

Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism: Localization in Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines

Prepared for the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund

By
Emma Cleveland
Sascha Glaeser
Lauren Jorgensen
Lewi Negede Lewi
Anders Shropshire

Workshop in Public Affairs
Spring 2020



**Robert M. La Follette
School of Public Affairs**
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

©2020 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System
All rights Reserved.

For an online copy, see www.lafollette.wisc.edu/outreach-public-service/workshops-in-public-affairs or
publications@lafollette.wisc.edu

The Robert M. La Follette School of Public Affairs is a teaching and research department of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The school takes no stand on policy issues; opinions expressed in these pages reflect the views of the authors.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison is an equal opportunity and affirmative-action educator and employer. We promote excellence through diversity in all programs.

Table of Contents

FOREWORD	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	IV
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	V
ACRONYMS	VI
1 INTRODUCTION: PREVENTING AND COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM	1
1.1 COUNTRIES OF ANALYSIS: KENYA, KOSOVO, AND THE PHILIPPINES	2
1.2 KENYA.....	3
1.3 KOSOVO	3
1.4 THE PHILIPPINES.....	3
2 DECENTRALIZATION: STRUCTURE INFORMS IMPLEMENTATION	4
2.1 DECENTRALIZATION IN CASE STUDIES	5
2.1.1 <i>Decentralization in Kenya</i>	6
2.1.2 <i>Decentralization in Kosovo</i>	6
2.1.3 <i>Decentralization in the Philippines</i>	6
3 SUMMARY OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS	7
3.1 KENYA.....	7
3.1.1 <i>Summary of Kenya’s Local Action Plans</i>	8
3.2 KOSOVO	9
3.3 PHILIPPINES	10
4 NATIONAL ACTION PLAN CODING ANALYSIS RESULTS	11
4.1 SIMILARITIES AMONG NAPs	13
4.2 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NAPs.....	13
5 DECISION SPACE ANALYSIS	13
5.1 DECISION SPACE ANALYSIS: KENYA’S NATIONAL AND LOCAL ACTION PLANS.....	14
5.2 DECISION SPACE ANALYSIS: KOSOVO’S NATIONAL ACTION PLAN	15
5.3 DECISION SPACE ANALYSIS: PHILIPPINES’S NATIONAL ACTION PLAN	16
6 IMPLICATIONS FOR GCERF’S FUTURE WORK	16
6.1 GOALS	16
6.2 FUNDING PRIORITIES.....	17
7 RECOMMENDATIONS	18
8 AREAS OF FOCUS IN THE FUTURE	19
REFERENCES	20
APPENDIX A: COUNTRY BACKGROUND – KENYA	24
APPENDIX B: COUNTRY BACKGROUND – KOSOVO	25
APPENDIX C: COUNTRY BACKGROUND – THE PHILIPPINES	26
APPENDIX D: EXPANDED DECENTRALIZATION LITERATURE	27
APPENDIX E: KENYA NATIONAL ACTION PLAN WORK PILLARS	33
APPENDIX F: NATIONAL ACTION PLAN CODES	34
APPENDIX G: KENYA NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS ROLES AND REQUESTS	35

APPENDIX H: DESCRIPTION OF PRIORITY RATINGS.....	53
APPENDIX I: CRAFTED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	54

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Decentralization Rankings Summary	6
Table 2: National Action Plan Coding Results	12
Table 3: Comparing Goals and Priorities.....	18
Table 4: Comparing Roles Assigned in National and County Plans.....	36
Table 5: Arts and Culture Pillar Activities.....	37
Table 6: Education Pillar Activities.....	38
Table 7: Faith-Based and Ideology Pillar Activities	39
Table 8: Legal and Policy Pillar Activities	40
Table 9: Media and Online Pillar Activities	41
Table 10: Refugee and Border Pillar Activities.....	42
Table 11: Political Pillar Activities	43
Table 12: Psycho-Social Pillar Activities.....	44
Table 13: Security Pillar Activities	45
Table 13: Security Pillar Activities (continued).....	46
Table 14: Training and Capacity Building Pillar Activities	47
Table 15: Women Pillar Activities	48
Table 16: Rule of Law Pillar Activities.....	49
Table 16: Rule of Law Pillar Activities (continued).....	50
Table 17: Economic Pillar Activities	51
Table 18: Miscellaneous Activities	52
 Figure 1: Countries of Analysis	 2

Foreword

This report is the result of collaboration between the La Follette School of Public Affairs at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund. The overall learning objective of our program is to provide graduate students at the La Follette School of Public Affairs the opportunity to improve their policy analysis skills while providing the client an analysis of a policy problem on which a decision or set of decisions needs to be made.

The La Follette School offers a two-year graduate program leading either to a master's degree in public affairs (MPA) or a master's in international public affairs (MIPA). Students study policy analysis and public management, and they spend the first year and a half of the program taking courses in which they develop the expertise needed to analyze public policies, including statistics, economics, and policy analysis. The authors of this report all are in their final semester of their degree program and are enrolled in the Workshop in Public Affairs. Although acquiring a set of policy analysis skills is important, there is no substitute for actually doing policy analysis as a means of experiential learning. The Workshop in Public Affairs gives graduate students that capstone opportunity as they produce a report for a real-world client about a question of importance to the organization.

The client for this project is the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF), an international non-governmental organization (NGO) based in Geneva, Switzerland. Its mission is to facilitate achieving the goals of the 2011 Global Counterterrorism Forum, which itself has the goal of reducing the vulnerability of people to terrorism. La Follette School alumnus Tony Carroll (MA '80) serves on GCERF's Governing Board and made the connection that led to this collaboration. Two key contacts at GCERF, Kristen O'Connell and André Alves Dos Reis, brought the question of localization to the La Follette School, seeking input on how GCERF might help promote localized efforts at combatting violent extremism.

This group of five graduating MPA and MIPA students—Emma Cleveland, Sascha Glaeser, Lauren Jorgensen, Lewi Negede Lewi, and Anders Shropshire—have spent the last four months working on this issue. They identified three key case study countries to assess: Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines; in addition to understanding each country's context, they assessed national actional plans to combat violent extremism and local efforts to implement those plans. They developed an innovative coding scheme to comprehensively assess the performance of each country by evaluating each on 16 items. Their three recommendations for GCERF they identify are the result of careful analysis and rigorous research and embody the mission of the La Follette School, to:

*Train leaders and conduct research to inspire evidence-based
policymaking and to advance the public good.*

Gregory F. Nemet
Professor of Public Affairs
La Follette School of Public Affairs
Madison WI
May 2020

Acknowledgments

We would like to extend our gratitude to the numerous people involved in developing this report. First, we would like to thank our client, the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund, for the opportunity to partake in this project. Specifically, we would like to thank Kristen O'Connell and André Alves Dos Reis for serving as our primary client contacts. Without their guidance and knowledge of the various National Action Plans and threats facing the countries we analyzed, this project would not have been possible. Next, we would like to thank Lisa Hildebrand for her careful review of our final report. Her feedback was useful for making this report the product you see today. Finally, we would like to recognize Professor Gregory Nemet of the La Follette School of Public Affairs for assisting us with this report through its various stages. His constant support and assistance were vital for this project's success.

Executive Summary

Violent extremism has become a substantial international concern. Efforts to prevent and counter violent extremism (P/CVE) were formalized at the 2011 Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), where 30 countries identified community-level efforts to reduce violent extremism. National Action Plans (NAPs), and in some cases, Local Action Plans (LAPs), are developed to prevent and counter violent extremism. Based on this community-driven focus, the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was founded in 2016 to assist and fund local communities in their efforts to prevent and counter violent extremism.

We address three key research questions to provide insight as to how NAPs and localization promote the P/CVE agenda:

1. To what extent do National Action Plans consider local governments or local entities as part of planning and structure?
2. How should GCERF support its local partners in the future?
3. What are some shared strategies for preventing and countering violent extremism in the three case study countries' National Action Plans?

To provide examples of localization efforts, we analyzed three countries as case studies: Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines. To understand regional and local efforts against global violence in these countries, we completed a three-step analysis. First, we performed a literature review covering decentralization and decision space analysis. Next, we reviewed each NAP, providing a summary of the plan, its goals, and the stakeholders involved. Finally, we developed a qualitative coding scheme to comprehensively assess NAPs in terms of best practices laid out by the United Nations (UN). Using our literature review, we identified three categories of best practices for the NAPs. These categories, as advised by the guidelines of the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism are Local Interventions, Reintegration and Rehabilitation, and Media and Communications.

Based on our literature review and analysis of the National and Local Action Plans available, we identified four possible priorities that GCERF could consider—cultivating awareness raising, promoting empowerment, building capacity, and connecting communities. In measuring these priorities against our goals (social cohesion, community agency, equal access to opportunities, creating a sense of purpose, efficient use of resources, and feasibility), we ultimately endorse three of our priorities to GCERF. **We recommend that GCERF prioritize:**

- 1. funding that promotes empowerment,**
- 2. general capacity building activities, and**
- 3. connecting development agencies and NGOs to improve decentralization outcomes.**

In addition to reviewing the NAPs, we had planned to conduct interviews with local stakeholders such as local government officials, religious leaders, educators, and other community leaders in each country via a phone or video call. However, we were unable to complete the interviews mainly due to time constraints associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. We instead included a list of interview questions in the Appendix to further this research.

Acronyms

CSO:	Civil Society Organization
CVE:	Countering Violent Extremism
DILG:	Department of the Interior and Local Government (Philippines)
GCAP:	The Garissa County Action Plan for Prevention and Countering of Violent Extremism
GCERF:	Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund
GCTF:	Global Counterterrorism Forum
GDP:	Gross Domestic Product
GNWP:	Global Network of Women Peacebuilders
GoK:	Government of Kenya
IA:	International Agency
KPR:	Kenya Police Reserve
LAP:	Local Action Plan
MCAP–P/CVE:	The Mombasa County Action Plan for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism
NAP:	National Action Plan
NGA:	National Governmental Agency (Philippines)
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organization
NATO:	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCTC:	National Counter Terrorism Centre
NSCVE:	National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism (Kenya)
P/CVE:	Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism
UN:	United Nations
UNGCTS:	United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy
VE:	Violent Extremism
WCAP:	The Wajir County Action Agency Plan to Prevent and Counter Violent Extremism
WPS:	Women, Peace, and Security

1 Introduction: Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism

The 21st century has seen a significant increase in violent extremism—the use of violence to advance certain political or social goals—worldwide. In 2000, an estimated 3,329 people were killed because of violent extremism (UN Development Program, 2016). In 2018, this number rose to 15,952 (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2019). The root causes of violent extremism are complex and intertwined. Social, political, economic, and historical factors all influence radicalization of individuals to join violent extremist groups. High levels of poverty and unemployment, insufficient educational systems, human rights abuses, governance failures, and other acute challenges contribute to the increase in violent extremism.

The 2011 Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF) formalized efforts to prevent and counter violent extremism (P/CVE) (GCTF, 2011). Leaders of 30 countries gathered to identify community-level efforts for reducing extremism events. Today, GCTF members partner with other countries and international institutions to identify long-term strategies to P/CVE. Inspired by this idea, the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was established as an international, multi-stakeholder non-governmental organization that assists communities at risk of radicalization (GCERF, 2018). GCERF is governed by a board with representatives from donor countries, beneficiary countries, think tanks, foundations, civil society organizations (CSOs), and the private sector (GCERF, 2018). It receives funding from governments, international organizations, foundations, corporations, and individual donors. By working with local and national governments that seek funding, GCERF identifies communities that are vulnerable to violent extremism. GCERF then provides funding exclusively to community-based organizations such as schools, youth groups, women’s groups, media outlets, and religious institutions to increase the country’s resilience to violent extremism. Currently, GCERF works with 159 local partners in eight countries: Bangladesh, Kenya, Kosovo, Mali, Nigeria, Tunisia, Somalia, and the Philippines (GCERF, 2018). GCERF does not focus its efforts on countering one particular ideology, religion, or ethnicity because violent extremism can manifest itself in many forms. Recognizing that military actions alone have not proven sufficient in dismantling violent extremist groups, GCERF addresses the causes, rather than the symptoms, of violent extremism at the community level.

Increased attention to the role of improving good governance has led academics and practitioners to focus on the crucial roles of local governments in the process (United Nations Development Programme, 2016). Local governments, such as municipalities and counties, comprise the basic unit of public service delivery and often are the first responders to violent extremism and other challenges (Campbell et al., 2004). However, devolving more responsibility to local governments in developing countries is challenging because they often are not financially independent and do not have strong institutional and technical capacity. Additionally, local entities like community groups and religious organizations must be considered when improving localization efforts.

In 2006, the United Nations (UN) General Assembly adopted the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (UNGCTS) to coordinate national, regional, and international efforts to counter terrorism (UNGCTS, 2006). The strategy is built on four pillars:

1. Addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism.
2. Preventing and combating terrorism.
3. Building states’ capacity to prevent and combat terrorism and to strengthen the role of the United Nations system in that regard.
4. Ensuring respect for human rights for all and the rule of law as the fundamental basis for the fight against terrorism (UNGCTS, 2015).

The UN General Assembly has reviewed and updated this strategy every two years. Its 2016 review called for every member country to implement a National Action Plan (NAP) (UNGCTS Review, 2016). NAPs allow each member country to set priorities for addressing country-specific factors that contribute to violent extremism. The 2016 strategy review emphasized the first and fourth pillars, highlighting the need for member countries to craft NAPs that focus on preventive measures for addressing violent extremism. The review also encouraged member states to integrate local communities and non-governmental organizations to implement preventive initiatives at the local level.

To identify how well these plans define and operationalize the role of local governments, this report compares the NAPs and localization efforts to prevent and counter violent extremism in Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines in order to identify how well these plans define and operationalize the role of local governments. We address three key research questions to provide insight about how NAPs and localization promote the P/CVE agenda:

1. To what extent do National Action Plans consider local governments or local entities as part of their planning and structure?
2. How should GCERF support its local partners in the future?
3. What are some shared strategies for preventing and countering violent extremism in the three case study countries' National Action Plans?

1.1 Countries of Analysis: Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines

After consulting GCERF, we selected three countries—Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines—as case studies for this analysis. These three were chosen because their NAPs are available in English and the dates of implementation allow for temporal analysis: Kenya (2016), Kosovo (2015), the Philippines (2019). Additionally, Kenya has LAPs available for review.

Figure 1: Countries of Analysis



1.2 Kenya

Kenya, formally the Republic of Kenya, is an east African state with a population of 53 million (CIA World Factbook Kenya, 2019). In 2010, Kenya adopted a new constitution that devolved power to 47 counties and created stronger checks and balances on executive power. Kenya has experienced an average of 5 percent Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth in the last decade—reaching the rank of a lower-middle-income country in 2014. Despite steady economic growth, a significant amount of Kenya’s population is unemployed or underemployed, with some estimates putting the unemployment rate at 40 percent.

The Global Peace Index creates a ranking system that measures the general peacefulness of a nation with one being the most peaceful. In 2019, Kenya ranked 119th out of 163 countries. Kenya faces an ongoing threat from terrorist organizations—chief among them al-Shabaab. Al-Shabaab has pledged itself to al-Qaeda and operates in Kenya’s eastern border region with Somalia. The group has conducted several high-profile terrorist attacks in Kenya, including the 2013 Westgate shopping mall attack in Nairobi, which killed 67 people (CNN, 2013), the 2015 Garissa University College attack, which killed 141 people (BBC, 2015), and the 2019 DusitD2 hotel attack, which killed 26 people (Counter Extremism, 2020). In 2014, it was estimated that 25 percent of al-Shabaab’s forces were Kenyans. Additionally, there have been several cases of Kenyan citizens joining the Islamic State (Counter Extremism, 2020). The risk of further terrorist attacks and increased radicalization efforts continues to be a major source of concern for Kenyan authorities. For full country background, see Appendix A.

1.3 Kosovo

Kosovo, formally the Republic of Kosovo, is a parliamentary representative democratic country in the Balkans with a population of 1.9 million. (CIA World Factbook Kosovo, 2019). Kosovo has 38 municipalities, each consisting of a mayor and a municipal assembly. Since the disintegration of Yugoslavia, Kosovo has transitioned toward a market-based economy and has seen gains in economic growth over the past decade; however, it is still considered a lower-middle-income nation based on the CIA World Factbook. Despite modest economic progress, Kosovo has an unemployment rate of 33 percent and a youth unemployment rate of 60 percent.

The 2019 Global Peace Index ranked Kosovo 86th out of 163 countries. Although the country does not have a history of religious violent extremism, it has been a significant recruitment source of foreign fighters for the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. Kosovo is a secular state with no official religion; however, 95 percent of the population is Muslim. Foreign extremist organizations have exploited local grievances to radicalize and recruit members to their cause. Since 2012, an estimated 400 Kosovars have traveled to Iraq and Syria to join the Islamic State (New York Times, 2019). Moreover, the municipalities of Hani I Elezit, Kaçanik, Mitrovice, Gjilan, and Viti have provided a disproportionate number of foreign fighters. Accounting for 14 percent of Kosovo’s total population, these five municipalities have contributed more than one-third of Kosovo’s foreign male fighters (Shtuni, 2016). Although the Islamic State has not carried out attacks in Kosovo, it was estimated in 2016, that 37 percent of those who left to join terrorist organizations in Iraq and Syria had returned to Kosovo (Shtuni, 2016). The recent increase in Kosovars enticed to join extremist groups abroad highlights the necessity in understanding and countering the complex dynamics of radicalization in Kosovo. For full country background, see Appendix B.

1.4 The Philippines

The Philippines, formally the Republic of the Philippines, is a Southeast Asian country with a population of 109 million. The Philippines is a presidential republic and has three branches of government:

legislative, judicial, and executive. Although the Philippines has 81 provinces and 38 chartered cities, it is governed as a unitary state except for the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao. The Philippines has experienced GDP growth averaging over 6 percent per year from 2011 to 2017. One-fifth of the population lives below the poverty line, and the unemployment rate is approximately 6 percent (CIA World Factbook Philippines, 2019).

The 2019 Global Peace Index ranked the Philippines 134th out of 163 countries. There are several violent extremist organizations in the Philippines. The most notable of these, Abu Sayyaf Group and the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters, are religious nationalist organizations that operate in the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in the southern Mindanao Islands. Additionally, the New People's Army, which is associated with the Communist Party of the Philippines, operates throughout the country (The Stabilization Network, 2019). Bangsamoro is the only majority Muslim region in the predominantly Christian country, and the marginalization of religious minorities in the Philippines has led to tensions since the 16th century (Hall, 1981). While the Bangsamoro region has been home to several armed movements resulting from long-running hostilities, most extremist groups that are active in Bangsamoro were established in the last 40 years (BBC News, 2012). Until recently, most of these groups conducted guerrilla warfare. For example, a 2009 study estimated that the Abu Sayyaf Group had no more than 100 hardcore and 200 part-time militants, 30 foreign fighters, and less than 350 weapons at its disposal (Chalk, 2009). However, these groups have increased their capabilities in recent years by becoming allied with trans-national extremist groups such as the Islamic State, leading to a violent five-month conflict in the city of Marawi in 2017 (Betteridge-Moes, 2017). For full country background, see Appendix C.

2 Decentralization: Structure Informs Implementation

Decentralization is appropriate for P/CVE strategies for several reasons. Primarily, local units of government have stronger, more trusting relationships with the communities they serve. A key part of our literature review examines the inclusion of local governments in NAPs. However, the content of plans may not necessarily align with the reality of the plan's implementation. Decentralization involves a complicated unbundling and delegation of fiscal, administrative, and political authorities, and its implementation can be rendered ineffective through intentional or unintentional provisions. Policy areas can differ substantially in how these authorities are balanced, making for a difficult process of evaluating limitations and feasibility of the NAPs as written. Understanding the context in which a P/CVE plan is operating helps predict the feasibility for effective decentralization. We include a summary of the findings below and a more comprehensive review in Appendix D.

Decentralization can take three forms (Rondinelli, 1981)—deconcentration, delegation, and devolution. Deconcentration shifts authority into regional offices within a national agency and is a limited form of decentralization. Delegation shifts authority into semi-autonomous agencies that generally remain under national jurisdiction and is similarly limited. Devolution shifts authority into local governments and is the most complete form of decentralization.

At the theoretical level, devolution improves governance by bringing decision-making closer to the communities affected, leveraging the relationships local governments maintain with their constituents. This may also lead to more unique and experimental programs that can be used as learning opportunities. Additionally, it can reduce the burden on national governments to oversee dozens or hundreds of local areas (Litvack et al., 1998; Rondinelli, 1981). However, empirical literature has found mixed evidence of decentralization's positive impacts. When decentralization is attempted, political and cultural factors as well as technical capacity limitations of local governments are frequent hinderances. These factors affect P/CVE programs. Decentralization initiatives can be undermined by failing to provide local governments

with necessary authority related to revenue generation, administrative independence, or legal autonomy. Ambiguous responsibilities between tiers of government also can limit local independence.

The three key takeaways from our literature review are the following. First, context matters. The country-specific situation, such as the structure and norms of governance, experience of local officials, and current degree of decentralization, will greatly impact localization beyond the content of the plans (Azfar et al., 1999). There may be instances when local governments need significant new authorities or resources and some areas may be unprepared to endorse or absorb robust decentralization. Second, design is key to success. Design must be appropriate for the context and must balance the responsibilities that are devolved with tools to deliver them. This involves attending to political/legal, fiscal, and administrative dimensions. Avenues for oversight and monitoring by the national government must exist, but in a way that does not allow needless or opportunistic intervention. Specificity will be key because ambiguous designations allow other factors to contour the relationships. Third, there are some P/CVE-specific elements to be mindful of. For example, the ‘whole-of-government’ approach implies decentralization must be broad, touching on many areas. This can make the process of decentralization more technically difficult and politically contentious. In addition, opportunities for personal gain in some countries—such as access to donor funds or the ability to use P/CVE strategies against political opposition—can create resistance to decentralization. GCERF should be mindful of these perverse incentives.

There are some brief implications of this literature. GCERF should continue to work with local stakeholders to identify the priority areas for decentralization. Based on the plans we reviewed, areas where localization may be most needed include social services, education, security, prisons, and economic development and trainings. Additional review of literature in these areas, interviews with government officials, and development of guidance for what authorities will contribute to success could help countries develop better plans and make necessary legal changes. Additionally, templates for systematically analyzing and comparing decentralization context in partner countries could help identify priority regions or common barriers for guiding GCERF’s work going forward.

2.1 Decentralization in Case Studies

We build on our country context to frame how government decentralization generally informs the content of the national and local action plans. A 2012 World Bank paper ranks the level of decentralization of governments across the globe (Ivanyna & Shah, 2012). The overall index is based on weighting the security, fiscal, political, and administrative capacities of local government. Security measures restraints on arbitrary dismissal of local governments. Fiscal measures the ability of local governments to raise revenues independently. Administrative measures the ability of local governments to make personnel-related decisions. Political measures the existence and contestability of local elections. Administrative capacities include controls for population, geographic area, and development level. Based on the index, western democracies generally score the highest, while developing nations show more centralized governments. Table 1 shows the World Bank rankings for the three case study countries. It should be noted, though, that the data is from 2005 and earlier. Situations may have changed since then, and these countries have embarked on decentralization initiatives, most successfully and deeply in Kenya. The results show the Philippines as the country with the most thoroughly and securely devolved nation in the analysis. Kosovo scores in the middle of the range overall, but with relatively low levels of security and fiscal decentralization. Kenya is shown to be the least decentralized overall; however, its 2010 constitutional decentralization reform would likely move Kenya above the Philippines if re-scored.

Table 1: Decentralization Rankings Summary

Country	Overall Decentralization Index Ranking	Security of Local Governments Ranking	Fiscal Decentralization Index Ranking	Political Decentralization Index Ranking	Administrative Decentralization Index Ranking
Philippines	33	49	42	26	33
Kosovo	75	140	110	47	60
Kenya*	96	73	71	137	105

*Kenya's numbers are not reflective of the constitutional reforms made in 2010 and thus poorly represent its current position.

2.1.1 Decentralization in Kenya

Kenya has undergone the most thorough and recent decentralization of the three case study countries, with some scholars calling it one of the most ambitious decentralizations ever. The country adopted a new constitution in 2010 with a new governmental structure that added 47 county jurisdictions as a tier between the national government and municipal and other local governments. The counties operate independently from the national government with county-level elected officials and decisions on economic development, healthcare, education, and infrastructure. The new constitution also added robust oversight of the national executive's power. Since the change, the country has experienced mostly healthy contestation between the new actors for power and independence (Cheeseman et al., 2016). Overall, the impacts of broader decentralization are still coming to the surface and despite some growing pains, generally appear to be positive (*Kenya's New Constitution Brings Political Change*, 2017).

2.1.2 Decentralization in Kosovo

Kosovo is the most centralized country among the three cases. Underneath the national government, municipal governments operate along with villages and other smaller jurisdictions. Although these municipalities are allotted typical authority such as economic planning, education, health, and utilities, they lack autonomy in raising revenue and in administration. Approximately 80 percent of funds are delivered as grants from the central government and held in the national treasury (Ebel et al., 2007). The remaining funds come from local property taxes. This lack of fiscal autonomy has hampered efforts to decentralize social services (Kahlert & Danaj, 2018). The central government also determines personnel numbers and pay for municipalities. In many policy areas, municipal governments must act based on plans dictated by the national government, which renders them operational managers rather than full policymaking entities. Despite recent decentralization efforts, fiscal and legal constraints continue to prevent robust outcomes. As one paper notes, "decentralization in Kosovo is strong in letter, but weak in practice" (*First Draft: Necessity to Re-Think Decentralization*, 2016).

2.1.3 Decentralization in the Philippines

The Philippines also has recently moved toward decentralization, beginning in the 1990s. More recently, President Rodrigo Duterte abandoned his campaign promise to adopt a federal constitution (Teehankee, 2019). Underneath the federal government, the country is divided into 18 regions, which reflects a deconcentration style of government. Beneath the federal government, there are provincial, municipal, and other types of local government. Decentralization in the Philippines has been hampered by unclear

divisions of responsibility, poor bureaucratic capacity building, and inadequate revenue-raising powers (*Philippine Institute for Development Studies*, 2017). The Philippines’s local governments have somewhat more taxation authority than in Kosovo, with business and other minor taxes allowed. The local governments also may borrow from certain entities. Regarding responsibilities, local governments oversee health services, education, and social welfare services. Overall, the Philippines’s experience with decentralization has been more successful than in Kosovo, although local governments experience fiscal limitations.

3 Summary of National Action Plans

3.1 Kenya

Published in 2016, Kenya’s National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism (what we refer to as a NAP), offers an over-arching goal of unity, with the Government of Kenya (GoK) working to “rally all sectors of Kenyan social, religious, and economic life to emphatically and continuously reject violent extremist ideologies” (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016). This message is woven throughout the NAP, which uses patriotism, community, and similar themes to overcome the antithetical missions of extremist organizations. By creating this unity, the GoK hopes to prevent Kenyans, especially youth, from joining extremist organizations. See Appendix E for the GoK’s nine work pillars.

The GoK defines radicalism as “a gradual or phased process that exploits the psychological, political-religious, and ideological conditioning of individuals to believe that they are part of a threatened or combative collective identity, in order to socialize them to violent extremism” (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016). With this in mind, the GoK outlined the three phases of preventing radicalization and has used them to determine prevention levels (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016). The general prevention effort focuses on society as a whole and builds community resilience. The specific preventive efforts focus on environments where radicalization tends to occur, such as schools, poverty-stricken neighborhoods, and the internet. This prevention level informs, educates, and empowers local communities. Finally, the individual-oriented efforts work with people who are becoming radicalized. The GoK works with these people before they are immersed in an extremist group.

Finally, the NAP indicates how various stakeholders will work together to end the threat of violent extremism and radicalization. The GoK has created a hierarchical organizational approach with the national government leading the initiatives. However, the NAP is very clear that communities are “ground zero” and must be consulted (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016). Kenya’s NAP reflects its progress in creating a dialogue between the national government and local entities. The GoK asks local communities to assist with P/CVE efforts by engaging religious leaders, non-governmental organizations, economic development organizations, the private sector, researchers, and citizens (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016). These communities are already poised with an understanding of who has the largest circles of influence.

The NAP also lays out four initiatives for local communities—communicating with national agencies, building relationships between local communities and the national government, utilizing community policing including Nyumba Kumi and Peace Communities, and applying early intervention teams to prevent radicalization (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016).

3.1.1 Summary of Kenya’s Local Action Plans

This report also compares three Kenyan LAPs and how they fit into the country’s NAP. While Kenya’s NAP does not exclusively discuss LAPs, they are an important component for understanding localization efforts. In Kenya, LAPs are organized by the county level.

Located in the southeast coastal region, Mombasa County is the smallest of Kenya’s 47 counties based on land mass size. Mombasa County contains the city of Mombasa, Kenya’s second largest city after the capital of Nairobi. The Mombasa County Action Plan for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism (MCAP-P/CVE) was developed to guide the county’s P/CVE efforts between 2017 and 2022.

The MCAP-P/CVE identifies the unique challenges presented by Mombasa County’s diverse population and historical factors. To address these challenges, the MCAP-P/CVE outlines four strategic objectives:

1. To build community resilience toward violent extremism.
2. To promote human dignity, security, and access to justice for all.
3. To enhance county cohesion and integration, especially between people of different faiths.
4. To promote networking and cooperation between state (national and county) and non-state actors. (MCAP P/CVE, 2017).

Mombasa County seeks to coordinate the implementation of the MCAP-P/CVE by adopting a multi-stakeholder approach that includes, government officials, academia, religious organizations, civil society organizations, cultural leaders, people with disabilities, and others (MCAP P/CVE, 2017).

The MCAP-P/CVE builds upon the nine pillars of Kenya’s NAP by including an economic pillar and a pillar for women (MCAP P/CVE, 2017). Widespread unemployment, high taxes, inflation, inadequate inclusion of women in decision-making processes, and deficient information and research on issues relating to women and violent extremism are challenges that county-level stakeholders identified. For each of the nine pillars plus the additional two that Mombasa County added, the MCAP-P/CVE identifies an issue, outlines a strategy to address the issue, allocates responsibility to certain stakeholders, outlines needed resources, and provides an expected result and impact of successful implementation. This approach ensures that county-level stakeholders are actively engaged in P/CVE efforts.

Wajir County is in northern Kenya, borders Ethiopia and Somalia, and it is part of the historically marginalized North Eastern Province. However, under Kenya’s new constitution, the devolution of power has led to an opening of the county’s democratic space. Wajir County has a high incidence of violent events, including cross-border clashes between clans over natural resources and trans-national terrorism. The Wajir County Action Plan to Prevent and Counter Violent Extremism (WCAP) lays the framework for Wajir County’s efforts to counter violent extremism between 2018 and 2023. The plan includes the following strategic objectives to address local challenges with violent extremism:

1. Expand the rule of law and justice systems in Wajir County.
2. Maintain focused momentum and stakeholders toward knowledgeable P/CVE.
3. Build a collective platform of religious leaders, women, politicians, and youth for action against violent extremism.
4. Establish countering violent extremism forums for effective and efficient implementation of WCAP (Wajir County Government, 2018).

Similar to other LAPs in Kenya, WCAP has adopted the nine pillars in Kenya’s NAP. The WCAP also has three local pillars that emerge from local stakeholder discussions—women, access to justice, and the rule of law.

Garissa County is in eastern Kenya. Like Wajir County, Garissa County is part of the historically marginalized North Eastern Province, and borders Somalia. The county houses the largest refugee camp in Kenya based in both population and physical size of the camp. In 2016, the camp in Dadaab had more than 250,000 Somali refugees, which made up about one-half of the county’s population. Additionally, Garissa County was the site of the 2015 Garissa University College attack. The Garissa County Action Plan for Prevention and Countering of Violent Extremism (GCAP) lays the framework for the county’s efforts to counter violent extremism between 2018 and 2023. The plan identifies five strategic objectives to address local challenges with violent extremism.

1. Provide at-risk people with vocational and life-skills training.
2. Establish and promote structures for political socialization of youth.
3. Provide mentoring and religious guidance for at risk people.
4. Establish countering violent extremism forums to enhance collaboration between key state and nonstate actors.
5. Develop and implement framework for integrating county government’s interventions into P/CVE (Garissa County Government, 2018).

The county’s action plan shares the nine pillars in the national strategy and has four additional pillars important to its local context—national/county government relationship, women, citizenship, and refugees.

3.2 Kosovo

Kosovo has increasingly seen threats from violent extremism, especially in its northern region. Kosovo’s NAP was created in 2015 and offers a comprehensive action plan based on the following four pillars (Strategy on Preventing of Violent Extremism and Radicalisation Leading to Terrorism, 2015):

1. Early identification
2. Prevention
3. Intervention
4. Deradicalization and reintegration

By strengthening these pillars, Kosovo hopes to disrupt radicalization efforts of violent extremist groups, resulting in fewer Kosovars joining.

Kosovo defines radicalism as “the process of approving extremist religious beliefs and in some cases converting into a violent extremist.” (Strategy on Preventing of Violent Extremism and Radicalisation Leading to Terrorism, 2015). The NAP also defines violent extremism as “extremism which involves the use of violence; including but not limited to terrorism” (Strategy on Preventing of Violent Extremism and Radicalisation Leading to Terrorism, 2015).

Kosovo has identified two overarching motives of extremism based on these definitions. Push factors, such as economic and social challenges and inadequate institutional capacity, which push Kosovars away from civil society and into extremism. Economic and social challenges outlined in the NAP are high unemployment rates and poor-quality schools. Kosovo fears leaving people vulnerable to either of these conditions will create a higher number of youth being radicalized (Strategy on Preventing of Violent Extremism and Radicalisation Leading to Terrorism, 2015). Pull factors deal exclusively with inadequate institutional capacity. The government of Kosovo has experienced corruption and poor administrative

reforms; and without a strong and united government, the government of Kosovo fears it will leave Kosovars vulnerable to radicalization.

However, Kosovo has completed a comprehensive list of objectives and activities that fall into each of the four pillars. These activities give concrete steps for completing each objective. They delineate who is responsible and if there is a deadline for completing the activity. Kosovo plans to review and update its NAP every five years. In addition, the NAP outlines a proposal for an accompanying document that will give a more detailed explanation on implementing the plan's activities.

3.3 Philippines

The Philippines's NAP has a substantial basis in research on violent extremism. The overall goal of this plan is to “prevent radicalization leading to violent extremism through a ‘whole-of-nation’ approach or the convergence of the government, CSO, religious sector, and other key stakeholders” (National Action Plan on Preventing or Countering Violent Extremism, 2019). The government's hope is to encourage participation between the public and private sectors as well as local communities.

The Philippines have determined four levels of P/CVE—identifying vulnerable populations, analyzing push and pull factors, identifying stakeholders to carry out interventions, and identifying intervention techniques (National Action Plan on Preventing or Countering Violent Extremism, 2019). From here, the NAP discusses push factors such as poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, historical hardships, discrimination, and political and economic marginalization (National Action Plan on Preventing or Countering Violent Extremism, 2019). It also discusses pull factors such as ideology, a sense of belonging within an extremist group, reputation, and fame (National Action Plan on Preventing or Countering Violent Extremism, 2019). The choice to discuss these factors is based on research completed by the Philippines's government on P/CVE strategies.

The Philippines's NAP then moves into a discussion about the connection between actors who participate in violent extremism or are vulnerable to being radicalized and identifies factors that contribute to increased radicalization among Filipinos. Finally, the NAP identifies various groups, organizations, and means of communication that are vulnerable to radicalization. The NAP puts little focus on localization efforts specific to the Philippines. While some of the NAP's interventions would occur at a local level, many are generic.

Because the Philippines's NAP was developed in 2019, LAPs do not yet exist. However, the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) issued a memorandum circular to local officials on the inclusion of CSOs and international agencies (IAs) on P/CVE projects. It dictates a significant role for regional DILG offices to oversee engagement of these actors by local governments and outlines how provinces and cities should report their activities to the national government through the DILG. The memorandum circular also specifies that local goals are to “synchronize NGA, CSO, and IA projects and services for monitoring purposes, proper coordination, and more proactive interventions” (Engagement of All Civil Society Organizations and International Agencies in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Insurgency, 2019).

The DILG is responsible for overseeing implementation of the institutional arrangement specified in the memorandum, vetting proposed programs, and monitoring CSOs and IAs that implement projects. These activities are placed under the authority of the Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Insurgency - Project Management Office (PCVEI-PMO). It implies the secretary must approve of proposed programs, although it is unclear about how much authority the secretary has to prohibit proposals. Partner CSOs or IAs must submit a letter explaining the proposed project, a concept based on a

template, and an information sheet. The memorandum circular does not indicate how local governments are expected to participate in this arrangement.

4 National Action Plan Coding Analysis Results

To understand regional and local efforts against violent extremism in Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines, we developed a qualitative coding scheme to comprehensively assess NAPs. A literature review allowed us to identify three categories of best practices. These categories, as advised by the UN Office of Counter-Terrorism NAP Report, are Local Interventions, Reintegration and Rehabilitation, and Media and Communications (UN, 2017). Codes in the Local Interventions category most directly relate to GCERF's goal of transitioning NAP mandates to the local level. The Reintegration and Rehabilitation category includes codes about reintegrating people who previously engaged in violent pursuits. Finally, the Media and Communications category includes codes about engaging media outlets to disseminate thorough, accurate information about local violence. Full codes are in Appendix F.

To code the NAPs, two members of our team read each of the three case study countries' NAPs and assigned codes individually. When coding a document, we highlighted the text being coded and identified which coding item we were scoring. Team members then compared their codes. If stark differences arose, a third member made the final decision. When coding was complete, we ran basic descriptive analyses of the codes. We analyzed each country's scores as well as mean scores across the three countries. These scores are in Table 2 below.

Table 2: National Action Plan Coding Results

Code Item	Country			
	Kenya	Kosovo	Philippines	Overall
Local entities involved in planning	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Evidence of Resource Allocation	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.67
Efforts to include women	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.67
Efforts to include youth	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Efforts to include civil society	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Strategies for law enforcement	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Consider needs of particular regions	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.67
Mentions local groups	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.67
Mention reintegration	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Evaluates reintegration needs	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.67
Reintegration and development work in tandem	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.67
Funding for reintegration	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Contact information included	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.33
Partners with a platform	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.33
Publicly available	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Communicated to stakeholders	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Overall	0.75	0.69	0.56	0.67

A list of all codes is in Appendix F. A score of 1.00 indicates that the country's NAP included the coded item. A score of 0.00 indicates that the country's NAP did not contain the coded item. Overall, NAPs had 67% of the coded items. Kenya had the most items in its NAP (75%), followed by Kosovo (69%), and the Philippines (56%).

4.1 Similarities Among NAPs

All three countries—Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines—had relatively similar scores with 0.75, 0.69, and 0.56 out of 1.0 respectively. More compellingly, all three NAPs demonstrated high scores in two categories of best practices: Local Interventions and Reintegration and Rehabilitation. This suggests that, in relation to national security, these three countries appear highly focused on involving local organizations and local governance in developing and implementing national security initiatives. The language in the NAPs also suggest these countries recognize the importance of rehabilitating and reintegrating radicalized people into society. Additionally, all NAPs emphasized youth and preventing their emergence into violent extremist groups.

Despite relatively high scores in the Local Interventions and Reintegration and Rehabilitation categories of best practices, all the NAPs were quite vague. They described the need for reducing violent extremism as objectives to ideally accomplish, rather than as definitive initiatives. Further, all NAPs centered around a common theme of government leadership, but they did not put forth specific duties. Although scores were high in the Local Interventions and Reintegration and Rehabilitation categories, these codes were based on the UN best practices document, which was also quite vague. Finally, despite ambiguity, none of the NAPs incorporated LAPs specifically into its broad blueprints.

4.2 Differences Between NAPs

While not directly analyzed by the codes, the coders found each country had a unique approach. For example, the Philippines had a much less action-driven NAP compared to Kenya or Kosovo. This could be due to numerous factors, including age of the NAP, an understanding of priorities, or differing goals. However, with the age of the NAPs comes more experience in assessing the problem and finding solutions. While there is no right answer to P/CVE, the Philippines scored lowest based on UN best practices, signaling a need to create more action-oriented steps. This is especially apparent considering the Philippines's NAP lacked language about reintegration and rehabilitation of extremists. While Kenya and Kosovo have plans and systems in place for reintegration, the Philippines's NAP only briefly mentions them.

Besides the difference in style, substantial differences exist between the three countries' use of media. While none of the countries made its NAP available to the public, only Kenya gave any contact information for further questions or information requests. Kosovo's NAP, on the other hand, mentioned working with local officials and news outlets to disseminate necessary information. While not necessarily a focus for GCERF or P/CVE measures, relaying important information is key to creating a unified message against extremism. This is something that NAPs should take into consideration.

5 Decision Space Analysis

To help connect our decentralization findings to our NAP analysis, we conducted an abbreviated decision space analysis. We discovered this approach in a paper on decentralization in the health sector (Bossart, 2002). Decision space analysis evaluates how much autonomy or constraint the law places over local entities in key aspects of governance, such as raising revenues, changing policies, or setting priorities. The decision space refers to how much restriction a local government faces in setting its own course or responding to pressures. For example, if a local government was legally prohibited from setting its own property tax rate to raise more revenues, it would face a very narrow, or limited, decision space. If that jurisdiction instead could choose to change that rate but not exceed a certain level, it might have a moderate decision space. If that jurisdiction was legally permitted to change the rates or choose to levy a

new tax, it would face a wide, or open, decision space. Whether the decision space is narrow or wide, therefore, depends on the legal constraints placed on local jurisdictions in the context of decentralization.

It was evident in our review of the NAPs that they lacked the specificity necessary for a proper decision space analysis. The plans sometimes identify whether local or national governments are stakeholders but fail to expand on the division of roles in operations, rendering it impossible to fully evaluate the decision space. Therefore, in this abbreviated decision space analysis, we seek to accomplish two items. First, determine which areas the plans identify local governments as stakeholders, and second, where there is sufficient context, characterize the local government roles in those areas, including whether they are overseeing implementation, have discretion to tailor the program to their needs, or receive resources to assist in implementation. We generally assume where there are fewer details, local governments directly implement a nationally determined program or have no direct role in implementation – the most narrow decision space.

We preface this analysis with two primary takeaways. First, local governments are inadequately considered in the plans. And second, when local governments are considered, it is unclear the roles and responsibilities between tiers of government. Optimistically, this may be a result of the novelty of P/CVE strategies, which implies governments have little experience in developing and implementing these strategies. This could suggest national governments are approaching cautiously to gain expertise and a more complete understanding of what resources, programs, and powers will be necessary to achieve the larger goals. This may allow for more targeted and deep localization in future plans when this experience is developed, but it remains to be seen.

5.1 Decision Space Analysis: Kenya’s National and Local Action Plans

Kenya’s NAP does the best job of incorporating local jurisdictions, namely county governments. The NAP acknowledges that responsibilities between tiers of government must be carefully distinguished. Several of Kenya’s nine work pillars—political, training and capacity, and legal and policy—include explicit references to local governments. Kenya identifies a necessary role for local governments in disengagement and reintegration efforts. Kenya’s NAP outlines areas for national and local action, which generally tasks county governments with expressing support, coordinating, and bringing people together.

Kenya’s NAP also identifies priorities for accomplishing the P/CVE work, including, “enhance support to local communities that are targeted by violent extremists” as its third priority (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016). The NAP delegates that “regional coordinators, county commissioners, and county security/intelligence committees will play a role in coordinating implementation on the ground” (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016). It will establish action-led county-level bodies which suggest a wider decision space. The plan also promotes coordinated budgeting and joint efforts which could either enhance or restrict decision space, depending on how the relationships form between the levels of government. Thus, while the NAP is most comprehensive in including local governments, it lacks specifics on the degree to which implementation will be led by the county versus national governments. This may undermine the limited roles it designates to the counties.

Additionally, we performed a decision space analysis on Kenya’s Local Action Plans. The LAPs should be considered in the context of ongoing political contests. The counties affirm and often mirror the activities outlined in the NAP and note the support from the National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC). However, these documents also display tensions with the national government’s past policies and actions. The LAPs include requests of the national government in providing resources, technical support, or legal frameworks and clarity. They also identify activities to be undertaken by the county and/or national government. In addition, the LAPs critique national government activities for stoking tensions and sowing

distrust, although the NAP acknowledges these histories to a lesser degree. In other countries, this sort of criticism could be reason to prohibit decentralization. Despite this criticism, the LAPs are reconciliatory and express intents to foster better working relationships. They document both assertions of independence and recognition of the need for partnership, and implying a moderate to wide decision space.

The LAPs identify unique strategic objectives for the respective counties. Each LAP included women as a pillar, where the national government did not. Two of the LAPs also added rule of law as a pillar. This capacity to set policies and priorities implies a wide decision space. The LAPs establish investment and policy priorities for the counties; however, the ambitions do not significantly differ from the NAP. The plans present slightly different interpretations of the roles between national and county governments, which is detailed in Appendix G.

The LAPs present potential points of conflict with the national government, which can lead to productive or destabilizing dialogue. The LAPs all include criticism of the national strategy for security, although these accusations do not appear highly controversial. All the plans acknowledge that extra-judicial killings, harassment, and intimidation of citizens by security services have contributed to deep mistrust. The WCAP explicitly calls for asymmetrical decentralization to increase counties' authority to conduct their own security operations related to these issues.

The counties also include some requests of the national government. The WCAP, for example, calls for county and national investment in infrastructure and educational institutions, additional action on corruption, better training on respect of the law, border security improvements, and other actions. Appendix G includes a comparison of how the LAPs identify priorities and actions and split responsibility between tiers of government. The general finding is that LAPs proscribe a more active role for counties than the national government does. These assertions imply county governments interpret their decision space as being fairly open.

To be sure, the local plans call for greater partnership and collaboration with the national government and read as confrontational. The discourse appears healthy but demonstrates the challenge of localization in that central governments must cede authority and place trust in the local units, potentially at the expense of receiving criticism or allocating further support. In sum, the LAPs and NAPs in Kenya largely align. However, the LAPs present an opportunity for counties to assert their roles and carve a wider decision space for themselves. It seems likely that this positive outcome is colored by the recent decentralization reforms and their wide support in the country.

5.2 Decision Space Analysis: Kosovo's National Action Plan

Kosovo's NAP includes the least amount of information about decentralization. It specifies that responsibility for the plan rests with the Office of the Prime Minister, with support from a Government Working Group and Technical Working Group, predominately made up by cabinet members. It does not mention how municipal governments are involved at this level of oversight; suggesting that only the national government, CSOs, the private sector, and NGOs serve on the two working groups. Although the NAP makes note of community, religious, educational, and international organizations relatively frequently, local governments are rarely mentioned. Exceptions include identification and deradicalization, where local government is mentioned. The plan states that "the government" anticipates supporting new employment programs, but it is vague on which level, or if both, are to institute them. Kosovo's NAP states that municipal officials will be included in compulsory training on identification of at-risk people with teachers and police officers. Prisons and schools also are strategic priorities for intervention: however, the NAP fails to spell out what authority the national government has compared to municipalities and school boards and how those entities could focus their efforts. Finally, Kosovo's NAP

includes points of uncertainty in the rapid response teams and phone lines it says will be established in communities. It does not specify whether these efforts will be municipally or nationally supported and directed. The NAP notes that grants will be provided to support the agenda, but it is unclear at what level and for what purpose.

In sum, the Kosovo NAP fails to specifically involve municipal governments, indicating the national government drives the process with only minor opportunities for local governments to contribute. The NAP notes a Strategic Implementation Plan will include more specifics, but we were unable to access the document. In sum, local governments in Kosovo seem to have a very limited decision space in implementing P/CVE strategies.

5.3 Decision Space Analysis: Philippines's National Action Plan

As noted previously, the Philippines NAP was far less action-oriented than Kenya's and Kosovo's NAPs, adding further difficulty to this analysis. Overall, the Philippines's NAP includes few clear mentions of local government units and their responsibilities. However, it suggests in the "Interplay of Key Actors" section that local elites in some municipalities have relationships with groups engaging in illegal activities, potentially including violent extremism. The plan also notes that weak central authority in some regions contributes to conflict. Thus, corruption and a lack of government presence may cause national planners to be wary of devolution with the expectation that pursuing this course would further erode good governance and their P/CVE efforts. Like in Kosovo, the NAP notes interventions in prisons may be necessary but does not spell out local and national responsibilities. The section on education is the only one that explicitly mentions local officials, but their roles and precise positions are not defined.

Finally, as noted above, the Philippines developed further policy in a memorandum circular that indicated a deconcentrated strategy of authority. It is unclear from this memorandum circular what the roles of local and provincial governments are, although it calls for "participation of all government agencies, local government units, international organizations, and local communities" (Engagement of All Civil Society Organizations and International Agencies in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Insurgency, 2019). The memo strongly implies that the national government will maintain oversight and coordination of programs and will attempt to evaluate their performance through the DILG. The lack of clarity for local governments implies a deconcentrated manner through its regional and provisional offices with centralized monitoring and input by the DILG secretary. Although the Philippines is in the early stages of developing P/CVE activities, the current trajectory implies a narrow decision space for local government.

6 Implications for GCERF's Future Work

After analyzing the LAPs and NAPs for Kenya, Kosovo, and the Philippines, we used evidence from our analysis to identify priorities for GCERF's programs for addressing P/CVE efforts.

6.1 Goals

It is difficult to evaluate the progress of P/CVE efforts around the world because no widely accepted metrics to measure violent extremism exist (Baruch, 2018). Therefore, practitioners and academics use proxies as tools to assess the impact of P/CVE interventions. These tools generally measure individual or societal behavior, attitudes, and relationships (Holmer, 2018). Because this is an emerging field of study and P/CVE needs vary among countries, universally accepted approaches to measure violent extremism are unavailable (Baruch, 2018). Therefore, we used the goals in GCERF's 2017 strategic document as the basis for our analysis. These goals are social cohesion, community agency, equal access to opportunities,

and a sense of purpose. Based on our literature review, we added two goals: efficient allocation of resources and feasibility. These are important considerations for GCERF programs and its donors.

- **Social Cohesion:** GCERF uses its programs to create strong social cohesion in communities where it works. Programs increase social cohesion by creating an inclusive atmosphere that allows community members with different ideologies and backgrounds to have an open and honest discussion without feeling marginalized. As social cohesion in a community increases, the allure of violent extremism decreases.
- **Community Agency:** As an organization that works at the community level, GCERF uses its programs to increase communities' capacity to actively and effectively organize, make choices, or advocate for their interests and beliefs. Communities that strongly advocate for themselves would not have a sense of disenfranchisement because they could have constructive engagement with their government.
- **Equal Access to Opportunities:** GCERF aims to use its programs to minimize constraints that impede community members from having equitable access to resources they need for achieving their aspirations and improving their livelihoods. Leveling barriers to opportunities would decrease alienation that might lead to violent extremism.
- **Creating a Sense of Purpose:** GCERF aims to create a positive sense of purpose in people as a sense of self-worth. People who have a strong sense of purpose are less likely to be engrossed by violent extremism.
- **Efficient Use of Resources:** GCERF aims to use funding in ways that have the most impact on preventing violent extremism.
- **Feasibility:** This goal measures the technical, administrative, and political viability of the proposed priority.

6.2 Funding Priorities

By reviewing GCERF's annual reports, strategic plan, and "pathways to change" for each of the case study countries, we classified GCERF's funding priorities into four categories: raising awareness, promoting empowerment, building capacity, and connecting communities. While the first three priorities are taken from GCERF's strategic plan, we added the fourth priority, connecting communities, because research indicates that knowledge sharing is a crucial tool for amplifying the impacts of cooperation (McGrath, 2003).

- **Raising Awareness:** These programs increase a community's awareness of violent extremism's dangers and encourage engagement in civic and social activities such as interfaith dialogue and community meetings.
- **Promoting Empowerment:** These programs allow community members, especially young people, to access opportunities such as job fairs and training that would help improve their livelihoods and achieve their aspirations.
- **Building Capacity:** Activities such as training media professionals, civil servants, and community leaders aim to make these industry professionals more responsive to the needs of their community and to develop their organizational and technical capacity as institutional leaders.
- **Connecting Communities:** As GCERF works in several countries, connecting communities across borders to learn best practices would enhance their efforts to prevent violent extremism.

After identifying these goals and priorities, we compare each priority against each goal in Table 3. A detailed description of how each priority was rated against each goal is available in Appendix H.

In addition to these priorities, we considered supporting judicial reform, evidence-based policing, and community policing as possible priorities. We decided against including these because they may not be currently feasible in the three case study countries; however, they are future considerations for GCERF.

- **Judicial Reform:** Activities such as improving the judicial system, transparency and accountability, ensuring the judiciary’s independence, improving fairness in the criminal justice system, and improving the quality of services to avoid turning legal grievances into violent conflicts fall under this priority. These programs would strengthen the judicial system and reduce the push factors to violent extremism (Robinson, 2017).
- **Evidence-based Policing:** This priority is an important aspects of P/CVE strategies in the United States and Western Europe. By using data, police departments can target resources in areas that need increased presence. This priority aims to increase the public’s trust of law enforcement entities by providing better service (Murry, 2015).
- **Community Policing:** This priority also aims to increase the public’s trust of law enforcement by working closely with local communities and establishing links between police officers and community members. A close relationship between the public and law enforcement can help prevent violent extremism by increasing timely information sharing, responsiveness, and resilience (National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, 2017).

Table 3: Comparing Goals and Priorities

		Priorities			
		Cultivating Awareness Raising	Promoting Empowerment	Building Capacity	Connecting Communities
Goals	Social Cohesion	High	Medium	High	Low
	Community Agency	High	High	Medium	Medium
	Equal Access to Opportunities	Low	High	Medium	Low
	Creating a Sense of Purpose	High	High	Medium	Low
	Efficient Allocation of Resources	High	High	Medium	Medium
	Feasibility	High	Medium	High	Low

This table scores the priorities on all the goals established in this report. A score of high means the priority scores well in meeting the goal, while low means it poorly meets that goal.

7 Recommendations

Our analysis provides the basis for recommending that GCERF prioritize the following priorities:

1. Promote Empowerment: We recommend that GCERF fund activities such as job fairs or employment preparation activities. The goals/priorities matrix (Table 3) shows promoting empowerment has the most “high” scores. All three case study countries recognize the need for rehabilitation and reintegration as high priorities; however, our research indicates that they lack adequate funding to sufficiently support these initiatives. Reintegration tends to be more successful when individuals have job security, so a

greater focus on employment could improve GCERF's overall impact. Rehabilitation and reintegration efforts support equal access to opportunities, social cohesion, and community agency, promote a sense of purpose, and are highly feasible given GCERF's funding scope. Supporting employment activities also would be an efficient allocation of resources because UN documents consistently state that rehabilitation and prevention work are some of the most important outlets for reducing violent extremism (UNGA Resolution 60/288, 2006; UNSC Resolution 2250, 2015).

2. Support General Capacity Building Activities: We recommend that GCERF support general capacity building activities. Our research indicates that most initiatives promoted by all three case study countries are underfunded. Additionally, local governments in developing countries may lack staff experience and resources, including personnel, to steward P/CVE initiatives. GCERF should continue to serve as a funding source for local community initiatives and should attempt to connect resources and expertise among stakeholders for more efficient outcomes. Activities that train media professionals, civil servants, and community leaders to develop their organizational and technical capabilities will give local actors a greater capacity to support the needs of their respective communities. While this goal does not have the most "high" scores in the goals/priorities matrix (Table 3), the need for supporting capacity building of local government entities is apparent in our research.

3. Connecting Development Agencies and NGOs to Improve Decentralization Outcomes: We recommend that GCERF coordinate with development agencies and NGOs specializing in promoting good governance, democracy, and human rights to improve decentralization outcomes. In countries that are unprepared for decentralization, either politically or technically, a region's needs may exceed the resources and capabilities of GCERF alone. Pursuing decentralization in a country not yet ready risks adverse results that may discourage other countries and undermine support for localization. This is included as a recommendation because the decision space analysis for all three case study countries shows they need support with improving decentralization outcomes. Decentralization does not directly impact P/CVE, and for that reason, it was not initially considered in the goals and priorities matrix.

8 Areas of Focus in the Future

We developed interview questions (Appendix I) based on localization questions from our NAP analysis. However, due to extenuating circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic, we were unable to conduct these interviews. In short, we crafted interview questions that would allow us to measure how local entities were included in the creation and implementation of NAPs. Interviews could better support the performance of each of our recommended priorities given the goals we crafted. Additionally, interviews would allow for the development of new, more robust priorities. Participants for these interviews can vary depending on the NAP's focus, but they may include local government officials, religious leaders, educators, and other community leaders. These interviews will help inform the applicability of the NAPs and inform progress made by communities in P/CVE.

Furthermore, we suggest that our framework be utilized to analyze other NAPs as they become available. We recognize that our work is a limited analysis, and future results would be more complete with additional countries (our sub-selection of countries could have skewed results). Additionally, future research could look at larger localization trends among global regions.

References

- “Assessing Progress Made, and the Future of Development Approaches to Preventing Violent Extremism.” Koninklijke Brill NV. 2018. https://doi.org/10.1163/2210-7975_HRD-9927-20180001.
- Azfar, Omar, Satu Kähkönen, Anthony Lanyi, Patrick Meagher, and Diana Rutherford. “Decentralization, Governance and Public Services the Impact of Institutional Arrangements,” 1999. 37.
- Baruch, Ben, Tom Ling, Rich Warnes, and Joanna Hofman. “Evaluation in an Emerging Field: Developing a Measurement Framework for the Field of Counter-Violent-Extremism.” *Evaluation* 24, no. 4. 2018. 475–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389018803218>.
- Betteridge-Moes, Maxine. “What Happened in Marawi?” 2017. <https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2017/10/happened-marawi-171029085314348.html>.
- Bossert, T. J. “Decentralization of Health Systems in Ghana, Zambia, Uganda and the Philippines: A Comparative Analysis of Decision Space.” *Health Policy and Planning* 17, no. 1. 2002: 14–31. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/17.1.14>.
- Brillantes, Alex B, and Donna Moscare. “Decentralization and Federalism in the Philippines: Lessons from Global ...” *International Conference of the East West Center*. 2002. 13.
- Campbell, Tim, and Harald Fuhr, eds. *Leadership and Innovation in Subnational Government: Case Studies from Latin America*. WBI Development Studies. Washington, DC: World Bank. 2004.
- “Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook: Kenya.” N.d. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ke.html>.
- “Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook: Kosovo.” N.d. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/print_kv.html.
- “Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook: Philippines.” N.d. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/rp.html>.
- Chalk, Peter. “The Philippines’ Continued Success Against Extremists.” *CTC Sentinel* 2, no. 8. 2009. 4.
- Cheeseman, Nic, Gabrielle Lynch, and Justin Willis. “Decentralisation in Kenya: The Governance of Governors.” *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 54, no. 1. 2016. 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022278X1500097X>.
- “Deadly Mall Attack: It’s Not over, Somali Terrorists Tell Kenya - CNN.” 2013. <https://www.cnn.com/2013/10/02/world/africa/kenya-mall-attack-shabaab-warning/index.html>.
- Domanovic, Milka. “List of Kosovo War Victims Published.” *Balkan Insight* (blog). 2014. <https://balkaninsight.com/2014/12/10/kosovo-war-victims-list-published/>.
- East Asia Forum. “Duterte’s Federalist Project Indefinitely on Hold.” 2019. <https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2019/07/24/dutertes-federalist-project-indefinitely-on-hold/>.

Ebel, Robert D, Gábor Péteri, and Luan Shllaku. *The Kosovo Decentralization Briefing Book*. Pristina: Kosovo Foundation for Open Society and Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, Open Society Institute-Budapest. 2007.

“Engagement of All Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and International Agencies (IAs) in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Insurgency (P / CVEI) Projects and Activities in the Philippines - Issuances - DILG.” 2019. <https://dilg.gov.ph/issuances/mc/Engagement-of-All-Civil-Society-Organizations-CSOs-and-International-Agencies-IAs-in-Preventing-and-Countering-Violent-Extremism-and-Insurgency-P-CVEI-Projects-and-Activities-in-the-Philippines/3014>.

“First Draft: Necessity to Re-Think Decentralization.” Kosovo Local Government Institute. 2016.

“Full Cycle WPS Implementation: Localization as Key Implementation Strategy | Global Network of Women Peacebuilders.” 2018. <https://gnwp.org/program/localization/>.

Garissa County Government. “Garissa County Action Plan to Counter Violent Extremism 2018-2023.” Garissa County, Kenya. 2018.

Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund. “Strategy to Engage Communities and Address the Drivers of Violent Extremism (2017-2020).” Geneva: Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund. 2017. <https://www.gcerf.org/wp-content/uploads/GCERF-Strategy-2017-2020.pdf>.

Global Counterterrorism Forum. “Political Declaration.” New York. N.d. https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Foundational%20Documents/GCTF-Political-Declaration_ENG.pdf.

“Global Terrorism Index 2019: Measuring the Impact of Terrorism.” Sydney: Institute for Economics & Peace. 2019. <http://visionofhumanity.org/reports>.

Government of Kenya. “National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism.” Nairobi, Kenya: Government of Kenya. 2016.

Government of Philippines. “National Action Plan on Preventing or Countering Violent Extremism,” 2019.

“Guide to the Philippines Conflict.” *BBC News*. sec. Asia. 2012. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-17038024>.

Hall, D. G. E. *History of South East Asia*. London: Macmillan Education, Limited. 1981. <https://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=5638545>.

Holmer, Georgia, Peter Bauman, and Kateria Aryaeinejad. “Measuring Up: Evaluating the Impact of P/CVE Programs.” Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace. 2018. <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/2018-09/preventing-counteracting-violent-extremism-measuringup.pdf>.

Institute for Economics & Peace. “Global Peace Index 2019: Measuring Peace in a Complex World, Sydney.” Sydney: Institute for Economics & Peace. 2019. <http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2019/06/GPI-2019-web003.pdf>.

Ivanyna, Maksym, and Anwar Shah. “How Close Is Your Government to Its People? Worldwide Indicators on Localization and Decentralization.” *World Bank WPS6138*. 2012.

- Kahlert, Rahel, and Sonila Danaj. “Decentralization of Social Services in Kosovo – Policy Challenges and Recommendations.” *European Centre for Social Welfare Policy*, no. Policy Brief 2018/5. 2018. 12.
- Litvack, Jennie, Junaid Ahmad, and Richard Bird. *Rethinking Decentralization in Developing Countries*. The World Bank. 1998. <https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-4350-5>.
- McGrath, Simon. “Knowledge Sharing in Development Agencies: Lessons from Four Cases.” N.d., 20.
- Menon, Balakrishna, James Mutero, and Simon Macharia. “Decentralization and Local Governments in Kenya.” N.d., 33.
- “Miki Jacevic on Localizing National Action Plans on Women, Peace and Security.” 2018. <https://oursecurefuture.org/blog/miki-jacevic-national-action-plans>.
- Mombasa County Government. “Mombasa County Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) Mapping Report.” Mombasa County, Kenya. 2017.
- Murray, Alex, Katrin Mueller-Johnson, and Lawrence W. Sherman. “Evidence-Based Policing of U.K. Muslim Communities: Linking Confidence in the Police With Area Vulnerability to Violent Extremism.” *International Criminal Justice Review* 25, no. 1 (2015): 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567715574384>.
- “National Action Plan on Preventing or Countering Violent Extremism - Philippines (NAP P/CVE-Philippines).” Government of the Philippines. 2019.
- “National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism.” Government of Kenya. 2016.
- National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism. “Community Policing to Counter Violent Extremism.” 2017. 36.
- “Philippine Institute for Development Studies.” 2017. <https://www.pids.gov.ph/infocus/115>.
- Press, The Associated. “Kosovo Flies Home Jihadists’ Families From Syria.” *The New York Times*. sec. World. 2019. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/20/world/europe/kosovo-jihadist-families.html>.
- Republic of Kosovo Government. “Strategy On Prevention Of Violent Extremism And Radicalisation Leading To Terrorism 2015-2020.” Prishtina. 2015.
- Robinson, Nicholas, and Catherine Lena Kelly. “Rule of Law Approaches to Countering Violent Extremism.” 2017. 24.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. “Government Decentralization in Comparative Perspective: Theory and Practice in Developing Countries.” *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 47, no. 2. 1981. 133–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002085238004700205>.
- Rosand, Eric, Emily Winterbotham, Michael Jones, and Franziska Praxl-Tabuchi. “The State of the Global P/CVE Agenda.” N.d., 74.
- “Security Questions as Kenya Mourns.” *BBC News*. sec. Africa. 2015. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-32177123>.

- Shinichi, Ichimura, and Bahl Roy. *Decentralization Policies In Asian Development*. World Scientific, 2008.
- Shtuni, Adrian. “Dynamics of Radicalization and Violent Extremism in Kosovo.” *United States Institute of Peace*. 2016. 16.
- “Strategy on Preventing of Violent Extremism and Radicalisation Leading to Terrorism.” Government of Kosovo. 2015.
- “The Philippines: Delegation and Decentralization.” 2018. <https://www.afd.fr/en/actualites/philippines-delegation-and-decentralization>.
- The Stabilisation Network. “Violent Extremism in the Philippines: A Country Needs Assessment.” 2019. <https://www.gcerf.org/wp-content/uploads/TSN-GCERF-Violent-Extremism-in-the-Philippines--A-Country-Needs-Assessments-April-2019-.pdf>.
- “The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy Review.” 2016. https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/291.
- “The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.” 2015. https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/70/674.
- United Nations Development Programme. “Roadmap for Localizing the SDGs: Implementation and Monitoring at Subnational Level.” 2016. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/commitments/818_11195_commitment_ROADMAP%20LOCALIZING%20SDGS.pdf.
- United Nations General Assembly. Resolution 60/288, The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, Pub. L. No. A/RES/60/288. 2006. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/504/88/PDF/N0550488.pdf?OpenElement>.
- United Nations Security Council. Resolution 2250, Pub. L. No. S/RES/2250. 2015. § 7573rd meeting (2015). [https://undocs.org/S/RES/2250\(2015\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/2250(2015))
- Wajir County Government. “Wajir County Action Plan to Prevent and Counter Violent Extremism 2018-2023.” Wajir County, Kenya. 2018.

Appendix A: Country Background – Kenya

Historical Context

Kenya, formally the Republic of Kenya, is an East African country with a population of 53 million (CIA World Factbook Kenya, 2019). Kenya was subjugated to British colonial rule from 1888 until it gained its independence in 1963. As a sovereign independent state, Kenya has experienced corruption and political turmoil. Jomo Kenyatta became Kenya's first president, ruling until his death in 1978. In 1982, under Kenya's subsequent ruler Daniel arap Moi, the country was legally declared a one-party state and opposition groups were actively suppressed. In 1991, domestic and international pressure resulted in Kenya introducing a multi-party political system. Political violence continued with elections in 2007, resulting in over 1,000 deaths. The African Union mediated a power-sharing agreement that included working toward broad-based reforms. In 2010, Kenya adopted a new constitution that devolved power to 47 counties and created stronger checks and balances on executive power.

Government and Economy

Kenya is a presidential representative democratic republic with three branches of government: legislative, judicial, and executive (CIA World Factbook Kenya, 2019). Kenya has a local governing system, and 47 counties responsible for governance on the local level. Each county has a governor and assembly. Kenya has experienced an average of 5 percent GDP growth in the last decade, reaching the rank of a lower-middle-income country, in 2014. Despite steady economic growth, a significant amount of Kenya's population is unemployed or underemployed, with some estimates putting the unemployment rate at 40 percent.

Threat of Violent Extremism

The 2019 Global Peace Index ranked Kenya 119th out of 163 countries, with the top-ranked country considered the most peaceful. Kenya faces ongoing threats from terrorist organizations, chief among them al-Shabaab. Al-Shabaab has pledged itself to al-Qaeda and operates in Kenya's eastern border region with Somalia. The group has conducted several high-profile terrorist attacks in Kenya, including the 2013 Westgate shopping mall attack in Nairobi, which killed 67 people (CNN, 2013); the 2015 Garissa University College attack, which killed 141 people (BBC, 2015), and the 2019 DusitD2 hotel attack, which killed 26 people (Counter Extremism, 2020). In 2014, it was estimated that 25 percent of al-Shabaab's forces were Kenyans. Additionally, there have been several cases of Kenyan citizens joining the Islamic State (Counter Extremism, 2020). The risk of further terrorist attacks and increased radicalization efforts continues to be a major source of concern for Kenyan authorities.

Appendix B: Country Background – Kosovo

Historical Context

Kosovo, formally the Republic of Kosovo, is a partially recognized state in the Balkans with a population of 1.9 million people. Over many centuries, Kosovo has been subject to regime instability. These regimes include the Serbian Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and Communist Yugoslavia. The breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s resulted in a widespread ethnic and national conflict throughout the Balkans. The Kosovo War, fought primarily between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and ethnic Albanians, lasted from February 1998 to June 1999. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) intervened in the conflict, initiating a bombing campaign targeting Yugoslav forces. NATO forces helped bring an end to the war, culminating in the signing of the Kumanovo Agreement on June 9, 1999. The war resulted in over 13,000 deaths (Domanovic, 2014) and displaced an estimated 1.4 million Kosovo Albanians (OSCE, 1999). Kosovo declared its formal independence in 2008, and more than 100 countries recognize it as a sovereign state.

Government and Economy

Kosovo is a parliamentary representative democratic republic (CIA World Factbook Kosovo, 2019). The republic has three branches of government: legislative, judicial, and executive. Kosovo has 38 municipalities, each having a mayor and a municipal assembly. Since the disintegration of Yugoslavia, Kosovo has transitioned toward a market-based economy and has seen gains in economic growth; however, it is still considered a lower-middle-income nation. Despite modest economic progress, Kosovo has an unemployment rate of 33 percent and a youth unemployment rate of nearly 60 percent.

Threat of Violent Extremism

The 2019 Global Peace Index ranked Kosovo 86th out of 163 countries, with the top-ranked country considered the most peaceful. While the country does not have a history of religious violent extremism, it has been a significant recruitment source of foreign fighters for the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. Kosovo is a secular state with no official religion; however, 95 percent of the population is Muslim. Foreign extremist organizations have exploited local grievances to radicalize and recruit members to their cause. Since 2012, an estimated 400 Kosovars have traveled to Iraq and Syria to join the Islamic State (New York Times, 2019). Moreover, the municipalities of Hani i Elezit, Kaçanik, Mitrovica, Gjilan, and Viti have provided a disproportionate rate of foreign fighters. Accounting for 14 percent of Kosovo's total population, these five municipalities have contributed more than one-third of Kosovo's male foreign fighters (Shtuni, 2016). While there have not been any attacks carried out by the Islamic State in Kosovo, it was estimated that 37 percent of those who left to join terrorist organizations in Iraq and Syria had returned to Kosovo (Shtuni, 2016). The recent increase in Kosovars enticed to join extremist groups abroad highlights the necessity in understanding and countering the complex dynamics of radicalization in Kosovo.

Appendix C: Country Background – the Philippines

Historical Context

The Philippines, formally the Republic of the Philippines, is a Southeast Asian state with a population of 109 million. It was colonized by Spain in the 16th century and became a protectorate of the United States in 1898 after the Spanish-American War. Although it became a self-governing country in 1935, it fell under Japanese occupation during World War II and was liberated with the assistance of United States' forces in 1946. It has been a strong ally to the United States since then. The Philippines had a turbulent political history with the 21-year Marcos dictatorship, which was overturned by popular dissent in 1986. Following the Marcos dictatorship, Corazon Aquino became the first Filipino female president, but her government was rocked by several coup attempts. Since Rodrigo Duterte's election as president in 2017, the country has experienced an increase in state-sanctioned political violence (CIA World Factbook Philippines, 2019).

Government and Economy

The Philippines is a presidential republic and has three branches of government: legislative, judicial, and executive. Although the Philippines has 81 provinces and 38 chartered cities, it is governed as a unitary state except for the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao. The Philippines has experienced GDP growth averaging over 6 percent per year from 2011 to 2017. A unique feature of the economy is the inflow of remittances from approximately 10 million Filipinos who live and work overseas and its crucial role in stabilizing the economy. One-fifth of the population lives below the poverty line, and the unemployment rate is approximately 6 percent (CIA World Factbook Philippines, 2019).

Threat of Violent Extremism

The 2019 Global Peace Index ranked the Philippines 134th out of 163 countries, with the top-ranked country considered the most peaceful. Several violent extremist organizations operate in the Philippines. The most notable of these, Abu Sayyaf Group and the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters, are religious nationalist organizations that operate in the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in the southern Mindanao Islands. Additionally, the New People's Army, which is associated with the Communist Party of the Philippines, operates throughout the country (The Stabilization Network, 2019). Bangsamoro is the only majority Muslim region in the predominantly Christian country, and the marginalization of religious minorities in the Philippines has led to tensions since the 16th century (Hall, 1981). While the Bangsamoro region has been home to several armed movements resulting from long-running hostilities, most active extremist groups in Bangsamoro were established in the last 40 years (BBC News, 2012). Until recently, most of these groups conducted guerrilla warfare. For example, a 2009 study estimated that the Abu Sayyaf Group had no more than 100 hardcore and 200 part-time militants, 30 foreign fighters, and less than 350 weapons at its disposal (Chalk, 2009). Militants associated with the group would occasionally raid villages and attack infrastructure (Chalk, 2009). In recent years, though, these groups have increased their capabilities by becoming allied with trans-national extremist groups such as the Islamic State, leading to a violent five-month long conflict in the city of Marawi in 2017 (Betteridge-Moes, 2017).

Appendix D: Expanded Decentralization Literature

Decentralization has been a growing trend around the world in response to globalization, diversifying populations, expansion of government-delivered services, and other pressures. The presumed benefits of decentralization map well with the strategic objectives of P/CVE agendas in engaging local communities. National governments often are ill-equipped to address highly localized factors that contribute to violent extremism, and many groups use grievances against national governments as recruitment tools. It is also difficult for national governments to sustain and manage programs across their vast areas and populations. However, national governments will need to provide resources, leadership, and coordination as decentralization must be done with great care as research shows success can be hard to attain. This review provides GCERF with a guide for understanding the importance of decentralization to successful localization efforts, supporting localization efforts, and connecting our findings of the plans to existing literature.

Forms of Decentralization

Decentralization can take three forms (Rondinelli, 1981)—deconcentration, delegation, and devolution. **Deconcentration** shifts responsibilities or limited authority into central or regional offices within the structure of a national body. For example, a national education department might be broken into several offices overseeing each region, but authorities are not transferred to local governments. **Delegation** shifts authority into semi-autonomous agencies that may remain under indirect control of the central government. This may remove responsibility and authority from an executive office but does not involve the geographic refocusing that is likely part of deconcentration. Delegation brings the benefit of maintaining the delegated responsibility as a priority to central government, preventing a semi-autonomous agency from being deprioritized by an office with a wider scope. Delegation can involve transferring authorities to local government as well, but the central government generally retains oversight. Healthcare delivery is one example of local jurisdictions being tasked with delivery but a central government monitoring and setting goals. Finally, when thinking of localization, the closest focus of decentralization is **devolution**, which shifts more complete and independent authority into local governments like county or municipality governments (Rondinelli, 1981). It is the most complete form of decentralization, but much depends on execution and scope. Each of the countries in our analysis have made attempts at greater devolution on political, administrative, and fiscal responsibilities, but these efforts have had varying degrees of success. Kenya has seen the most comprehensive devolution with its 2010 constitution, establishing independent counties as units of government, although the national government retains power as a unitary, rather than federal, state (Cheeseman et al., 2016). Kosovo has struggled to provide sufficient autonomy to local governments despite several efforts (*First Draft: Necessity to Re-Think Decentralization*, 2016). While it has devolved service delivery, Kosovo has not included new fiscal, legal, and administrative powers to enable sufficiency. In the Philippines, discussions of adopting a more federalist system have occurred; however, this has not led to any credible efforts. While the Philippines has devolved many functions, entrenchment of local politicians, interventions from the national government, and insufficient funding have been problematic (Llanto, 2012).

The various forms of decentralization within a country, broadly and specific to P/CVE, will inform GCERF priorities. In jurisdictions that have or wish to pursue devolution, GCERF interventions may use more typical programs because these countries have exhibited trust in their local units of government. Devolution is a desirable approach to further localization but advocating for devolution as an outside actor presents more of a challenge because an international donor, such as GCERF, pursuing too forcefully may risk alienating leaders in that country. For countries preferring deconcentration, delegation, or no decentralization, GCERF may need a more nuanced and tailored approach that reflects the reasons devolution has not been the preferred route. Pursuing media awareness and encouraging collaborations with countries that have more robust localization might sway strategies toward better localization in the long term. Another option is working from the ground up, by directly engaging with

local governments. This could risk relationships with national governments, but where this risk is assessed as minimal following on-the-ground research and conversations, it may be a feasible strategy. In general, countries that do not pursue devolution will have a more difficult environment for localization because local governments will have smaller roles and less ability to carry them out.

The Case for Decentralization: Government Closer to the People

This section focuses on the challenges and barriers to decentralization—first discussing the case for decentralization in P/CVE programs. Local governments often have more trust and relationships among members of the community they serve (Litvack et al., 1998). This can help meet the goals of developing specific programs for the challenges faced by that area, ensuring public campaigns and programs are appropriate to the community’s sensitivities. Community participation is especially salient because local governments can make events or programs more accessible. Further, many at-risk populations are skeptical of their national government and could be more willing to engage in a local program than a national one. Finally, local governments acting independently may develop more creative and innovative programs for learning. Further limiting the national government’s operations may lead to other benefits because overseeing activities across a country can stretch resources and lead to oversights or poor outcomes. A national government cannot dedicate its full attention to one geographic area, and the ambitions of P/CVE efforts require constant attention and efforts.

Deep Attention to Country Context is Key

The context of decentralization in a country is significant to whether localization of P/CVE is feasible, and if so, how it should be designed. As Litvick and co-authors write,

Designing decentralization policy in any country is difficult because decentralization can affect many aspects of public sector performance and generate a wide range of outcomes. But it is particularly difficult in developing countries because institutions, information, and capacity are all very weak. The cross-cutting nature of decentralization, the importance of local [and national] institutions in influencing the impact of decentralization, and the limited empirical evidence on what works and what does not make the design and implementation of decentralization a considerable challenge. Evidence suggests that the problems associated with decentralization in developing countries reflect flaws in design and implementation more than any inherent outcome of decentralization (Litvick et al., 1998).

Embarking on decentralization is a difficult process of reassigning fiscal, administrative, and political powers in a balanced fashion. New service responsibilities may require more fiscal authorities, and more fiscal authorities may require higher degrees of political accountability, and so on. P/CVE efforts involve a range of cross-cutting policy areas, including social services, education, security, and justice systems. Countries will vary in how much responsibility local governments have over these relevant areas. Some will lack an effective tier of government for devolution. In Kosovo, for example, local governments are the largest tier of government under the national unit, which may make localization a more complicated undertaking. Where middle tiers do exist, they may have little control in delivering social services or education, meaning interventions they wish to undertake would depend on the national government or more local effort. On the other extreme, services may be operated by relatively autonomous entities, such as school boards, private organizations, or public corporations, where local authority is similarly limited. A country’s legal structures implicate what areas of P/CVE can be localized, and which ones need broader action to be localized. Political factors can influence the willingness of stakeholders to pursue decentralization and must be considered on a case-by-case basis. Robust or complete localization may not be immediately feasible or advisable in all countries.

The Empirical Record: Inconclusive Results

It must be acknowledged that empirical research has found mixed evidence for the claims of decentralization as a ‘silver bullet’ to governance challenges. Research has also struggled to identify generalizable lessons for designing decentralization. This is partly due to the literature’s focus on fairly broad decentralizations, such as Kenya’s recent constitutional change or changes to the health sector. These complicated processes are prone to missteps and resistance which can make initial promises seem quite lofty in hindsight. Improvements to political representation can be hindered where local structures, such as powerful clans, come to dominate local governments. Poor monitoring and enforcement by higher levels of government can enable local corruption as well. These factors can limit the accountability elected leaders have to their constituents even at the local level (Litvack et al., 1998). Efficiency promises may not be met where devolution of services is not accompanied by investment in technical capacity for local government units or expansion of revenue generation to fund the delivery of services. Another factor contributing to mixed findings is the range of contexts in which decentralization is pursued. The same form of decentralization will differ in its outcomes depending on where it was pursued, but decentralization initiatives are likely to take different forms, making it difficult to draw firm conclusions. The point to be taken is that decentralizing alone will not guarantee these outcomes, and it is incumbent upon policy designers to assign an appropriate and well-structured framework to the initiative, as well as generate political will across stakeholders, to attain success.

Barriers to Implementation and Success: Politics, Capacity, Inequality

The primary reasons for unattainable decentralization are political factors or technical capacity factors, although infrastructure and geography also can play a role (Litvack et al., 1998). As noted above, decentralization efforts are often unsuccessful due to poor design. Political factors can overlap with cultural factors based on understandings of the roles of government, or they may relate to control over resource flows. Corrupt motivations such as maintaining power over personally enriching resources like donor funds or politically influential institutions are relevant as well (Rondinelli, 1981). However, political entrenchment of local elites can also limit accountability and create the potential for corruption (Azfar et al., 1999). In the P/CVE context, there may be many possible reasons political leaders are discouraged from localization. For example, they may wish to use P/CVE as a political tool against their opponents. Some plans expressed fears that local politicians with connections to illicit or extremist groups will misuse funds to support them. Finally, there may be financial gains through misallocation of donor funds.

Capacity issues arise when local jurisdictions lack the expertise, personnel, or resources to efficiently fulfill their responsibilities. In some cases, trainings may be adequate to reduce these challenges, but in others they extend to political or fiscal problems that are not easily addressed. In developing countries, capacity issues are often present. However, some researchers present the view that assigning more responsibilities can be a means to improve local capacity as opposed to building capacity prior to assigning responsibilities. GCERF should evaluate broadly whether local institutions are prepared to execute the mandates of P/CVE in developing country strategies.

Well-Designed Decentralization is the Key, but Best Practice Lessons are Few

Designing a decentralization framework involves careful consideration of fiscal and institutional arrangements. As noted, P/CVE initiatives involve providing services in education, rehabilitation, employment, counselling, religious institutions, security, and other areas. It is significant to outcomes whether these services are managed by national or local authorities, and if the latter, how local governments will be monitored and supported by the higher authorities. The optimal arrangement is likely context-specific, so it is difficult to make general statements. Empirical literature also is thin on how institutional arrangements impact outcomes, particularly for a novel initiative like P/CVE. It is understood that where the balance across fiscal, political, and administrative dimensions is mismatched, the consequences can be significant. For example, in Kosovo and the Philippines, most revenue for

municipalities (and provinces in the Philippines) is directed through the national government and not raised locally. Municipalities in Kosovo also lack the capacity to set the number of staff they employ or their pay rates. In these cases, adding P/CVE responsibilities may cause a stretching of resources and capacities unless accompanied by more independence to receive funds, set policy, and staff the government. Outcomes may be better where officials are held accountable and public information is widely accessible (Litvick et al., 1998). This can be improved by robust monitoring and publication of results by a national government or an independent body. On this principle, the Philippines's reporting guidelines are a promising start. Kenya's plan noted it would develop a 'Partner Assessment Framework' and seek to utilize interventions for further research. If local units of government do not face public accountability through competitive elections or public participation, this condition is more difficult to satisfy.

The impacts of decentralization also are important metrics to anticipate in design and to gauge success. Researchers note that decentralization can have impacts on equity and macroeconomic stability. Local governments may become less financially stable if the decentralized service requires significant added funding and pressure to national finances, but the more relevant issue for P/CVE is equity. Decentralization can be harmful or beneficial to equity, but several studies have found that where local governments are made responsible for funding services, inequality increases (Azfar et al., 1999). This is because within a country, regions and local jurisdictions will face different degrees of threat, have differing levels of revenue to draw, and thus require different levels of support. In the Kenya plans, for example, the border regions indicated their threats required more attention from the national government in resources, security aid, and addressing feelings of discrimination or marginalization. The Philippines similarly face threats of extremism mostly located in the southern island of Mindanao. It may be necessary to acknowledge in the NAPs how the distribution of threats impacts resource allocation and whether to pursue asymmetrical decentralization, whereby some jurisdictions receive additional authority not permitted to others. Asymmetrical decentralization can acknowledge some areas lack capacity to carry out new functions. Still, despite the potential gains from this path, it carries the risk of instigating political conflict. On the other side, decentralization can be a means to increase equity by allowing jurisdictions to reach vulnerable populations or improve their service delivery where the national government failed to do so.

Ambiguity in decentralization plans is another major threat to implementation. If roles are unclear, they may cause lapses or duplications in delivery, disputes in courts, or other mechanisms of coercion to contour the division of responsibility. Thus, documents and policies delineating the devolved roles and authorities must be as specific as possible in defining roles and inappropriate interventions, and the documents and policies are best supported by an independent judiciary.

Conclusion

Decentralization has the potential to improve the outcomes of P/CVE initiatives, but pursuing decentralization is tedious and requires a high degree of attention to country context. GCERF may find it beneficial to invest in building its technical capacity in these areas to aid in developing plans that improve implementation of outcomes, or seek partnerships with organizations having expertise in those areas. It will be important to take the time necessary for understanding the laws, structure, political relationships, norms of public participation, and needs of local jurisdictions to develop realistic decentralization targets. The design will be highly influential in whether the initiative succeeds, and there are no one-size-fits-all solutions.

The following items are key issues GCERF may wish to consider in identifying whether and how far to pursue decentralization (Azfar et al., 1999). The answers to many of these items do not imply a clear response but rather must be interpreted based on this and other contextual points. They also vary in relevance to the activities of a specific P/CVE approach:

Political Framework

- *Constitution and Legal Framework.* What are the offices, branches, and tiers of government, and authorities provided to them? How strong is the executive? How independent is the judiciary? Are local governments protected and given independence in management, particularly in fiscal management? What roles and responsibilities are given to local jurisdictions? Is it feasible or necessary to change these frameworks?
- *Political and Electoral System.* How contested are elections? Where is electoral power influenced? Where is political power held within and across tiers of government?
- *Unitary vs. Federal Government?* How much independence is given to local governments, and who are they accountable to?
- *Size of Government.* Larger governments may be at greater risk of corruption or poor management of services, including at lower tiers.
- *Role of Central Government.* How much control does the central government have over other tiers? How actively does it involve itself in the affairs of other tiers, legitimately or illegitimately?

Fiscal Dimension

- *Political and Jurisdictional Aspects of Fiscal Decentralization.* Does devolution of financial power increase self-determination?
- *Incentive Effects of Fiscal Decentralization.* What methods of funding exist, for example, are there central government transfers? Are local governments equal in their revenue base size? How will oversight or independence be changed by new revenue streams?

Transparency of Government Actions

- *Fiscal and Administrative Transparency.* Can the central government maintain oversight of these activities? Is the public informed and able to monitor these activities? Where and how strong is audit authority?
- *Role of the Media.* Are the media independent? Can the media exert influence on the governments through investigations and accessing information? Is there media competition?

Citizen Participation in Public Services Delivery

- *Mechanisms: Voice and Exit.* Are there mechanisms for the public to influence policymaking such as elections, surveys, meetings, legal suits, referenda, direct involvement in service delivery, or demonstrations? How free are the public to 'exit' the jurisdiction or service?
- *Access.* Are all members of the public allowed equal access to these methods and participate? Do elite or dominant groups have undue influence?

Civil Society and Social Structure

- *Civil Society.* Is there an active civil society? Who comprises the active civil society?
- *Heterogeneity of the Population.* A more heterogenous population can cause conflict and inhibit service delivery due to differing values or discrimination, but this is not always the case.
- *Economic Heterogeneity.* Inequality can lead to different levels of participation and access to services and may be particularly problematic when inequality is tied to social factors like race or ethnicity.
- *Trust.* Does the public have trust for each other, or are there conflicts and tension?
- *Cultural Norms and Traditions.* These issues can impact levels of cooperation and participation in government. They also pertain to gender or racial discrimination, crime, and corruption.

Capacity of Local Governments

- *Human Capital.* How knowledgeable and capable are bureaucrats and officials at various levels of government and parts of the country? Four general areas to consider are: identification and

analysis of local problems, mobilization and management of resources, communication and coordination of policy implementation, and resolution of local conflicts.

- *Physical Capital.* Is communication infrastructure robust? Transportation infrastructure? Are buildings and facilities adequate? Are computers, systems, and other at work items sufficient?
- *Incentive Structures.* Are structures producing the right incentives? Will officials be held accountable for their work? Do personal interests supersede public interests? Is patronage common? Are there punishments for improper behavior?

Lessons from Other Interventions

Decentralization has been a global trend for the last several decades, and while most initiatives have involved large-scale diffusion of government powers, lessons from the healthcare sector (a more specific area of programming) and the UN-led National Action Plans on Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) from 2000 are similar to P/CVE for comparison.

In one blog-post interview, researcher and peacebuilding practitioner Miki Jacevic outlines the challenges and opportunities for localization on WPS programming. He suggests that some activities toward localization are occurring outside the text of the plan and that these efforts could be incorporated into plans explicitly (*Our Secure Future*, 2018).

Donor roles can promote localization by going through government ministries and embassies. Because donors have specific host countries they partner with, they may extend those relationships by choosing host provinces, cities, or regions to focus localization efforts. This model would have funds channeled through the host countries to the local areas.

The Global Network of Women Peacebuilders (GNWP) spearheaded localization campaigns in six developing countries, including the Philippines and Serbia. The group's strategy included three components. The first, convening local authorities and other key local actors, involved GNWP organizing workshops for local actors to introduce key concepts and push for commitments on localization through LAPs and establishment of a Local Steering Committee. The second, developing local legal/policy instruments for implementation at the local level, can mean developing a LAP, finding existing development plans to incorporate the concepts and steps into, or adopting laws and policies to implement the WPS agenda at the local level. A combination or all of the above can be taken as steps, and the GNWP aids the process by hosting a 'write shop' to begin the brainstorming process by reviewing local policies and integration strategies, and by beginning to draft an LAP. The third component, building capacity to ensure implementation and sustainability, involves training and guidelines that can be dispersed to local communities not visited by the organization (*Global Network of Women Peacebuilders*, 2018).

In sum, the approach taken by GCERF and the P/CVE agenda broadly mimics the approach taken in the WPS agenda.

We advise that health, education, security, and economic development are other areas to review for decentralization literature given their relevance to P/CVE. Unfortunately, the breadth and technicality of the literature and our limited time did not allow us to conduct reviews in these areas.

Appendix E: Kenya National Action Plan Work Pillars

Kenya's NAP identifies nine work pillars that offer stakeholders the ability to engage in countering violent extremism:

- “1. Psychosocial Pillar: It is important to address the psychosocial needs of individuals who have been radicalised and even joined violent extremist groups. The focus here is on rehabilitation, re-integration of reformed extremists, and providing support to their families and social networks.
2. Education Pillar: The aim is to address radicalisation in learning institutions.
3. Political Pillar: Engaging political leaders at the local, county, and national levels.
4. Security Pillar: To ensure that radicalisation is met with the full force of law.
5. Faith Based and Ideological Pillar: The aim of this pillar is to ‘immunise’ the Kenyan population to violent extremist ideologies.
6. Training and Capacity Building Pillar: Will ensure that GoK institutions, political and religious leaders, and all actors with a mandate to undertake CVE possess the right skills and awareness.
7. Arts and Culture Pillar: Radicalisation at its core is an attack on the cultures and heritage of the Kenyan people. Under this pillar, the focus is on protecting and promoting Kenya's heritage.
8. Legal and Policy Pillar: Relevant laws and policy frameworks must support CVE.
9. Media and Online Pillar: The aim of the pillar is to have CVE practitioners move their campaigns to cyber space and to have the tools and mind-set to keep with the pace of innovation by terrorist groups.” (National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, 2016).

Appendix F: National Action Plan Codes

Local Interventions

1. Is there clear integration of local governments and entities in the planning and implementation process?
2. Is there evidence of resource allocation to build the technical and financial capacity of local governments or entities?
3. Does the National Action Plan address inclusive approaches that include women?
4. Does the National Action Plan address inclusive approaches that include youth?
5. Does the National Action Plan address inclusive approaches that include civil society?
6. Does the National Action Plan/Local Action Plan include strategies for local law enforcement to build relationships, capacity, expertise, and knowledge with the local community?
7. Does the National Action Plan mention needs/concerns for particular regions of the country?
8. Does the National Action Plan mention local/community groups involved in violent extremism prevention?

Reintegration and Rehabilitation

1. Does the plan mention reintegration and/or rehabilitation?
2. Is there intent to analyze and evaluate reintegration and rehabilitation needs?
3. Does the National Action Plan implement reintegration and rehabilitation processes in tandem with ongoing prevention and development work, ensuring coordination and synergy?
4. Does the plan mention where funds for reintegration/rehabilitation will come from?

Media and Communications

1. Is there contact information for how to get involved?
2. Does the National Action Plan partner with a trusted platform or source to disseminate information?
3. Is the National Action Plan publicly available?
4. Is the existence of the National Action Plan communicated to relevant stakeholders?

Appendix G: Kenya National and Local Plans Roles and Requests

The Kenyan case study provided an opportunity to understand how various levels of government work together on P/CVE activities. Our analysis suggested that coordination and assignment of roles among government actors would be a potentially problematic factor if it is vague and implies local governments experience a moderate decision space. This appendix seeks to illustrate these points by comparing how national and county governments conceived of each other's roles at a macro and micro level.

Table 4 presents information on the delegation of government roles from the Kenyan NAP and the Mombasa County LAP. These are mostly general roles, while Tables 5 through 18 address more specific responsibilities and activities. Table 4 shows that NAP specifications place more actionable responsibilities under the national government, leaving county governments to fill more passive support and coordination roles. The Mombasa LAP identifies more actionable roles for the county, such as legislating, and several additional roles for the national government. It also carries over some similar roles from the NAP. This report describes how this pattern was observed in other county plans as well.

Table 4: Comparing Roles Assigned in National and County Plans

Kenya National Plan	Mombasa Local Plan
<p>National Government Roles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop legislative framework covering returnees • Launch disengagement and reintegration initiative • Coordinate training and capacity building • Provide psychological support and counseling programs, employment support, support for reintegration, mentoring and religious/ideological counselling • Ensure effective information sharing between government agencies covering status of returnees and disengaged individuals • Establish training clearinghouse at the NCTC for agencies involved. It should deconflict and align donor capacity building initiatives. 	<p>National Government Roles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide security infrastructure • Policy formulation such as rehabilitation and amnesty • Provide high-level goodwill for plan implementation • Provide linkages with local and international CVE actors • Ensure fair administration of justice • Allocate budget to development projects • Convene the County CVE Committee through the County Commissioner • Provide technical support
<p>Local Government Roles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult with county Security Committees, and coordinate with NCTC and local leaders • Communicate on regular basis with national authorities on de-radicalization • Communicate with national authorities on efforts • Build confidence between communities and security agencies • create linkages between community efforts • create Early Intervention teams 	<p>Local Government Roles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide political goodwill through the branches of government • Enact relevant laws at the county level • Allocate budget for CVE initiatives • Integrate the spirit of MCAP into county security plans • Provide technical support

NCTC: National Counter Terrorism Center. CVE: Countering Violent Extremism. MCAP: Mombasa County Action Plan.

Tables 5 through 18 build on the above analysis by comparing work pillars across the three county plans. The tables show some of the activities specified under each pillar and how the plans delegate responsibilities between the national and county governments. They include where counties ask the national government to provide policy guidance or resources for assistance with development. This helps demonstrate the aspects of decentralization that may be necessary in P/CVE including: the range of activities local governments intend to carry out, the resources or legal powers they may need, and the support or involvement from the national government that may be necessary. It also provides insight on the differences and similarities in approaches to P/CVE being taken by these local governments.

The comparisons are made across the county plans only. There were differences in how many actions were specified per pillar by each county, and how well the roles were defined. Actions that were similar across two or more counties were placed along the same row, but not all rows include similar actions. Where a face-value reading of the text did not make clear if a level of government was included in delivery of the action, it receives a designation of ‘unclear.’ Requests were included only when they were made specifically, otherwise the box was left blank. Summaries of the number of actions, number of clear responsibility designations, and requests are presented at the end of each pillar section.

Table 5: Arts and Culture Pillar Activities

Table 5: Arts and Culture Pillar Activities											
Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Hold Annual Sports and Cultural Events	Yes	No						Promote cultural performance and celebration of heritage	Yes	Yes	
Market Tourism based on historic cultural sites	Yes	No		Trainings for increased appreciation of cultural diversity	Yes	Yes		Improved appreciation of cultural diversity, through training	Yes	Yes	
Develop Art and Talent Promotion Infrastructure	Yes	Yes	County and national gov't should develop Art Talent Promotion Infrastructure	Intercultural outreach activities and festivals, dialogue forums, and security meetings	Yes	Yes		General	Yes	Yes	Department of Cohesion should encourage cultural values that promote human dignity
3	3	1	1	2	2	2	0	3	3	3	1

Table 6: Education Pillar Activities

Table 6: Education Pillar Activities											
Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Improve physical infrastructure in School	Yes	Yes	County and national gov't should improve physical infrastructure in schools. Security officers should be seconded to each school to prevent closure from VE activities	Promote interfaith activities in schools	Yes	Yes		Ensure qualified and adequate staff in schools	Yes	Yes	
Make scholarship programs available	Yes	Unclear						Establish and promote peer education and mentorship on CVE	Yes	Yes	
Make alternative training and skills development available	Unclear	Unclear						Allocate enough resources to improve learning institutions in the county	Yes	Yes	Resource allocation
Propose a streamlined CVE curriculum	Yes	Yes	Ministry of Education should propose the curriculum, which should be devolved to counties	Develop and operationalize civic education curriculum for P/CVE	Yes	Yes		Establish bursary fund to ensure children who pass exams are supported to the next level	Unclear	Unclear	
4	3	2	3	2	2	2	0	4	3	3	1

Table 7: Faith-Based and Ideology Pillar Activities

Table 7: Faith-Based and Ideology Pillar Activities											
Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Government should get right information to target clerics involved in VE without profiling innocent ones	Unclear	Unclear		Address religious profiling and stereotypes	Yes	No		Address religious profiling and stereotyping by law and police	Yes	Yes	National and county governments will set up legal structures for expanding and implementing the rule of law
Set up drug rehabilitation centers across sub-counties	Yes	No						Dialogues with religious leaders on CVE moving toward taking positions against Al-Shabaab	Yes	No	
Strengthen interfaith dialogue in Garissa through regular trainings	Unclear	Unclear									County and national governments should conduct trainings on CVE for civil society, religious leaders, and schoolteachers
3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	2

Table 8: Legal and Policy Pillar Activities

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Security agencies should observe rule of law	Unclear	Unclear		Lobbying and advocacy campaigns on laws and policies around resilience and cultural development	Yes	Yes		Enhance legal awareness on laws and policies, IEC materials, and security	Yes	Yes	
Should be a policy framework regarding public participation in CVE policies and laws	Unclear	Unclear		Enhance provision of legal aid, alternative dispute resolution, and litigation	Yes	Yes					
Create awareness around laws so locals appreciate the laws are not intended to make their life difficult	Unclear	Unclear		Enhance realization of rights for victims of terrorism and counter-terrorism	Yes	Yes					
Address historical injustices and embrace truth, justice, and reconciliation	Unclear	Unclear									
Undertake regular reviews of the laws, policies, and measures to ensure they continuously respond to changing dynamics of VE and terrorism	Unclear	Unclear									
5	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	1	1	1	0

Table 9: Media and Online Pillar Activities

Table 9: Media and Online Pillar Activities											
Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Train local and national reporters to report on terrorism and VE	Unclear	Yes		Alternative and credible narratives to counter extremist propaganda	Yes	Yes		Develop objective reporting of information related to CVE	Yes	Yes	
Government forces should be able to block media outlets belonging to VE suspects	Unclear	Unclear	Government security forces should be able to block media outlets	Enhance reporting of information related to terrorism	Yes	Yes		Social media has allowed online radicalization and recruitment	Unclear	Unclear	Government should install security features that make it impossible to access online platforms that propagate online radicalization and recruitment into VE
Youth should be trained on how to use media as a CVE tool	Unclear	Unclear		Increased dialogues on human rights and security on media platforms	Yes	Yes					
Improve connectivity and communication infrastructures	Unclear	Unclear									
Quarterly meetings with County CVE officials and media for briefings	Yes	No									
5	1	1	1	3	3	3	0	2	1	1	1

Table 10: Refugee and Border Pillar Activities

Table 10: Refugee and Border Pillar Activities											
Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Need to have clear and consistent process for obtaining national ID cards	Unclear	Yes	State should develop and promote process that enhance sense of citizenship of Kenya amongst county residents								
Management of refugees should be open to a participatory method involving communities	Unclear	Yes	Involve communities in setting refugee policies								
Identify locals who might have registered as refugees to find a lasting solution	Yes	Unclear									
3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Note: Only Garissa County included this pillar in its plan											

Table 11: Political Pillar Activities

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Convene a meeting for elected and nominated leaders in the county to present and generate buy-in for GCAP	Yes	No		Political leaders engaging communities, particularly youth and women, to address marginalization and discrimination	Yes	Yes		Political leaders working together on P/CVE and speaking out against it	Yes	Yes	
Ensure there are clear criterion for accessing employment and political participation	Yes	Yes	Make and spread clear criterion	Legal framework in place to promote human rights and access to Justice	Yes	Yes		Corruption	Yes	Yes	State agencies must ensure that corruption is punished
2	2	1	1	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	1

Table 12: Psycho-Social Pillar Activities

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Support should be available in places that are safe for reforming VE suspects and their families	Unclear	Unclear		Provide psychological and social services to the community	Yes	Yes		Provide psychosocial and psychological services to the community	Yes	Yes	NCTC should work and deliver a disengagement program
Develop comprehensive returnee and rehabilitation and reintegration program that is devolved to the county levels	Yes	Yes	Develop and devolve the program	Increase outreach and awareness of the strategy and solutions it offers	Yes	Yes					
Map and publicize services in the county	Yes	Unclear									
Have a toll-free number where those in need of assistance can call	Unclear	Unclear									
4	2	1	1	2	2	2	0	1	1	1	1

Table 13: Security Pillar Activities

Table 13: Security Pillar Activities											
Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Need for trust building between communities and security agencies	Unclear	Unclear		Improved police/ community relations	Yes	Yes					
Interagency security team should work with local communities to address VE conflicts	Unclear	Unclear		Improved village and inter-community safety awareness and programs	Yes	Yes	Outreach activities, community meetings				
Community policing structures should be strengthened	Unclear	Unclear		Increase awareness of the interlink between human rights and security	Yes	Yes	Trainings and capacity building activities	Establish community peace and security committees	Yes	Yes	
County security agencies should coordinate interventions to avoid overlapping responsibilities and security lapses due to lack of clarity of roles and misunderstandings	Unclear	Unclear									

Table 14: Security Pillar Activities (continued)

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Improve coordination and information sharing between local communities and security agencies	Yes	Yes	Improve coordination and information sharing between local communities and security agencies					Establishment of a joint operation committee	Yes	Yes	County and national governments should establish a joint operation committee to enhance coordination
Improve security along borders through increasing number of security personnel and KPRs along the borders	Yes	Yes	Improve security along borders through increasing number of security personnel and KPRs along the borders								National police reservists should be deployed to work with other security agencies
6	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2

Table 15: Training and Capacity Building Pillar Activities

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Ensure these activities reach rural and nomadic populations	Unclear	Unclear		Improved quality of training programs around CVE and curriculum development	Yes	Yes		Improved quality of training on CVE issues, including a curriculum development	Yes	Yes	
Build youth capacity through awareness and development centers	Unclear	Unclear		Increased number of training platforms	Yes	Yes		Investing in training youth on life skills	Yes	Yes	
				Increased number of outreach activities to sensitize communities on human rights	Yes	Yes					
2	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	2	2	2	0

Table 16: Women Pillar Activities

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Should be mechanisms for promoting the role of women in public life in Garissa	Unclear	Unclear		Full involvement of women in P/CVE initiatives	Yes	Yes		Full involvement of women in CVE	Yes	Yes	
Learn from morocco where women were turned into religious scholars and provide religious counter messages	Yes	Unclear		Engagement of women in peace building and conflict management initiatives	Yes	Yes		Engagement of women in peace building and conflict management initiatives	Yes	Yes	
Promote girls and women's education through scholarships, free sanitary pads, and other material	Unclear	Unclear		Improved efforts in promoting women's involvement in action plan implementation	Yes	Yes		General	Unclear	Unclear	Implementation of the 1/3 gender rule
Inculcating the culture of gender-based programming in all CVE and development activities	Unclear	Unclear									
4	1	0	0	3	3	3	0	3	2	2	1

Note: This pillar was included in all of the LAPs, but not in the NAP.

Table 17: Rule of Law Pillar Activities

Table 17: Rule of Law Pillar Activities											
Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Address numerous historical injustices and recent cases of brutality by policy and military personnel	Unclear	Unclear						Provision of legal aid, alternative dispute resolution, and litigation	Yes	Yes	
Should be stronger relationship on P/CVE between the judiciary and all stakeholders	Unclear	Unclear									
Authorities should ensure rule of law to prevent officials from using VE to intimidate, manipulate, or extort citizens	Unclear	Unclear						Increased awareness and respect of the rule of law	Yes	Yes	
National Assembly should review the Terrorism Act of 2012 and repeal punitive and discriminative provisions, especially when considered so by frontier counties	Yes	Yes	National Assembly should review the Terrorism Act of 2012 and repeal punitive and discriminative provisions, especially when considered so by frontier counties								

Table 18: Rule of Law Pillar Activities (continued)

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Kenya National Commission of Human Rights should document all cases of alleged extra-judicial killings in the county and make recommendations to prevent further killings	Unclear	Yes	Kenya National Commission of Human Rights should document all cases of alleged extra-judicial killings in the county and make recommendations to prevent further killings								
Need for regular training of security agencies on relationships with community	Unclear	Yes	Need for regular training of security agencies on relationships with community								
6	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0

Note: Only Garissa and Wajir counties included this pillar.

Table 19: Economic Pillar Activities

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
Support at-risk youth in gaining vocational and employment opportunities	Unclear	Unclear		Trainings and capacity building of vulnerable individuals	Yes	Yes					
Attract investors from within and outside the county	Yes	Unclear		Enhanced service delivery for all by National and County Governments	Yes	Yes	Public empowered to audit public funds. Office bearers more accountable for their decisions				
2	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0

Note: Only Garissa and Mombasa County included this pillar.

Table 20: Miscellaneous Activities

Garissa Plan				Mombasa Plan				Wajir Plan			
Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments	Action	County Role ID	Nat'l Role ID	Requests of National Governments
								Poor physical infrastructure	Yes	Yes	National and county governments coordinate and allocate resources to improving physical infrastructure in the county
								Vast unused land	Yes	Yes	National and county governments should develop a framework for economic use of vast land to improve livelihoods of locals
								Unemployment	Yes	Yes	National and county governments should develop a framework which maps skills of men and women in Wajir county and exposes them to possible employment
								Arms crossing porous borders	Yes	Yes	Relevant agencies should ensure illegal arms do not cross the borders. Those with arms in the country should be given amnesty to surrender.
								Illegal border trade	Yes	yes	Joint border immigration and trade committees to prevent contraband from entering the country
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5

Note: Wajir County included these requests that did not fall under specific pillars but were judged to be relevant.

CVE: Countering Violent Extremism

VE: Violent Extremism

KPR: Kenya Police Reserve

Appendix H: Description of Priority Ratings

		Priorities			
		Cultivating Awareness Raising	Promoting Empowerment	Building Capacity	Connecting Communities
Goals	Social Cohesion	<i>High</i> —increased awareness of the risks of violent extremism increases social cohesion	<i>Medium</i> —empowerment may not lead to open and honest discussions between people with different ideologies and backgrounds	<i>High</i> —political and media elites in the community can create an environment for dialogue between members of the community, leading to more social cohesion	<i>Low</i> —connecting communities in different countries would not increase social cohesion in a community
	Community Agency	<i>High</i> —communities that understand the risks of violent extremism would have increase sense of agency	<i>High</i> —economically empowered communities would have more civic and social engagement	<i>Medium</i> —political and media elites in the community could create a culture of civic and social engagement is communities	<i>Medium</i> —communities might learn how to be more civically and socially engaged from each other
	Equal Access to Opportunities	<i>Low</i> —awareness raising efforts would not contribute to creating equity in societies	<i>High</i> —economically empowering members of the community leads to equality of opportunities in society, reducing the allure of violent extremism	<i>Medium</i> —increased responsiveness of governments might lead to increased access to opportunities	<i>Low</i> —experience sharing among different communities would not lead to increased access to opportunities
	Creating a Sense of Purpose	<i>High</i> —having an increased awareness of the dangers of violent extremism reduce the sense of disaffection that might lead to violent extremism	<i>High</i> —the responsibilities and skills that economically empowered individuals would gain allow them to have a strong sense of purpose	<i>Medium</i> —increased capacity can lead to increased responsiveness, which would lead to creating a strong sense of purpose in individuals	<i>Low</i> —connecting communities in different countries would not increase strong sense of purpose in individuals
	Efficient Allocation of Resources	<i>High</i> —awareness raising campaigns could reach large number of people at low cost	<i>High</i> —activities that promote empowerment can be done at a low cost and can serve large numbers of people	<i>Medium</i> —these activities would require experts, increasing costs	<i>Medium</i> —there are high costs associated with connecting communities in different countries such as translators and travel costs
	Feasibility	<i>High</i> —communities and governments are generally receptive to awareness raising campaigns	<i>Medium</i> —communities may have financial and administrative barriers to creating initiatives that increase empowerment	<i>High</i> —governments are generally more receptive to activities that might improve their capacities	<i>Low</i> —there may be administrative and financial reasons that prohibit connecting communities across different countries

Appendix I: Crafted Interview Questions

While we were unable to perform interviews based on time constraints and the COVID-19 pandemic, we prepared questions that we believe will capture the localization efforts not explicitly outlined in the NAPs from our case studies.

1. Is there clear integration of local entities in the planning and implementation process?
2. What are the biggest issues regarding violent extremism in your community? Does the National Action Plan reflect the prominence of these issues?
3. How do national actors communicate goals from the NAP to local actors? Is this communication stream sufficient?
4. To what extent are local actors involved in the design of the National Action Plan?
5. What would you like to see included in the National Action Plan? Is this included in Local Action Plans?
6. Do the National Action Plans consider the skills of local governments and entities, and how can gaps in their skill sets be improved? (for example, financing or policy implementation)
7. What resources and at what stage of the process do local partners need assistance in implementing Local Action Plans?
8. At the local level, are women, youth, and civil society included in violence prevention initiatives?
9. Do you partner with organizations outside of the government? If so, to what extent and what types of organizations?
10. Do you implement reintegration and rehabilitation processes in tandem with ongoing prevention and development work, ensuring coordination and synergy?