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Executive Summary

Since 2011, Kenya has experienced increasing violent extremist (VE) attacks, radicalization, and recruitment especially among communities in the coastal region. Capitalizing on existing feelings of marginalization and exclusion, VE groups have developed a narrative for recruitment that resonates with certain communities in coastal Kenya. Historic grievances of economic and political marginalization, combined with perceptions of discrimination and bias have created an environment of distrust and suspicion between communities and government forces. Security forces in coastal Kenya often use heavy-handed approaches to threats of VE exacerbating these tensions and pushing at-risk individuals towards VE. In addition to these existing historic divisions, the 2017 presidential election increased political tensions after the election results were annulled and a vote rescheduled. This heightened conflict and violence across Kenya. Search for Common Ground (Search) conducted a conflict scan in November 2017 across four counties in Coastal Kenya (Lamu, Kilifi, Mombasa and Kwale) with the aim to understand and respond to these dynamics. Since then, political tensions have eased as opposing political parties have reached across the divide. However, persistent conflict drivers and critical community concerns remain. Search’s latest conflict scan (June 2018) helps understand how the conflict trends have changed and what new conflicts have emerged in Coastal Kenya.

Key Findings

1. Evolving conflict dynamics: Following the reconciliation between political parties in the aftermath of the 2017 presidential election, politics and the 2017 election decreased as a driver of conflict compared to the previous scan. The heightened tensions from the annulled and rescheduled presidential election eased as opposition politicians have sought to bridge the divide and walk the country back from the escalating conflict. While other drivers like abuse of power, and culture and religion have similarly decreased in importance, two drivers identified during the previous conflict scan remain important for the communities: access to land and access to employment. In Lamu these two drivers came together under community frustrations with the new development projects proposed for the county, including the construction of the new Lamu Port-South Sudan-Ethiopia-Transport (LAPSSET) corridor, which Lamu residents perceive are unfairly taking land and employment away from local communities.

2. Emerging conflict trends: This last scan identified key emerging conflict trends in coastal Kenya. The re-emergence of violent juvenile gangs, particularly in Mombasa and Kwale, appears as a growing concern that threatens security and peace in these communities, and is exacerbated by the violent response from Kenyan police forces. Another emerging conflict trend is the increasing prevalence of youth drug abuse. Of particular concern in Lamu, drug abuse has been linked to increased family conflicts and to VE, primarily because VE groups are believed to use drugs. The last developing dynamic identified by communities surrounded the increase in gender-based violence and domestic abuse cases. Communities were particularly concerned with the apparent rising trend of women beating their husbands and kicking them out of the house. This has been linked to a larger issue of family disintegration, identified by the
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targeted communities as being triggered both by increased domestic abuse and the growth of juvenile gangs (due to poor parenting) and drug abuse (parental neglect). This trend is worrying when considering the family as a key pillar of support for at-risk and vulnerable individuals to VE.

**Recommendations**

Although these trends do not have quick solutions that can be applied across counties but rather require long-term commitment and support from all stakeholders, based on the scan findings, Search proposes the following recommendations:

- Support long-term engagement on critical community concerns by reinforcing existing platforms like County CVE Action Plans and CSO-led interventions.
- Encourage multi-stakeholder discussions on new tensions that are creating divisions between communities and government.
- Explore the evolving domestic violence trends to verify and then understand the causes and consequences on the community.
- Support strengthened family networks and relationships to reduce the risk of youth joining gangs, using drugs, or being radicalized.
- Increase understanding of any existing or potential connection between youth gangs and VE groups.

**Context and Methodology**

Since September 2016, Search and partners have been conducting programming in coastal Kenya to address community grievances and build the capacity of communities, youth, government, CSOs, and security forces to prevent radicalization and VE in coastal Kenya. As a part of this project the team undertook a conflict scan in November 2017 and followed on with another conflict scan in June 2018 to provide insights into community conflicts and dynamics that can positively and negatively influence project implementation and outcomes.

The data collection for this conflict scan was undertaken in June 2018. The research focused on the same four counties of Lamu, Kilifi, Mombasa and Kwale and utilized focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews (KIIs). 15 FGDs were held in total, the groups included young women, youth, women, and religious leaders, totaling 120 respondents in all four counties combined. The 15 KIIs that were conducted included interviews with security actors, national government officials, country official/elected officials, community-based organizations (CBOs), and religious leaders. Through this scan Search has been able to determine the current dynamics and identify any changes to previous conflict trends and from there recommend opportunities for peace.

Conflict scans are utilized by Search teams around the world, as a quick method of monitoring and improving the use of Do No Harm principles and Conflict Sensitivity. Search and its program partners: Kenya Muslim Youth Alliance (KMYA), Muslims for Human rights (MUHURI), Kiunga Youth Bunge Initiative (KYBI) have been implementing the project Inuka! to build trust and capacity of communities in coastal Kenya to prevent VE and radicalization. The conflict scans are intended to be conducted every
6 months with the aim of improving understanding of conflict contexts and evolution of conflict and peace dynamics over time in target areas, enabling all actors to be more effective in their efforts.

**Objectives of the Conflict Scan**

The main objective of the scan was to understand the evolution and dynamics of conflict in the four counties of Mombasa, Kilifi, Kwale and Lamu, comparing them with the previous scan (November 2017) and baseline study (March 2017). Specifically, the conflict scan had 3 objectives:

1. To help Search and its partners to plan or adapt program/project activities based on the specificities of the context and changing dynamics;
2. To ensure that Search and/or other actors’ interventions do no harm;
3. To provide a set of recommendations to resolve conflicts and prevent VE.

The research questions guiding this can be found with the Terms of Reference (TOR) in the annexes of this report.

**Key findings**

**Evolution of conflict dynamics**

The previous conflict scan highlighted issues of access to land, access to employment, abuse of power, politics, culture, and religion as the common conflict drivers in the four coastal counties. Although these drivers are still noted as issues in the target communities, their relative importance and influence has changed and given way to new dynamics. Other emerging conflicts identified in this scan include increased economic marginalization in Lamu, domestic and gender-based violence, the rise of juvenile gangs – especially in Mombasa county - and drug abuse in all counties, but significantly in Lamu county.

a. **Politics and Government Efforts to Address VE**

Since November 2017, the importance of politics and the 2017 presidential elections has substantially decreased across all counties. The “handshake” between the Kenyan President Uhuru Kenyatta and main opposition leader Raila Odinga in the aftermath of the 2017 elections had a significant role in restoring peace and calm to the entire nation. Though conflict scan participants were not aware of the details of the handshake, they were glad that it happened. The handshake also encouraged politicians from opposing political divides to sit and share a meal together, something that would never had happened before. This conflict scan also found that elected politicians were very influential in the community. The majority of community respondents across all four counties trust and believe them.

Despite this trust, respondents felt that politicians could play a larger role in addressing VE and advocating for the protection of human rights through counter-terrorism (CT) and preventing/countering violent extremism (P/CVE) efforts. A potential avenue exists to engage politicians around the key strategies put forth by the National Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism (NSCVE) and the County CVE Action Plans. However, the strategy and action plans are not well known in the community. The majority of the respondents (both FGDs and KIIs) were neither aware of the existence of the county action plans nor the content of the plan. The implementation of these plans heavily depends on joint
efforts between the national government, county governments, and communities to identify opportunities for governments to commit more resources, enable sector coordination and accountability, build community trust, and educate and sensitize both the community and state officials on their roles and responsibilities in actualizing the CVE action plans.

Alongside the decrease in politics and 2017 presidential election as conflict drivers, communities also placed decreased importance on abuse of power and culture and religion.

b. Land and Employment
Access to land and to employment were two critical drivers identified during the previous scan, and the latest scan shows that they are still important drivers of conflict in the target communities. Participants in Kilifi and Kwale viewed land conflict as having the greatest impact on security and social cohesion in their communities as well as posing the greatest risk for the future. Cases of deaths resulting from land disputes are still reported - especially in Kilifi county.

In Lamu county, conflict drivers related to access to land and to employment revolved around the economic marginalization felt by Lamu residents concerning two big development projects in their county: the Lamu-Port-Southern Sudan-Ethiopia-Transport corridor (LAPSSET) and the Lamu Coal Plant. Previously, land conflict in Lamu referred to conflicts between farmers and herders over grazing land and the issue of access to employment was a key frustration felt acutely by youth. However, this dynamic has shifted in this most recent conflict scan with the increased importance of the development projects on land and employment opportunities.

Lamu inhabitants feel that the LAPSSET project has created job opportunities for “outside” people instead of benefiting the locals, for instance, the LAPSSET office in Nairobi has no employees from Lamu. FGD participants in Lamu noted that “The majority of employees in the LAPSSET project are ‘outsiders’”. Recently, scholarship opportunities for a degree in mechanical engineering was advertised by the project. However, this hasn’t resulted in fair treatment. According to one FGD participant, a Lamu resident who had qualified for the position did not receive their certificate because it was hidden. It was only found when someone intervened.

Land issues also emerged as a result of the LAPSSET project. Some of the community members and key informants interviewed felt that compensation of inhabitants evacuated from the area had not been done in a fair and open manner. The fate of mangrove cutters and fishermen whose livelihoods were disrupted as a result of the project was also unknown as they had not yet received compensation. One of the key informants, on the other hand, felt that the value of land had highly increased because of handsome compensation offers by the government. The discrepancy between these two accounts could be from the lack of transparency in the compensation process - although the government is offering a high compensation for the land, respondents indicated that the compensation wasn’t going to the owners of the land themselves.

In addition to issues with the LAPSSET project, the proposed Lamu coal plant is believed to have adverse environmental impact by the community. This has created strife between the community and the
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2 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lamu_Port_and_Lamu-Southern_Sudan-Ethiopia_Transport_Corridor](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lamu_Port_and_Lamu-Southern_Sudan-Ethiopia_Transport_Corridor)
3 The proposed lamu coal power station is a potential 1,050 MW (1,410,000hp) coal-fired thermal power station
government. Anyone who opposes this project is seen as an enemy of the government and is treated that way. This treatment by the government makes the people of Lamu feel further marginalized economically. They feel that their needs are not valued by their government. Such feelings make them vulnerable to recruitment and radicalization which thrives in such environments. Extremist organizations present themselves to be valuing the needs of the people and since communities want someone who appreciates and listens to them, they easily fall prey of these tactics.

c. **VE Prevalence**
The prevalence of VE was generally viewed to be decreasing, with the exception of Mombasa. In general, respondents attributed this decrease to the existing platforms and forums for dialogue that have been established by CSOs. Although recognizing that the number of violent attacks had decreased, many respondents were suspicious of the relative peace and calm believing that VE organisations were most likely still planning an attack. Despite the general sense that VE had decreased in the region, each county identified specific communities and areas where VE remains a significant concern, some of these same areas overlap with areas impacted by youth gangs and drug abuse.

In Mombasa, respondents did not identify VE to be decreasing and instead noted key neighborhoods that were hotspots. In particular the areas of Majengo, Kisauni and Likoni were seen to be areas with increased juvenile gang activity as well as a higher VE prevalence. A KII also noted that even though there were no attacks, recruitment was happening behind the scenes.

Meanwhile, Kwale respondents attributed the decreased prevalence to the month of Ramadan, during which Muslims were fasting and not allowed to engage in sinful acts.

In Kilifi, VE prevalence had decreased though youth respondents and KII participants felt that Malindi town was still volatile. The town was identified by respondents as a hideout and transit route to Somalia. One of the key informants reported that a group of youth was recently caught going to Somalia under the pretext of fishing while they were actually going to join Al-Shabab.

Despite news reports of increased VE threats in Lamu, Lamu respondents felt that VE prevalence had decreased with some key informants reporting it to be close to zero. The decreased VE prevalence, noticed by communities, was credited to the security forces in the area who were on high alert and urged communities, through one of their security alert updates, to be vigilant and report suspicious behavior. In spite of the general belief that VE had decreased, one of the key informants felt that the prevalence was high, reporting that at least two people were killed in a month in Lamu East.

d. **Juvenile Gangs**
Participants from the conflict scan, identified juvenile gangs as groups of young boys, some as young as 10 years old, who rob, attack and in some instances kill people in the community. This has been confirmed by news reports that describe the gangs as being made up of youth from 12-24 who are using
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crude weapons such as knives and pangas (machetes) to instill fear in community members, preventing them from doing their usual daily duties.\(^5\)

These gangs have become very present in Mombasa county especially the areas of Likoni, Kisauni, and Majengo, which are considered risky to walk at night as gangs terrorise and kill locals. For instance, a Mombasa county security report indicates that there are 12 criminal gangs in Likoni alone;\(^6\) the police were also able to roundup and arrest 120 suspected members of three gangs in Likoni in March 2018.\(^7\) In a bid to contain the situation, the police officers engaged in open fire with the gangs resulting in several deaths, including 12 people in March, who were killed by police officers and criminal gangs in Mombasa County.\(^8\)

Respondents reported that these gangs use the neighbouring counties of Kilifi and Kwale as hideouts after committing crimes in Mombasa. In Kwale County, a gang group known as “wachafu waliokamilika” was discovered at a local school in mwaroni village. Gang members were young boys aged between 9-16 years of age and were believed to be receiving mentorship from an organized gang in Mtongwe. The youth were surprisingly not aware of the existence of any juvenile gangs but acknowledged that indeed young boys are vulnerable to recruitment into gangs and VE groups.

In Kilifi, respondents described the county as an ideal hideout for the gangs due to its proximity to Mombasa and the laid back structure of the county.

According to Lamu respondents, VE groups were looking for gangs from which to recruit, although there are only spot cases of youth gangs in the county and it is not as a big of an issue like it is in Mombasa.

The majority of respondents interviewed were in agreement that juvenile gangs are part of violent extremist networks. Those who responded that there is a connection opined that the juvenile gangs are used by VE networks to gather information and intelligence and can act as a recruitment stage for extremist organizations. Others believed that the juvenile gangs receive weapons, training and mentorship from extremist organizations. In particular, FGDs in Mombasa reported that youth in gangs are vulnerable and can easily be recruited by VE groups, thus the juvenile gangs can act as a recruiting pool for them. Other participants considered the violence used by these gangs an aspect of VE in and of itself, although this wasn’t supported by many respondents.

On the other hand, a section of respondents did not agree that there is a connection between VE and youth gangs at all, arguing that juvenile gangs are just small boys who commit petty crimes and act out of peer influence. Respondents who felt that there was no connection between juvenile gangs and extremist organizations justified it by saying that juvenile gangs are criminal in nature while extremist groups are rooted in ideologies and religion. According to these respondents, violent extremism involves the use of violence to defend ideologies and is not just violence.

\(^6\) https://www.the-star.co.ke/news/2018/03/30/youth-gangs-terrorise-likoni-children-hooked-on-hard-drugs_c1738245
\(^8\) https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/2001274852/coast-insecurity-panic-as-12-killed-in-two-weeks
It is worth noting that while respondents were very sure of the existence of juvenile gangs, their responses to the question of a connection between juvenile gangs and extremist organizations were mainly based on personal opinions, since there hasn’t been any research or reporting done on this connection. Despite this disagreement, all respondents interviewed agreed that the two main drivers to juvenile gangs were poor parenting (discussed under family disintegration below) and peer pressure. The pull factor was the potential financial gains. Programs aimed at reducing the prevalence of juvenile gangs should therefore focus on these three areas.

e. Family disintegration
Family fights and domestic violence were consistently mentioned to be a common conflict in all target counties. Both KIIs and FGDs respondents believe that a family unit is the pillar of the society and that violence within homes often leads to divorce and family disintegration. Recent research recruitment and radicalization shows a link between family disintegration VE recruitment, demonstrating the importance of the family unit to the resiliency of Kenyan society. Family disintegration was also linked to the issue of drug abuse, VE, and juvenile gangs. Children were found to be growing up without morals due to lack of proper parental guidance making them vulnerable to juvenile gangs and extremist organizations.

In Mombasa and Kwale respondents gave specific examples of this issue. A Mombasa respondent reported domestic violence to be a common conflict, stating that many cases of domestic violence had been taken to court and culprits jailed up to 6 months. This fuels more conflict as inmates seek revenge once freed. In Kwale at least ten cases of domestic violence were reported per week. Most of these cases involved women beating their husbands and sending away their children, a trend contrary to the prevailing habit in which men beat their wives. Kilifi and Lamu also mentioned issues of domestic violence and family conflicts but mainly in reference to family fights caused by drug abuse.

Ironically, the issue of domestic violence and divorce was mostly mentioned by male respondents in both KIIs and FGDs. Female respondents were relatively silent on the problem and only mentioned family fights caused by drug abuse.

f. Drug abuse
Drug abuse, an increasing trend in coastal Kenya, has been cited by participants as one of the major hindrances to eradicating VE and radicalisation in the coastal region. Drug markets have become a ground for collaboration and competition between organised crime groups globally. Organised crime groups are concentrated along drug markets. Though a common problem along the entire coastal strip, drug abuse was subliminally mentioned in all the four counties but came out strongly as a common conflict in Lamu County. Drug abuse has been known to make people vulnerable to VE organisations because extremists organisations are believed to operate under the influence of drugs.

The issue of drugs is very complex and difficult to deal with. Despite evident efforts made by the government to fight drug abuse, community members do not have faith in the government to do so effectively. None of the drug sellers are arrested, while drug users are always arrested. Respondents
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11 https://africacenter.org/spotlight/interdiction-efforts-adapt-drug-trafficking-africa-modernizes/
unanimously agreed that to successfully fight the war on drug abuse, there is a need to sensitize youth. Respondents noted that the drug cartels are “untouchable” and declared that “not even the government can do anything about it”. Sensitizing and educating youth on the dangers of drugs is believed by respondents to be a way to end the demand for drugs, with the hopes that the drug cartels would lose power and be dismantled.

Lamu FGD participants reported drug abuse to be a cause of family fights and increased crime rates in the region, especially among female respondents. “Our youth have turned into zombies. The entire generation has been wiped out.” As has been mentioned previously, drug addicts often steal from their families and the community in order to get money to buy drugs. This causes conflicts in the family and creates insecure communities which rely on family stability.

**Opportunities for Peace**

**Spaces for dialogue**

Although this scan highlighted the persistence of certain conflict drivers in Coastal Kenya, respondents identified key opportunities for the government, civil society, and security sector to continue and to strengthen engagement with community members. FGDs identified NGO, CSO, and government platforms for dialogue as key methods for conflict resolution and addressing VE.

In addition to the existing platforms for dialogue, respondents also identified the role that police have in addressing community conflicts and VE as an opportunity to engage further. Respondents believe police officers are critical in addressing VE and conflict issues. Therefore, police officers need to frequently interact with community members, through dialogue platforms. An additional suggestion was that police officers should engage with community youth in talks at schools to help reduce cases of youth leaving school to join gangs or do drugs.

**Do No Harm**

This conflict scan also assessed the program in terms of whether it did any involuntary harm, the community perceptions of NGOs, and potential risk factors for future programming. Overall, the conflict scan found that this project upheld principles of conflict sensitivity and do no harm. Respondents indicated that NGOs were very important to P/CVE work and specifically mentioned that the program included all stakeholders and that the dialogue forums were conducted so that all participants felt that their voices were respected and valued. In particular, multi-stakeholder dialogue forums and awareness creation forums were noted to be important to the communities.

Although NGOs were seen to be key actors in P/CVE work, there was one area which could prove to be a risk for future programming. Respondents also identified some issues with NGOs, which are explored more in the next section, which require the attention of Search and necessitates careful assessment and capacity building in the future.
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13 Lamu FGDs
Lessons learned

As mentioned, despite this scan recognizing the importance of NGOs and CSOs in providing platforms and opportunities for dialogue and discussion, respondents in Mombasa reported that some NGOs and CSOs may, in fact, be causing harm in these communities. Respondents cited instances of local NGOs/CSOs being used by youth gang members, who pose as ‘transformed youth’, as cover while still engaging in criminal activity. In addition, some NGOs are viewed by the public as solely seeking publicity and attention from the media rather than meaningfully engaging in peacebuilding work. To address this issue in future programming, it will be important to build the capacity of NGOs and CSOs in coastal Kenya to ensure they are implementing conflict sensitive and do no harm principles in all of their work.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Despite increasing concerns of new and emerging issues, and the persisting importance of previously identified conflict drivers, there are opportunities for conflict resolution and community engagement through renewed and continued commitment to address these critical community concerns. Communities have recognized in this scan the importance of CSOs and NGOs continuing their work on engaging all stakeholders through a variety of dialogues and platforms.

1) Support long-term engagement on critical community concerns by reinforcing existing platforms like County CVE Action Plans and CSO-led interventions.

Comparing the conflict dynamics in this most recent conflict scan with the one conducted in November 2017, a number of the key conflict drivers remain important concerns in the target communities. Pursuing resolutions to these drivers takes long-term commitment and engagement from all stakeholders. Sustainable peace in the region requires a commitment to engagement, discussion, and adapting to evolving contexts, this will help to ensure that drivers which have reduced in importance do not increase later on.

2) Encourage multi-stakeholder discussions on new tensions that are creating divisions between communities and government.

Highlighted within this scan was the importance of platforms and dialogues created by NGOs, CSOs, and religious institutions to address conflict. These forums should be encouraged and supported to address new and emerging conflict trends and tensions before they escalate. Using these spaces for open discussion among multi-stakeholder groups will help to address new tensions and voice critical community concerns while finding solutions alongside the government, security sector, and other actors.

3) Explore the evolving domestic violence trends to verify and then understand the causes and consequences on the community.

This conflict scan identified increased reports of domestic violence by wives against their husbands. Since the common understanding of domestic violence, and the prevailing trend, is husbands beating their wives, this dynamic needs to be explored further to be verified and understood.
4) **Support strengthened family networks and relationships to reduce the risk of youth joining gangs, using drugs, or being radicalized.**

Family dynamics and family networks have been shown to be integral aspects of preventing radicalization and recruitment into VE groups. This conflict scan also demonstrated the importance of family networks in preventing youth from joining gangs or abusing drugs. In order to increase the long-term resilience of coastal Kenyan communities to conflict, it is important to support the resilience and strength of family networks.

5) **Increase understanding of any existing or potential connection between youth gangs and VE groups.**

Since respondents seemed to have differing opinions on whether there was a connection between juvenile gangs and VE groups, more research should be dedicated to the issue. This will provide clarity for police and security forces and help communities better understand the dynamics in their communities. An increased understanding of the possible connection between youth gangs and VE organizations could also provide an opportunity for intervention to address this possible connection point.
Annexes

Annex 1: Focus Group Discussion Guide

Introduction text for researchers: Hello. My name is ___________________. I am conducting research for an organization called Search for Common Ground, who have been working in peacebuilding since 1982. Search for Common Ground is currently implementing a project in called Inuka. The Inuka project focuses on promoting community led security approaches in regions at-risk to violent extremism in Coastal Kenya. We are conducting this research in order to make sure the program is as relevant, and useful as it can be. We are undertaking focus groups with youth, women, and community leaders in this and other communities, and we are speaking with security actors and elected officials as well so that we fully understand the issues and ideas that your community members feel are important.

There will be no compensation for speaking with us today, the purpose of this research will inform our programing and the programming of our partner organizations and will also provide us with a better understanding of the details of some of the issues facing your community today. We do believe you will find this activity interesting and it will give you an opportunity to exchange views on topics you might not necessarily find time to discuss otherwise.

Everything that you say will remain confidential, and we will not collect information that could be used to identify you. I will be taking notes as we speak, to allow us to analyze the data from your responses. However, I won’t share these notes with anyone outside of the research team. When we do share information in our report, the feedback will all be anonymous. Your name and identity will never be associated with any information we share.

The focus group should not last more than 2 hours, and you are free to leave at any point should you feel uncomfortable with any of the questions. It is important to make sure we hear what all participants want to say; therefore, we hope you can stay for the whole discussion. What I’m looking for today is a discussion. There are no right or wrong answers. I won’t be offended if you say negative things. I just want your honest opinion. I also don’t want you to feel like you have to direct all your comments to me. If anyone says something you disagree with, feel free to speak up. Our goal is to have a respectful discussion with lots of different opinions. I also want you to speak up, even if you think you are the only person at the table who has that opinion. But, also if you don’t have an opinion on something, I want you feel free to say that too.

Now that you understand who we are and why we are here, please help us set some ground rules for the discussion.
**Ground rules need to include: Phones off/silent, facilitator has the right to interrupt someone to move the conversation along, participants speak one at a time, no side conversations.**

Before we start, do you have any questions to ask? **Consent:** Ask everyone to raise their hand if they understand and accept to follow the rules of the discussion. Ask everyone to raise their hand if they agree to let Search for Common Ground use the information they share in order to write a report that will influence current and future Search for Common Ground and partner projects? (Anyone that does not raise their hand should be asked to leave)

**Questions:**

**Recent developments and evolutions in the conflict(s) & Specific examples of how the conflict(s) has manifested itself within local communities**

1. What kind of conflicts currently exist in this community?
2. Of the conflicts mentioned, which ones are
   a. Most common, Why?
   b. Most violent, Why?
   c. Most prone to endangering the future of the community, why?
3. Do you feel that the famous “handshake” has had any effect on peace and security?
   a. National level
   b. Local level
   c. Has the reconciliation trickled down to make people feel more represented by public institutions?

**Impact of the conflict(s) on Violent Extremism**

4. What are the key drivers and triggers of VE and recruitment?
5. Do you consider juvenile gangs part of VE?
6. Is there a connection between juvenile gangs and:
   a. Extremist organizations
   b. Returnees
   c. What is the connection

**Conflict resolution processes currently underway within the communities**

7. Who does your community look for or go to when they want to resolve conflict?
   a. In theory, do they trust public institutions for conflict resolution?
   b. In practice, do they use public institutions for conflict resolution?
8. What are the principal mechanisms for local peaceful conflict resolution hope for by the population?
   a. Any of these new? Any old ones that have become ineffective?
9. Are you aware of County CVE Plans?
   a. Can you give an example of what the CVE Plan is doing in your community?
   b. Are you aware of opportunities to be involved in CVE Plan development and application?
      i. What are those opportunities?
   c. Are you active in the plans development and application?
i. If yes, How?  
ii. If no, Why not?

10. What is the relationship between National and County government?  
   a. How does this relationship impact on the implementation of strategic development plans including CVE?

Recommendations by the local population for how to resolve the conflict(s) and respond to VE

11. What are the entry points and windows of opportunity for peace that the project can take advantage of?
12. What is the role of religious actors in CVE?  
   a. What legitimacy do religious leaders have in CVE?
13. What is the role of elected politicians in CVE?  
   a. What legitimacy do elected politicians have in CVE?
14. What is the role of the Kaya Council of elders?  
   a. What legitimacy do the Kaya elders have in CVE?

Do No Harm

15. Has there been any negative change as a result of the project activities?  
16. Are there changes to the activity design that you would recommend?  
17. What is working well?

Thank everyone for their time and sharing their important ideas!

Closure Ensure all participants leave in a positive state of mind and are clear about what happens next and ensure all administrative matters have been dealt with full.

The results of the report will be shared back with participants, either during specific restitution events or during planned project activities.
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2. Context

The Project

Since Kenyan forces intervened militarily in Somalia in October 2011, a toxic combination of push and pull factors has led to the emergence of a home-grown, Kenyan Al-Shabaab insurgency that is feeding on historical religious and regional divides across the country. Violent attacks have occurred across Kenya but have been carried out with greater frequency in the primarily-Muslim coastal region, a part of Kenya that has experienced long-standing exclusion and marginalization as well as active separatist movements. These attacks have devastated the local economy by causing the collapse of the tourism industry in the coastal counties, leaving a large population of idle and unemployed youth with little hope for a positive future. These youth are then vulnerable to radicalization, particularly by clerics who have been influenced by extremist groups in Somalia and throughout the coastal region’s geographic connection to the Middle East.

Heavy-handed security responses involving human rights abuses and the “guilty-by-association” criminalization of the entire Muslim community have led to a lack of trust, communication, and coordination amongst key community, government, and security stakeholders around preventing and countering VE. This approach has further exacerbated tensions between communities and security actors, leaving vulnerable populations more susceptible to the influence of radicalization.

In this context, Search along with its three local civil society partners, the Kenya Muslim Youth Alliance (KMYA), the Kiunga Youth Bunge Initiative (KYBI), and Muslims for Human Rights (MUHURI), are working to develop platforms for effective and meaningful collaboration and engagement between communities, mothers and wives, male and female youth, local, regional, and national leadership, and security forces, building a unified and localized community security framework to halt the cycle of radicalization and violence that has affected the coastal region, Kenya more broadly, and the greater East African community.

Goal: The Inuka! Project contributes to build increased trust and collaboration between key community stakeholders to prevent radicalization and violent extremism (VE) in coastal Kenya.

This scan seeks to understand the evolution and dynamics of conflict in the four counties identified in the previous scan and combined baseline study, determine emerging trends away from those identified in the previous studies, explore effective local mechanisms for conflict resolution, assess community perceptions of VE, and understand risks and opportunities that promote state-citizen relations and cooperations in securing the communities.
3. Goal and Objectives of Study

The main objective of the scan is to understand the evolution and dynamics of conflicts in four locations one per county in, Kilifi, Kwale, Lamu and Mombasa.

The specific objectives of the conflict scan are to collect and share data that highlights the following elements in a readable and accessible format:

1. To plan or adapt program/project activities (of Search and partners) based on the specificities of the context and changing dynamics;
2. To ensure that Search and/or other actors do no harm;
3. To promote dialogue, reflection and reduction of tensions.

4. Key Questions of the Study

Recent developments and evolutions in the conflict(s) and specific examples of how the conflict(s) has manifested itself within local communities

- What conflicts currently exist in the target communities?
- Which conflicts are most common, most violent, and the most prone to endangering the future of the community?
- Has the “Handshake Deal” influenced political conflict?
  - Does this reconciliation trickles down to make people feel more represented by public institutions?
  - Does this reconciliation trickles down to resolve tensions between the county and national level government?

Impact of the conflict(s) on Violent Extremism

- Push and pull factors to VE
  - What are the key drivers and triggers of VE and recruitment?
  - Are there links between gangs and extremist organizations?
    - Connections between VE, returnees and gangs?
  - Is VE prevalent in your community?

Conflict resolution processes currently underway within the communities

- Who do communities list as influencers they look to for how to resolve conflicts?
  - In theory, do they trust public institutions for conflict resolution?
  - In practice, do they use public institutions for conflict resolution?
- Are there any new mechanisms for conflict resolution in the community? Are there any old or outdated mechanisms?
- How aware are communities of County CVE Plans?
  - Can they provide examples of what the CVE Plans are doing in their communities?
  - Are communities aware of opportunities to be involved in CVE Plan development and application?
    - What are those opportunities?
● Are communities active in the plans development and application?
  ● If yes, How?
  ● If no, Why not?
● What is the relationship between National and County government?
  ● How does this relationship impact on the implementation of CVE plans?
  ● How does the relationship impact on the overall security of the community?

Recommendations by the local population for how to resolve the conflict(s) and respond to VE
● What are the entry points and windows of opportunity for peace that the project can take advantage of?
● What should be the role of Peace Building committees & Community Policing actors in CVE?
  ● What legitimacy do Peace Building Committees & Community policing have in CVE?
● What should be the role of elected County Government and Elected Leaders in CVE?
  ● What legitimacy do County Government and Elected Leaders have in CVE?
● What is the role of the Cultural Council of elders?
  What legitimacy do the Kaya elders have in CVE?

Do No Harm
● Did project activities have negative unintended consequences? Positive and negative.
● Are there changes to the activity design that participants would recommend?
● What is working well?

5. Geographic Locations

The project will target 4 counties, and the following specific locations within each county:

Mombasa: juvenile gang groups are a major cause of insecurity in Mombasa. Specifically, Likoni and Majengo areas have been selected as target locations for this conflict scan because of the pivotal role they play in juvenile gangs. The first conflict scan identified these areas as a hotspot for juvenile gang groups. These gang groups are rumoured to be receiving training and coaching from returnees who are not able to smoothly reintegrate into the society. The scan will seek to explore the connection, or lack of, between juvenile gang groups and returnees and how it impacts on VE.

Kwale: land issues and historical marginalisation are the major causes of conflict in Kwale. The natives, who are predominantly Mijikenda, feel that outsiders have invaded their land and taken up job opportunities meant for them. Both the first conflict scan and combined baseline highlight the importance of the council of elders ‘Kayas’ in conflict resolution. In both studies, communities expressed confidence in addressing their conflicts through the council of elders depicting them as important influencers in the community. The scan will look at the role of the ‘Kayas’ and elected politicians in CVE.
Kilifi: The scan will explore how the County and National government interact in mainstreaming and implementation of the CVE into the CIDP and NDP.

Lamu: The scan will examine the evolution of the conflict highlighted in the first scan between the predominately Christian farmers and the predominantly Muslim herders. It will also assess emerging conflicts or issues following the lifting of the night fishing ban.

6. Methodology and Data Collection Tools

In order to reach set objectives of the conflict scan, the Search team will use qualitative data collection methods. This data collection methodology is based on two principal activities: semi-guided group discussions with members of the community (using the guide for group discussion) and individual interviews of key players and actors in society (using the guide for individual interviews).

The Regional ILT and country DME team will collaborate with the program team to implement this study. The Regional ILT and country DME team will prepare and coordinate the strategy for this study including the development and implementation of data collection tools, and the planning and writing of the final report. ILT will conduct the approval of tools, methodology, and content of data collection and the final report. The program team will ensure the quality of the project reports and the DME Officer will conduct the final report quality assessment. ILT will provide final approval of reports and report sharing.

A brief final report will be produced of no more than 15 pages, excluding annexes. This will include a 1-2 page summary (purpose, summary, context, findings, recommendations) and a summary of the methodology applied, with Annexes referenced for detailed methodologies and information on the approach. Annexes will include all the important additional information: tools, important data excerpts, etc.

The Conflict scan will be shared, internally and externally with partners, so as to foster dialogue and provide recommendations to those working in the region. Two versions of the report may need to be produced: a confidential Search version, and an external edited version. The Final report will be shared with Search Staff, Partners, Communities, Government, Civil Society and other external groups.

The scan will be gender sensitive thus will gather information from both men and women, with particular attention to the sensitivities of data collection from women and young girls, as these are people affected by VE, and have been sensitive on engagement with security and governmental structures for fear of victimization. In addition, response from men and women differed regarding the push and pull factors of conflict as revealed in the first conflict scan. Key informant interviews will be conducted with Government security officials, elected officials and CSO leaders. Specifically, the first conflict scan noted a disconnect between the community’s perception of drivers of conflict and what government officials identified to be drivers of
conflict. The scan also identified mistrust and lack of confidentiality among security actors, which this scan will seek to examine.

The tools will be designed by the Search Kenya DME Officer and reviewed by Search’s ILT. Questions in the tools will be analyzed to ensure that they are contextually and culturally appropriate, conflict sensitive, gender sensitive, and respect Do No Harm principles and Search’s general ethics policies.

Before data collection begins in the field, enumerators will attend a two-day training for general training and testing of tools. This phase will allow the team to anticipate possible complication during research implementation.

Inclusive data validation processes will be employed early on to elicit immediate feedback from stakeholders. If the safety and security of participants could not be ensured, the research will stop. Search will ensure that enumerators are attentive to conflict sensitivity issues, protection of participants and the importance of keeping data anonymous. They will also have experience working in the area. Search ILT and Kenya staff will provide ongoing supervision and support for enumerators. The agreement of the participants will be a precondition to their participation, as well as their consent. Interviewers will ensure that participants know they could stop or withdraw at any time. In this respect, consent forms and information tools will be developed. No documents (including notes and data collection reports) will name individuals, but instead will give a generic, non-identifiable description. The interviews and all other activities related to data collection will take place in clear, safe and reassuring places according to the comfort of the respondents.

The partners will support to mobilize the target groups to be engaged in the FGDs since these are participants from our activities under Inuka! project. Search will provide mobilization costs for this and follow up. As for the KII, Search and partners will use their networks and influence to mobilize these as well. Finally, for the mixed FGD of non-participants; Search, partners and grassroots networks will support in their mobilization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Number of individual interviews</th>
<th>Number of focus group discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youths (Male and Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 per location (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives and mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 per location (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 per location (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of elders</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 per location (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Security actors (in person)</td>
<td>1 per county (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials (national)</td>
<td>2 per county (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials (county)</td>
<td>2 per county (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Survey**

**Focus Group Discussions**

As the primary means of data collection, four focus groups of 8 local community members will be held across the four counties in order to collect qualitative evidence to provide a clear understanding of local conflict contexts and evolutions. The four focus group participant categories were chosen based on the target populations of the *Inuka* programming.

The first FGD will be comprised of youth at risk, combining young women and young men. Between 8, male and female, will be identified in collaboration with the Inuka partners. All of the participants in these FGDs will have directly participated in an Inuka intervention. Efforts will be made to include perspectives from the PWD (people with disabilities) community.

The second set of FGDs will consist of 8 Wives and Mothers of VE Actors, who have participated in Inuka interventions. The selection of the representatives of the mother and wives will also be done in collaboration with Inuka partners.

The third set of FGDs will consist of 8 Religious and Community leaders (such as community elders, leaders of peace structures, previously identified community influencers, private sector, religious leaders, with the types of leaders combined, and gender combined) from each county. All of the participants will have directly participated in an Inuka intervention.

The final set of FGDs will be with young mothers who have participated in the Inuka interventions.

The selection of participants will be done in collaboration with Inuka partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FGD 1: Youth</th>
<th>FGD 2: Mothers and Wives</th>
<th>FGD 3: Young Mothers</th>
<th>FGD 4: Religious/Community Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who?</strong></td>
<td>Youth Men and Women (18-35 years) in equal numbers</td>
<td>Women – Wives and Mothers</td>
<td>Young Mothers</td>
<td>Council of Elders, religious leaders, community influencers and leaders of peace structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How are they engaged with Inuka?</strong></td>
<td>Direct Intervention Participants</td>
<td>Direct Intervention Participants</td>
<td>Direct Intervention Participants</td>
<td>Indirect Intervention Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many?</strong></td>
<td>4 FGDs * 8 participants = 36</td>
<td>4 FGDs * 8 participants = 36</td>
<td>4 FGDs * 8 participants = 36</td>
<td>1 FGDs * 8 participants = 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data collection team will focus on open-ended direct questions during the FGDs to collect qualitative evidence on the research objectives in the area.

All FGD activities and questions will take into consideration mixed levels of education and literacy, as well as cultural hierarchy, divisions of power, and gender norms.

**Key Informant Interviews**

Key Informant Interviews will be conducted with state security actors and elected officials working in the four counties.

The KIIs will follow the same themes as the FGDs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Security Actors</th>
<th>National government officials</th>
<th>County officials/elected officials</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCPD</td>
<td>Probations officer, Assistant County Commissioner</td>
<td>Ward administrator, Women representative, Director CVE</td>
<td>HUDA, LFRT (Likoni first response team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How are they engaged with Inuka?</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>How many?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Intervention Participants</td>
<td>OCPD</td>
<td>4 (1 per County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct and Indirect Intervention Participants</td>
<td>National government officials</td>
<td>8 (2 per County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Intervention Participants</td>
<td>County officials/elected officials</td>
<td>8 (2 per county)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Intervention Participants</td>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>2 (In Likoni and Mombasa County)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Sharing and Feedback Sessions**

At a minimum, the study will determine the following key information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: To plan or adapt program/project activities (of Search and partners) based on the specificities of the context and changing dynamics</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of conflicts currently exist in this community?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the conflicts mentioned,</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Who?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which ones are a) Most common, why? b) Most violent, why? c) Most prone to endangering the future of the community, why?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that the “handshake” has had any effect on peace and security at national and local level?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the reconciliation trickled down to make people feel more represented by public institutions?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the key drivers and triggers of VE and recruitment?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider juvenile gangs part of VE?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How prevalent is VE in your community?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a connection between juvenile gangs and</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Participant Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Extremist organisations? b) Returnees? c) What is the connection?</td>
<td>elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2: To ensure that Search and/or other actors do no harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there been any negative change as a result of the project activities?</td>
<td>FGD, KII Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there changes to the activity design that you would recommend?</td>
<td>FGD, KII Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is working well?</td>
<td>FGD, KII Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: To promote dialogue, reflection and reduction of tensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who does your community look for or go to when they want to resolve conflict?</td>
<td>FGD, KII Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any new mechanisms for conflict resolution in your community? Are there any old or outdated mechanisms that are no longer effective?</td>
<td>FGD, KII Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of County CVE Plans and opportunities involved in CVE plan development and application?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship between County and national government and how does this relationship impact on the implementation of strategic development plans including CVE?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the entry points and windows of opportunity for peace that the project can take advantage of?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role and legitimacy of religious actors in CVE?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role and legitimacy of elected politicians in CVE?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role and legitimacy of council of elders in CVE?</td>
<td>FGD, KII</td>
<td>Youth (18-35yrs), Women, Young mothers, Council of elders, elected officials (County and National government), State security actors and CBOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Do No Harm and Conflict Sensitivity

Since the scan will be conducted in conflict prone areas, there are a number of risks involved in conducting the exercise. First is the context in which the scan is conducted. The scan will bear in mind that any slight behavioral or procedural change could easily trigger conflict. Secondly, participants may not be willing to share information for fear of profiling. Lastly, age and gender differences could also be a risk factor. For instance, youth may not open up when put together with elders. Similarly, women and young mothers playing a passive role during a joint discussion with elders and youth.

The scan will be attentive to conflict sensitivity issues by ensuring that it is contextual and culturally sensitive. The scan will take into consideration cultural hierarchy, division of power and gender norms. Participants’ identity will be kept confidential and all data collected will be made anonymous. No documents (including notes and data collection reports) will name individuals, but instead will give a generic, non-identifiable description. The agreement of the participants will be a precondition to their participation, as well as their consent. Interviewers will ensure that participants know they could stop or withdraw at any time. In this respect, consent forms and information tools will be developed. The interviews and all other activities related to data collection will take place in clear, safe and reassuring places according to the comfort of the respondents.

Risk Assessment

8. Data Quality Assurance and Management

The first draft of the tools will be written by Search staff in country, in collaboration with the Institutional Learning Team’s Regional Specialist and implementing partners. Every question in the tool will be analysed to ensure that it is contextual and culturally appropriate. More so, it will be analysed to ensure that it does not cause harm to any stakeholder and that it is gender sensitive.

The DM&E officer supported by the Regional DM&E Specialist will conduct quality assurance on data collected. All data collected will be digitized and stored in google drive under the June conflict scan folder.

The first draft of the report will be written by the DM&E officer. Search staff in country and the Institutional Learning Team’s Regional Specialist will then review the report. Once the review team is finalized, the conflict scan report will be ready for dissemination.
9. Dissemination and Utilization of the Report

[In this section, please outline the strategy for sharing the report findings to different audiences, both internal and external.]

**Internal**

Search employs learning and utilization-focused M&E practices, and in line with these expectations will organize a sharing meeting with the project team to reflect on the lessons learned from the conflict scan. The project team will include: Search in country staff, the regional program team and the regional Institutional Learning Team. The Country Director will be responsible for developing a utilization plan to adapt the program to study findings or suggest larger strategic changes for the team that extend beyond the project.

**External**

In line with its policy of transparency, Search will publish the report on its website. Hard copies of the report will also be produced and distributed to all the KIIs that participated in the exercise.

A two-level dissemination workshop will be conducted. The first level dissemination workshop will comprise of KIIs and implementing partners. All KIIs and Implementing partners will be brought together in a joint workshop after which findings will be shared.

The second level dissemination workshop will be conducted at the grassroot level. All FGD participants will be brought together in each county. Findings will then be shared in simple, easy to understand manner taking into consideration the varying educational level.

10. Key Deliverables and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Deadline/Estimated Time</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical and logistical preparation of mission</td>
<td>28\textsuperscript{th} May-11\textsuperscript{th} June</td>
<td>Judy and Carlotta?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th} June</td>
<td>Judy, Susan &amp; Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of survey agents</td>
<td>11\textsuperscript{th} – 12\textsuperscript{th} June</td>
<td>Judy &amp; Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>13\textsuperscript{th} – 15\textsuperscript{th} June</td>
<td>Susan &amp; Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{th} June</td>
<td>Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft of report</td>
<td>27\textsuperscript{th} June</td>
<td>Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of report by program team and ILT</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} July</td>
<td>Judy &amp; Carlotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of report</td>
<td>6th July</td>
<td>Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval and sharing including back with communities</td>
<td>13th July</td>
<td>ILT &amp; Inuka partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL TIME ESTIMATED**

11. **Budget**

*Removed.*