



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Those who direct USIP funded projects are required to submit narrative and financial performance reports outlining project progress and accomplishments. As outlined on page two of the Statement of Grant Conditions and Special Provisions document, these reports are due at specified regular intervals during the grant period and at the conclusion of the grant. Unless other arrangements are made with the Grant Oversight Officer, signers of the grant award Acceptance Form are responsible for the content and timely submission of these reports.

USIP provides two report forms for submission of grantee reports. Please use Award Enclosure 1 for narrative reports and Award Enclosure 2 for financial reports. Please remember that an authorizing official at the grantee institution must sign all financial reports before they are submitted to USIP.

Failure to submit reports as scheduled will result in delayed payments or the interruption or termination of the grant at the discretion of USIP.

Guidelines

- Interim and final reports serve to measure progress of a grant supported project
- These reports help USIP administer its grant supported projects effectively and monitor expenditure of the award.
- Electronic versions of reports should be submitted to the USIP Program Officer responsible for the project.

Interim Reports

- Interim reports are scheduled periodically throughout the grant period. Grant payments are contingent upon the review and clearance of reports.
- USIP provides two report forms (in hard copy or electronic format) for submission of grantee reports. Please attach relevant photos, training materials, and other documents such as published reports, surveys, etc.
- Failure to submit reports as scheduled will result in delayed payments or termination of the grant at the discretion of USIP

Close Out Reports

- Grantees must submit a narrative and financial close out form within 90 days after the end of the grant period
- These forms can be found in your award package, and will be resent after receiving the penultimate interim reports

Products

- If any grant products have been completed, please include an electronic copy of those products with your report. For books, please mail two hard copies to the Responsible Program Officer at USIP:

Your Assigned Program Officer
United States Institute of Peace
2301 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037



**GRANT REPORTING FORM
Award Enclosure 1**

USIP Grant Number	SG-417-15 WARRIORS TO PEACE GUARDIANS INITIATIVE (WPGI)		
Project Director(s)	Prabha Sankaranarayan		
Organization	Mediators Beyond Borders International		
Reporting Period	March 15, 2015 – September 30, 2016	Final?	Yes xx No
Report Due Date	December 29, 2016	Reporting Phase	Phase II
Proposed Changes (check all that apply, & elaborate on page 4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Budget	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeline	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
Were any grant products completed?	Yes No XX	If yes, follow the guidelines below for product submission	
Did the project receive external funding during this reporting period?	Yes No XX	If yes, include the name attach a list of the amount received from each source. ²	
Complete this section if the project provided any training sessions during this reporting period.	Yes XX No	Total number of individuals trained by this project: 77	



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

II. NARRATIVE SUMMARY – PROJECT CLOSEOUT

Complete the Monitoring and Evaluation close out form. Copy the Goal, Objective, and Indicator information from the Monitoring and Evaluation form that USIP approved with your application. Next, complete the four Data columns according to the work conducted over the course of the project. Finally, complete the Impact section by explaining how the results of the project's activities relate to the original goal of the project.

Overview of Project Adaptations

As discussed in the previous interim reports, the project design evolved over time based on community input and changes in conditions on the ground. The activities and results outlined in the following table, while related to the Theories of Change (TOC), are therefore not a linear reflection between the objectives outlined in the proposal and what actually occurred.

The project originally envisioned training Peace Guardian Professionals from Nairobi and Baringo, who would in turn mentor and train Community Peace Guardians (Objectives 1-3). Based on recommendations from the three communities, this shifted in the early Nakuru meetings. The work focus moved away from Nairobi to Baringo participants; this meant that trained Peace Guardians (PGs) consisted almost entirely (97%) of Baringo professionals and community members selected by their communities. It was also decided that only the six (6) Peace Guardian Core (PGC) members should be trained as trainers (TOT) who also developed the PG curriculum.

A larger than anticipated group of Baringo PGs (63 rather than 40) were trained in two sessions and bonded as PGs. Bonding became a critical component of all joint meetings to increase inter-community coordination and relationships. The cost savings of not transporting large numbers of participants from Nairobi to Baringo further allowed the project to conduct a greater range of meetings and events in the field which brought together professionals, community leaders, government officials and key conflict actors across ethnic lines of division, consistent with TOC 2.

As our work progressed, it became clear that the emphasis for our local partners was on TOC 2, and participants and staff had difficulty with the concepts encompassed in TOC 1 regarding mediation and negotiation skills development. As discussed in Section III, staff skills deficits and turnover combined with cultural challenges led to significant irregularities in the surveys and dispute database, such that we determined the statistical data could not be trusted sufficiently to identify quantitative results. Therefore, proxy indicators are used from extensive qualitative data collected as indicated in the Results column, and may reflect more on the theory of change than the objective as originally articulated.

Objective 6 assumed that a joint peace committee could be formed; however, once the PGs were identified it became clear that the conflict was spread over too large an area to convene the three communities regularly in a single committee. This was directly related to the dynamic nature of the conflict when the project started. Communities within proximity to each other are finding other ways, such as water and pasture committees,



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

collaborative irrigation projects and shared markets, to work across ethnic lines. Other alternatives are being discussed, including expanding the Ruko Conservancy, and a new PG-led community based organization.

All project data was analyzed qualitatively using NVivo 11 qualitative software. Proxy indicators were developed based on PG narratives provided to staff; staff, PGC and Mediators Beyond Borders International (MBBI) observations and meeting notes; focus group notes; and most significant change questions answered by narrative and in groups during the August 2016 meeting.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

Objective (From M&E Plan)	Indicator (From M&E Plan)	Activity (What did you do?)	Results (What happened?)
<p>Theory of Change 2: IF we bring community leaders together across sectarian, ethnic or other lines of division...</p> <p>Objective 1: Urban and Baringo Professionals who are members of the warring Tugen, IlChamus and Pokot ethnic groups of Baringo County will reconcile with one another and bond as Peace Guardian Professionals (committed to joint promotion of non-violent conflict resolution between themselves, and within and between members of their tribal communities in remote Baringo County).</p>	<p>4 events that bring community leaders together [across lines of divide]</p>	<p>The project convened a total of 13 multi-ethnic events:</p> <p>6 joint UP meetings in Nairobi.</p> <p>2 bonding/conflict assessment residential workshops in Nakuru.</p> <p>2 residential trainings with multi-ethnic bonding of women, youth and elder PGs selected by their communities in Marigat Baringo.</p> <p>3 multi-ethnic community meetings in Baringo, each preceded by single community meetings.</p>	<p>PGs from all three ethnic groups reported a significant increase in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interethnic cooperation • interethnic relationships • freedom of movement across community lines • opening of inter-ethnic markets • reopening of schools closed by conflict • reopening of roadways closed by conflict
	<p>2 multi-ethnic training sessions</p> <p>40 people trained in conflict resolution skills</p>	<p>6 people from 4 ethnic communities trained as trainers in 4 sessions.</p> <p>2-day residential training in Dec 2015 with 31 PGs, 3-day residential training in Feb 2016 with 30 PGs, with 3rd training day for Dec. trainees and full group bonding.</p> <p>Total of 77 individuals trained in conflict resolution skills.</p>	<p>MBBI trained and mentored a core team of 6 trainers that are already being asked to provide trainings for other organizations in Kenya.</p> <p>PGs reported that this was the first time all three communities were brought together for training and bonding.</p>
	<p>50% change in perceived mediation/negotiation expertise</p> <p>50% change in confidence about ability to resolve disputes</p>	<p>Training sessions and bonding noted above.</p>	<p>No reliable data available on these indicators.</p> <p><i>Please see narrative section for details.</i></p>



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

Objective (From M&E Plan)	Indicator (From M&E Plan)	Activity (What did you do?)	Results (What happened?)
<p>Theory of Change 2: AND we see an increase in interaction and trust ...</p> <p>Objective 2: Reconciled and bonded Urban and Baringo Professionals from all three ethnic groups who have completed basic mediation and peacebuilding training will practice non-violent conflict resolution amongst themselves and in their daily lives.</p>	<p>50% change in # of interactions of members of divided groups</p> <p>50% change in levels of trust between members of divided groups</p> <p>30 people trained in conflict resolution skills</p>	<p>Field staff collected weekly reports from PGs regarding participation in a range of dispute resolution processes.</p> <p>PG participation in joint meetings listed for Objective 1 above.</p> <p>Mediation and peacebuilding training conducted for 68 total individuals from December 2015 to February 2016.</p>	<p>Reported increased participation by PGs in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resolving a range of local conflicts including domestic, territorial, resource and socio-economic • inter-ethnic early warning and cooperation in thwarting and resolving raids and cattle rustling • convening peace meetings in their communities • attending peace meetings held by other groups <p>Final residential and focus groups had 96% participation, indicating consistency and motivation among nearly all program participants.</p>
<p>Theory of Change 2: THEN we will see an increase in [joint conflict resolution, joint training, joint activity] to address shared challenges</p> <p>Objective 3: Pokot, Tugen, and IlChamus Peace Guardian Professionals will apply newly acquired mediation and mentoring skills to jointly design an accessible culturally inclusive pastoralist-centered mediation and peacebuilding training curriculum.</p>	<p>2 joint activities/projects that address shared concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 Professionals from four ethnic groups participated in the curriculum development and trained as trainers. • PGs organized and convened meetings with the Warriors from their communities, and then brought them together in a joint warriors meeting. • PGs organized meeting between the Tugen community and Pokot warriors. • PG participation in joint meetings listed for Objective 1 above. 	<p>PGs report that bonding did a great deal to bring cohesion to PGs who have since spoken to the communities as a united team.</p> <p>PGs reported significant changes via interviews and focus groups in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in communities working together to return stolen livestock, or address crime • Increase in PG participation in government security meetings • Reduction in fear of other communities • PGs no longer wait for the government to help solve conflicts and build peace.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

Objective (From M&E Plan)	Indicator (From M&E Plan)	Activity (What did you do?)	Results (What happened?)
	<p>50% change in joint conflict resolution across lines of division</p> <p>50% change in levels of trust between members of divided groups</p> <p>50% change in perception of the value of working across divided groups</p>	<p>Held series of barazas in each community and then a joint baraza.</p> <p>In July, added a series of peace caravan meetings to reach deeper into the remote areas.</p> <p>In September, upon strong community request, the PGs organized meetings with warriors in each community, and then held a joint meeting of warriors.</p>	<p>Reported significant improvement by PGs from all ethnic groups in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resolving a range of local conflicts • Levels of trust between communities, especially between PGs of different communities <p>Warriors meetings resulted in Verbal Agreement, endorsed by elders, between the three communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock market in Kiserian to be re-opened. • Another meeting to speak further on way forward for peace; all three groups' chiefs agreed to decide this. • Pokot will unblock roads (had been previous security concern) to free all movements.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

Objective (From M&E Plan)	Indicator (From M&E Plan)	Activity (What did you do?)	Results (What happened?)
<p>Theory of Change 1: IF we strengthen negotiation/mediation skills through training...</p> <p>Objective 4. Multi-ethnic Peace Guardian Professionals will use the accessible pastoralist-specific curriculum they have designed to teach mediation skills to members of their ethnic communities in remote Baringo County who have agreed to become Community Peace Guardians.</p>	<p>30 people trained</p> <p>50% change in methods used to resolve disputes</p> <p>50% change in perceived mediation/negotiation expertise</p> <p>50% change in confidence about ability to resolve disputes</p> <p>50% change in the number of cross-group interactions the Ground Professionals facilitate</p> <p>50% change in the Peace Guardians' perception of the value of working together across divides</p>	<p>6 people from 4 ethnic communities trained as trainers in 4 sessions on conflict management and mapping; facilitation and dialogue; ethical mediation and group dynamics; preparing for and managing focus groups; practical skills for working with communities; how to develop a clear mission, vision and values statement for themselves and the project.</p> <p>2-day residential training in Dec 2015 with 31 PGs, 3-day residential training in Feb 2016 with 30 PGs, with 3rd training day for Dec. trainees and full group bonding.</p> <p>Total of 77 individuals trained in conflict resolution skills.</p>	<p>77 people received training overall. 63 trained as PGs, 6 as trainers.</p> <p>The 6 PGC trainers adapted the conflict resolution training for the Baringo context and illiterate PGs, and successfully delivered culturally appropriate conflict resolution training to 63 participants.</p> <p>Trainers identified success in being able to listen to, engage with, and bring together groups of people who six months ago previously refused to sit in the same room together.</p> <p>No reliable data available on change in methods, expertise, confidence, or number of cross-group interactions facilitated. Proxy indicators and qualitative data suggest that the number of interactions and the value of working together increased by more than 50%.</p>



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

Objective (From M&E Plan)	Indicator (From M&E Plan)	Activity (What did you do?)	Results (What happened?)
<p>Theory of Change 1: AND support the application of those skills through mentoring...</p> <p>Objective 5: Professional Peace Guardians will apply the ongoing individualized training and mentoring they receive from WPGI Trainers, staff, and Kenya Pastoralist Network to strengthen mentoring they provide for Community Peace Guardians serving as mediators in Tugen, IlChamus and Pokot communities in remote Baringo County.</p>	<p>60 people will be mentored</p> <p>Bi-weekly meetings between program staff and trained participants</p>	<p>Mentoring of PGs occurred during meetings and through biweekly staff contact between April and August 2016, and phone calls from the PGC.</p>	<p>As previously noted, the project design changed with 97% of PGs located in Baringo. This fundamentally changed the planned mentoring process. Staffing challenges and internet connection problems further affected a consistent mentoring process.</p>



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

Objective (From M&E Plan)	Indicator (From M&E Plan)	Activity (What did you do?)	Results (What happened?)
<p>Theory of Change 1: THEN we will see an increase in both the frequency and the complexity of disputes/conflicts being resolved.</p> <p>Objective 6: Community Peace Guardians will demonstrate effective application of mediation and peacebuilding skills as they facilitate weekly Peace Committee Meetings and when community members have interpersonal and inter-ethnic disputes with potential for escalation into sustained and/or violent conflict.</p>	<p>50% change in # of negotiations/mediations conducted</p> <p>50% change in # of disputes/challenges resolved</p> <p>50% change in # of negotiation or mediation attempts of complex disputes</p> <p>50% change in the # of complex disputes resolved</p> <p>50% change in # of violent incidents associated with disputes/challenges</p>	<p>3 Field staff, one selected by each community, interviewed CPGs between April and August 2016 regarding their dispute resolution activities</p>	<p>No reliable data available on the change in # of mediations, disputes resolved, or # of complex disputes attempted or resolved. Qualitative data suggests a range of stakeholder meetings as well as a significant reduction in the type and frequency of violence throughout the three communities.</p> <p>The PGs engaged regularly with their communities, PGs from other communities, the government and conflict actors. Proxy indicators and qualitative data indicate a significant reduction in violence and an increased feeling of calmness and security.</p> <p>The PGs self-organized a Steering Committee with representatives from all three communities, women, youth and elders to promote continued inter-ethnic communication and establish a Baringo Community Based Organization.</p> <p>In response to the peace caravan meetings, the Ruko Conservancy is now planning to expand to include the Tugen Community.</p>

Project Impact

Impact in evaluations is often measured quantitatively, and as further described in this report, we are unable to report on quantitative impact from the data collection. However, in terms of relevance and effectiveness, qualitative data supports the conclusion that this project was both relevant to the context, and effective in achieving the project goal and objective.



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

The goal of the Warriors to Peace Guardians Initiative was to enable members of the Pokot, Tugen and Ilchamus ethnic communities of remote Baringo County to interrupt existing cycles of violent conflict through adoption of conflict analysis, resolution, mediation/negotiation, reconciliation and peacebuilding practices that promote sustainable peaceful co-existence and foster an environment characterized by continued non-violent resolution of conflicts, improved livelihoods, social stability, and economic prosperity.

When the proposal was submitted, there was significant ongoing violence in Baringo, and over 50 people had been killed in the months leading up to the proposal. Several activities had been initiated by the government and local organizations, interventions such as the convening of peace meetings and conducting security operations. As noted during early meetings with professionals in Nairobi, “government has been coming in to resolve the issue but they are not seeing the positive impacts. That is, nothing is happening; the DPCs [District Peace Committees] also have failed in peace initiatives.” In addition, police corruption and government officials purchasing guns for their ethnic communities were further inciting more violence. A group of Pokot professionals organized the Baringo Peace Network, working primarily with Pokot warriors, but they ran into resistance when they tried to meet with the Tugen professionals in Nakuru. The early months of our own efforts were frustrated by high levels of mistrust and anger between Nairobi professionals, and a disconnect between the Ilchamus professionals in Nairobi with those on the ground in Baringo.

Over the first six months of the project, the training was postponed until the professionals’ networks could be extended deep enough into Baringo to connect with representatives from each community who were committed to working for peace. The Nakuru meetings led to each of the three communities selecting 20 women, youth and elders from each community to be trained as peace guardians. Six Peace Guardian Core (PGC) members and staff were trained as trainers. The communities then each selected their own staff member, who were trained as PGs with the second group in February 2016. A total of 64 community members were trained in conflict management and mapping; facilitation and dialogue; ethical mediation and group dynamics; bias recognition, perceptions, active listening, conflict sensitivity including examples of activities in a training environment that serve to break down barriers between people to help them work together as a team and to allow trainers to demonstrate and model cross cultural unity. In addition to practical skills for working with communities, at the beginning of the USIP WTPG project we assisted seven Kenya Pastoralist Network (KPN) members to develop a clear mission, vision and values statement for themselves and the project.

In March 2016, the PGs were introduced to their communities in a series of barazas – three whole community public meetings and a joint meeting – with strong participation by local government officials, connecting with more than 1,000 community members over the course of four days with messages of peace that were well received. What was learned, however, is that the PGs for the most part talked to the communities rather than listening to them, and the baraza format was too typical of government meetings which we believed was not as effective as could be. The communities however were very receptive to the messages, and asked for more meetings to be held even deeper into hot conflict areas. Several PGs and professionals stayed after the barazas to meet with armed Pokot warriors they had noticed and talked to in the area, and brought them together with the Tugen community. The consensus from that meeting was that there were Pokot warriors not in attendance



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

with whom they needed to meet, who were the conflict actors, and therefore no agreements could be reached at that time.

Staff reported in the following weeks that cross-community communication between the PGs was still limited, so the June midline focus groups residential included more bonding activities between the PGs. The focus groups were organized by women, youth and elders which further integrated the conversations, and led to a significant observable increase in cross-community alliances and subsequent coordination on security and development issues. The PGs worked together to plan a peace caravan deeper into conflict hot spots.

The peace caravan was implemented the following month in Tangelbei, Kakir, and Komolion, with a joint meeting in Mukutani. Mukutani ward is the least developed among the 30 wards in Baringo county per the ward administrator. The area is occupied by the Pokot and IlChamus communities, the former being the predominant. Tensions are still high in this area as IlChamus are returning one by one after being previously displaced by violence. However, the area chief gave a very positive outlook for his community, noting that the PGs were involved in conflict management of all disputes, that informants provided him information discreetly and that all conflicts were resolved with agreement. There was general agreement among all participants that meetings still needed to be convened with the warriors. These may be seen as the kind of negotiated settlements and agreements that do not fit into the database as typical “mediations.”

Reports from our drivers experienced in transporting NGOs, government officials, and community members were that no one had previously held meetings at the village level that brought all three communities together. *The impact of this strategy, to build a network of trained local peace guardians and bring communities together across ethnic divides, was exhibited across all communities.* Over the course of the project, cattle rustling, raiding and the sound of gunshots decreased significantly, with regular raiding and violence dropping to one minor theft incident every month or two. Significant improvements in security and inter-ethnic relations and cooperation were reported by endline, resulting in a new freedom of movement across community lines, inter-ethnic friendships, development and business activities, and reopening of schools, markets and roads that had been closed for security concerns. Social media is now free of hate speech and incitement, and there is a shift in the way communities speak in meetings, away from blaming and othering, to specific concerns for joint problem solving. The PGs are engaged with each other, the elders and local chiefs across community lines and with government in addressing and resolving conflicts. In this way, the project accomplished its objective to promote sustainable peaceful coexistence and the application of mediation skills to resolve conflicts within and between the Tugen, IlChamus and Pokot communities of Baringo that are suffering the impacts of persistent conflict-driven violence. Cycles of violent conflict have been interrupted through the adoption of conflict resolution, reconciliation and peacebuilding practices, and the communities report they are now for the most part peacefully co-existing in an environment characterized by sustained non-violent resolution of conflicts, improved livelihoods, increased social stability, and economic development. More work needs to be done to solidify these gains, and the peace guardians have established an interethnic and inclusive steering committee, and are registering a community based organization for joint development and peacebuilding efforts. They have asked for additional support to facilitate dialogues in terms of mobilization and meat sharing ceremonies. The PGC and MBBI maintain contact and ongoing mentoring of our trained PGs, and continue to seek further funding.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

III. NARRATIVE REFLECTION, DEVELOPMENTS, AND CHALLENGES

Midline through Endline Reporting (Please note—in addition to including this information in the second interim report— this information should be submitted to the IMPACT team upon completion of the midline evaluation)

- *If possible, please accompany this report with the raw data from the data collection process (entered into the dispute database).*
- *Summary of the process of using the tools*
- *Revisit the questions outlined above for the baseline report. Are the same trends apparent? Are participants more or less comfortable with the process at end-line compared to the baseline?*
- *Program staff:*
 - *How well does our theoretical framework and tools perform as an M&E system for the project?*
 - *What outcomes of the project have we not been able to capture with the tools?*
 - *Have we been able to capture dispute resolution activities by participants in a sufficient way? If not, what is missing for us to better capture this outcome?*
 - *Would you (or will you) use these tools in other programs?*

The mid-term bonding and focus groups residential was held in Marigat, Baringo on June 8-9, 2016 with 97% attendance. Community leaders from Laikipia also attended and talked to the PGs about the Laikipia Peace Caravan and what the communities had been doing together to sustain peace. Discussions between the PGs and the Peace Guardian Core (PGC) determined that another set of community meetings was needed, this time deeper into the remote areas, and something not so associated with government, which the barazas were perceived to be.

Survey data was reportedly collected by the PGC and field staff at both midline and endline. Staff indicated challenges with travel due to insecurity and road conditions in the rain, but contacted their PGs by phone when they could not travel. At a meeting in July they still expressed questions about the database, such as concerns that some conflicts are ongoing without an immediate result. Due to lack of staff oversight to address questions immediately, errors in the participant IDs, and questions about who filled out the survey forms (participant, interviewer,), the survey data is unfortunately not considered reliable. These same staff problems resulted in the field staff only having partial PG lists from 3/23/16 to 5/8/16, thus only a few PGs from each community were being contacted. The field staff were to use interview forms that included the dispute database questions to contact their 20 PGs at least once every two weeks, with data to be entered in the dispute database by the staff, then later the PGC. Two reports were received in April. Starting in early May, after the Project Coordinator was let go (a 4-month process in Kenya) and additional training was provided by the Monitoring and Evaluation Manager (MEM), nearly daily reports were provided in May and June, then only two reports in July and one in August. Very limited data was collected on disputes – 22 total entries with incomplete information – although narrative information and observations from staff were included in all reports. This could be because 1) two staff trainings were insufficient without regular mentoring and oversight by a qualified staff person, 2) narrative seems to be a much more comfortable reporting process in this context, and there is cultural resistance to being “questioned”, and/or 3) staff was filling out the forms to show they were working, without doing them correctly. While culturally the staff and PGC appeared to understand the training and what was required, what became clear was that they were most comfortable with storytelling and only the narratives were consistently provided.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

From midline to the end of the project, three more major activities were conducted. The peace caravan was conducted 15-17 July in Tangelbei, Kakir, Komolion and Mukutani, and was led by the PGC and 2 PGs from each community. There was a much higher participation by youth than at previous meetings, and the community made many requests to have another set of meetings specifically with warriors from each community, since they are the key conflict actors.

The final focus groups and bonding residential were held August 13-14 in Marigat. Because of concerns about the staff data collection, a simplified 'most significant change' process was added to elicit reflection from the PGs regarding progress made during the year. While we originally anticipated that this would be our last meeting, delayed financial reporting by our local partner identified sufficient funds to extend the project another month and hold the requested series of meetings with warriors' groups. This was both necessary (do no harm) and encouraging as it was a direct outcome of the prior gatherings.

The PGs convened meetings with the warriors from each of their communities to set the stage for a joint meeting in September. It was observed by MBBI at the joint meeting that the community-specific warriors' meetings appear to have helped this meeting be more proactive in solution building (past meetings discussed situation to analyze rather than craft ideas for action proposals). It also shifted the responsibility for organizing from the PGC to the PGs. Warriors led the substantive content of the meetings, and most of their ideas were endorsed by the elders present.

While the PGC, PGs and the staff were clearly more comfortable with the Tools by the end of the process, the issues noted above preclude us from trusting data validity. Three main challenges arose out of the IMPACT Tools having been designated for this grant. The first challenge involved the need to be vigilant against the Tools themselves defining the work of the project. The questions in the survey and focus group as well as the information needed for the database pushed a certain set of activities and focus in the project design that did not always easily connect with the particular context as the project emerged on the ground. While there were some indications that this might be problematic while we were writing the proposal, the challenge became particularly clear as the project moved along in somewhat different directions than initially thought. As the local partner and participants took more control over what they wanted to happen, these specific tools became almost more of a distraction, and required effort to figure out how to fit them in to what was currently happening.

The second challenge, related to the first, was around the focus on mediation training. Again, this came up while writing the proposal as the way of talking about the project's work. While Theory of Change 2 was clearly consistent with the project goal, TOC 1 put a stronger emphasis on training and mentoring individuals in mediation and negotiation, and many of the quantitative tools were oriented towards measuring such training and results of mediation practice. Objectives and indicators were then written as a function of the data the tools were to collect, more than the TOC or project goal. Since our training was more intended to educate and build community based conflict resolution skills rather than train practicing mediators, the pastoralist peacebuilding process design needed to be adapted to fit the focus of the Tools for the proposal. Then as the project progressed, our local partners acknowledged the design but focused on people connecting with each other, and learning to trust and communicate across ethnic lines of division. It also became clear that there was a discomfort with the very individual action focus of the questions in these communitarian cultures. The training



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

involved the participants gaining confidence in their ability to and in the efficacy of speaking out as tensions arose or conflicts threatened to move toward violence. That kind of work did not lend itself easily to the language in the Tools, and respondents and staff alike struggled with the questions. While they used the skills identified (communication, negotiation, active listening, bias reduction, group facilitation, etc.) they were not easy to gather in the database as they were not always used in individual mediations. However, the foundations of mediation were familiar and practiced by the project's end albeit in more community engagements than individual sessions. The final project activity drawing from single-group warriors' meetings, leading to a successful joint warriors meeting with a peaceful agreement, drew upon shuttle mediation: gathering information in private between single group meetings and preparing based on analysis of shared concerns and goals to ensure a productive final meeting. The distinction might be between focusing the inquiry on a **shift in the way communities deal with conflict versus recognizing individual skill development.**

A third challenge relates to the limited staffing capacity of a volunteer organization working with volunteers on the ground. Because of the nature of this grassroots, volunteer based project, it was difficult to ensure the necessary consistency between different implementing volunteers, time constraints, and cultural reactions to the questions. There was no full-time staff member on the ground with M&E experience that could provide continuity and guidance to local volunteers. Every few weeks, throughout the project, MBBI team members conducted on site training and collaborated in the design, and development of training with the PGC Team. While not on site, the MBBI team conducted weekly video-conference calls with staff and the PGC to monitor and mentor, and required routine reporting on outcomes from the Tools, but data was delayed or not forthcoming. These video-conferences were often difficult to conduct due to interference in computer satellite connection, lack of consistent locations available for the conferences so staff resorted to internet cafes where it was difficult to hear one another. Reported problems that interfered with delivery of results on Tools included participant resistance to report other than by narrative, computer issues, that data had been collected and was forthcoming but voluminous and difficult to enter. Only later, in analyzing results did the Team learn that reported data was inconsistently gathered and inputted. More on site professional M&E assistance and oversight may have improved this outcome.

With a limited budget, local hires started with strength and commitment and ended up being less than reliable. This lack of oversight and continuity was reflected in the way the data was collected and the focus groups were implemented. For example, trainers adapted the focus groups and used it as a participatory tool with report backs. They found in the first weekend training that organizing by ethnic group resulted in each community validating their common narrative about how they were the victims and the other communities were the perpetrators. Therefore, on a positive note, they made the necessary adjustments and in the second weekend they organized the focus groups by women, youth, and elders, which provided a different perspective on the questions. However, due to time constraints based on a limited budget and long travel distances for many participants, the questions were divided up, so each group only answered a couple of questions, and only the report back notes were provided to MBBI. Questions were further adapted on site for the midline focus groups; while completely appropriate to adapt based on learning, it makes baseline to endpoint comparisons problematic.



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

Focus Groups

In attempting to adapt the focus group questions, the locally adapted probe questions were sometimes rewritten as closed ended rather than open ended questions that would elicit discussion; again, a challenge without professional staff oversight. Despite the training provided on facilitation and notetaking, and plans to have trained facilitators and note takers for the focus groups, many things changed in the field. Facilitators and note takers were self-selected from the groups on site, without training, and did not probe in important areas; for example, the question “Who is involved in addressing these conflicts?” could have been reworded to find out who are the most influential parties in addressing conflicts, making for more organized data. When endline responses indicated that now both traditional and “peace guardian methods” are used to resolve conflicts, there was limited probing and response regarding what those methods were and how they were different from traditional, and how they may have added value. The time allotted and budgeted for the focus groups was clearly insufficient, as time and budget constraints led to dividing questions to different sub-groups rather than asking all questions to all. Because of the long travel distances and residential costs, and time away from work and families for volunteers, the data collection goals were overly optimistic in this remote and volunteer context.

Fewer questions, more carefully focused on the relevance for one TOC rather than two, and experienced facilitators may have allowed for more probing and elicited more detailed responses. The variance in responses were an indication that some concepts were not universally interpreted between facilitators. For example, “What are the most important conditions for successfully resolving disputes in your community” received answers from “consistent application of set rules” to “using vulgar and insulting language”.

Surveys

In the Pastoralist context, the surveys may have been too lengthy for the resources and M&E skills available, as the 20 + question list included some questions with four parts to them. The participants seemed to have difficulty judging their level of “expertise” in solving conflicts, and it is unclear how knowing the types of disputes resolved between baseline and endline would inform us in this context. The distinction “complex disputes” also occurred as too technical for this context, and was not information we needed to meet our objectives. We probably should have better contextualized the “process” discussed in question 19. It would have been helpful to have a question in the survey that specifically related to quantifying the level of violence over the previous two months – in our context, it could have been a range of how often gunshots are heard in their community.

Quantifying responses over a six-month period for non-mediators may have been too difficult for community members to recall (i.e., questions 16-18 concerning number of disputes respondent was involved in over a six-month period, and categorized by outcome and output). What we did not get from the Tools, which would have been helpful, was a sense of how participants were using the skills they learned, and in what contexts. Results at baseline showing mostly “effective” responses of the existing dispute resolution process may infer that either the conflict resolution process was fine as it was, or perhaps MBBI and USIP had different definitions of what was effective, or, there were misunderstandings of the question or meaning of responses. Question 14 presents an important area – sense of expertise; however, any change between baseline and endline could have come from training, experience, or opportunity at hand such as a rise in conflict (or could have decreased due to less



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

conflict), so results would be unclear. In addition, baseline surveys seem to indicate that most considered their expertise to be high to start with, which could be why they were chosen by their communities to be PGs. Culturally, there could also have been a reluctance to answer such an individualistic question. Question 15 regarding influence could also come from becoming a chief, being well trained, being a relative or a certain person, or other unknown factors; adding at least one-probing question attached to certain questions, such as “What two factors caused the change in expertise?” may help provide more useful data in our context.

Dispute Database

While staffing problems are likely most responsible for the less than optimal data collection, it could also be the difference in emphasis on the purpose of training. The Tools seem to assume that the training is intense enough to create practicing mediators/negotiators. In our project, the training was intended to create a safe environment and new approaches to working across ethnic divides, and strengthening the voice of women and youth in peacebuilding. Thus, dispute database responses were primarily collected from PGs who were chiefs and elders who regularly resolved conflicts, although some were from youth. The lack of entries, take-up and usage of this tool could also mean that the questions were not considered relevant, or easily answerable in this context, or, that the training they received did not prepare them to step in and act as mediators, especially women and youth in a patriarchal society. Although the endline focus group responses indicate that traditional methods were mixed with what they learned in the training, the Tools did not specifically tease out that distinction. That would be helpful information for us to have in the future, especially to know whether such a shift is effective and useful to these communities.

A less intensive tool may be easier for post-entry analysis and processing in the field with limited resources. Consideration could be given for alternative options that perhaps look at the process of dispute resolution in a measurement format that suits pastoralists (designed by them).

For our low budget, volunteer and remote context, and lack of professional full time staff, there were too many tools (focus groups, survey, database) and too much data to manage effectively. However, what we did do well was monitor throughout the project, reflecting on each activity along the way and responding to emergent realities with project design changes. USIPs flexibility in schedule and budget adaptations were greatly appreciated. While the quantitative data collection was challenging because we did not have, and were unable to create within the context and with resources available, an adequate organizational structure for intensive data collection, qualitative data indicates we still successfully met the overarching goal and objectives of the project.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

IV. NARRATIVE REFLECTION, DEVELOPMENTS, AND CHALLENGES

Provide an overview of any developments or challenges that impacted the implementation of the project during this reporting phase.

- *Did your organization face any challenges during the reporting period? If yes, please describe these challenges and how the project will adjust to mitigate or resolve the issue during the next reporting period.*
 - *Internal challenges:*
 - *External challenges:*
- *Please use this section to explain, elaborate, and justify any changes to the project.*

Internal challenges:

Between June 1 and the end of the project, the primary internal challenge was the lack of staffing needed to provide adequate oversight on the Tools. Field coordinators, who carried out surveys, required more on-site supervision and support. Although the PGC were based in Nairobi, and MBBi team available via correspondence, the presence of in-person support and oversight on the ground in Baringo was missing to help guide the data collection and processing. Communication of data challenges not reported until field visits identified it. Incomplete and sometimes unverifiable work (i.e., there were indications that some staff may have sometimes filled out forms just to get it done) invalidated the data collection that was done. Data discrepancies may also have been an outcome of culture, such as saying that they understood the role and the training to perform their responsibilities to save face even when they were not sure. Field coordinators (surveyors) also reported challenges of access to respondents (PGs) physically and with mobile reception to contact respondents.

Although timely financial reporting from Kenya was a challenge (establishing accountability such as receipts are a challenge in a cash system), we turned the situation into a positive for the work and used the excess funding to add the peace caravan and complete the needed warriors' meetings.

External challenges:

Given the remote geographical context, access to the PGs was a challenge for field staff to conduct interviews (poor road access, ground conditions due to rains or mobile telephone reception). The ongoing security risks, posed by the ongoing threat of violence made data collection more challenging. However, even rumors of violence were taken seriously and reported in case they were active threats. WhatsApp messages from the field received immediate responses and permissions for adjustments to plans. Quick mobilization of the PGs and community members took place to respond to conflicts immediately. Conflict management and Dialogue skills were used and led to better in-group accountability of each group to address internal violence rather than acting on false accusations of outside groups.

We observed that cultural norms within the communities may have led to some PGs (specifically some women and youth) being excluded from, or not feeling welcomed in, local peace processes, although there was full participation during the project meetings. Continued emphasis on the importance of women and youth voices, and planning to include all groups including spoilers during community peace dialogue meetings was part of adapting to emergent realities.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

V. UNINTENDED RESULTS

Please comment on any unintended results/outcomes (both positive and negative) which occurred during this phase (those not included in the program's results and indicator framework).

At the endline meeting in August, it was not anticipated that the PGs would spontaneously self-organize a Steering Committee to continue supporting the PGs, and start registration papers for a community based organization they call ILPOTU Peace Guardians Baringo CBO (they combined the first two letters of each community to create the name). This was a very positive sign of local initiative and a commitment to continue their roles as local peacebuilders.

It was also not anticipated that we would have the funds needed to conduct the requested additional peace caravan meetings and warriors' meetings. *Through careful planning by the PGC, and delegation of duties to the PGs on the ground, both series of meetings were successfully held, with the following benefits:*

Real time monitoring, review and adjustments leading to more sustainable, community driven peacebuilding

- Post Peace Caravan outreach identified warriors to be considered outsider sub-groups in relation to the peacebuilding process. To reach this group, appropriate interventions were planned with warriors, chiefs and community members to allow warriors to participate, contribute to problem solving and plan way forward in peacebuilding.
- PGs gained valuable lived peacebuilding experience, knowledge and skills over time. With support by mentorship from PGC, more responsibility was given to PGs, and they now help lead meetings such as the individual warrior meetings without the PGC present, and report results to the PGC.

Supporting review and planning of peacebuilding with potential spoilers of peace, namely the warrior sub-groups of the Tugen, IlChamus and Pokot, has paid dividends in regards to:

- A rise in more frequent and better quality engagement of individual warrior groups in a short period of time.
- The commencement of warrior led inter-group dialogue rather than the traditional overrepresented peace and conflict stakeholders taking control (chiefs and elders).
- Forming agreement points decided collaboratively in regards to re-opening markets and unblocking previously blocked roads (previously blocked as a security and defense measure).
- Community planning to build on the momentum of peacebuilding led by warriors and a commitment to have further meetings.

Improved facilitative peacebuilding roles by PGC and Peace Guardians

- The PGC and PGs took on a more facilitative role in peacebuilding, and they have helped communities create space for participatory dialogue. In the Baraza meetings, the PGC and PGs were more active in providing technical support in a more instructive nature; this method of intervention had a greater chance of unintentional over-influencing community decision making and we have since adjusted the



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

role of PGC and PG actors. As efforts are now to support community members through mentoring (not facilitating) there is a greatly minimized risk of outside influence and direction.

- The above was initially witnessed at the Peace Caravans taking place in July 2016, where the PGC and PGs started Peace Caravans with advising in a way that was not necessarily responsive to the community input, which came after the PGC and PGs had spoken for some time substantially. As the Peace Caravan progressed, with mentoring by MBBI, this improved whereby the PGC and PGs still made advisory remarks but more in reaction to community input.
- Observed Empowerment of Warriors. A joint warriors meeting was a successful final activity for the project in that all three groups had previously held individual warriors' meetings (Tugen, IlChamus and Pokot), led by the PGs without the PGC, to review and plan for the joint meeting. The PGC and PGs prepared well through reviewing access to the warriors' individual group information to be used as needed, plus perspective taking and other conflict resolution techniques. Once the meeting began, substantial dialogue was led by the warriors on challenges, objectives and proposals with minimal intervention needed by the PGC and PGs, a positive result with technical decisions made in full by the community.

Previous formation of a joint conservancy in Komolion with Pokot and IlChamus, as well as a separate land and pasture committee between Tugen and Pokot helped improve associational engagement, communication and decreased insecurity. Since the WTPG project started, talks have been held to increase membership of the pasture committee to include IlChamus and feature 12 youth each, and add Tugen and youth from each community to the conservancy. The inclusion of youth is an important link to the lesson learnt mentioned above about involving spoilers such as warriors.

The process to reach a successful final agreement during the joint warriors meeting in Mukutani, an output in and of itself, demonstrated the improved facilitative roles of the PGC and PGs. The attendance at Peace Caravans helped identify warriors as potential spoilers of peace in sensitive situations. Their lack of participation in the peace caravan process was underscored by the presence of warriors who were in the vicinity of the Peace Caravans but remained physically outside. Responsive action by the PGs and PGC led to single-group followed by joint (all three group) warrior meetings that helped ensure warriors would be mainstreamed into peacebuilding, an outcome endorsed by chiefs and elders present. A warrior led peace agreement in Mukutani near the end of the project between the three groups helped strengthen intergroup links, and prepare for future dialogue with promising prospects for continuing peacefully.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

NARRATIVE CLOSE OUT FORM

****ONLY COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT THE END OF THE GRANT, REFLECTING THE WHOLE EXPERIENCE****

1. *Per the evaluation plan approved with the original application, briefly describe how the evaluation was undertaken and by whom. Describe the results of the evaluation as well as your overall assessment of the project, lessons learned, success stories, or other achievements. Please submit any findings or reports from the evaluation.*

The evaluation in this report was conducted by MBBI team members.

Results

The goal of the Warriors to Peace Guardians Initiative was to enable members of the Pokot, Tugen and IlChamus ethnic communities of remote Baringo County to interrupt existing cycles of violent conflict through adoption of conflict resolution, mediation/negotiation, reconciliation and peacebuilding practices that promote sustainable peaceful co-existence and foster an environment characterized by sustained non-violent resolution of conflicts, improved livelihoods, social stability, and economic prosperity.

Government activities and peace meetings have been held in the region before and during the lifetime of our project, and the baseline indicated there was an existing trend towards less violence and improvement in the return of stolen livestock and government relationships. At midline, the women indicated that “The situation now is fair, relative peace is there but not sustainable” with the situation “Not better nor worse, still some raids in reduced number at 70%.” By endline, the data supports a conclusion that the WTPG project has contributed to the following recent significant positive observations reported by the PGs:

- **Reduced crime, violence and cattle rustling.** The PGs reported that the sound of gunshots has reduced significantly, and few young men are going to raid. Previously frequent raids are now only experience once every month or two. “For example, the raids that were being organized by larger number of raiders have been reduced to normal theft where one or two persons encroach to steal and make sure they are not identified. There has been punishment or fines to curb the stolen cattle if the thieves are identified.” “As a peace guardian I saw in our location Arabal where bandits from Pokot community used to shoot on anyone on sight. Bandits these days wait for straying livestock and take them away without shooting.”
- **Interethnic cooperation.** Many reports of communities now working together to track stolen livestock or implement development projects. For example, Tugen and IlChamus are now cultivating together with the Mosuro irrigation scheme; Pokot and IlChamus are sharing water and pasture in Kiserian; communities are coming together to handle problems together “as one family;” Pokot and Tugen are living together and sharing markets and economic activities in another area; Tugen, IlChamus and Pokot are sharing the Mukutani market. “Even our cows are eating grass in some places where we are not going long time ago.” They are also reportedly convening their own multi-community peace meetings. “People have started to sit down together and reason to solve conflict in all our neighboring areas.”
- **Improved interethnic relationships.** The joint peace meetings have given the communities an opportunity to interact, bond and share ideas, and were credited with increasing the sense of cooperation and interaction based on increasing trust. An example was given that in Kakir, Pokot and Tugen are now



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

living together where there previously were inter-ethnic clashes. “There is no fear again because even IlChamus, Tugen and Pokot will not run away when he/she see someone. Even when a person sees or heard other which are planning to raid another communities, he will give out that information before action taken.”

- **Freedom of movement across community lines.** One account was given of an IlChamus youth who returned to Mukutani for the first time in eight years because of lack of peace; travel was considered proof to his fellow IlChamus who questioned the security of his journey (he returned so there was peace).
- **Improved community coordination with local government.** The PGs are recognized by local government officials and “the project has brought engagement of PGs with government officials to combat remaining cattle thieves and rustlers.”
- **Reopening of inter-ethnic markets.** Markets that were closed because of conflict have been reopened in Mukutani, Yatia and Loruk, “where all communities now frequent to buy, save and meet in inter-social programs organized by communities.”
- **Reopening of schools closed by conflict.** “We opened schools which were closed for almost 3 years, e.g. Arabal and Kapindesum.” Teachers have returned, and enrollments have increased. “Their primary school, which is at the center, now has children from both communities after the communities decided to embrace peace.”
- **Reopening of roadways closed by conflict.** Warriors have agreed to reopen roads, and many roads had already been reopening as the security situation improved.
- **Sense of calmness and increased security.** The PGs described this as “normalcy has returned” and “Since the rain has started people are now going/doing their daily chores” in areas throughout the three communities. “Generally, there is a big change since the herders from Pokot moved their cattle from are Arabal, because we did not experience any negative thing like animals being stolen. People are living with no fear again. We are continuing with our normal jobs.” This is a very significant shift, because the onset of rains traditional means the onset of raiding and violence as warriors move their livestock home and violently glean livestock from their neighbors to replace losses during the drought season. “The IlChamus cows are going to graze at Lokojokoni, and many people are going to collect vegetables. At Lokojokoni this shows that there is a sign of peace. People at Kiserian, Sokotei, and Mukutani are busy preparing their gardens. Others are planting, others are irrigating.” “I attended our church service whereby people were very many in the church, like 200. This is a clear sign that peace has continued to prevail in the area. Our church was on one of the affected by insecurity and many members run away from the area and the number of the attendance was very low, like 30 members, but now 200 this time.”
- **Increased development and economic security.** The security improvements have allowed the National Youth Service (NYS) to conduct new projects throughout the area. “We are seeing good future because NYS are doing good in our area, they are repairing roads and even clearing school compounds and that is a good because much of schools are becoming bad since pupils were not attending due to fear of thieves, and now they have gone to schools like Arabal and Kapindasum.” There were numerous reports that the economy and business activity has improved in many areas. A shift from a livestock economy to farming is now occurring in some areas as raiding becomes an unacceptable way of improving wealth.
- **Social Media and Community Discourse.** A key shift was community discourse regarding other communities. Initially the other communities were to blame for their woes. The PGs learned, and passed



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

on to their communities, a way of speaking of raiders as criminals, rather than for example, “the Pokot” or the “IlChamus.” Social media, such as Facebook and WhatsApp, where being used to spread hate messages and incite violence; such messages have reportedly disappeared. “Professionals [are now] condemning violence by even their own people without hate messages and accusing other groups, seen in a significant change in social media messages.”

The PGs each have the name, phone number and location of every PG in Baringo, and were provided a generous airtime card to support their ongoing communications.

Lessons learned

- Training in this context is more about the skills for creating a safe environment for interethnic association, taking another’s perspective and and gaining confidence in standing up as a peacebuilder, rather than the typical skills of a trained mediator.
- Flexible scheduling and funding arrangements allow the ability to be responsive to outside and interior influences, and adapt to emergent conditions for greater local empowerment.
- Future projects in this context should have more indicators that are directly relevant to the project goal, are outcome based, and are a result of community input regarding how they measure change.
- PG Training needs to include more on how to listen, how to elicit from community in meetings, observe, and listen for local solutions.
- Intensive data collection such as the Tools requires professional, experienced staff on site with a proven track record, and sufficient budget to cover it.
- Barazas are too associated with government. More effective conversations are conducted by peace caravan meetings in conflict hot spots, and the budget and schedule flexibility to convene meetings directly with key conflict actors.
- Ongoing stakeholder engagement and analysis is critical to ensure implementation is not only the right method, but is also driven by the appropriate community members. This lesson of adjustments to work differently with potential spoilers, in this case the warriors, can be applied in future to ensure appropriate community members are at forefront of decision-making.
- It will be helpful to identify the development partners working in the area (i.e., Action Aid, World Vision, church groups) and coordinate possible peace dividends to follow improvements in security. The communities consistently asked for peace dividends such as education and livelihood programs.

Success stories

“Since the commitments and capability of peace guidance started most of the warring communities have effectively benefited as most of them can even speak to one another as compared to the past when they were against each other. Peace have been maintained at least among major cultural societies bordering each other due to lessons articulated by peace guidance. Domestic instabilities have been minimized over the past one year as peace guidance have improved their solving problem tactics hence less breakups.”



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1

Following the December meeting/training in Marigat, in which the Pokots apologized and the IlChamus accepted, each of the ethnic groups went back to their communities and held meetings within their own, to share the information, and update them about events and upcoming activities. The PGs took the initiative to facilitate these meetings in their communities.

“After a lengthy discussion with my neighbor peace guardian, we come to realize that there is a bit of change in the area comparatively with the previous months whereby raiders were attacking their neighbors en masse. The most significant change is that in some parts/areas communities share ideas together in market days, e.g. Mukutani. We are also seeing youth are interacting by having sport games. The specific example youth from Mukutani (IlChamus) and Tangelbei (Pokot).”

“The program has been instrumental to bring the three warring communities together. The change which I have experienced is Pokot come to Kiserian and discuss the ways of ending the fights which had happened for the last ten years. After they discuss, the warriors of both sides resolve to open the market at Kiserian and allow the Pokot to come to the dispensary for health matters. The three communities had series of meetings at Rukus, Tangelbei and Mukutani. The meetings which had never happened for the last 10 years. The program have brought a lot of change within our warring communities.”

“I have joined parents of grades seven and eight at Kiserian primary school for Academic Day. The committee and the head teacher organized for it. It was successful, the parents were able to look on the progress of their children academically; 80% came, and the number of both classes were 103. The issue of peace was among issues discussed, because most of the children in the school were traumatized by cattle rustling. It is a school which have accommodated the pupils from Rukus and Nusukuro, which were closed because of insecurity. According to my observation the success of the meeting was a sign of peace in the area. For the short time, which crimes subside, then people can talk about development.”

Kakir is a small center which is near Yatia centre, and they are both found in Baringo North. The place is currently occupied by the Tugen and the Pokot, the former being predominant. They experienced inter-ethnic clashes, between the two communities, like most parts of Baringo County, but they are now living together. They embraced peace sometimes ago after peace efforts that were carried out in the area by several players, including the peace guardian network. They are still trying to cement the peace they have and they were very pleased that we visited their area to help them consolidate the peace which they are still nurturing. They are determined to have sustainable peace and they don't want to go back to violence again. They have taken several steps to entrench they newfound peace that they currently enjoy. They have formed groups (women and youth), that they are supporting financially by use of fundraising to support their activities. They have a fundraiser planned very soon and they have invited the Peace Guardians to chip in so that the groups can engage in their economic activities. They are also planning to revive their common market place that was closed during the years of conflict and cattle rustling. Their primary school, which is at the center, now has children from both communities after the communities decided to embrace peace.

More involvement of government authorities, namely the Sub-County and Ward Administrators of the project areas, played a useful role in supporting the dialogue coming out of the peace caravans peacebuilding meetings.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

Government participated by including opening meetings and observing processes, the latter, an important act of allowing the community to lead in general with their solutions. Furthermore, transparency of the process helped diffuse any negative or skeptical feelings towards peacebuilding. In one case, a Sub-County Administrator helped respond to community calls for better service delivery, by sharing information inviting opportunities regarding local development funds available from County government.

Posted September 26, 2016 on Kenya Initiative, MBI-KI Facebook Page

This weekend a joint moran (warriors) peace meeting was conducted in Mukutani between Pokot, IlChamus and Tugen warriors which resulted in pledges of peace, an agreement to re-open joint markets, unblock roads and plan a future joint peace meeting to carry on peaceful co-existence. Peace Guardians were on hand to support but the decisions were led by the warriors and their respective communities. Here, an IlChamus warrior spoke with approximately 200 participants on the way forward for fellow IlChamus and how they desired to live in harmony with others.



Photo Credit: Marcus Tan de Bibiana

On being a Peace Guardian: “Being a PG is good, it brings people together from different communities. If not being PG I could not have seen somebody from Silale, Mukutani and various places” (Tugen). “It has brought individual members of different communities together which were warring together, to bonding then they move to the community in unison” and “Has allowed PGs to go to area they would have otherwise not gone (and got)



GRANT REPORTING FORM
Award Enclosure 1

exposure” (IlChamus). “Make two different communities reason together, understand on another, value and appreciate someone else” (Pokot).



GRANT REPORTING FORM

Award Enclosure 1 NARRATIVE CLOSE OUT FORM

****ONLY COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT THE END OF THE GRANT, REFLECTING THE WHOLE EXPERIENCE****

2. *Describe plans, if any, to continue or follow up on the project after the grant period ends because of the positive impact of the project and/or interest it has generated. In the event that the project goals were not achieved, indicate what plans there are to continue the project after the grant period, how project activities will be funded, and the likely conclusion date.*

The PGC and MBBI continue to stay in contact with and mentor the PGs they can reach through WhatsApp and phone calls. There was expressed interest by the communities to expand training into additional areas that are not adequately covered by the current PG corps, plus concerns that the PGs still need further training in peacebuilding and conflict resolution. In addition, there are recent (Dec. 2016) reports of conflicts instigated by political actors as the country gears up for the next elections, which makes the need for expanding the islands of peace that have been established even more critical. The areas surrounding the communities from which the PGs participated remain at risk and thus the need for ongoing vigilance and expansion of this cadre that has developed significant skills. MBBI and the PGC plan to continue to seek additional funding to address these needs.

In keeping with the original idea that ‘islands of peace need to expand and interconnect or all peace is threatened’, MBBI and the PGC are currently working on a county grant in Samburu County, directly to the north of Baringo. We hope to include some Baringo PGs in these meetings, similar to the way Laikipia leaders came to share their wisdom with the Baringo PGs. We are also in the process of finalizing a Rotary Global Grant for Laikipia that is focused on establishing a corps of PGs in that area, with livelihood support in a positive peace project. Future plans are to scale up that project into Baringo to further solidify the gains made to date.

MBBI has been in consultation with the National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) which has been mandated the lead role in mediation and ADR related issues under the UWIANO platform, alongside the other legislatively supported peace work that the commission has under way. The goals of these consultations are to develop a mediation support unit that will have the capacity to respond locally, across counties, and in the region. There is also a concerted attempt to find better ways of building and enhancing mediation and ADR capacities among the actors and different stakeholders of the UWIANO platform. Connecting the local trained PGs to this national mediation effort will serve as a pilot for building mediation capacity at all levels.

Lastly, through our partner Local Capacities for Peace International, we are also in consultation with the Inter-religious Council of Churches of Kenya under the leadership of Dr. Kuria.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

NARRATIVE CLOSE OUT FORM

****ONLY COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT THE END OF THE GRANT, REFLECTING THE WHOLE EXPERIENCE****

3. *Describe efforts to disseminate the product(s) and/or findings of the project if applicable. Also indicate what grant products were made available to scholars, students, or the general public and what demand there was for the use of or reproduction of this material.*

Project related photographs, activities and updates are continually shared with the peacebuilding community as well as interest groups focused on Kenya and emergent peacebuilding. This is done through the MBI website and using social media such as Facebook. The project was featured in an Africa centered peace building online journal, academic and international mediation conferences (CAPCR, Africa & Diaspora Conference Sacramento, World Mediation Summit Madrid) and ACR (Baltimore). As the final report is completed, we will present the outcomes of this stage of the Kenya project in ongoing publications including a book chapter for a book to be published by the University of Denver, Cultural Encounters and Emergent Practices in Conflict Resolution Capacity-Building (d'Estrée & Parsons, eds.).

The videos based on the barazas and training sessions are being reviewed for production as training and marketing materials.



GRANT REPORTING FORM Award Enclosure 1

NARRATIVE CLOSE OUT FORM

****ONLY COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT THE END OF THE GRANT, REFLECTING THE WHOLE EXPERIENCE****

4. *Please comment on USIP's performance in the administration of your project.*

First, MBBI is enormously grateful for this opportunity and honored to be able to contribute to developing and refining outcome tools and data. As a first time grantee of USIP funding, it has been very satisfying to work with the support and flexibility of the grant managers. Being funded by an organization of expert practitioners meant a few key differences in our experience: From the beginning, there was a clearly communicated understanding that:

- the circumstance on the ground guided the activities;
- that conditions were dynamic and might therefore need adjustments in the activities planned;
- that principles of 'do no harm' and safety of all involved were key factors; and
- flexibility for schedule changes and approval of changes in budget were approved.

The above factors contributed to our ability to be responsive to the evolving circumstances recognizing that we were testing tools designed for a whole range of contexts.

Changes in grant managers of which there were two, were managed quite seamlessly as each was familiar with the grant when they came on board. The IMPACT meetings ending early in the grant meant that there were few interactions with the AFSC project and this was one of the features that might have been helpful, as we hoped to both shared data on the project as it developed.

We look forward to USIP's feedback and ongoing collaboration.