



**AN IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE
NAKURU COUNTY RAPID ACTION PLAN FOR PREVENTING
AND COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM**

**CAP ASSESSMENT UNDERTAKEN BY
PATRICK MUTAHI**

Acknowledgements

MidRift Hurinet thanks all the Nakuru County Engagement Forum (CEF) stakeholders who took part in the focus group discussions, key informant interviews and validation of this report. Specifically we thank Erastus Mbui, County Commissioner Nakuru and Michael Wathika representing the Governor during the CAP assessment report validation.

We also express gratitude to the Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD) for providing funding for the assessment. We specially thank Patricia Crosby, the Programme Manager, East Africa –ISD and Dominic Pkalya, Senior Program Manager – ISD in Kenya for their technical support and input into the process.

Similarly, MidRift Hurinet does the role played by Walter Mwanja, Project Coordinator – PROACT Project in ensuring that this CAP assessment report is produced. Equally, we thank Joseph Omondi, Executive Director MidRift Hurinet for his leadership in the CAP assessment process.

Lastly MidRift Hurinet thanks Patrick Mutahi for conducting research and writing the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY4

INTRODUCTION.....6

IMPLEMENTATION CONTEXT FOR THE NAKURU COUNTY RAPID ACTION PLAN 7

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT 8

METHODOLOGY 9

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....9

 1. Awareness, Relevance, Ownership and Communication of the CAP 10

 2. Stakeholder collaboration and coordination of the CAP Implementation 11

 3. Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) Framework 12

 4. Assessing Status of Pillar Implementation..... 12

 5. Resourcing the CAP 14

 6. Capacity gaps 16

LESSONS LEARNED 16

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS 17

ANNEX 20

Annex 1: Key informant interview guide 20

Annex 2: Focus group discussion guide 22

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACLED	Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project
CAP	County Action Plan for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism
CEF	County Engagement Forum
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CHRIPS	Centre for Human Rights and Policy Studies
CVE	Countering Violent Extremism
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
NCTC	National Counter Terrorism Centre
NSCVE	National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
P/CVE	Preventing and Countering Violent extremism
R-CAP	Rapid County Action Plan
ToTs	Training of Trainers
VE	Violent Extremism

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of an implementation assessment of the Nakuru Action Plan on Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism (CAP) which was implemented from August 2019 to 31 July 2020. Coming after the lapse of the one year operational implementation plan, this is a forward-looking assessment report, which speaks to the relevance of the CAP, effectiveness of delivery of intended outcomes, impact and sustainability of outputs and outcomes. These findings are supposed to enrich the ongoing P/CVE activities as well as inform the next County Action Plan.

Through document study, key informant interviews and focus group discussion and analysis of collected data, the evaluation found that the CAP is based on a sound design and is relevant to the needs of Nakuru residents as they prevent and counter violent extremism. The CAP is a framework that seeks to reinforce broader national efforts of countering violent extremism envisioned in the National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism (NSCVE) through proposition of local solutions at the county level. It is a product of collaborative and consultative efforts between the National and County Governments through the offices of the County Commissioner and Governor respectively as well as non-state actors ranging from the private sector, civil society, security officials and representatives of the National Counter-Terrorism Centre (NCTC). The strategic choices of the projects and outputs in the CAP are aligned to the overall desired changes of reducing chances of radicalisation and extremism in the County.

The investment that Nakuru County Commissioner and the Governor have made in creating a conducive environment for the joint collaboration in implementing the action plan is laudable. Convening of both the national and county governments as well as multi-sectoral stakeholders under the County Engagement Forum (CEF) has led to a friendly environment for the stakeholders and facilitated the limited but crucial results realised in a span of one year. The positive results from this political goodwill holds promise for the continuation of an integrated strategic approach in addressing issues of VE in Nakuru County.

Different stakeholders within the CEF have made some progress towards implementing selected activities related to reducing and preventing VE for example through capacity building by NCTC, dialogues, advocacy and community outreach. These interventions, according to the respondents, have led to greater awareness of VE issues in Nakuru County. Nevertheless, they seem to be at an individual sector's or organisation's level, and not carried out as part of CAP implementation matrix. There was hardly a connection between the stakeholders' programmatic work in relation to the CAP or how they could feed into it. As a result, opportunities for greater engagement and integration of the stakeholders' perspectives and experiences into the CAP have not been fully exploited.

The assessment revealed that while there was more stakeholder engagement in the drafting and launch phases of the CAP; the absence of a dedicated secretariat has slowed down the implementation, creating a gap in accountability measures, monitoring and evaluation to the different pillars' activities. This has led to slow down of necessary follow ups that would have

ensured meetings are held and engagements around the pillars are more active. While, the Nakuru County Commissioner has provided office space for the Secretariat, the lack of dedicated personnel has been the CAPs biggest flaw. This has led to weak co-ordination of the CEF and as noted in the report, some of the pillars are not active and there is no cross collaboration between the stakeholders. As a result, many of the stakeholders' are of the opinion that the CAP implementation process is non-participatory and exclusivist. As a solution to the mentioned short-coming, the report notes that there is need to innovate ways that ensure broad-based consultations in the next phase of CAP development and implementation.

Inadequate financial resources and strategic omissions have led to the CEF failing to significantly make progress towards attaining the full breath of its goals and hence have more impact. While like most of the country the COVID-19 pandemic forced people to rethink how they undertook their activities, most of the CEF actors did not make the necessary changes. For example, CEF members could not meet because of the restrictions of holding meetings, yet they could have done so online using skype, zoom and WhatsApp. An implicit reliance on physical meetings in the current environment will not be possible and hence there is need to find and utilise other ways for stakeholder engagements.

So far, the CEF and Secretariat's ability to implement the CAP is currently fully dependent on availability of donor funding, which is channelled through MidRift Hurinet. While the different stakeholders recognise the need to formulate and implement a sound financial sustainability strategy, progress toward this has not been realised. The report identifies the need for a financial and resource sustainability model to secure funds in coming years for sustainability of the CAP. Further, there is need to link the CAPs to the Nakuru County integrated Development Plan (CIDP) for budgeting purposes. This will help CAPs follow up on realisation of government goals instead of setting up an independent implementation infrastructure with the limitations of resources and personnel.

Nakuru County launched the Rapid County Action Plan (R-CAP) in July 2019 as part of the National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism. The R-CAP had a one-year operational implementation plan and this assessment report after the introduction and methodology, presents a status of implementation of the CAP, successes and challenges, and then offers recommendations of priorities moving forward in line with national and local P/CVE strategies and needs.

INTRODUCTION

Terrorism, radicalization, and recruitment into violent extremism remains a persistent challenge for Kenya. While official statistics on attacks and recruitment patterns are not readily available, non-state actors have been documenting the trends. For example, The Centre for Human Rights and Policy Studies (CHRIPS) documented that the country has had 110 attacks, 423 arrests of terrorism suspects and 251 fatalities between 2017-19.¹ The Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) data shows that there were 416 attacks in Kenya between January 2010-January 2020, which were attributed to the Al Shabaab and as a result, 1,484 fatalities were reported.²

Several official, independent as well as academic reports and studies have documented how different factors have led many of the young people into extremism. Some have highlighted its link to youth unemployment, lack of livelihood opportunities and structural inequalities.³ While others have argued that a combination of extremist ideology, discriminative security actions, widespread poverty, chronic underdevelopment and a deep sense of marginalization especially amongst Muslims at the Coast and North Eastern part of the Country has contributed to the recruitment of Kenyan youth into the Al Shabaab.⁴

As a result, the government has acknowledged the need to adopt a preventive approach as part of its response to this problem as it continues to counter the threat using intelligence and police. This preventive approach has recognized the need for better engagement between communities and the police, the need to promote alternative messages and find means of diverting young men and women away from the paths of violent extremism.

In 2016, in an effort to streamline the prevention approach, the Kenya government launched the National Strategy for Countering Violent Extremism, which sets out the national CVE priorities and interventions to prevent and address violent extremism and provides entry points for the collaboration of security agencies with the public. A review of the National CVE strategy, which was updated in March 2019, shows that it aims at aligning itself to the existing counterterrorism legislation and related policies.⁵ It also calls upon counties to take up a role in supporting its implementation.

¹ <https://www.cve-kenya.org/>

² <https://acleddata.com/2020/01/15/acled-resources-al-shabaab-in-somalia-and-kenya/>

³ For a nuanced and critical examination of this assumed link, see, Corinne Graff “Poverty, Development, and Violent Extremism in Weak States” in *Confronting Poverty: Weak States and U.S. National Security*. Susan E. Rice, Corrine Graff and Carlos Pascual (eds), (Brookings Institution Press, 2010).

⁴ Crisis Group, “Kenya: Al-Shabaab – Closer to Home” Africa Briefing N°102, 25 September 2014; Botha, A. *Assessing Vulnerability of Kenyan Youth to Radicalization and Extremism*. Johannesburg: Institute for Security Studies. 2013; Raeesah Cassim Cachalia, Uyo Salifu and Irene Ndung’u, “The dynamics of youth radicalisation in Africa - reviewing the current evidence”, Institute for Security Studies Papers, Volume 2016, Issue 296, Aug 2016

⁵ This includes the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2012; the Security Laws (Amendment) Act, 2014; the Proceeds of Crime and Anti-Money Laundering (Amendment) Act 2017. These laws focus on addressing violent extremism through policing, money laundering controls, intelligence-gathering, and prosecution

Counties, borrowing from this national Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism have also set out to address the root causes of violent extremism in their counties by launching their own County Action Plans for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism (CAPs), which seek to have community-based interventions. Recognising that by localising CVE efforts at the county level, the fight against violent extremism not only stands to increase manpower, thereby improving effectiveness, economies of scale, accountability, transparency and public participation. It also enables the implementation of the CVE strategies to go beyond the security sphere into the socio-economic space incorporating strategies such as the provision of employment and business opportunities all aimed at reducing vulnerability.

In Nakuru County, there is growing appreciation that VE is an eminent threat. The ethnicised politics, resource-based conflicts and presence of organized gangs offer potential in-roads for extremists as does conditions of frustration, hopelessness and access to criminal networks by especially young people. It is in light of this background that the Nakuru County Rapid Action Plan for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism was developed and launched in July 2019 by different stakeholders with the support of the National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC). While the involvement of non-state actors in CVE work is not new in Kenya, the CAPs have now placed their work under an official policy framework that prioritizes their partnership with state actors to address the drivers that lead people towards violent extremism.

IMPLEMENTATION CONTEXT FOR THE NAKURU COUNTY RAPID ACTION PLAN

The success or failure of a policy is substantially influenced by the economic, political, legal, cultural and social contexts within which it is implemented. The Nakuru County Rapid action plan for P/CVE has identified structural, individual, push, pull and enabling factors to the threat of violent extremism in the County. These include identity-based divisions and grievances which are mostly triggered during elections or when there are highly charged political activities. Historically, a mix of politics, resource competition and ethnic differences in Nakuru county have led to huge divisions and violence. Further, the CAP notes that the County has high levels of poverty and deprivation as well as gaps between poor and rich, which can feed destructively into resource competition politics and criminality. The document also raises concern that breakdown of the family structure, drug abuse and illegal businesses/contrabands continue to flourish, high illiteracy levels, poor infrastructure and inadequate numbers of security personnel are factors that could contribute to terrorist activities in Nakuru.

The CAP presents the youth as highly susceptible to getting involved in extremist violence. It notes that the County has a large and increasing number of unemployed young men and women, whose frustrations and hopelessness can be taken advantage of, hence prone to being lured by promises of employment and quick money schemes into engaging in terrorist activities. As has been noted, some of the youths have previously been involved in political violence during election years and the concern of them being enticed by material gains to get involved in extremist activities is not far-fetched. Further, there have been many cases reported of youth being engaged in organised criminal groups for example Confirm, which has been operating in Nakuru Municipality.

The Nakuru CAP on P/CVE states that its success is partly dependent on the extent to which it is aligned to the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), national CVE strategy and enhanced collaboration with the national government, in particular the NCTC. Noting that successful CVE work is local in nature, the County Engagement Forum (CEF) was established to work under the joint leadership of the County Commissioner and that of the Governor. The CAP also produced a small number of priorities whose implementation was to be coordinated and monitored by County P/CVE Forum.

In addition, the CAP recognizes the need for more effective engagement and co-ordination between various sectors including national and county governments, civil society, religious leaders, communities and the police. Hence, the stakeholders during the development of the CAP also identified joint practical interventions against violent extremism, which were located in five pillars namely: economic, media and online, political, education and ideological. These pillars had objectives and key result areas which were to be achieved within 6-18 months in order to lower the chances or instances of recruitment into violent extremism in Nakuru County.

Noting this background, this assessment seeks to assess implementation status of the Nakuru CAP within the one year it has been in operation.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT

This evaluation was undertaken with the overall goal of strengthening the county-level P/CVE structures particularly the County Engagement Forum, a key organ of the CAP. It was guided by three objectives, namely:

1. To strengthen coordination mechanisms within Nakuru County Action Plan (CAP).
2. To improve communication and impact of the CAP.
3. To enhance the resourcing, both human and financial of the CAPs.

The consultant thus assessed the CAP under the following themes:

1. Awareness, Relevance, Ownership and Communication of the CAP
2. Stakeholder Collaboration and Coordination of the CAP Implementation
3. Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) Framework
4. Assessing Status of Pillar Implementation
5. Resourcing of the CAP
6. Capacity gaps

The findings, analyses and conclusions documented in this report are a resource for the CEF's future planning as well as immediate use to sharpen its strategy, systems and actions for better results. The task of the consultancy was therefore to collect and analyse both quantitative and qualitative facts in respect of the CAP's implementation so far and formulate coherent evaluative statements to aid in informing ongoing P/CVE activities as well as in crafting a new action plan.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation employed a mixed methods approach to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. This allowed for triangulation of data, hence ensuring that findings are credible, reliable and accurate. Specifically, the following methods were used.

Documents study

The evaluator reviewed and analysed key relevant documentation on P/CVE in Nakuru including the Nakuru County Action Plan (CAP), Nakuru County Violence Prevention Policy, Nakuru County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), draft Nakuru County peace building and conflict management council bill (2018), CAP Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) framework, National Strategy for Countering Violent Extremism (2016). Based on this process, evaluator developed a Master Evaluation Questionnaire as well as accompanying data collection tools, primarily key informant interview questionnaires tailored for relevance with the diverse sampled respondents and a focus group discussion guide (annexed).

Key informant interviews and Focus Group Discussions

The evaluator interviewed a total of 23 individuals (14 female, 9 male) representing sectors in all the five pillars under CAP and representatives of the County Government and County Commissioner. All respondents were selected on the basis of their known familiarity and involvement in the CAP. Where the evaluation team experienced no-shows for some of the invited participants, discussions were held with those who turned up.

All collected data was transcribed and collated for analysis by the evaluators. Analyses applied qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques. Qualitative analysis included convergence-divergence analysis, comparisons and theme analysis. Quantitative analysis included descriptive statistical analyses of quantitative data where available. Moreover, the evaluators triangulated all the data from key informant interviews, FGDs and documentary evidence.

The draft assessment report was presented and discussed in a validation meeting held on 23 September 2020 and attended by 40 participants representing all the pillars, National and County government. Their views are incorporated in this report.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This section presents the findings of the evaluation based on analysis of the gathered data from document study, consultations with stakeholders and interviews. It is to be noted that this evaluation is based on the status of implementation of an action plan that has lapsed but the findings are a credible statement of the state of performance of the CAP and draws evidence-based conclusions.

1. Awareness, Relevance, Ownership and Communication of the CAP

Based on consultations with stakeholders, it is evident that the process of developing the Nakuru CAP on P/CVE sought and integrated perspectives from wide range of stakeholders from the national and county governments, police, religious leaders, business people and CSOs. “We were involved from the word go. The ownership is higher since we formulated it,” noted a respondent. Another one said, “we own the pillars since they are contextual to our situation. They are cross cutting and their objectives are intertwined.” Stakeholders proposed that psychosocial support be added as a stand-alone pillar to address emerging mental health issues.

Design of the CAP also used a participatory and evidence-based approach in identifying priority areas of vulnerability to VE and radicalisation, and opportunities to develop effective preventive and counter VE mechanisms. This was done through interviews from a short survey, which was administered to a diverse group of 56 workshop participants on April 29, 2019, who included 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. This sample was not representative and hence the results though important for mapping, were only indicative. Nevertheless, this was a good starting point for Nakuru county to get officially engaged in CVE work.

The push, pull and enabling factors that drive people to VE are complex in nature and therefore require a multidimensional approach to comprehensively mitigate. The strategic choices and programme interventions as outlined in the CAP, reflects this logic and are therefore valid and relevant in the potential to contribute towards lowering the chances or instances of recruitment of people into violent extremism in Nakuru County. Therefore, the assessment notes that to a large extent, the strategic choices and objectives of the CAP are well aligned with the everyday experiences and needs of the CEF and stakeholders in Nakuru County.

Some of the stakeholders pointed out that the CEF is one of the forums where civilians and security agencies sit and plan together on how to curb insecurity in the county. Strategically, the CEF stakeholders has included universities and colleges, which has presented an avenue for engaging the university population in Nakuru. It’s now possible to invite security agencies to sensitize students and staff on issues around prevention and countering violent extremism. The Police and NCTC have been invited to speak during some of the university forums, which according to education pillar representatives, has seen a reduction of hostility between the security agencies and students. As highlighted by one of the stakeholders, the collaboration with students has been an eye opener since they have been able to share information on unrests in the universities as well as suspected cases of targeting the schools for attacks and recruitment into organized crime. Thus, it has led to the university and college students embracing the CAP and issues of VE.

The media and local outreaches using radio, *barazas* and NGO community meetings have also increased people’s awareness on violent extremism and according to some stakeholders, people are keener on what is happening on the ground. As a result, some felt it is easier now to talk about

radicalisation, criminal gangs and groups, unlike before. For example, a person suspected of engaging in extremism was reported by residents of Free Area after a meeting on VE was held there.

However, it is to be noted that there is great demand from stakeholders and CEF members for continued engagement and consultations within and across the pillars, so that they can channel their perspectives and contribute towards planning and implementation processes. Whereas it is practically impossible for every individual stakeholder to participate in a strategic or project planning process given operational and financial implications, there is strong a case and benefit for the CAP secretariat to explore use of simple but viable options to expand opportunities for willing members to feed into the implementation processes in future. For example, some of the stakeholders said they had never held a meeting since the launch of the CAP while others noted they hardly receive any communication from the secretariat. One easy and quick way to address this issue would be to consider establishing Whatsapp groups for not only the pillars but also for the CEF members at large to keep the conversations going as well as sending updates. It will also ensure coherence in the choices made by the CEF on networking, collaboration and operationalisation of the pillars. In this way, the comparative advantages of stakeholders are channelled towards specific outcomes that are outlined in the CAP and any challenges can be quickly addressed.

2. Stakeholder collaboration and coordination of the CAP Implementation

Based on consultations with stakeholders, creation of the CEF as a space for collaboration between the national and county government, educationists as well as non-state actors was highlighted as a key achievement in the implementation of the CAP, during the one year it has been in operation.

Rolling out of the CAP has been made easier by the good working relationship between the Nakuru County Governor and County Commissioner. Respondents highlighted that this collaboration has made it easier to mobilise and engage both governments at the highest levels. The two offices have seconded personnel to coordinate the CEF and this political goodwill needs to be encouraged and harnessed in the next phase of the CAP implementation.

Relatedly, the consultant noted that the Secretariat has an office at the County Commissioner's office from where an interim coordinator operates. This office is accessible, visible and known to stakeholders. Due to this, most of the respondents considered the CAP to be domiciled at the County Commissioner's office though there is expectation that the County government needs to fund its activities. Nevertheless, it is notable that both offices enjoy high levels of legitimacy by the stakeholders and there is hope that the good working relationship between the County Governor and Commissioner will continue for better coordination of the CEF.

However, there has not been adequate communication between the CEF stakeholders and secretariat. This has been attributed to lack of leadership within the pillars, and full-time coordinator of the secretariat. Lack of communication budget was also pointed out as a hinderance to adequate communication with stakeholders. Nevertheless, the assessment notes that within the CEF there are stakeholders who said they were ready to volunteer and use their technological and digital expertise

to ensure information continues to be shared but they had not been involved or reached out to. The CEF needs to review its communication strategies and reach out to members who can assist in ensuring it becomes more vibrant and interactive using the available technological platforms.

3. Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) Framework

From the interviews, stakeholders are cognizant of the CAP's weakness in respect to monitoring, evaluation and learning. While a MERL framework was part of the CAP, it had not been implemented at the time of this assessment and also lapse of the CAP. In the development of the new CAP, monitoring, evaluation and learning should be resourced and a specific person trained on using the framework.

Stakeholders need to consider having pillar leaders and dedicated staff/representatives to the CEF to ensure that there is consistency in project implementation and monitoring. The pillar leaders and secretariat also can develop work plans and activities tied to the CAP for easier monitoring and learning. A basic practice could be developing quarterly/half year/ annual plans and tracking their implementation through internal reporting mechanisms that could be done by the secretariat. The feedback should then be fed into the on-going activities.

4. Assessing Status of Pillar Implementation

The Nakuru Action Plan on P/CVE is focused on safeguarding the people of Nakuru County and Kenya from violent extremism and terrorism. The efforts of the CAP therefore were designed to reflect the urgency of this task by prioritising interventions that support at-risk individuals and environments. Stakeholders sought to fulfil this objective through conducting activities organised in five pillars which had clear pillar objectives:

- a. **Economic:** Reduce the feeling of hopelessness among the most at-risk of recruitment youth by increasing their income-generating opportunities.
- b. **Political:** Reduce divisive and antagonistic politics among the political and civic leadership in Nakuru County to appreciate, understand the threat of VE and synergise their efforts towards P/CVE by 30th August 2020.
- c. **Education:** Integrate simple tools and methods to identify and respond appropriately to radicalisation in education and learning environments in Nakuru County.
- d. **Ideological:** Support responsible parenting, interfaith tolerance and respect amongst at risk families and diverse religious groups in the medium and high-risk areas of Nakuru County by 30th August 2020.
- e. **Media and online:** Increase responsible reporting of emerging threats of radicalisation and VE and increase citizen resilience through proactive media campaigns.

These pillars are aligned and primarily located within the five national CVE strategy pillars but domesticated to reflect the reality of Nakuru's P/CVE environment. They are designed to each contribute in different but reinforcing ways towards achievement of the stated outcomes of the CAP.

Moreover, the strategic choices and intervention options outlined in the CAP pillars are based on a situational analysis and an extensive mapping and analysis of stakeholders with identification of their interests, potential for collaboration and specific areas of possible engagement.

The assessment noted that the choice to integrate advocacy, entrepreneurial and capacity building strategies are consistent with what needs to be done to achieve the intended results of the CAP. Consulted stakeholders aver that the five pillars are still relevant and there is clear concurrence between the larger strategic goal of preventing and countering violent extremism and intended strategic outcomes.

Nevertheless, there is a strong case for a review of the pillars, especially taking into consideration the findings of the baseline study, which has been recently carried out through PROACT Project. Further, there is need to establish whether the ‘media and online’ should remain as a stand-alone or be incorporated to the other pillars. Participants in the interviews for this assessment felt that the media stakeholders would play a stronger role if they were members of the other four pillars since they would use the information generated from the activities to disseminate through their platforms. Others noted that media is cross cutting and cannot operate alone, therefore needs to support the other pillars. While some of the CEF members had conducted media outreach, this it was noted was out of their own volition and had not involved the media pillar stakeholders since as narrated by a respondent, “we already have connections to the radio and TV stations through our organisations and other engagements.” Nevertheless, for synergy and coherence in terms of implementing the CAP, there is need to reconsider how these activities are conducted and how they feed to the overall goal.

Further, some of the stakeholders raised the need to incorporate mental health issues into the pillars. Respondents raised the need to examine mental health disorders in a nuanced way and identify functional links between specific aspects of the mental health and ways that this contributed or has potential to lead to extremism. For example, some noted that victims of gender and sexual violence or criminal violence will require psychological support. Similarly, those that have committed these acts when they want to change their ways will also need psychosocial support. In these cases, practitioners will need to determine when and how to oversee, carry out, and monitor the disengagement of these individuals from radicalisation and extremism, in ways that provide appropriate alternative protective factors.

From the assessment, it is evident that there are little common activities under the CEF. Most of the organisations in the pillars are carrying out individual activities and there is hardly a reference to how they are related to the CAP implementation matrix. Due to this, the consultant could not gauge how far the work plan has been implemented by the CEF stakeholders as they had agreed. Relatedly, there is lack of clear leadership within the pillars and there is no mechanism of evaluating the Secretariat’s work. That is why stakeholders in some of the pillars have never held meetings or when meetings take place, are attended by few stakeholders. Moreover, this has denied inter-pillar activities and strategies, which could have strengthened implementation of the CAP.

The Nakuru CAP on P/CVE has not been publicised widely even among the CEF stakeholders. Some of those interviewed said they were not aware what each pillar does or even its members. Others said due to the lack of activities, they had forgotten most of the issues they had been taught about VE in the initial stages. It was also pointed out that most of the CEF stakeholders do not have a specific representative who is sent to the meetings and this has led to lack of continuity once the person does not attend the activities or leaves the organisation. Further, the outreach has not been cascaded to the sub-counties and hence the advocacy targets are generally lower than had been planned. This, as was explained by the stakeholders, was due to lack of financial resources to undertake planned activities.

There is therefore a strong case for the establishment of a full-time coordinator who will oversee the Secretariat and implementation of the CAP, and ensure a more robust integration of the pillars. As it is, the members of the secretariat have to split their work of CAP with other engagements and this has slowed things down. The co-ordinator will also maintain complementary relationships with other stakeholders like donors, NCTC, international, regional and national organisations who would support the CEF on such issues as securing funding, research and information on VE and growing its network beyond Nakuru County and Kenya.

The importance of sound performance management and integration of sustainability measures to enhance the CEF's ability to discharge its mandate effectively, efficiently and in a sustainable way cannot be over emphasised. Having a permanent co-ordinator and CEF stakeholders who volunteer as members of the pillars in a more consistent manner, will reduce the risk of succession planning and management should a member exit given the considerably specialized nature of the engagements.

5. Resourcing the CAP

The stakeholders are a resource since they have continued to commit time and organizational resources to implement some of the agreed activities. This includes organizational led awareness and sensitization of community on VE and radicalization issues, creating linkages between skills development of the youths, the job market and economic opportunities as well as developing models/guides for formation of school clubs that can aid in mitigating extremism and violence. Some of the respondents have conducted trainings on VE and radicalization at the universities and community levels. Others have created a pool of ToTs on P/CVE matters who are expected to train community members on what to look out for in terms of radicalization and extremism. Others have linked some of the youth with the offices of the youth and women enterprise funds in order for them to apply and access funding opportunities. They have also engaged youth in urban farming programming by the county government. This has been done with an aim of strengthening the youths' resilience by addressing the economic situations that could drive them to extremism.

Through donor support channelled through MidRift Hurinet, the CEF has held some meetings and capacity building exercises. For example, MidRift facilitated the initial meetings that led to the development of the CAP as well as its launch. MidRift also has seconded its staff as an interim coordinator to the CAP secretariat. This support was acknowledged by most of the stakeholders

interviewed since it has been pivotal in ensuring the CAP is implemented despite having limited resources.

Implementation of the Nakuru CAP has anchored its results sustainability strategy in recognizing and engaging the power of stakeholders within the pillars in ways that not only pool resources but also create pathways through which diverse stakeholders can apply their comparative advantages to ensure the outcomes are realised. For example, in the County Operational Implementation Plan, various stakeholders committed to undertake activities to realise the pillars objectives. This was a creative way of raising resources to kick start the implementation process but most of the partners did not follow these commitments or tied their implementation to the CAP. In addition, there is no linkages between the resources contributed by different stakeholders and this has sometimes led to duplication of efforts and activities as each organisation has conducted its activities alone and not through the CEF.

Whereas resource constraints are acknowledged, the inroads already made in the last 12 months are of higher potential if they can be utilized for greater efficacy, particularly through reviewing methods of engagement. One way might be for the stakeholders to continue implementing the CAP activities through their organisations but also report to the CEF secretariat to ensure there is linkages with the CAP and other pillars. Apart from the donors, the County government also needs to provide funds to the CAP which can be used to cover some of the activities and in case of a shortfall, possibly cost-share with the stakeholders.

An inherent challenge to the CAP's sustainability lies in its current arrangement where it relies on donor funding and specifically, through MidRift Hurinet. This presents existential risks in the long term in case donor funding is not available and also makes for a strong case for the County government to allocate funds for the CAP implementation. Further, the CEF needs to formulate a plan through which it can generate income for example through approaching private companies and local philanthropies and hence reduce the proportion of reliance on donor grants. Such monies can be channelled to a strategic fund that can be managed as body corporate by the CEF stakeholders.

Moreover, there is need to consider how the CAP can be aligned with the Nakuru CIDP for budgeting purposes. The county sectoral plans are programme based and form the basis for budgeting and performance management. Further, there is need to integrate the CAP into the County Annual Development Plans, which are periodically reviewed by the county executive and approved by the county assembly. This offers a great opportunity for CVE actors and practitioners to ensure prioritization of the CAP agenda into the county sectoral programmes. In this regard, there is need to lobby the Nakuru County Assembly and the County Executive Committee to ensure that the CEF is funded. Some members of the political pillar are members of the County Assembly and they could be reached out for this endeavour. Furthermore, the CEF should engage the County Assembly Budget Committee to sensitize them on the CAP and need for the County to fund it. Other funding opportunities within the County can also be explored with the assistance of the budget committee for example through the County Peace Bill if passed by the Assembly.

6. Capacity gaps

The assessment notes that the CAP has created new pathways and possibilities for VE actors in Nakuru to play their roles more visibly. Some of the respondents attested that their capacities and confidence to act on VE issues had significantly increased in the last year that the CEF has been in operation especially through the trainings and access to the political and security leadership in the county. According to the stakeholders consulted, the existence of the CAP and the CEF has resulted in significant increase in their realisation of the need to tackle extremism in Nakuru County. A few outreach meetings and capacity building efforts have been successful in building requisite capabilities among individuals and their networks for advocacy and interventions to reduce radicalisation and extremism.

To enhance these gains and deepen potential for their contribution to lasting change, the consultant notes a strong case for strengthening the secretariat in terms of carrying out monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning. Violent extremism will continue to be a significant challenge and one that requires continuing monitoring as well as understanding as a multi-dimensional dynamic challenge. Hence, there is need for continuous refresher seminars/talks for the CEF members, which can be periodically presented by invited guests from the Universities, other Counties, research institutes and the like. Further, there is need to build capacity for the secretariat on proposal writing for enhanced fundraising from donors, business people, county and national governments. Other capacity gaps include: need for training CEF members on co-reporting by CAP pillar heads to the secretariat; the need to create awareness on P/CVE among peace and security grassroots structures including Assistant County Commissioners, Chiefs, Peace Committees, Community Policing Committees (CPCs), and Nyumba Kumi on prevention and countering violent extremism so as to cascade the CEF to the Sub County, Locational and Sub-Locational levels across the county; and on mobilization local resource mobilization to deepen P/CVE awareness among stakeholder within each pillar.

LESSONS LEARNED

Based on the foregoing, the following are noted by the consultant as the key lessons:

- a. The strategic collaboration and networking within the CEF stakeholders from the National and County governments as well as a broad range of non-state actors is perhaps the most viable pathway for influencing the required structural level changes to prevent and counter VE in Nakuru. Based on the proven efficacy of this approach so far, there is a strong case for CEF to think ways of cascading the gains so far onto new policy and administrative platforms at the sub-county levels.
- b. Leadership matters. The CAP so far has succeeded because of the support and collaboration between the County Commissioner of Nakuru and the Governor. This is a unique partnership that can be showcased as a success to other Counties.
- c. Despite the complexity of P/CVE work and its nascent nature in Nakuru, the CEF has been able to come up with programmes and projects that are relevant to the local needs. The activities have already slowly started having an impact on the understanding and relevance

of P/CVE activities in Nakuru. It is important that a longer-term vision is imagined given the complexity and intensity of VE work.

- d. Public ownership of the CAP is vital and this needs to be matched with financial resources. For greater effect and impact, the Nakuru County government needs to take up the mantle of seeing that the CAP is better-resourced and implemented.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the assessment determines that the CEF and CAP secretariat have made initial steps that are vital in starting implementation of the Nakuru Action Plan on P/CVE. The CEF has opened up new spaces through which discourses on insecurity and VE are brought to the fore in unique and more localised ways and understandings. Nevertheless, it is clear from the findings that there is still much that needs to be done on institutional strengthening, outreach and resourcing of the CAP. The new county action plan needs to build up on the gains made so far and learn from the shortcomings.

Failure to effectively address the identified challenges as the CEF plans for the next county action plan will lead to drawbacks in the ability of stakeholder to consolidate its successes from the past and grow them towards more viable relationships with members and increase visibility and outputs from the action plan. Incorporation of the analysis of this report as well as data generated from the baseline study presents a strong basis for the creation of new indicators for the CAP.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and lessons learned, the evaluator makes the following recommendations:

1. Recommendations to CEF stakeholders:

- Adopt and utilise other means of engagement including online meetings and WhatsApp chats to enable members and partners to engage and collaborate in and between the pillars;
- Review current CEF membership to incorporate members who have ability to influence wider stakeholders within a pillar.
- Engage in further discussions on the relevance of the ‘media and online pillar,’
- Incorporate mental health issues into the new CAP with Psychosocial support as a stand-alone pillar;
- Identify leaders of the pillars who will lead the implementation process and ensure horizontal collaborations within the CEF.
- Consider establishing a permanent coordinator’s office, which will be driving the CEF and coordinating activities as well as engaging with partners.
- Continue holding regular forums in the communities to increase awareness of the CAP, engender trust and buy-in of the plans as well as generate ideas for how to prevent and Counter Violent Extremism.
- Embed the values of volunteerism in P/CVE activities.

2. Recommendations to the CAP secretariat

- Integrate CAP activities within the individual CEF stakeholder programmes in order to complement the few resources allocated for project implementation. This might provide a more viable platform for cascading gains more effectively through the organisations and networks.
- Expand the financial resource base by carrying out more enhanced fundraising from donors, business people, county and national governments.
- Consider setting up a P/CVE fund that will be run as a body corporate, and gets donations from donors, foundation, and private sector among other institutions to support CAP activities.
- Invest more time and resources to formulate a thoughtful and comprehensive sustainability strategy that builds on the strong goodwill from the national and county governments.
- Ensure the sustainability strategy encompasses key human and financial aspects as well as consolidating the already positive steps made towards process and results sustainability.
- Monitor and evaluate the CAP on a continuous basis to ensure it responds to the changing contemporary VE realities.

3. Recommendations to National and County governments

- Continue the good working relationship between the Governor and County Commissioner.
- Agree on the roles and responsibilities of each office in implementing the CAP.

4. Recommendation to National government

- Continue supporting the Secretariat with the office space and any other needed human and financial resources.

5. Recommendation to County government

- Incorporate and fund the CAP activities as part of the Nakuru CIDP and County Annual Development Plans since peace and security is key to enhancing and sustaining development.

6. Recommendation to the County Assembly

- Support and pass the Nakuru County Peace bill to set up a framework within county government for supporting peace and P/CVE activities.

7. Recommendations to Donors

- Invest in CEF stakeholder capacities for ensuring oversight and accountability of the Secretariat

- Strengthen the secretariat through capacity building for members in conducting fundraising, monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning as well as constantly increasing their P/CVE knowledge.
- Continue supporting implementation of the CAP through funding its activities

ANNEX

Annex 1: Key informant interview guide

My name is XXXX and I'm collecting data that seeks to establish the status of implementation of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE, the challenges stakeholders are facing in the implementation and recommendations on how this can be improved. The information will help in strengthening the implementation of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE and in future programming on P/CVE

Your answers to this interview will be kept confidential. No one will be informed that you participated other than Mid Rift Hurinet but they will not have access to the information you provided me. Your name will not be used or appear in any part of this research. You have the right to stop the interview at any time or to skip any question that you do not want to answer.

Some issue may be difficult to discuss with us, but we hope you will find it useful to have the opportunity to talk about it. Your participation is voluntary, but your experience will increase our understanding on the implementation status, and we hope that the result of the research will serve to unlock the bottlenecks and challenges that stakeholders might be facing in the implementation of the Nakuru CAP on P/CVE.

If you have any question about this research you may ask the question now or at any point during the interview.

Do you agree to be interviewed?

Introduction

1. Please describe your involvement with Nakuru CAP on P/CVE (*did the respondent participate in the design, implementation length of time, nature of interactions, motivations, etc.*)

Relevance

2. How relevant is Nakuru CAP on P/CVE from your point of view and experience to your sector? (Probe on CAP ownership. How is CAP aligned to the sector or aligned your sector to the CAP?)
3. Do you know of the County Engagement Forum? How relevant is the County Engagement Forum (CEF) in coordinating implementation of the CAP? Does it adequately meet your needs as a beneficiary/partner? (Probe for specific examples)
4. How were stakeholders, existing initiatives, policy or legal frameworks consulted during the planning process of the CAP? If not, why?
5. Was CAP design preceded by a contextual analysis of VE? How far did the research help you to revisit and test assumptions and theory of change? Is this still appropriate to the problems/needs the CAP is trying to address?
6. How relevant are the five pillars (economic, media, political, education and ideological) in P/CVE? Is there any pillar that needs to be added? If yes, which ones and why do you think so?

Effectiveness

7. In your opinion, what are the major achievements/successes during the implementation of CAP over the last one year? What would you say is the most successful thing about the CAP? Please explain your response.

8. What were/are the major stakeholder strengths during the CAP implementation? Why do you say so?
9. What were/are the major weaknesses you noticed in the last one year during the implementation of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE? Why do you say so?
10. What factors, in your view, were crucial for the achievements and/or failures?
11. Are there particular limitations or county-specific conditions that affected the implementation of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE? If yes, how? How, if at all, have the challenges/constraints been addressed?
12. Who monitors the CAP implementation and whom do they report to? How can we enhance efficiency of the secretariat?

Efficiency

13. How is the working relationship between the CEF representatives? What about between the National Government and the County Government in implementation of the CAP? Why do you say so? How can this relationship be made better?
14. How have the civil society, religious leaders, the business community and public been involved in the implementation of the Nakuru CAP on P/CVE? How can this be improved?
15. What hinders CEF members from being efficient? Are there capacity gaps that can be identified?
- 16.

Sustainability

17. In your opinion, how is the implementation of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE resourced/funded/supported?
18. In your view, do conditions exist to ensure that the results of the CAP will have lasting effects? (Probe: how effectively have stakeholders been in-built into the process and results ownership)
19. If you were to make recommendations on the sustainability of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE for the next three years, what would the main suggestions be? (probe gaps in terms of coordination and capacity?)

Impact

20. In your view, how has an implementation of the Nakuru CAP on P/CVE influenced the ecosystem of VE in Nakuru? (Probe for specific examples, e.g. what this has meant to you, your sector/agency or community, whether achieved changes are/can be lasting?)

Lessons learned, good practices and recommendations

21. What are the major lessons learned through your involvement in the Nakuru CAP on P/CVE implementation?
22. How can lessons from the CAP implementation be shared, taken up and replicated? Where are the challenges in this and how do we address them?
23. What lessons can other counties learn from Nakuru on CAP implementation?
24. How can we best share lessons on CAP implementation with other Counties?
25. What changes should stakeholders make, if any, to improve the achievement of results? (Probe for specific examples and specific stakeholders)
26. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Annex 2: Focus group discussion guide

My name is xxxx and I'm collecting data that seeks to establish the status of implementation of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE, the challenges stakeholders are facing in the implementation and recommendations on how it can be improved. The information will help in strengthening the implementation of Nakuru CAP.

Your answers to this interview will be kept confidential. No one will be informed that you participated other than Mid Rift Hurinet but they will not have access to the information you provided me. Your name will not be used or appear in any part of this research. You have the right to stop the interview at any time or to skip any question that you do not want to answer.

Some issue may be difficult to discuss with us, but we hope you will find it useful to have the opportunity to talk about it. Your participation is voluntary, but your experience will increase our understanding on the implementation status, and we hope that the result of the research will serve to unlock the bottlenecks and challenges that stakeholders might be facing in the implementation of the Nakuru CAP on P/CVE.

If you have any question about this research you may ask the question now or at any point during the interview.

Do you agree to be interviewed?

(If anyone wishes to not participate; allow for time for him or her to leave before proceeding)

Let's start by going around the circle and state our names so everybody knows one another.

Let participants know that the session will take 45 – 60 minutes of their time and you will be recording their responses on paper as they discuss.

In your notes, write down the location, time and date of the FGD, the number of participants and disaggregated by sex.

GUIDING DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. In what ways are you involved with the activities of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE? *(Probe for specifics on nature of involvement, key motivations, their contributions; benefits to individuals, timelines and understanding of what CEF does)*
2. What are the major benefits to your Sector/Community from the activities of implementing the Nakuru CAP in your area? *(Probe for specific examples for Sector/Community benefits, the extent of activities helping resolve what respondents view as major challenges related to VE in their area)*
3. What would you list as the most important achievements during the last one year to this county that can be attributed to the implementation of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE? *(Probe for specific examples, and if at all linked to CAP)*
4. Who monitors the CAP implementation and whom do they report to? How can we enhance efficiency of the secretariat?
5. To the pillars: How do you communicate the contents of the CAP to the public?

6. How is the working relationship between the CEF members? What about between the County Government and National Government in implementation of the CAP? Why do you say so? How can this relationship be made better?
7. How have the civil society, religious leaders, media, the business community and public been more involved in the implementation of the Nakuru CAP on P/CVE? How can this be improved?
8. What in your view should CEF improve on? Why do you say so? (*Probe for reasons of given suggestions, and if suggestions are based on specific experiences of engagement*)
9. Was CAP design preceded by a contextual analysis of VE? How far did the research help you to revisit and test assumptions and theory of change? Is this still appropriate to the problems/needs the CAP is trying to address?
10. How relevant are the five pillars (economic, media, political, education and ideological) to P/CVE? What needs to change and why?
11. What are the major lessons you have learned through your involvement in the implementation of Nakuru CAP on P/CVE?
12. How can lessons from the Nakuru CAP on P/CVE implementation be shared, taken up and replicated? Where are the challenges in this and how do we address them?
13. What changes should stakeholders make, if any, to improve the achievement of results? (*Probe for specific examples and specific stakeholders*)
14. In the next 3-5 years, what do you expect to see improve as the County tackles VE?
15. To your knowledge do you know if we have instances of recruitment to radicalization groups? How is this been done if you know?
16. Are there any additional views that you would like to share?