SAFERWORLD
PREVENTING VIOLENT CONFLICT. BUILDING SAFER LIVES

briefing

Isiolo County conflict analysis

Introduction

Isiolo County, like all other counties in northern Kenya, is arid. Most of its residents are pastoralists who move from one place to another in search of water and pasture for their livestock. The scarcity of these resources has often resulted in violent conflict as these pastoralist communities struggle to acquire and control the little that is available. This conflict and violence mainly takes the form of cattle rustling, inter-ethnic violence, and displacement. The environment has also changed drastically due to stress on existing resources, resulting in an increase in droughts, famines, and other natural catastrophes. The pastoralists are also facing myriad new land related conflicts, some of which are related to administrative and electoral boundaries. It is claimed that the recurrent violent conflicts in Isiolo County have been aggravated by the presence of small arms and light weapons; tensions with agricultural communities, especially those at the boundary with Meru County; and human–wildlife conflicts that are intensified by competing uses of land for commercial ranching and wildlife conservation, amongst others.

It is evident that the nature of pastoralist conflict has also changed over time and that new dynamics are at play. The recent increase in importance of northern Kenya and the politics surrounding devolution has had an effect on the conflict context in counties such as Isiolo, which had been ignored in the past. Isiolo County is known as the transit town or gateway to northern Kenya and has attracted a lot of interest as it has been earmarked as one of the beneficiaries of the national government's mega projects and is set to benefit from an international airport, a resort city, and a railway link under the proposed Lamu Port South Sudan–Ethiopia Transport project – making the County even more of a critical gateway to the north. This is expected to intensify development, leading to more secure livelihoods, better wellbeing, and a greater propensity for peace. Despite these positive upcoming developments, a lack of an understanding of devolution and complex political and economic interests converge to fan violence among Isiolo's communities. While the conflicts and violence in Isiolo County may appear to be the usual traditional pastoral communities' competition for pasture and grazing land, dominant political and economic interests are emerging as major drivers of ethnic violence in the county.[1]

This briefing examines the impact the devolution of governance has had on the drivers of conflict in Isiolo County, analysing people's perceptions of a range of issues, including the accountability of county governance structures, public participation, and fairness in resource allocation, and their potential to exacerbate existing tensions or give rise to new conflict situations in Isiolo County. The assessment covered five wards in Isiolo County and involved community members, representatives of the county and national governments, IPL staff, and other civil society organisations operating in Isiolo.

Drivers of Accountability

This briefing is based on a conflict assessment of Isiolo County undertaken by Isiolo Peace Link (IPL) with support from Saferworld. The analysis is produced under Saferworld's *Drivers of Accountability* programme, currently being implemented in three counties in Kenya. This programme supports conflict-sensitive approaches to devolved governance by supporting national level and county institutions to develop the knowledge, expertise, and resources to adopt conflict-sensitive approaches to public participation and service delivery. The programme also supports communities to hold their county administrations to account and to act as a check on any potential abuse of power.

The assessment revealed that both the administration and wider public have an increased awareness of the conflict implications of political decision-making. The general public and official authorities' better understanding of the impact of governance processes in affecting and exacerbating conflict is widely believed to have positively impacted the 2013 elections, paving the way for a more peaceful process than was anticipated and providing a stronger basis for the transition to devolved governance in the

[1] Sharamo, R, 'The politics of pastoral violence: A case study of Isiolo County, Northern Kenya', June 2014 .http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/Futureagriculture/FAC_Working_Paper_095.pdf accessed on August 2014.

County, including more deliberate steps to create a more inclusive executive.

A range of positive benefits were identified from the devolution process in Isiolo, including evidence of infrastructure development (especially the construction of roads) and perceived improvements in healthcare and education services. Many of those interviewed for this analysis felt that the County leadership was relatively accessible and that if the people 'raise their voices', they will be heard, praising efforts to increase levels of access to information, particularly through the use of information boards at the ward level.

However, discussions with representatives of the national and county governments and communities revealed a more complex picture. The remits of the county governor and the county commissioner overlap, and where they do, there are tensions. The county governor is an elected official, selected by the local, county population; the county commissioner is a national government appointee. Both have responsibility for similar areas, but are accountable to either the local people or the national government, respectively. A significant area of discord concerns security, which has not been devolved to county level, but is an area that greatly concerns the governor.

There are also other challenges linked to devolution in Isiolo County. While communities largely agree that there is evidence of development initiatives, particularly infrastructure development, they feel that the process involved in the award of tenders is unsatisfactory, and while the relationship between the county and national administrations is more amicable than is the national trend, a feeling of suspicion persists at an individual level, which may be born of ignorance as well as confusion over the division of powers between levels of government. Finally, many – particularly within authorities – felt that citizens in Isiolo County have so far failed to take advantage of devolution to engage with the county leadership, and this had hampered efforts to support more meaningful public participation, as provided for by the Constitution.

This briefing makes a number of recommendations, including a renewed programme of civic education for the public, provision of relevant trainings, and information, education and communication materials to enhance the capacity and increase the awareness of both the public and the leaders on public participation and accountability, establishment of processes that will ensure shared understanding between the people and the leadership, especially on tender allocation, and the participatory allocation of resources, including bursary funds among others.

Methodology

This briefing is based on a field assessment carried out in July 2014 by IPL and a desk review of relevant publications as well as feedback from the validation workshop undertaken with community members and county authorities. The field assessment employed qualitative data collection methods. Through structured focus group discussions, the interviewees participated in a joint analysis of their County to examine conflict dynamics current in their localities. The assessment was conducted in five wards in Isiolo County: Wabera, Bula Pesa, Burat, Ngare Mara, Kinna and Oldonyiro. The selection of wards was based on a ward history of conflict and the need to ensure equal ethnic representation in the research.

The assessment sought to understand:

- people's perceptions regarding the performance of the county in planning and decision-making processes, including issues of access, inclusivity and public participation and gender dimensions;
- power dynamics and relations between different structures and levels within Isiolo County and how these relate to conflict;
- existing interventions/mechanisms promoting accountability and conflict sensitivity at the county level;
- existing mechanisms for peace and conflict, including early warning and response mechanisms;
- an understanding of and capacity for conflict sensitivity among county officials.

Focus group discussions and key informant interviews were designed to ensure equal ethnic representation. Forty community members (25 men and 15 women, comprising a mix of youth and the elderly) took part in three focus group discussions. In addition, 10 interviews were conducted with selected key informants. The individuals interviewed were selected for their knowledge of the community and the Isiolo County context, taking into consideration the various locations and sub-ethnic groups in the area; they included local leaders as well as civil society representatives, county and national government officials.

The assessment team also reviewed documents with relevant information on the context in order to gain further understanding, including the National Conflict Mapping and Analysis, 'Embracing the practice of conflict sensitive approaches: An analysis of the Kenya context'[2] and the forthcoming National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC) County Profiles report.

[2] http://www.conflictsensitivity.org/publications/embracing-practice-conflict-sensitive-approaches-analysis-kenyan-context. accessed on 05 June 2014.

Context

Isiolo County, located in the upper eastern region of Kenya, is arid territory, with temperatures ranging from 12°C to 28° and rainfall between 150 mm to 650 mm per annum. It borders Wajir County to the east, Garissa County to the south east, Marsabit County to the north, Samburu and Laikipia Counties to the west and Meru and Tana River Counties to the south.

The County, whose capital and largest town is Isiolo, has a population of 143,294 according to the 2009 census, 49 per cent of whom are female.[3] It is one of the counties earmarked for development under the Kenya Vision 2030 programme which aims to transform Kenya into a middle income country by 2030, with plans to develop Isiolo town into a 'resort city' to boost tourism to the area.[4]

Isiolo's main inhabitants are the Samburu, Turkana, Borana, Somali, and Meru ethnic groups. Historically – prior to independence – Isiolo has seen persistent conflicts over resources between these communities. The County has also witnessed regular political conflict between ethnic groups, particularly around elections, resulting from the contest for political control and domination, which occasionally turns violent.

Following a number of violent, multi-faceted conflicts experienced in Isiolo County between 2008 and 2011, the intensity of which were magnified by the widespread use of illegal small arms and light weapons, there seems to be an appreciation of the impacts of conflict. This has resulted in a wider move towards cooperation and peacebuilding between ethnic groups, including an increasing number of joint forums between different ethnic leaders. This was especially notable in the processes leading to the March 2013 elections with Isiolo County remaining peaceful throughout the electoral process despite predictions that it would be a violence hotspot.

Absent voices: a case study of the Isiolo mega dam

The construction of a mega dam in Isiolo County has received mixed reactions, with some local communities protesting they will lose some of the fragile ecosystems which supply them with water. Communities negatively affected by the project claimed that they had been excluded from the process of identifying the location of the dam.

"We have never been consulted on this matter about the construction of the dam. We are a pastoralist community and our livestock depend on water and pasture largely. We don't have many rivers here, only Ewaso Nyiro, if it dries we are finished," Halkano Diba from Bulabao village laments. Similar views are expressed by some local leaders who claim the dam may cause serious water problems if certain factors are not taken into consideration. Generally, Isiolo is a water-scarce region and anything done to its ecosystems that may tamper with the water supply could lead to a huge setback for the struggling population.

Ewaso River Users Empowerment Platform chairman, Rashid Guyo, says, "This proposed dam has a lot of economic implications on the population here. First, what we need to understand is that the only source of water in this region is Ewaso Nyiro river; we perceive this river will be affected largely by this mega dam project. Our people have not been involved in any consultative forums. They are the custodians of this resource but nobody bothers to talk to them." Rashid notes how as an organisation, they are concerned by the state of affairs concerning the construction of the dam, and they need a full report on the environmental impact assessment that will incorporate the people's views together with the expert input.

Residents claim that they have never been involved in any consultation forums about the Sh. 10 billion twin dam to be constructed at Crocodile Jaws and Ngerendare which will be served by Ewaso Nyiro river. The dam is meant to supply water to the Isiolo Resort City which is part of the Government's Vision 2030 blueprint that aims to transform Kenya into a middle income country by 2030.

According to the Ministry of Environment, Water and Mineral Resources, under the economic pillar of Vision 2030, the government intends to develop a resort city that provides sustainable world-class living standards and working environments – a centre for finance, trade, business, services, sports, leisure and entertainment. And this calls for the supply of sufficient quantities of clean water to the city.

Drivers of conflict

Political rivalry

Recent conflict in Isiolo County has primarily been between the Turkana and Borana communities. Tensions between these communities date back to the 2007 elections when a parliamentary candidate from the Turkana community was supported by a large section of the Samburu community living in the county to contest the Isiolo North constituency seat, which had been traditionally held by a member of the Borana community. The Turkana and Samburu communities had come together to challenge what they considered a long-term political dominance by

[3] https://www.opendata.go.ke/Population/Vol-1-A-Summary-Population-Distribution-by-Distric/jizy-xanw

[4] http://www.vision2030.go.ke/

the Borana community. The Borana candidate won the parliamentary seat, but with a very small margin. The win was attributed to an alliance between the Borana community and the local Somali community.

The election results created long-term tensions between the communities and are considered to be partly responsible for the increasing incidences of ethnic conflicts in Isiolo, which have drawn other communities, including the Meru and Rendille, into the conflicts. The Meru and Rendille communities, being minorities, feel that the continued dominance of the Borana community is likely to ensure that they remain marginalised and do not benefit from the distribution of resources and governance positions.

The same rivalry was anticipated during the March 2013 elections because of expectations that with the devolution of government resources to previously neglected regions, land boundaries and political positions would become increasingly contested. As a consequence, significant efforts were put into building cohesion between the community groups and negotiating modalities for power sharing that would be considered fair by the major community groups. This resulted in a relatively peaceful election period and transition, but it was not without its tensions; during the election period, intra- and inter-ethnic tensions began to centre on income and socio-economic status, with poorer sections of communities feeling marginalised and neglected.

During the assessment, concerns were also raised as to the impact of Isiolo town's planned economic expansion as part of the Vision 2030 agenda on local rivalries and resource conflicts. There are concerns that Vision 2030 has served to further reinforce rivalries and resource based conflicts between the ethnic groups as the different ethnic groups try to position themselves in such a way that they directly benefit from any windfalls that come as a result of the project. There have also been allegations that politicians and other influential individuals are using the ethnic animosity that has existed between the communities to evict them from perceived prime lands through incitement to violence if they fail to leave the areas they have settled. Areas particularly affected by this include Isiolo Central, Tigania East, and disputed areas like Gambella, Ngaremara, Chumvi, and Kiwanja.

Dominant political agendas in Isiolo County have revolved around ethno-political competition to control and dominate the county government. Through such political dominance, groups seek to accumulate economic resources to generate wealth and better their positions in relation to rival communities. Some of the community members interviewed felt that there were sections of communities dominating leadership and political decision making in Isiolo. For example, in Kambi Garba in Burat Ward, one of the least developed areas of the county, many perceived that divide and rule tactics have meant that young people in particular have not been able to come together and establish a cohesive front from which to advocate to the county authorities. The result is a situation where many respondents from Bula Odha claim that 1 per cent of the population determines the political and economic destiny of the entire population.[5] According to the respondents, this is a trend that is emerging in a number of areas within the county and which needs urgent attention.

Natural-resource-based conflicts

Pastoral and agro-pastoral communities predominantly occupy Isiolo County, and limited grazing resources including water have historically contributed to conflict. Recurrent dry spells and drought in the surrounding counties have resulted in diminished pasture reserves, and the subsequent movement of livestock from the adjoining counties of Wajir, Marsabit, Tana River, Samburu, and Garissa. These livestock movements tend to converge in Isiolo and compete with local livestock for the grazing resources. The resulting resource depletion is exacerbated by the failure of communities migrating into Isiolo County in search of water and pasture to follow traditional resource-sharing mechanisms. It was noted that many instances where migrants are aware of negotiated rules of access, but act in disregard of these.

Closely related have been agro-pastoralist conflicts, particularly between members of the Turkana, Meru, and the Somali communities. In particular, the migration of camels is always associated with conflict because they are often left to roam and therefore to graze on any available vegetation, foraging on food crops, reserve pastures, and live fences (fences made of thorny plants). Conflict resulting from these disputes has turned violent. In 2012, fighting between members of the Turkana and Somali communities, with some Borana involvement, led to at least ten deaths and the displacement of over 2,000 people.

Land/boundary disputes

Land in Isiolo County is held in trust on behalf of the community under the Trust Lands Act Cap 288. However, land ownership rights have been complicated by political and ethnic considerations that have negatively impacted the conflict context in Isiolo County. Politicians in Isiolo have been accused of using land ownership as a political tool, making promises about ensuring ownership of contested parcels of land to get support from people from their own ethnic communities. The tensions that relate to land claims are anticipated to increase as the Isiolo Resort City takes shape. Closely related to this is the establishment of wildlife conservancies in Isiolo County, which have generated mixed reactions from

[5] Focus group discussion participants in Bula Odha, Burat Ward.

the different ethnic groups in the county, with some communities supporting the establishment of the conservancies while others feel they have been created to deny communities access to grazing areas. This is mainly attributed to a lack of information between those establishing the conservancies and the communities.

Devolution: threats and opportunities

From the analysis, it emerged that there is some positive progress by the county government and devolution is beginning to have an impact. However, there are still, which, if addressed constructively, provide opportunities for positive change.

Relationships between different levels of government

The analysis initially revealed a relatively cordial working relationship between the different levels of government within the county as well as across the county governments and the representatives of the national government; however, where national government appointees were in place at county level, there were tensions between county officials and national appointees.

The county commissioner and governor: roles and responsibilities

The county commissioner and county governor in Isiolo have openly shared information, especially with regard to their roles within the County. The commissioner shared guidelines so that there is clarity of purpose. The commissioner stated that he has on various occasions consulted with the governor on issues related to security in the County, even though he was not obliged to do so..

Discussions with various leaders indicated an intention on the part of the two structures to share information and commit to seeking opportunities for collaboration on development issues, particularly on the issue of county security.

Discussions held with respondents revealed that the two levels of government have been able to hold meetings and update each other on issues of concern, including on security matters. However, it emerged that despite these efforts, there remains suspicion on the division of responsibility within the various structures and positions, not only between national and county authorities but also within the county structures. This has been attributed, by a number of those interviewed, to the fact that a widespread civic education programme has never been implemented for either the public or for members of the administration, resulting in limited knowledge of the provisions of the Constitution and enacting legislation regulating devolution. In addition, these cordial relationships have slowly been eroded by the wrangles that have been witnessed between the County government and the County Assembly, which has served to slow down development processes within Isiolo.

Accountability and oversight mechanisms within the county

The Isiolo County government has taken steps towards establishing accountability and oversight mechanisms, including systems that involve the general public. An SMS system has been created for members of the public to send information and questions regarding county affairs, particularly on the budgeting process. It also emerged that the Members of the County Assembly in Isiolo County have been able to provide oversight to the executive though various departmental/house committees. The County has also engaged both external and internal auditors as part of the oversight over the expenditure of the county government.

However, despite these efforts, many community participants continued to report that they felt alienated from county processes.

The impact of efforts to consult and involve citizens is considered very limited. For example, the majority of those interviewed during this assessment were aware of budgeting processes going on, but were ignorant of meetings the executive claimed to have held within their wards. Many were not aware of the existence of the SMS number and the communications strategy for this SMS number remained unclear.

Many emphasised that the procurement and tendering process required specific attention as the Isiolo County government establishes itself. This would include a proposed digitalised procurement system, which has yet to be implemented, to address concerns about the transparency and fairness of the tendering process.

A number of respondents felt that some of the big developments might actually be meant for ‘display’ rather than use, because they have had no information regarding their access and user rights. One example highlighted the purchase of tractors where the farming communities claim they had no information on the purchase and the intended use, including how they could access vehicles and usage costs.

Service delivery

The majority of respondents emphasised significant changes in service delivery following the establishment of the County government. Key areas highlighted included improvements in healthcare, particularly the increasing availability of medication, better waiting times for treatment, and the purchase

of ambulances intended to cover all wards in the county. There were reported improvements in education; targets have been set for both primary and secondary schools and bursaries created to support poor students to continue their education. There was also evidence of infrastructural developments in most parts of Isiolo town and its environs.

However, a number of gaps were identified. Most respondents felt that the development initiatives are too concentrated around Isiolo town and that the effects of devolution are yet to be felt in interior or remote parts of Isiolo County. While this was in part attributed to the fact that the county is still in transition, it is important for the county to take steps to address this perception and to publicly set out its plans for rural areas of the county. This is particularly the case where those areas overlap with the existing conflict fault lines, that is, areas where the interior areas are associated with ethnic groups that already feel left out in the county due to political affiliations.

Other gaps related to processes of initiating development projects. The majority of respondents felt that some of the proposed initiatives did not necessarily reflect community priorities. Examples cited included the purchase of tractors despite a significant percentage of the county community being pastoralists. Others include the purchase of ambulances where communities did not feel adequately informed about how these would be distributed or how they would have access to them. In addition, there were concerns that communities are neither consulted nor informed about development projects, and as such have no way of monitoring processes to ensure accountability.

Public participation in decision-making processes

There are various provisions for citizen participation in the county government affairs in the constitution and particularly in the County Government Act, 2012, including in processes of policy and law making and in directing county strategies. Focus group discussions with the public, however, revealed that these provisions remain largely unknown. As a result, the levels of participation remain low and the citizens feel unable to demand inclusion in ongoing processes. Added to the challenge is that large sections of those consulted for this research are not interested in playing this role. A number of respondents believed there would be no difference between public consultation meetings and the previous chief *barazas*,[6] who did not support them to play a leading role in local governance.

There is a strong disconnect between public opinions and the opinions of the county leadership regarding the level of participation that has been achieved and whether adequate opportunities are provided for effective citizen participation. While Isiolo County leadership felt that they had created opportunities for public participation and provided information to facilitate this, community members who were mostly unaware of these efforts felt that these had been done as a formality to meet the requirements of the Constitution, claiming that information is only provided to those who are close to the leaders in question. Many felt that this locked out other political perspectives, particularly those that would be more critical of the administration. The majority of community participants also stated that they considered it a 'favour' to be called on to take part in county decision-making processes and activities, emphasising the low levels of community awareness about their right to participate in governance, and reducing their ability to challenge issues even where they feel gaps exist.

According to Dola, a resident from Bula Pesa: "The county officers are human beings; if you do not ask them, they will take advantage and not give, so it's up to us to find ways of asking the right questions."

More positively, many respondents felt there were opportunities for citizens to have their voices heard. While the county government has a responsibility to create opportunities for public participation, the onus also lies on citizens to organise themselves to influence decisions. In some areas, for example in Tulo, Roba, and Bula Pesa, the citizens have questioned service provision in the health facilities, resulting in improvements. They have also raised concerns regarding the quality of the construction of a marram road, which led to authorities summoning the contractor to discuss these concerns.

Resource allocation and citizen perceptions

Improvements to education services in Isiolo County, and particularly the bursary programme for poor children, were highlighted as key successes of devolution in Isiolo. However, as with many other processes, many community members felt excluded from the programme and were suspicious as a result. They raised questions over formation of committees at ward/village level to oversee initiatives such as the bursary allocation process and whether these committees were genuinely inclusive. There were concerns that there were disparities in the selection criteria used to identify the students most in need of support and concerns that differing amounts were given to different people.

[6] Community meetings or forums that are convened by the chiefs to discuss issues of concern within those communities as well as to share government policies on various issues.

It is important to note that while there might be justification for the varying amounts allocated to different students, particularly those with different levels of education, the county authorities need to publicly set out its criteria for selection. The absence of this information has created a vacuum for people to draw their own conclusion: a recipe for tensions between different groups.

Conclusion

It is clear that devolution has renewed hope in many who now feel increasingly involved in government decision-making processes and feel that the government has been brought closer to them. However, the analysis reveals that deep-seated issues, including widespread marginalisation, insecurity, poverty, drought, and famine, in Isiolo County continue to have a powerful impact. Although there is optimism that devolution will improve conditions, the continuing challenges mean some citizens are fast losing hope in the process. In order for the process of devolution to be successful and avoid further perceptions of marginalisation, measures urgently need to be put in place by the leadership and citizens themselves under a Constitution, which gives both a role and an equal measure of responsibility.

County governance processes in Isiolo County have the potential to either enhance cohesion and promote development or cause tensions between groups and derail the development process. There is a need to reduce ethnic, sub-ethnic, and clan competitions over local resources; to encourage and support cross sub-ethnic activities and partners and help bridge sub-ethnic groups in order to initiate processes that will in the long run create a culture of good governance, transforming opportunities for the people in Isiolo County and promoting just distribution of resources.

Isiolo County authorities and key decision makers must urgently consider the recommendations stated below if the impact of the devolved process is to be felt at the grassroots.

Recommendations

To the Isiolo County authorities

- Ensure any and all committees represent all areas and ethnic groups. The selection criteria for community representatives who will be involved in implementation of projects should be transparent and communicated.
- Set out a clear communications strategy that identifies and diversifies channels of information sharing and ensures that all citizens are able to access information. This should include: working with local FM radio stations, which are trusted; the creation of social media pages; and the use of information boards at ward and village levels.
- Establish and promote accountability mechanisms that involve members of the public. This should include a specific complaints feedback mechanism and inter-community or inter-ward accountability teams made up of government and public representatives' teams.
- Conduct civic education emphasising the roles and responsibilities of citizens under the Constitution, and the roles and functions of the county government structure to promote and support their effective participation.
- Increase the accessibility of the administration, including by establishing offices at ward level.
- Maximise transparency in the vetting of officials and issuing of tenders and job allocations in the county, including by using a advertisements and notices to reach the widest possible range of people.
- Monitor and publicly report on the gender and ethnic balance within the county government and take steps to ensure employment is open to citizens of all ethnic groups in the county.
- Establish a county peace infrastructure that links the villages and the wards through the existing local peace committees and the county levels, enabling them to monitor, manage, and respond to any emerging conflicts.
- In consultation with the local communities, prioritise development projects focusing on building resilience to drought. This should be linked to natural resource management and sharing mechanisms between different communities within the county and building links with neighbouring counties, particularly Samburu and Marsabit.
- Publicly set out and consult on plans for supporting the development needs of the county as a whole, particularly with regards to rural and remote areas, emphasising infrastructure and investment development.

To non-governmental organisations:

- Consider initiating regular monitoring and evaluation of projects to reduce the potential for corruption among those involved.
- Undertake continuous community awareness and capacity building on the role of citizens in identification and prioritisation of service delivery and development initiatives.
- Assist in the identification of accountability related gaps at the county and community

levels and undertake advocacy to address these gaps.

- Actively engage in conflict analysis and early warning so as to advise the county government and other stakeholders on potential conflict areas and issues for quick action.
- Support engagement in constructive rather than destructive group competition to foster cohesion through activities such as cultural days, sporting activities, business activities, among others.

Acknowledgments

This analysis was researched and written by Emmie Auma with contributions from Thomas Nyagah, Bonita Ayuko and Kathryn Achilles. Saferworld would also like acknowledge Isiolo Peace Link for their logistical support and assistance in data collection.

Saferworld would like to thank all the interviewees in Isiolo who agreed to participate in the focus groups discussions and interviews.

Saferworld would also like to thank UKAID for their financial support.

UKaid
from the British people

Towards a peaceful and cohesive society
ISIOLO PEACE LINK

About Isiolo Peace Link (IPL)

Isiolo Peace Link (IPL) is a community based network that brings together youth, women, faith-based and other civil society organisations and works closely with the county authorities and law enforcement agencies on security issues. IPL focuses on community level security initiatives such as small arms and light weapons control, facilitation of community dialogue and settling disputes as well as community policing. IPL is part of local early warning and early response structures that work closely with the National Steering Committee on Peace Building and Conflict Management, which coordinates national action on peace. IPL provides a useful interface structure between the government and community in responding to conflict and security situations in Isiolo County.

About Saferworld

Saferworld is an independent international organisation working to prevent violent conflict and build safer lives. We work with local people affected by conflict to improve their safety and sense of security, and conduct wider research and analysis. We use this evidence and learning to improve local, national and international policies and practices that can help build lasting peace. Our priority is people – we believe that everyone should be able to lead peaceful, fulfilling lives, free from insecurity and violent conflict.

We are a not-for-profit organisation with programmes in nearly 20 countries and territories across Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Europe.

Saferworld – 28 Charles Square, London N1 6HT, UK
Registered Charity no 1043843
Company limited by guarantee no 3015948
Tel: +44 (0)20 7324 4646 | *Fax*: +44 (0)20 7324 4647
Email: general@saferworld.org.uk
Web: www.saferworld.org.uk

Isiolo County