to peace and security since they can easily be mobilized to execute violence; and low trust between the communities and police affect their effective collaboration in violence prevention. Violence eruption in Nakuru County easily spreads to other urban areas in Kenya because of the cosmopolitan nature of the county especially the urban areas on Nakuru, Naivasha and Molo. This then presents the need for a strong county based regulatory intersectoral framework for violence prevention. A regulatory framework which is evidence-based for effective violence prevention.

1.3   Existing Policy Framework on Violence Prevention

There are national policies developed to address security issues such as the National Policy for Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (2014). The policy sets out an infrastructure for peace. The infrastructure proposes that representatives from communities, civil society and the government work together to prevent a range of conflicts, including resource-based, religious, cross-border, and wildlife-related conflicts among others. Components of the peace structure are a National Peace Council, National and County Peace Secretariats, National and County Peace Fora, Local Peace Committees and Mediation Support Units. This vital structure is underfunded and therefore requires leverages from other stakeholders in terms of collaborations if it is to be effective.

Additionally, the National Police Service (NPS) Act 2011 sets out the establishment of the County Policing Authorities (CPAs); Community Policing Committees (CPCs) and

---

[1] Report of the Commission into Post-Election Violence (CIPEV), Waki Report

Community Policing Forums (CPFs). The establishment of a county policing authority and community policing structures, as provided in the National Police Service Act, are key to enhanced people's involvement in local policing yet the Police Service continues to experience poor relationships and a lack of trust and confidence with communities they serve. The ongoing police reforms seek to transform the police into an effective, efficient, and trusted security agency for Kenya. This is impossible without effective collaborations among all stakeholders in policing.

The Nyumba Kumi (10 houses) Initiative, is another government initiative aimed at strengthening community policing where members of a neighbourhood are encouraged to know at least 10 of their neighbors so as to improve on security.

The effectiveness of these policies in violence prevention in Kenya is low noting that in 2016 police recorded 76,986 crime incidents compared to 72,490 in 2015 and 69,376 in 2014 according to the National Police Service (NPS) Crime situation report, 2016. This indicates that having good policies and structures in place is not an end by itself, but that the inherent gaps should be identified and addressed. One of the gaps in these policies and structures is the aspect of inter-sectoral dialogue and collaborations in violence prevention to reduce duplication of resources and efforts while ensuring greater impact.

These two policy guidelines are vital in addressing violence in Kenya. The two policy guidelines do not speak on inter-sectoral coordination but rather looks into incorporating stakeholders drawn from different sectors within their structures. Time and again relapses into violence in various parts of the country have been as a result of uncoordinated interventions. In addition, the drivers of violence in urban areas are complex and different from those of a rural set up. The urban violence prevention policy for Nakuru County seeks to address the inherent gap in the two policy guidelines through promoting county level inter-sectoral dialogue and collaboration in violence prevention.

Inter-sectoral collaboration in contextualized violence incidences in Nakuru County is therefore the foundation of this policy. It is envisaged that stakeholders drawn from: The police; Civil Society Organizations (CSOs); the public health; private sector; media; criminal justice system; educational and social development sector; Countering violence

Extremism Engagement Forum,and the County Peace Committee will work together. Ultimately, once the County Policing Authority (CPA) is set up; the role of inter-sectoral coordination will be ceded to it with a civilian oversight mechanism set up to ensure the CPA discharges on its mandate.

1.4   Legal Background

Devolution is one of the most transformative changes to Kenya's governance system brought about by the Kenya Constitution, 2010. Article 174 of the Constitution provides that one of the key objectives of devolution is to promote social and economic development and provide proximate, easily accessible services throughout Kenya.

Devolution under the Constitution of Kenya, 2010 comprises of two levels of government, namely the National and County Governments. The two levels of government are distinct and inter-dependent with constitutionally assigned and protected functions and powers as defined in the Fourth Schedule of the Constitution. The National Government comprises of the National Executive, Parliament and the Judiciary while the County Government comprises of the County Executive and County Assembly. The two levels are required to conduct their mutual relations on the basis of consultation and co-operation.

Under the devolved system of government, citizens participate in their governance by exercising their sovereignty either directly or indirectly through elected and appointed representatives. This is a major departure from the past where power and resources were centralized and citizens had minimal participation in governance. Policy making is part of public participation. The constitution under Article 10(2) lists public participation as one of the core national values and Principles while Article 196(1)(b) obligates the county assembly to facilitate public participation and involvement in the legislative and other business of the assembly and its committees. This is further elaborated under Section 87 of the County Government Act, which provides for the recognition of non-state actors in the formulation and implementation of policies.

While policing and security are a national mandate as per the constitution, counties have been allocated development roles that provide them with the opportunities to significantly shape security outcomes. Looking at the constitution, there are several roles

explicitly assigned to counties that will lead to security and safety outcomes. County Governments have been assigned such roles as the control and regulation of alcohol, drugs, pornography, transport, public nuisances, trade development, traffic management, street lighting and health. Moreover, county authorities will have crucial security and safety functions as they are for instance, the first line institutions in addressing domestic violence and violence against children. These roles place Counties at an important position to have implications and impact on safety and security of their residents.

The constitution under Article 244 (e) obligates the National Police Service (NPS) to foster and promote relationships with the broader society. The broader society in this sense includes but not limited to the Community; Faith Based Organizations and Civil Societies. The NPS Act 2011 Section 49 establishes the County Policing Authority (CPA). With regard to community policing, according to the NPS Act of 2011 CPAs are responsible for overseeing and promoting community policing activities and are described as the 'primary supervisory structure for community policing'. Given that the CPA is under the County as chaired by the Governor and policing is under the National Government through the County Security Committees, it expressly attempts to devolve security issues to Counties through community policing structures.

County governments' role as security players is embedded in the CPAs, headed by governors or their representatives. Other members are drawn from county security committees, the county assembly, and six appointees from among county stakeholders including business community, youth, women, persons with special needs, religious organizations and community-based organizations (CBOs). CPAs therefore are responsible for monitoring trends and patterns of crime, developing proposals on priorities objectives and targets for police performance, monitoring progress and achievements, overseeing and promoting community policing initiatives, facilitating public participation and providing financial oversight for the budget for policing. CPAs are yet to be formed due to legal delays. The CPA occupies an advisory role to the CSC and provides for civilian representation in security decision making, and a mechanism for accountability of police to the public.

Nonetheless, Section 10(K) of the National Police Service Act further empowers the Inspector General to Issue guidelines on Community Policing and ensure cooperation between the service and the communities it serves in combating crime. To this effect, the Inspector General of police has provided Community Policing and Community Policing Forum establishment that gives effect to the establishment of Community Policing Committees which oversee Community Policing Forums. These Committees just like the CPA are chaired by civilians with the vice chair being Officer Commanding Police station (OCS) and Secretary being the DCIO or his/her designate officer. Information gathered in this committees and forums therefore feeds into the CPA reaching the Governor before it is escalated to the Inspector General. Decisions of the CPAs are also expected to feed into the CSC, responsible for day to day management of security and deployment of police.

The shift to a devolved system of governance following the adoption of a new constitution in 2010 therefore is considered as the most important legal regime change in the Kenyan governance architecture since the country became independent fifty six years ago. Widespread optimism greeted the constitution, with the hope that it would enhance service delivery by allowing participation at the smallest devolved units (the village) in public policy making, resource accounting, development planning, and in fulfilling the desires and needs of local constituencies, thereby reducing inequalities and stemming the migration of both skilled and unskilled workers to Kenya's major cities.

With the foregoing legal framework that gives Counties leeway to formulate policies and regulations with specificity of local demand, this policy purposes to guide the Nakuru County government in aligning its service delivery processes on the peculiarity of its security needs as stipulated in the Kenyan Constitution and several other legislations allows.

2   The importance of and challenges facing violence prevention in Nakuru County

Violence thwarts the efforts by county and national governments to create a conducive environment for local and foreign investors to increase their investments. When investors fear losing out due to violence, they cannot expand their enterprises and this means that: (a) Many unemployed persons who would have been employed by such an expansion

remain unemployed; (b) Remaining unemployed becomes a risk factor as such persons are easily mobilized into organized gangs; (c) A vicious cycle of violence is experienced leading to a 'culture of violence' that view violence as normal. This normalization of violence breeds hopelessness of the possibility of living in a violence free society; (d) Persons who would otherwise contribute to national development through payment of taxes become a liability to the state.

Nakuru County is witnessing sprawling informal settlement areas (slums) especially in Nakuru and Naivasha municipalities. According to the National Police Service Crime Situation Report (2015), Nakuru county ranked second after Kiambu in the highest number of reported crimes at 4384 cases with Kiambu having 4768 reported cases. Nairobi county came third with 4383 cases reported the low crime rate in Nairobi is partly attributed to the installation of security surveillance cameras within the city.

3   Policy vision for the county

To create a safe and secure environment for all people and investments

3.1   Policy Objectives

3.2   Broad Policy Objective
The objective of this policy is to enhance the safety and security in Nakuru County through inter-sectoral collaboration and a multi-dimensional approach to violence prevention.

3.3   Specific Policy Objectives
The specific policy objectives are to:

a. To challenge the culture of violence in Nakuru County

b. To sustainably reduce organized violence in Nakuru County

c. To strengthen institutions for violence prevention in Nakuru County

d. To rebuild community trust in Nakuru County

e. To prevent and manage political violence in Nakuru County

f. To deepen violence prevention in land reforms in Nakuru County

g. To enhance reporting of violence and data use in Nakuru County

4   Policy Interventions:

Policy statements state the ideal dream of a secure county we want to create

4.1   Challenging cultures, values and norms that normalise violence

Culture includes traditions, values, and beliefs that are held by members of a group and evolves over time through intergenerational accumulation and communication (Geertz, 1973; Trimble, 2007). Embedded in culture, values and norms is violence that has been practiced over the years and it is now accepted as 'normal'. Normalization of violence is generally the acceptance that violence is an integral part of the life, that depictions of violence do not have real life consequences, and that it is the responsibility of the victim, not the perpetrator, to prevent violence. We see violence normalized through the media, and the language that makes light of violent acts. Children and citizen witness or fall victims acts of violence that are repeated over and over again and many grow up knowing for instance domestic violence is "a way of life." Some of these normalized violence includes: wife battering; Female Genital Mutilation (FGM); Mob injustice; muggings and domestic violence. There is low awareness on women rights, and on right to land ownership in line with the constitution. Many cases which are criminal in nature continue to be resolved domestically.

When violence is normalized , it is expected and accepted as a natural part of society; victims and survivors do not come forward, and the victim is blamed for the assault. Ordinarily, many people are not aware that acts of violence they commit or are victims of are contrary to the Kenyan penal code hence are criminal in nature. Lack of knowledge of what constitutes violence in itself entrenches 'normalized violence' because victims do not report such cases.

Research on violence prevention has found strong evidence to suggest the importance of the family, peers, school, and neighbourhood systems in reducing violent behaviors among children and adolescents (see Huston & Bentley, 2010). This policy seeks to have stakeholders engage in identifying forms of 'normalized violence' and starting to challenge them within their programming.

Challenges

1. Existing culture of violence
2. Normalization of violence due to the 'culture of violence above'
3. Human, social, and economic costs of violence hindering growth and people's welfare
4. Women traditionally do not own land 'have no title deeds' .
5. Sexual and gender based violence has been normalized.
6. Application of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms on criminal cases.
7. Women have no knowledge of their rights, need to know they have equal rights with men
8. FGM is normalized; girls cannot be married in certain communities unless they undergo the cut; many men and women aren't aware of the consequences of FGM
9. Lack of safety audits targeting the marginalized and the vulnerable in the community.

Policy Statements

1. Change attitudes towards zero-tolerance of violence in public and private domains
2. Change attitudes towards cultural practices that perpetuate violence

Partnerships

- o National Government – Resources and machinery
- o County Government – Resources and machinery
- o Civil society Organizations-Resouces and expertise

- Partnerships will help amplify identification, and challenging of normalized violence.

4.2   Sustainably demobilizing organized gangs

Organised Gangs play an integral role in violence in Kenya committing violent crimes, including armed robbery, muggings and kidnapping, trafficking of persons, extortion, firearms smuggling and the drug trade. The National Crime Research Centre (NCRC) estimates that there were at least 46 gangs in Kenya as of 2013 comprising mainly of young men in their 20s. Gangs are known to use violence against members of the public and with other gangs.

According to the National Police Service Crime Situation Report (2016) violent crimes such as armed robbery, murder, mugging, car-jacking, housebreaking, physical and sexual assault have been on the increase in Nakuru County. These forms of violence are

attributable to some form of organized violence by organized gangs like Gaza; Mugiki; Confirm; Twaweza; Kivumbini boys; Boda Boda related gangs.

Organized violence is manifest in urban areas in the form of territorial control and illicit trafficking by criminal networks (such as drug trafficking). Lessons learnt from some of the most violent cities in the world like Carcas in Venezuela, San Pedro Sula in Honduras is that violence is progressive especially when not addressed. The majority of violence in Latin America can be attributed to drug trafficking, gang warfare and political instability. In Nakuru, we have a high level of drug trafficking in areas like Bondeni and we have incidences where gangs have clashed violently. The 2007/2008 Post Election Violence (PEV) demonstrated how gangs can also be politically mobilized which then threatens political stability. This policy does recognize these challenges as follows:

Challenges

1. Organized violence expressed through extortion, theft, murder, assault and sexual violence.
2. Gang's offers identity; economic safety nets as motivating factors
3. Limited knowledge on the organizations, recruitment methods, and effective demobilization
4. Limited community resilience against gangs
5. Use of organized gangs to execute political violence
6. Unemployement
7. Breakdown of family institution & weak synergy among key stakeholders in interventions
8. Inadequate capacity of the institutions in addressing organized violence
9. Increased levels of poverty, with violence seen as an ease escape from poverty

Policy Statements

1. Identify the groups and devise mechanisms for sustainable demobilization.
2. Engage ex-gang members in demobilization
3. Entreprenuership trainings for reformed gang members and supporting establishment of companies, self help groups, and CBOs and facilitating their access to youth funds and the 30% tender provsions by the county and national government
4. Regulate motorcyclists and bicycle riders.
5. Enhance community resilience against organized violence.
6. Educate family on values

4.3   Countering Violent Extemism

Terrorism has metamorphosed over time. The national strategy and Kenya's security response to violent extremism appreciates the need for responses to be targeted to reach the most at risk of radicalisation and recruitment. The national response to this threat is increasingly guided by the national strategy to counter violent extremism that was launched by H.E. President Uhuru Kenyatta in September 2016 and updated in March 2019. The national strategy to counter violent extremism has guidelines and diagnostic tools for development of County Action Plans (CAPs), developed most recently by the National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC).

NCTC in collaboration with other government institutions, particularly the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government, and bilateral and multilateral partners, have catalysed the development and implementation of CAPs for the last two years.

The urgent need to safeguard Kenyans and Kenya has led to the Rapid CAP model that will deliver prompt and concrete actions that target low-hanging fruit and make an immediate impact in preventing and mitigating violent extremism. The Rapid CAP will offer Nakuru County's stakeholders an immediate action plan to protect communities and citizens from violent extremism. It will be developed within a period of two and a half days. It will include national government officials under the County Commissioner, County government officials under the Governor, NGOs with the interest and aptitude in working in CVE, and those with unique contributions to make on building resilience, citizens and community leaders. The process will produce a CAP that is aligned to the national strategy, with a small number of priorities, and whose implementation is coordinated and monitored by a County CVE Forum. A Nakuru county action plan for preventing and countering violent extremism was developed in May 2019.

Policy Statements
1. Support implementation of Nakuru County Action plan for preventing and countering violent extremism

4.4   Strengthening institutions mandated to prevent violence

Institutions for violence prevention like the County peace committee structure; Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), community policing committees (CPCs) and the police are inadequately facilitated to do their work. Some police stations and police officers for instance lack basic amenities like proper housing, adequate vehicles, good sanitation facilities, good police cells that meet standard human rights. Due to these limitations many police officers are not sufficiently motivated to discharge their duties amidst great citizen expectations. When offenders are put in police or prison cells that do not meet human rights standards, they will certainly have a low opinion on the police yet it is not the police office in charge of the facility in question who is to blame. Additionally, when the persons behind the institutions for violence prevention are not equipped with knowledge to better discharge their mandates, then their effectiveness becomes low.

Besides, while all these institutions are discharging their mandates to the best of their abilities their level of cooperation remains low. Poor inter-sectoral collaboration in violence prevention leads to duplication of efforts hence wastage of resources and overall low impact. The policy recognizes these challenges thus;

Challenges

1. Low capacity of public institutions
2. Poor intersectoral dialogue and coordination in violence prevention
3. Weak monitoring and accountability of the public institutions
4. Rampant corruption within institutions

Policy Statements

1. The county government and national government to capacity build institutions for violence prevention on their mandate
2. The county government or national government to Strengthen inter-sectoral coordination and dialogue
3. The county government or national government to Institutionalize vetting of the members of the community policing committees
4. Strengtheing GBV desks in the police stations
5. Entrench the national values in the article 10 of the Constitution in private and public sector

4.5   Rebuilding community trust between police, government and the citizens

Public confidence in the ability of the police towards Violence Prevention is low. This is occasioned by: years of less contact between the police and citizens in policing; negative image of the police from some police officers (who are rude, corrupt and/or violent); socialization of children by parents to fear/distrust the police; and hostility toward the police; poor communication and public relations by the police; and that police and citizens have different perspectives on how violence is caused and how to respond when it happens..

These factors in whole or in part prompted the police reform processes. One guiding principle to police reforms is the integration of human relations into law enforcement as police move beyond enforcing the law to actually connect with the communities they police. This will lead to the creation of the basic conditions for police and communities to collaborate towards violence prevention.

Some of the initial attempts to increase awareness and techniques of police–community relations were started with the introduction of human relations training into police training academies (Radalet and Carter, 1994; Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969).

This   policy envisages improved inter-sectoral collaborations by which police have a better understanding of the public's concerns (especially those that are crime related), and citizens are more inclined to report violence that occur to the police, provide tips/intelligence to law enforcement, willingly serve as witnesses, and are happy to participate in jury trials. By extension, police also will more likely become more proactive, thereby preventing violence before they occur or minimizing their impact, instead of simply reacting to calls for service. Good police–community relations prevent the possibility that the public thinks that police are simply a mechanism for intelligence collection. When there are poor police–community relations, the police typically lack a basic understanding of community problems, goals, and desires, and the community, particularly those citizens who are experiencing high rates of crime, poverty, and homelessness, perceive police as an occupying and out-of-touch force that does more harm than good. In these situations, police departments primarily assume a reactive mode of response to community problems.

Challenges

1. Low trust between the police and citizen
2. Knowledge gaps among the Police and Citizen on each other's rights and responsibilities
3. Poor confidentiality of intelligence information shared with the police
4. Minimal Police-Citizen platforms for dialogue and cooperation in violence prevention
5. Poor communication and public relations skills among the police
6. Poor accountability
7. Low capacity of investigators by EACC; few cases of those reported are investigated

Policy Statements

1. Government in partnership with CSOs to Enhance knowledge among police and citizens about police rights and duties
2. Make the witness protection act operational and strengthen protection mechanisms at grassroots level.
3. Provide incentives for best performing Police officers
4. Building police capacity to handle GBV issues
5. Strengthen partnerships with IPOA and EACC in policing and in figting impunity and corruption

4.6   Address political incitements and influence that threaten peace and security

Politicians' influence and incitements to violence remain a leading threat to peace and security in Nakuru County. Political leaders in the past have incited violence with impunity. During the 2007/2008 Post Election Violence, out of the 1133 people who died due to the PEV, 213 deaths occurred in Nakuru. Of the 3561 injuries documented during the PEV majorly as a result of sharp pointed objects, 1341 occurred in Nakuru.[2]

Electoral related, politically instigated violence continues to occur as a result of a combination of factors, including politicization of ethnicity, corruption, non-adherence to

---

[2] Report of the Commission into Post-Election Violence (CIPEV)

the rule of law, inequitable distribution of resources (state opportunities and natural resources) and a "winner-takes-all" kind of politics.

In the months leading up to elections, hate speech, including by leading political figures, is always rampant inciting ethnic conflict. Yet, political leaders who in the past have incited violence have not been held accountable and this promotes a culture of impunity.

Challenges

1. No single politician convicted of incitements hence ncitements to violence are hardly addressed
2. Epicenters of organized political violence before, during and after elections
3. The threat to violence ahead of, during and after the upcoming general elections
4. Conflict insensitive media reporting
5. Unequal sharing of resources
6. Enforcers of law on hate speech are not impartial and have weakness in enforcing the law
7. Ethnic mobilization and playing victimization by inciters who action is being taken against

Policy Statements

1. Strengthen intersectoral approach in addressing political violence
2. Need to set up a directorate on peace building and conflict management in the county executive
3. Holding political leaders accountable for their actions
4. Promote conflict sensitive media reporting
5. Ensure that the law applies equally to all
6. Ensure equal distribution of resources

4.7 Promote land reforms and management of natural resources

The manipulation of grievances over land ownership, access and utility remain central drivers of conflict in Kenya today. This is in part because of the limited availability of arable land and a tenure system that is inconsistent with the country's rising population

and the demands of modern agriculture. With modernization, population increase and urbanization, cities and urban centers have also had land conflicts resulting from double or multiple allocation of land and forgery of land tittle deeds. Many persons involved in land disputes seek the services of illegal organized gangs to pursue claims at hand due to lengthy judicial processes in setting land disputes. Much public land including land for schools and urban spaces like play grounds have also been grabbed. Politicians continue to use grievances over land to incite a community against another as they mobilize political support.

Challenges

1. Multiple allocation of land/ Existence of land cartels / land inheritance
2. Corruption at the lands office
3. Lengthy judicial process
4. Low public participation in the disposal and utilization of land
5. Challenges in implementing laws
6. District boards functioning illegally
7. Communities historical entitlement of land
8. Weak collaboration between the ministry of lands and relevant stakeholders (judiciary, ministry of planning)
9. Brokers and corrupt cartels in the lands ministry
10. Contestations over fake title deeds issued, and double allocation of land

Policy Statements

1. Digitalize the land records in Nakuru County
2. Promote learning on land rights and land use
3. Land audit in Nakuru County
4. Strengthen National Land Commission (NLC) to discharge on its mandate
5. Promote implementation of the National Land Policy

4.8 Improving reporting of violence and the use of data for evidence based interventions

Data is vital in informing decisions by policy makers and development practitioners. Data obtained from health facilities on injuries, as well as from the police on offences can be analysed to: measure the extent of violence in a local area and identify long term trends; identify when assaults are most likely to occur; identify at-risk populations and communities; identify hotspot locations for violence; and identify the circumstances of assault. These pieces of information can support violence prevention through e.g. informing needs assessments, identifying police priorities, setting and monitoring local targets for violence, informing the types of strategies needed, informing the timing and location of interventions, identifying which population groups interventions should target, and evaluating violence prevention activity.

Currently in Nakuru County, data sharing between the police and health facilities is nonexistent. It is good practice in violence prevention to develop a data sharing agreement between health services and local partners including the police to clearly specify how data will be provided, stored and used. This will ensure that the data remains protected.

This policy proposes the need for setting up an agreed framework among stakeholders working on violence prevention to share data on violence by establishing a violence observatory.

Challenges

1. Low reporting of violence to police and other authorities.
2. Little knowledge on electronic mediums for reporting.
3. No systematic data collection and sharing across institutions for monitoring and appropriate violence prevention.
4. Many victims of violence do not report cases for recording
5. Low creation of knowledge on ICT reporting platforms
6. No digitalization of OB numbers; Hospital reporting data

Policy Statements

1. Enhance knowledge through increased violence reporting and use of a standardized reporting tool.

2. Develop a one-stop shop for the reporting of violence.

3. Enhance police customer care and use of electronic reporting mediums

4. Improve the response through a data platform and an inter-sectoral coalition that take action.

5. Enhance customer care relations in the police stations

6. Enhance use of electronic gadghets in giving evidence

7. Court implementing set up of a data base for sexual violence offenders

8. Input criminals data in a database accessible to employers

5   Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Policy Implementation

The County Commissioner, The office of the Governor,Senior Police Officers, CSOs, Business community, religious institutions and the National Land Commission (NLC) Nakuru office will be key stakeholders. A stakeholder analysis will be done to identify the above actors and who among them can take leadership in one of the seven (7) policy thematic areas. An implementation plan will be developed with the identified stakeholders. Six bi-annual policy implementation stakeholder review meetings will be held in the next two years.

6   Implementation Framework

The implementation framework will designate the roles and responsibility of all stakeholders. A Theory of Change workshop will be held to develop performance indicators and measures to assess progress towards the effective inter-sectoral data collection, analysis, sharing and responses in violence prevention. Further, the framework will provide for institutional strengthening and capacity building for sustainable interventions.

7   Institutional And Legal Framework

The county government Departmenet responsible for enforcement , in collaboration with all relevant stakeholders, shall develop a framework for the implementation of this Policy Paper. The department shall be responsible for the coordination and operationalization of the policy pending establishment of the county violence prevention council envisaged under this policy paper. Key to coordination at the

Ministry level shall be the provision of capacity building and financing mechanisms to support implementation of this policy.

8   Nakuru County Violence Prevention Council

The Nakuru County Government with the approval of the county assembly shall establish a Nakuru county violence prevention council. County violence prevention council shall draw representation from: (a) the Governor who shall be a co-chair; (b) the County Commissioner who shall be a co-chair; (c) county representatives appointed by the Inspector-General, who shall comprise the County Police Commander; County Director of Criminal Investigations; county director of the National Intelligence Service; (d) two elected members nominated by the County Assembly; (e) at least six other members appointed by the Governor, from among the following categories of persons ordinarily resident in the county— (i) the business sector; (ii) community based organizations; (iii) women; (iv) persons with special needs; (v) religious organizations; and (vi) the youth.

9   Nakuru County Violence Prevention Secretariat

The county government   shall set up County violence prevention Secretariat to provide advice and technical support to the County Government and County violence prevention council on all matters related to violence prevention, peace building and conflict management. The County violence prevention Secretariat shall also provide guidance on implementation of peace building ,violence prevention mechanisms and conflict management strategies by the respective actors in the County, as well as monitor and support the work of violence prevention   Committees within the County, in liaison with the County Security Committees and County Policing Authority.

The secretariat shall be headed by a director who shall have a support staff of three.

10 Source of Funding for the policy implementation

It is in the best interest of the County Government of Nakuru to have sustainable peace and security. This is because there will be a secure environment to attract foreign direct investments as well as create room for local investors to increase their investments. This will have a direct effect on the economy as increased investments will directly lead to an expanded tax base and creation of job opportunities for thousands of unemployed youth. Moreover, the development projects will be assured of sustainability.

Hence, MIDRIFT HURINET a local NGO partnering with Nakuru County Government will support the policy implementation for at least the first year. Thereafter, the County Government will factor the policy implementation in its annual budget. Also, donor support will be mobilized to fund implementation. The Nakuru County Violence Prevention Secretariat will also be mandated to mobilize for donor funding as well as coordinate and supervise all NGO work in Nakuru working on peace and security.

11 The Legal Framework

The policy envisages the development of legislation to facilitate the establishment and operationalization of the institutions proposed herein. The County Governments, shall develop a legal framework making provision for:-

• Establishment of the county violence prevention Council, the Secretariat and the anti-violence Committees;

• Operational principles under which related institutions will function in line with the Constitution, Acts of Parliament and international legal instruments; The powers, role, mandate and functions of the Councils and its constituent organs;

• The sources and management of the funds of the Council and its constituent organs;

• The co-ordination and mechanisms of collaboration with government and non-governmental agencies;

• The mechanism that recognizes traditional methods and processes for resolution of conflicts.

CONCLUSIONS

This policy represents a commitment towards improving Safety and Security in Nakuru County.

The policy proposes comprehensive and innovative approaches to addressing the security agenda, which represents a radical departure from past approaches to addressing the security challenges in the county. It is based on the Constitution of Kenya 2010, Vision 2030, and Sustainable Development Goals.

This policy was developed through an inclusive and participatory process involving all key stakeholders in the security sector and related sectors over a period of 3 years. A situation analysis, based on review of programmes undertaken by several actors was undertaken to provide evidence of the challenges affecting the secutity sector, existing opportunities, and to define the necessary interventions.